COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, July 23, 2003

The Council met at 9:35 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Deputy Mayor Thomas.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Page for today, I'd like to introduce them.

Sosanna Goodin of Joseph Wolinsky Collegiate, resides in the Old Kildonan Ward.

There's a motion here by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Mayor Murray.

Motion
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Murray

That Council hereby offer its best wishes for a speedy recovery to Councillor O'Shaughnessy;

And That Councillor O'Shaughnessy be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan you have an announcement to make.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Members of Council, it's my great pleasure and honour to introduce some of the Ambassador Generals of Folklorama this year.

Just to quickly note, I've got my traditional outfit, as well I'd like to recognize Councillor Angus and Councillor Vandal for also coming in their traditional outfits as well.

Today we have the Ambassador General's for 2002 – 2003. I'll just call them up individually here.

Representing the India Pavilion we have Mr. Arvin Bahri.

Representing the Portugal Pavilion we have Tania Santos.

Representing the Scotland Pavilion we have Mr. Edward Court.

The Ambassador General's for 2003 and 2004, representing the Alpine Pavilion we have Andrea Berger.

Representing the Alsalvadore Pavilion we have Juan Antonio Monterrosa.

Representing the Tamil Pavilion we have Cindi Kirupakaran.

Representing the Warsaw Poland Pavilion we have Tom Kalkiewicz.

Thank you very much for coming down to Council and hopefully all of us will have a chance to see you during the two weeks of festivities of Folklorama.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Welcome Ambassador's to City Council.

MINUTES

Councillor Wyatt moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on June 25, 2003, be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Now we get into delegations. The ten minute slot, Theresa Ducharme.

DELEGATIONS

Ms Theresa Ducharme: Thank you Mr. Speaker and Councillors and all those people present.

I represent the residents of Transcona on my behalf as I've been a resident there since 1945. At that the same time I am very very aggravated and disturbed on the restructuring of the four district area at the point that the railway tracks all the consideration for Transcona residents has not been considered in the restructuring because of the fact that people such as myself and others fought to get to Transcona, we fought to keep Transcona, and we would like to make sure that we have the police station and all the public safety features as all other areas that are brand new and reconstructed and everybody is on top of everything. Yet every time Transcona gets anything they remove it. We're always at the tail end of everything to say that we don't exist, yet we have to pay the same property taxes, and we have to do everything like everybody else, and it aggravates me that they even get off their bedside to wonder how we're going to cross those railway tracks to get into the City of Winnipeg itself because it's always construction, or there's always something happening that Transcona is never even involved or protected as well as any other area of the City of Winnipeg.

I can't believe the four area structure, City Hall itself. When it was to be readministered and also redeveloped, they left it in the same place. The same as the general hospital. Big major areas like that that we depend upon such as our police department, we should have it in the same area where we recognize it, we accept it, also we go to it and we ask for help and we know exactly where it is instead of going to St. Boniface, point to everyplace else and saying, why don't we become one whole city and why municipalities. Why do we need city councillors? We used to have 50 other councillors running the City at one time, then we went down to 29 fools, now it's down to 15 councillors, and at the same time I can't believe why we need 15 councillors in this whole area. Why don't you look at your own face and your own development and the cost of what it costs the taxpayers to have you people here as councillors running our city and destroying our city because of the fact that, in Toronto they've got major major development of all sorts and manufacturing you name it and yet they only have nine councillors in the whole City of Toronto. Now why do we have to be down shamed in having a four district area for the Police Department. I was shocked to hear they weren't involving 5,000 more police officers because of the notice of crime and also people on the medical alert system.

I'm still alive thank God to them maybe that's why you people have redeveloped this restructuring to remove half of us so that we don't have the same protection as we do now. If there's a problem in our home we press our medical alert system, the Police come to us and it's not because of the crime it's because of medical, safety need and also life threatening situations. At that same time the Police are running here, there and everywhere, we should have 5,000 more police officers. I will be taking up a petition to see if we can reduce the number of councillors again back to seven. We could have seven Apostles here instead of having seven councillors destroying our whole City of Winnipeg.

I represent also People In Equal Participation Inc. Our PEP Organization is very very aggravated because of the people that are all on the medical alert system.

(9:42)

They're disabled, they're unable, more and more people are going out into the community, thank God for small favours. He's working overtime, I'm sure that's why we're not getting water, any rain, and pretty soon everybody is going to have to get down on their hands and knees and thank the Lord that I was even able to make it today because of my health condition not being the best that it should be. That's why Russ Wyatt's got a receding hairline too because he's working overtime. Right Russ? That's right, you're doing double duty here.

Mr. Lazarenko I haven't seen you aged in years, and at the same time are you sure

you're doing anything? That's what I want to know. Glen Murray has always got his back to his people that's why he's not working with us. There you go.

If Mr. Angus can pull his skirt down I wouldn't have such a frustrated heart. I'm bringing some jokes into this situation because I'm not here to destroy the councillors but at the same time I'd like them to reconsider the medical needs of people in all the areas and the safety features not only in crime situations that the Police are dedicated in doing because they've expended themselves beyond the call of duty, and at the same time there's over 5,000 of us pressing a medical alert system, and that's why there should be more police officers.

Has anybody done a restructuring of finding out what the duties of the police officers really are? Has anybody done research on that area or just that the building was dilapidated so we wanted to remove it? I can't understand why administration office and all City Council can stay in the same place, why don't you move it out to Steinbach so we can go out to Steinbach and say, well we're part of the Steinbach area as well. Come on Mr. Lazarenko, I want to hear a word from somebody here or are you all dead. I'm waiting for a comment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are you through with your delegation?

Ms. Ducharme: No I'm not, I still have a few words I want to wake you up first. At the same time the four district structure that you people did do, seems it was like without the involvement much involvement from the public itself, or public awareness.

When a bus, you're going to increase the bus fare, you put it out there for six months and you do this and you do that, and you give public awareness so people get stimulated, also encouraged and you also get involved and you make sure that everything is going to be for the positive not the negative.

At this stage a restructuring and saying well, we want to cut back costs, we want to save money, we want to do this we want to do that, at that the same there's hardly much awareness for the general public. In order to speak for the Police or with the Police, everybody is scared of the Police because of the fact that it's only dealing with crime. But the Police are there for many many many reasons, and at the same time that's why the four district area going from one, two, three, four from six, is not the answer for the Transconians or for the City of Winnipeg. We're going to have to go to court, whether it has to go to another position besides making the decision here, our PEP Organization will be reviewing all angles and all areas to protect the people in Transcona equal as all other citizens and not because the station has to be redeveloped someplace, so we'll place it in St. Boniface. We'll place it in St. Boniface across the tracks and we'll do this and we'll do that as long as we don't involve Transcona. And protect Transcona equal as all other areas.

At the same time it gives me a pain in the side that's not what I really want to say, because I want to be a lady, at the same time I really really thank the Lord for the sunshine today and the encouragement of getting me out of bed 6 o'clock this morning just to be here today because of the fact that all services aren't the same when we have to come here. At the same time, for the Councillors and everybody else that are here I hope you seriously consider all the angles, all the needs and the restructuring because of the fact that once you want to decrease in the area of importance by saying we only need four districts, we don't six, we don't need six office services.

It really really, hurts my feelings inside to think that with the population increase and the crime increase that we can do with four offices for the Police Department instead of six so that they have a closer location to go and you must consider from St. Boniface to Transcona the time location and everything else, to have our station in Transcona the way it is, and to have other people come to Transcona so that we can be part of the City of Winnipeg, then we should be considered

to pay the same taxes and equal services are ours. At the same time I can't believe that you people would make the wrong decision today because at the same time you'll probably be in the hospital bed with me because I'm going to outlive all of you.
Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any questions? Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker for the offer. I thought I heard the delegation mention that there was nine city councillors in Toronto. I popped up the website because I thought that sounded strange.

It says, Toronto City Council is comprised of a Mayor and 44 city councillors.

Ms Ducharme: We're talking about nine at a time. Nine show up a time.

Councillor Steeves: Sorry. Gotcha.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. No questions. Thank you.

Theresa thank you as always.

The next delegation is Brent Leeson also in opposition to Item No. 1.

Is Brent Leeson present?

We've got two more delegations if we get suspension of the rules and then we've got one delegation in support. Brent you have 5 minutes.

(9:50)

Mr. Brent Leeson: I'm a resident of Transcona, and I come as such non political just a resident looking at the issue of policing.

I'd like to say first that I voted for our councillor because he was very strong on public safety. I looked at his brochures, it's been that since day one. Any attacks I've seen in the paper on me and our Transcona citizens not on our councillor because he is speaking for us. I'd like to just make that point because it bothers me.

As a community we are concerned on public safety right from the beginning as I said when he was elected looking at voting for him, that was a big big issue. Transcona crime is going up like everywhere else.

I look at the four model policing and I say, does that make me feel safer. I say, no. I look and say does the removal of the police station presence in our area on Pandora, that we've always had, there's always been one there, we've never been without, does that make me feel safer? No.

A police officers uniform to me commands respect, when I see the uniform it's respect.

When you drive by the police station it commends respect. You see it there, you know there's a presence there. You're saying you're going to remove it.

Right now in the cars if there's an emergency and I live at the east end of Transcona, we had one night 12 cars, it wasn't in the paper I'm surprised, there was a beating out front, they were kicking a guys head in. Nothing in the paper because he didn't die I guess. There were 12 cars, eventually six came, six came, where did they come from. Another part of town. That happens and they pull our cars, right now we have a station there. I know I can go down to the station and see somebody on duty. When that station is gone, when those cars are gone, I feel helpless. And there's a psychology behind the whole thing when you think of being piece of mind for safety, when you know it's there and you can walk down there, and drive down there if you need to be. There's something about that, and to live in quality of life in our city, in our community, we need that.

I look now and say our access is going to be limited to the availability of a phone and a car in the area. I see you shaking your head Mr. Murray. Well when there's no police station for me, I talking as a citizen and you can say it's not accurate but I live out there and respectfully I say, I

look at my children, my neighbours, I spoke to many people and we look at it to say, okay, we have no station on Pandora. Now finally you have to phone to say you have an issue or there's a crime going on, whatever the case. I've heard they'll be more cars, more availability out there. The fact is, it comes down to me making a phone call to get in contact with the Police. Right now I can go down to Pandora and talk to the Police. When that's gone it's a big issue for us in Transcona. I'm speaking again how we feel. You might not agree with it, we have a different perspective, that's how we feel. That doesn't leave us with the peace of mind, it's not a comforting feeling.

The bottom line what I want to say, we got hit with amalgamation in a lot of ways. Most recently the school. We've had our school board ripped in two, and blind faith we're supposed to take it in. It's going to be savings. All these promises. I think we're being asked to do the same thing again. Blind faith, believe us. I haven't seen proof of how we will be safer because that's the issue to me, not asbestos in the building, changing rooms that were built in '74 that don't accommodate both sexes anymore. Safety is what we're concerned about. I need to see how it's safer.

I'm probably losing my time here. The point I want to make is, we'd like to see a guarantee. That community office that the Police Chief when he was in Transcona he said, we will definitely look at a community office if we do this. The other thing is, there's talk I've seen on TV the other day of Dugald and Lagimodiere. I'd like us just to leave our station on Pandora personally. But this is a freight train, political freight train that's going, and I think it's going to happen. Our councillor on our behalf we've looked and said, okay, if we have a guarantee of Lagimodiere and Dugald and if we have a community office in Transcona, and these are compromises because they're just office hours for that community. We would go for that. All I'm asking you Sir is that that be in this report that that guarantee is there because we've been told that by yourself, by the Police Chief we've put upon us. If it isn't then that's what we would like to see. If it isn't that is what we would like to see is those guarantees, then we can have peace. Otherwise we want just leave it as it is, leave our station.

That's basically what I want to say. Thank you for listening to me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Any questions to the delegation. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Leeson for coming forward today and speaking to this Council on this matter.

As you're aware today the report that's before us does not include specifics on the police service centre in Transcona or other communities around the City. From what I gather from what you're saying today that you feel if that were part of the report of the recommendations coming forward that would address your concern and maybe the concerns of your neighbours that there be a police presence in the future, that it become policy?

Mr. Leeson: That's my concern because I think it's going through, it's going to happen, and that's what we would like to see.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Murray.

Mayor Murray: Thanks Mr. Leeson. I apologize to you because I think there's been a great deal of confusion if not an outright disinformation campaign.

The decision of assignment of police cars, and the decision of location of police administrative offices, like the district offices and service centres, police service centres which are the frontline offices are not a decision of this council. It will never be voted on here. That decision is already made. The decision was made by the Police Chief, I think he announced it a couple of months ago in one of a 11 public consultations that he held. Jack

Ewatski, our Police Chief who I have a lot of confidence in has made a decision that there will be a community service centre right in downtown Transcona actually closer to the part of the City you live in.

Also last term on Council this Council added a fourth police car for the first time, and 18 additional officers in Transcona which was the biggest single increase in police services which no other part of the City got. And, we've increased the budget of the Police Department by I think in excess of $50 million in the last five years. This will put more police officers out in the neighbourhood.

I'm sorry you got misinformation. That will never be voted on, and I don't want to start the precedent of playing politics with police service office, that is the decision of the Police Chief. He consults the public independently. Eleven consultations and that.

I'm not sure you were aware of that. I would ask you if you were aware of that, I would also ask you if you would meet with the Police Chief and the Senior Inspector in the District 4 area. I'd be glad to arrange a community meeting for you.

Mr. Leeson: I was at one of those 11 meetings. I'd like to know have we seen a report on the recommendations of the citizens that were brought forward. Have we seen a report how it's affected either way the decision on what's going on with the models.

The other thing is, that decision that's made by the Police Chief then that's great, if it's already been made, let's put it in this thing today. You don't have to vote on it, but let's put in there that our Chief has said that. That's great, you've already okayed it.

(10:10)

Mayor Murray: Are you aware then, I'll put it that way, I conclude by saying, that is not the purview of the City Council. That is entirely the decision of the Police Chief.

Mr. Leeson: I would like to say regarding today's vote then, okay I understand what you're saying yes I do, my point is then, you are voting today right to basically say you're okaying the model and that Pandora will be gone.

All I'm saying, it's fine you can go and vote this today, then hold off your vote until where that new station will be is in place until we have the guarantee again of that service centre which you're saying to me that we have, then have that's in place that we know, and then vote to remove our station. But you're saying, do it first and I've seen this before, and as a citizen we've all seen it before where it sounds good and I'm not questioning your integrity, I'm not questioning that's going to happen but I'm saying, we've seen it before. We'd like to just have some guarantees for a change.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you for coming down here today. Are you aware question, the report on the public consultations which recommends the Police Chief's recommendations of where the service centres will go is a public document that's available at City Clerk's, it was received as information by the Standing Committee which is the normal process. The Police Chief reports to that committee with his intentions on issues that are operational. That's received as information by us.

You could obtain that report if you weren't able to be at that meeting. It's public information. I just wanted to ask you if you were aware of that.

Mr. Leeson: I think we're coming from two different perspectives here. I'm a citizen. I'm not a politician. I'm getting some political spin here and that's okay. I'll tell you something. The reason I'm here, let's simplify this here.

I'm here because today you're going to vote to take Pandora away. And I've heard, yes of the reports but I just want some guarantees. I don't think anybody

can guarantee anything. That's all we're asking. This isn't disinformation campaigns, this isn't motives, this is people of Transcona, our safety, we live out there. You're going to take something that's been there forever away from us and that's an important thing. We've got children out there.

Don't think the criminals wouldn't know if they pull all the cars out of Transcona that's there nobody there. It's not rocket science to figure that out.

My point here is, you're voting today to take our station away. We'd like a couple of guarantees. I don't think that's such a bad thing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further questions? Thank you Mr. Leeson.

Councillor Wyatt you're moving suspension.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, it's come to my attention that there's others who wish to speak on this issue, and I'd to move suspension of the rules.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have here Ron Schultz and Valerie Wadepuhl also in opposition. Are both of them present? Ron. Valerie are you up in the gallery too? Please come down.

Suspension of the rules, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Ron you have five minutes.

Mr. Ron Schultz: As you can see my hair is about the same colour as Councillor Angus' there so we've been around for a while.

I moved to Transcona in 1955 when the sign out on Plessis Road and Dugald said that there was 8,000 happy people there. I think for all things said, I think we were at that time. I can't say that the same thing applies today.

We had our own police and we had own mayor. I think at that time they listened to the voice of the people.

I'm sure that we're not a small town anymore like we were then. However, what I'm about to say is that, it's relative to it all.

If you go outside of the City of Winnipeg to some smaller towns who have their own police force, they don't build their police departments and stations two miles out of town, they build them right in town where they should be.

I worked on service for 20 some odd years, I drove from one end of the City to the other. Believe you me I've seen all kinds of traffic. We see individuals cutting in and out on the road, speeding. When they caught up to a cruiser car they maintained the same type of routine that they should have been in the first place. This is what I'm saying. Once you take our police station away the visual presence of them are gone, and what have we got left.

I hear that we're going to have more cars in the area. Great. However, what happens when the cars check in and check out at the police station two miles away. They're still not going to show the same presence as if they're shown checking in when the police station is in Transcona.

I know they say they're going to save millions of dollars here, what the hell is the reason for having a police force if we're not getting the value for our money. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any questions of the delegation? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I just wanted to thank Mr. Schultz for coming down here and making your presentation. The points were well taken.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's not a question.

The next delegation in the five minute slot, Valerie Wadepuhl also in opposition to Item 1.

Ms Valerie Wadepuhl: Thank you so much for hearing me today.

Last night Jennifer walked me through on my computer how to download this whole report.

I can't understand how replacing five with three can be an improvement. It just doesn't make sense to me, that's like saying you're going to improve the presence of my financial situation by putting $3 in my wallet instead of $5. It just doesn't add up.

However, I'm looking at page 5030. It says, a recommendation, a new police station within 2 kilometres of Dugald Road and Lagimodiere. Aren't we lucky now that we've gone metric. Two miles I might be able to live with, but one mile is 1.6 kilometres. It's almost just a little over a mile that the police station will be. Not only that, that's awfully far away from Transcona. Dugald Road and Lagimodiere.

It says, they're recommending having a fully operational police service centre in downtown Transcona. This sounds very nice, however, I would like to know, I wish somebody would tell me, what the heck fully operational means. Because Tim Horton's is fully operational.

(10:08)

They're open 24 hours a day. It's bad enough that our police station when I moved to Transcona in '75 used to be open 24 hours a day, now in the evening it's not open. I don't like that that service has been cut.

It says that fully operational police service centres must be established in both Transcona and St. Boniface prior to the closures of District 4 and District 5 Police Stations. Again, please tell me what does fully operational mean. I can't see how a storefront police station that's not open the hours that is needed is fully operational. Why did you put in the word fully, why did you even bother.

Again, there's aspects where it says, this report be considered by the Committee prior to reconsidering the four district model. I think that there's a lot of things that haven't been considered yet prior to.

On page 5034, recommendation number two it says, the replacement of five existing police stations existing police locations with three newly constructed police stations at each of the sites referred to herein. Where are the sites referred to herein? There is no specific sites referred to. This is far too vague. I understand that you have to kind of keep things hush hush if you want to acquire property because otherwise the prices will escalate by the seller to the City. But I feel that some of these things should have been put in place before these big decisions are made.

I was speaking to somebody who is with the police station in Ottawa last night. They have a similar situation there as you are proposing here. It has not been more efficient, it has not supplied the people with the help they need as much as it did when they had the type of situation we had, we don't even have it anymore, when there were police stations individually.

I was helping with the petition. Now the petition doesn't say that we're against police stations, it doesn't say we're against new ones, we do need more state of the art. However, some of the people were saying, they're taking it away, we need an extra one never mind taking one out, they should build another one out here. I don't think we're getting the service that our taxes are paying for.

I really wish that there could be more of a plan put before the public before you just push this through so quickly. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any questions of the delegation? Thank you.

The final delegation that will get 10 minutes in support, is Peter Skakum and Edward Plozsay.

Mr. Peter Skakum: Good morning Mayor Murray, City Councillors. My name is Peter Skakum. I am the Chair of the West Kildonan Residents' Association. As I have in previous presentations I want to make absolutely clear and we really need the identification. Is the fact that I represent West Kildonan. We are West Kildonan, we are not the North End to spite what the electoral boundaries might indicate.

We support the Police Department's rationale to develop a four district system. What we have objection to, the Police Department have not been forthright with their plans and their rationales in terms of the locations of the stations and the community offices as you've already heard this morning.

We also support the City of Winnipeg by doing everything in our power to keep our properties in West Kildonan totally maintained, bettering our properties which in turn attracts stable families to West Kildonan, and keeps the incidents from crime down. That's critical, we need that here in the City so badly.

The City of Winnipeg profits from the efforts from all of our community members by keeping those property values up and criminal activity down in spite of the fact that we're dealing with our roads crumbling, with our trees being in dire need of pruning and in most cases the limbs really covering off most of the illumination of the street lamps.

West Kildonan is a community on the brink. We're suffering the same fate and will suffer the same fate as the North End. In a very short period of time the West Kildonan Residents' Association was able to muster 125 of its residents to an emergency town hall meeting back in the spring, which was just the first of the hearings and of course we had a second hearing with the Police Department at West Kildonan Collegiate.

I'd like you all to imagine if you can the loss of the Winnipeg Jets and I think we can all remember that. The loss of the CFA Team contract and the emotions attached to that. Numerous corporate offices that we continually lose to Edmonton, Calgary, Vancouver. Imagine Winnipeg's roads crumbling, the Hells Angels gaining foothold in our city. Imagine the City having the dubious honour of being known as the murder capital of Canada. Now I'd like you to imagine losing the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, the Winnipeg Symphony and they're in danger. The Winnipeg Blue Bombers, Rainbow Stage, the Forks all of them could go. None by the way are essential services. But lose them as we have some of the icons we already have and you begin to lose the soul of a city. The City begins to disintegrate. Rather than attracting the erudite, the influential, the proactive, the entrepreneurial, the community spirited personalities, Winnipeg begins to attract the independent or rather dependant individuals.

Subsistence dwellers who further compromise the City's image, compromise the City's resources, who are consumers rather than creators. More individuals who stretch the resources of the Police Department because they live on the periphery of law and order. Crime begins to escalate, alienating even more of our citizens who are already running scared. Moving away from the older neighbourhoods into the newer developed neighbourhoods. Moving out of Winnipeg, moving out of Manitoba.

Now imagine the eventual shell of a city trying to regain its place in the sun. Pretty tough thing to do.

I mention all of this because now councillors I'd like you to transpose everything I've said from the City of Winnipeg to a neighbourhood, and the very same dynamics apply.

A police station in our community represents more than safety, it represents more than uniqueness, influence. It represents more than authority. What it represents is stability. That is what we are so dearly trying to hang onto in West Kildonan.

West Kildonan is an older community. It's not Whyte Ridge, it's not Lindenwoods, we don't have the stature of Tuxedo, River Heights. But what we do have, is we have a congregation of committed proud homeowners fighting to create a unique stable community within which we can raise our babies, sustain our equity and be able to turn that equity over to our offspring at some point.

(10:17)

Councillors, no one in the slums in the stressed communities of the City of Winnipeg are lobbying to bring a new police station into their fold. No one in our city's distressed neighbourhoods is presenting a rationale to attract a police station to their streets. Why? Because the nature of most of the individuals that live in these very stressed communities, these slums, don't attract community spirited people. Their idea of community spirit is swilling beer at 2 in the morning after the bars have closed while they sit on their rooftops spouting profanities, they're down on the lawn urinating in the bushes, clothing hanging from mailboxes, doors hanging off of hinges, blowing in the wind. Pickup trucks being driven up on boulevards, littering, wild parties. Disgustingly maintained yards and homes, and yes even murder.

Do I know of what I speak? Well Mayor, Councillors I do, I live right next to a house just like that.

We call the City of Winnipeg for help in dealing with these properties and this is just one of many in West Kildonan, to enforce the very by-laws that have been put into place to protect us from these sort of things, and we are flatly and blatantly ignored.

Then to add insult to injury the City of Winnipeg is contemplating locating a new north city police station within two kilometres north or south of Redwood and Arlington. Doesn't sound like anywhere in West Kildonan I know.

The very icon of stability our community so desperately needs is being denied families who have done everything in their power to keep West Kildonan from becoming a burden to the City. We're looking for support, that kind of reciprocation.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that we have no illusion that a police station built in West Kildonan will result in faster police response times to our homes.

The Chief of Police has pointed out time and again in every one of the public hearings on the four district model, that the station locations will not impact on response time because cruisers are dispatched from the downtown station.

Our logic for keeping needing the new station in West Kildonan is the same logic we all support or we have all supported for keeping the Jets here in Winnipeg. We recognize how important it was to try to keep the Jets here. That dynamic applies in West Kildonan. It is that critical for us to keep our police station, the new police station built in West Kildonan.

West Kildonan has more to lose without a station than the North End will ever hope to gain. The dignity and morale of our community will be irreparably damaged if we lose the station or lose a station. So why then is our Police Chief so singularly focused on sacrificing the critical mass of West Kildonan to the detriment of our community in favour of building a station in the North End which will likely go on Aberdeen and Arlington in the old Margaret Scott School Grounds. Where its presence and impact on that neighbourhood will hardly be felt at all. Why did the Winnipeg Police Department come to West Kildonan….

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You're speaking in opposition now to the clause that's before us. You're marked down as in support.

Mr. Skakum: We are in support of the four district system, and I haven't changed my position on that one iota.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would you please stick to that.

Mr. Skakum: The premise here ladies and gentlemen is the fact that while we support the four district system, we're simply asking for help to keep our community together by building the new north city police station in West Kildonan.

As I was saying, why did the Winnipeg Police Department come to West Kildonan Collegiate to listen to our concerns and then flatly ignore them without a single word of justification because we haven't heard any. In fact Chief Ewatski failed to attend our hearing at the West Kildonan Collegiate.

Finally I'd just like to say ladies and gentlemen, build and I know the decision isn't yours to be made it's Police Chief Ewatski's and I ask for your support in helping the Police Chief make a decision in our favour. Influence them please.

Build a police station where you know it's wanted. Build a police station where you know it's valued and that we will add value to it. That where men and women are still willing in a community, where men and women are still willing to stand for what they believe, it's critically important to our future. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Skakum you've taken up the time of the next speaker. You said you were going to share the time with him.

Mr. Skakum: You then said we had 10 minutes each.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I said you had 10 minutes for both of you.

Mr. Skakum: So where do we stand?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Plozsay gets five minutes.

Mr. Edward Plozsay: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Chair, City Councillors. My name is Edward Plozsay, it's Polish.

Basically just give you a little bit of history. My father grew up on Aberdeen Avenue. My mother grew up on Magnus Avenue. They attended Holy Ghost Church on Selkirk Avenue. Basically my roots are in North Winnipeg.

My grandfather was building houses in the Rural Municipality of West Kildonan back in the 1950s he was a contractor.

I basically built a house in West Kildonan, I tore down an older home in West Kildonan I built a new house next door to my parents. If you want urban renewal, I put my money where my mouth is, I did urban renewal. My sister lives across the street. It's a community within a community. I also work in West Kildonan.

I'm here with Peter, I'm the Director of the West Kildonan Residents' Association. Just to point out a few things.

My father was also an assessor with Manitoba Hydro for 33 years and he was also on the Board of Revision with the City of Winnipeg upon his retirement from Manitoba Hydro. I know a little bit about property assessments.

I would like to read you the principle of anticipation. This principle affirms that values arise by means of anticipated benefits to be delivered in the future, and in value sense it is a future which is of account. The past is buried with its yesterday's 10,000 years and all incomes and benefits of the past have been collected and spent. The only significance of past incomes if any, is the indication of the amounts of future incomes. Therefore follows that value of property is not collected by what it is sold for in the past, or the price paid by its owners, or its cost of creation, rather it effectively set by what perspective owners anticipate it will do for them in the future. Such as the amount of net income reasonably expected.

In value process the emphasis belongs on the anticipation of what the future holds in store and not upon a realization of the past .

I would also like to read you the principle of regression. Where there's an interplay between properties there's a trend in adjusting towards the lower or less value.

The classic example is a barrel of apples in which one is spoiled. This good will not cure the bad, but the bad eventually will reduce the value of the good. Will reduce the value of the good.

A neighbourhood. A neighbourhood is a division of a city community. It is a segment within a large unit of the community. Is a grouping of individuals of similar reasons. Whether they be for commercial industrial, residential, cultural or civic reasons. It is shaped and moulded by social economic and civic factors and any fluctuation of these broad basic factors will modify its character. The appraiser considers the pattern of the neighbourhood. The sector encompassing the neighbourhood. The shifting nature of neighbourhoods.

(10:25)

The appraiser raises in measures the neighbourhood under three headings. Social, physical, economic and governmental. Factors which have a positive effect on the neighbourhood. The natural advantages of topography. The good approach. Prestige, good planning and subdivision. Cultural advantages. Civic minded population with a sense of community responsibility. I have community responsibility. I put my money where my mouth was, I did not move out to East St. Paul, or West St. Paul or St. Andrews. I moved and I built in West Kildonan.

Factors which contribute to the derogation of the neighbourhoods. The trends towards new land away from the core. Miscellaneous factors, taxes, zoning laws, lack of poor planning, and lack of community pride.

List of factors in residential neighbourhoods. Schools, churches, commercial buildings, police departments. Taxes, street layouts, subdivision methods so on and so on.

Just to point something else out to you and this is from the City of Winnipeg. This is my assessments.

In 1995 I was assessed at it was a 1,200 square foot bungalow with all the extras for my wife. I was assessed at $97,500. In 1999 my assessment dropped down to $92,400. I lost $5,100 of assessed value. How long do I sit and wait and watch my assessment drop.

I'd like to point out one more thing to you please. This comes from the City of Winnipeg, June 6, 2001. Basically it's a map of the City of Winnipeg and I'd like you to look at the core of that map. At the core of the map is decrease greater than 13%. I'd like to read you a quote from your Chief Assessor Mr. Moore.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You're not even speaking to the topic what we're here for.

Mr. Plozsay: I'm pointing out by losing something within the neighbourhood you put the whole neighbourhood in a negative light. The City of Winnipeg with all its perception, and it's perception that we're fighting. How can you deny me? I've always lived in West Kildonan all my life. I've lived on the same street since 1966. You could allow me a few more minutes.

You would not let me speak on this matter that's so important.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Speak to the subject Ed.

Mr. Plozsay: Meanwhile the primary assessment confirms that an innercity is a huge black hole as decaying property values. Moore said he didn't have an estimate of the lost value but it has been roughly estimated in the past as being in the millions of dollars.

Mr. Lazarenko, Councillor Harry Lazarenko said, reassessment will make it more difficult to rebuild a city since the collapse of property values will only discourage people from moving into the area. Fueling the downward spiral.

Mr. Harvey Smith, innercity residents will benefit from lower property taxes, but Councillor Smith said, lower housing values are hardly something to look

forward to. It's like a small neighbourhood or a small town losing its grain elevator. That's what West Kildonan has to lose. How much more do we lose in our neighbourhood. Build a new station but please take into consideration, build it in West Kildonan. Thank you. And thank you for the allotted time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There's a question. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Sir, I'm confused. Are you here to support the four station model?

Mr. Plozsay: Mr. Smith is by not having a new station in West Kildonan you take more out of the neighbourhood, and by taking more out of the neighbourhood the neighbourhood regresses. Over time and the interplay between neighbourhoods we lose in the neighbourhood that I'm in and the neighbourhood that I live in and the neighbourhood that I support.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your second question Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: It's still not clear to me. If you were a city councillor sitting around this chamber today, would you support the four district model?

Mr. Plozsay: As I said before Mr. Smith I support the model. What I'm asking Council to do is to consider building or having influence on the Police Chief to build the station in West Kildonan Mr. Smith. I'm all in favour of a four district model, I would just like to see the station be built in West Kildonan in order to keep the neighbourhood together and keep what we have in that neighbourhood together.

If I can point out to you the West Kildonan Public Library was built by the City of West Kildonan. The fire hall on McGregor was built by the City of West Kildonan. The community centre on Perth Avenue was built by the City of West Kildonan. Maybe it's time that the City of Winnipeg build the new police station in West Kildonan. Save what you have, don't let it be degraded.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further questions? If not, thank you.

Executive Policy Committee, Report of July 16, 2003.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 16, 2003

Mayor Murray: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would move the consent agenda Items 1 through 5.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Items 1 and 4. No. 1 has been stood down. The rest all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 1.

Item No. 1 – Funding from the City Centre Land Dedication Reserve Fund – Corydon Avenue Business Improvement Zone Benches and Seating File EP-2

Mayor Murray: This is just a report that comes through Executive Committee from the Community Committee. We're just passing it onto Council. I don't know the details of it Mr. Speaker. I think it's on policy under a capital acquisition on Corydon Avenue Business Improvement Zone which I think has come out of the Community Committee before.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I didn't raise this as an nuisance item but I think it's germane to the debate that's going to be coming later on.

When this particular clause came to our community committee the Chair was very frank in stating, it did not meet criteria for a community incentive grant. Said accordingly I'm going to be moving it to land dedication reserve, which also doesn't meet criteria for.

The fascinating thing about it is simply this. What are the sets of rules around here about? I think it's fascinating that Executive Policy Committee where land dedication reserve accounts go, it says point blank. In number two, waive the criteria.

I have no objections to the issue. I voted against it as a matter of principle because if we've got a set of rules, are there one set of rules for Council, the members that are not on EPC and another set of rules for EPC? The Chair was very very frank in stating it, it didn't meet CIG criteria, it doesn't also meet land dedication reserve criteria. But we're going to be moving it this morning with the blessings of EPC. I guess I'd be fascinated to hear why. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

(10:33)

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. I would just like to hear a reply on this if we could from the respective councillor without making nasty politics here. I think it's important that we just describe for ourselves as we go through this issue today how we end up with this particular process. I seem to recall during the course of the last 4 ½ years that we have indeed taken the CIGPs for selected issues to support business zones and whatnot. It seemed to have passed muster around here because it made sense on behalf of the individual councillor.

Perhaps we could have just a further explanation rather than dig into valuable land dedication money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. It is a bit difficult right now because right now we're really acting in the absence of policy, we're about to make I think we're going to have a very interesting debate today and make some changes to policy. I was trying to avoid acting outside of policy and I guess it's difficult in that particular case to do that.

I think Councillor Steek raises a good point. However, it's a small project. It's a worthy project. It's something I've done for the Corydon BIZ for the last 3 years.

We've all broken the criteria on the community incentive grant and I know people today are probably going to get up and point fingers at everyone else. I don't intend to point fingers at everybody else on this issue or any of these other issues because I think what we're talking about is what kind of policies do we want to have and how do we give Council the authority to have some sense of control over our policies so that they make sense.

I have certainly have never said that I've never broken criteria on CIG, I do it quite often. After our debate today I think we can come up with policies that we can all follow and we can all be a better more fiscally responsible government. If people choose not to support this today I respect that and I'll go back to the BIZ and explain that Council doesn't support it. In the future I hope that all of us can make a better more fiscally responsible decision and have clear policies that the public can understand. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Murray you want to speak.

Mayor Murray: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. I have said over and over again that until the policy changed I would support anything that came through a community committee because I didn't think it was fair. I think we abrogated our community incentive grant policy. It's interesting hearing that from Councillor Steek because he stands out singularly as the leader in having come to Council repeatedly with things that are not.

I'm not sure why this does not meet criteria. It is a capital investment. It is a physical piece of property being installed on city property. These are benches, you can see them. They're installed. If it isn't criteria it's darn close. I'm not sure and quite frankly Councillor Steek I appreciate you catching it. I didn't, when I read it, I assumed it met criteria.

We're talking about a physical bench, they're made of granite. They're at bus stops and all along Corydon Avenue. We're buying something that is city-owned to improve a business district. This is a far cry from the kinds of things we've seen here of operating grants to organizations that have absolutely nothing to do with the City or any purpose.

This is a shade of grey. It does require a simple majority of Council to suspend the rules. I'm quite happy if we made it 2/3rds. This is about as close if it's not in the rules it's about as close as you can get.

Having said that, I think we're about to launch a review of land dedication shortly. We had Councillor Lubosch here with a very good proposal and we didn't stand in the way of that. I've actually gone out and visited this project. It was quite impressive. Councillor Lubosch and I are now working on some funding alternatives of how we build these things into the budget in the future.

I want to make since this seems to be the preamble to the upcoming debate. This has been a debate going on for two years. I've invited many of you my dear friend Councillor Steek and others to come up with a policy framework that would address operating grants and things that don't fit the criteria. And two years later for all the carping and complaining and criticism not one councillor has sat down and taken pen to paper outside of the committee members and come up with an alternative. Today finally when push comes to shove there's a proposal from Councillor Vandal and Councillor Steeves to look at a modification of a coherent accountable framework and I want to commend Councillor Steeves and Councillor Vandal for actually contributing something positive because it's very easy to criticize around here.

If you want an alternative to community incentive grants. Land dedication I'm not sure why this doesn't meet criteria. We could certainly refer it back. It's a small project. This is the pot calling the kettle black. This one is so close to the criteria that it's hard to imagine.

If you want to vote against it, vote against it. I think given the latitude that many members of council have had in the last two years, and I think I've been very supportive when I said, engage in the debate. You know it's coming. You've known it's coming for two years. Come up with better ideas. Come up with alternatives. There's been an absolute famine of ideas on this and here we are today.

If you want to look at land dedication I'll say the same thing. I'm prepared to be flexible until we review the rules but once we've agreed to a new set of rules then I think we should follow them. If you projects that don't fit the rules, build them into the budget as we did with things like art city as we'll be doing with Councillor Lubosch's proposals, or come up with another program and argue it in front of your colleagues. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. A recorded vote called by Councillor Steek. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as taken:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Clement, De Smedt, Steek.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 3.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's carried.

Next on the agenda, clause 4.

Item No. 4 – Federation of Canadian Municipalities – Infrastructure Program File GC-5.1

Councillor Steeves: Just briefly Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

I just want to pull Council's attention to Item No. 4. It is an action item for Council if it is at all possible. As your dutiful FCM representative on the National Board, I can tell you this is a little bit more important than it might appear at first blush. I take it by the second resolution that Council is going to be conveying its commitment to the resolution. But I would like to ask everybody on Council if they are at all able, and I'll send you a reminder e-mail, that we all have a relationship with our members of Parliament regardless whether opposition or city members of the governing party.

It is very very important I think both from a practical and an optical view that we can if we have the time, make the actual effort of writing a letter or sending an e-mail to your member of parliament in your area, it will make a big difference.

(10:40)

As you move into the fall and potentially some pretty hardnosed discussions on a new deal for cities in Canada, it is going to be very very important that we are on record as supporting new infrastructure projects and pushing the Federal Government in that direction. And the down potentially if we haven't done that we do stand the chance of being embarrassed somewhere down the road.

If you are all able to take that step I would recommend it and appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt you want to speak.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just rise just to say thank this for coming forward and thank Councillor Steeves for his efforts with FCM.

This is something that I think would great if we could all support unanimously coming forward from this council. I, for one will write to my member of Parliament, the Honourable Bill Blakie and encourage him to lobby on this behalf.

Also I think point in time that we also work with the Association of Manitoba Municipalities. They're strongly in support of this as Councillor Eadie is aware as our representative on the committee. As well as the fact that they are strongly lobbying for a tripartite program or infrastructure for recreational facilities geared specifically to recreational facilities.

I thank Councillor Steeves for this and for the work he's done and will definitely supporting this Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour of Item No. 4? Contrary? Carried.

Special reports Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Murray: I'd like to move suspension of the rules to hear the Report of Executive Policy Committee of July 23, 2003.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 23, 2003

Mayor Murray: Mr. Speaker these are a number of items of various importance.

Item No. 1 – Federation of Canadian Municipalities - Municipal Partnership Program with the City of Kampala, Uganda File GC-5.1

Mayor Murray: I would move Item No. 1 which is, quick explanation, this is through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, it's for a partnership with Kampala, paid for by the Government of Canada through FCM. I want to commend Councillors Steeves for his work on this. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any discussion? All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 2 – Request for a Heritage Conservation Tax Credit of the Victor Fox Foods Building, 130 –132 James Avenue
File G-3.1.5

Mayor Murray: Thank you. As you know Council's downtown policy is to encourage the restoration of historic buildings and encourage residential development in downtown for a quarter of a million dollars for a multi-million dollar redevelopment about two blocks from City Hall. This will trigger a significant residential project right adjacent to Waterfront Drive. So I would recommend it to you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any discussions? If not. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 3 – Request for a Heritage Conservation Tax Credit for the Travellers Building – 283 Bannatyne Avenue
File G-3.1.5

Mayor Murray: Thanks. Again a similar request for multi-unit condominium development in the upper level floors of the Travellers Building. Again it's a request for $250,000, again for a multi-million dollar private sector investment just in Old Market's Square.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 4 – Memorandum of Settlement Negotiations between the City of Winnipeg and the Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1505
File GU-4.5

Mayor Murray: Thanks. As you know we've been negotiating with the Amalgamated Transit Union. This is the same package of 3% per year and adjusting the pay day to January 1, 2004.

You can see the financial consequences are minimal, it's about $1.2 million accumulatively over the life of the contract. More than it's in the budget which would mean some budget adjustments going forward, it's a relatively small number.

This is below most settlements in the private and public sector of organizations with employees over 500 which is the standard in which we compare ourselves. I think it is a positive development given recently Calgary and Vancouver have both experienced prolonged transit strikes and have come in with much higher settlements. I think this is a very reasonable settlement that's a fair compensation for our very good Transit Department and our very enthusiastic transit operators.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions, No. 1. Automatic referral. Motion No. 3, Councillor Angus would you like to introduce it.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Angus
Seconded by Councillor Eadie

WHEREAS as part of the 2003 Capital Estimates passed by Council, $5 million has been approved in start-up funds for the Rapid Transit project for a technology review of Bus Rapid Transit options, for the detailed design of the Southwestern Corridor and the Eastern Corridor, environmental assessments, public outreach, and the construction of the first part of the Southwestern Corridor between the Fort Rouge Transit Base and Pembina Highway and Jubilee Avenue;

AND WHEREAS the Capital Budget does not contain any provision for the proposed acquisition of the properties required for the initial phases of the Rapid Transit project slated for construction after 2004;

AND WHEREAS the Administration requires instructions to commence negotiations for the acquisition of those privately owned properties required for Stage 1 of the Southwestern Corridor and Stage 1 of the Eastern Corridor slated for construction after 2004;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council authorize the Director of Planning, Property and Development Department to negotiate such property acquisitions as the Transit Department through its Consultants may identify for completion of Stage 1 of the Southwestern Corridor and Stage 1 of the Eastern Corridor for construction after 2004, and to report back with the results thereon.

Councillor Angus: Thank you. I respectfully request suspension of the rules to deal with this item.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Angus: This particular clause was approved by Executive Policy Committee. As you know we approved $5 million for the investigation of rapid transit in the Southwest Corridor and in the North and East Corridor. The Consultant's are out there trying to put together land prices and everything else.

It simply allows negotiations, Law Department, Real Estate Department under Councillor Vandal's Committee, had some concerns that because we didn't do five year capital budgets because there's no money after 2004 that there was no authority to be out negotiating. This motion allows them to negotiate. Any recommendations as to acquisition will come back to Council and Committee for approval through the normal process. But it will allow the Consultant's to talk to owners of land and our people will be involved in talking to owners of land in relation to what the cost of those lands would for the completion of their report. I respectfully request approval of this particular motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair of Public Works, and maybe he'll correct me if I'm off the mark on this.

My understanding was that when we passed the Capital our $5 million was contingent on Federal and Provincial support to the best of my knowledge. That hasn't been realized at this point yet. That draws me to one simple conclusion, why the sense of urgency to start negotiating for acquisition of property if we indeed haven't had Federal and Provincial concurrence? That's my question and I hope it can be answered. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further speakers? If not, Councillor Angus would you please close.

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker the motion that Council approved for $5 million was $5 million that we were putting in to do the test track, to do the technological review of options that were available. To look at where the tracks would go. To hire the consultant's. To prepare the report and provide the information back to Council.

At that time we said, that we were very hopeful that there would be a tripartite agreement when the $5 million was on the table. That's what Council has approved.

I will tell you that it is my understanding that most recently we have indications that the balance of the $8.3 million or $8.8 million of the most recent infrastructure program is going to be allocated partially to this project and partially to the Kenaston project.

For the Kenaston project it would have been included in this motion to allow them to negotiate on that property as well. but the $3.4 million or $3.5 million we put into the Kenaston project allows for us to do the land acquisition we would need. They don't see the acquisition of land for Kenaston beyond 2003.

(10:50)

I hope that answers your question. I think Council has given the authority for the first $5 million. If we were going to be proceeding it was on the understanding it would be tripartite level agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steek wants to be recorded in opposition.

EPC By-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Murray: I'll move that the following by-law be read a first time, By-law No. 124/2003.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 124/2003

Mayor Murray: I'll move that By-law No. 124/2003, be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 124/2003.

Mayor Murray: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 124/2003, be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Question Period. None.

Public Works. Councillor Angus.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED MAY 13, 2003

Item No. 1 – Canada – Manitoba – Rural Municipality of Ritchot – City of Winnipeg Amendment on Flood Protection for the Community of Grande Pointe and the Area of St. Mary's Road South – Draft Amendment (March 2003) File PD

Councillor Angus: I have the Report of Public Works dated May 13, 2003.

This is a Canada-Manitoba-Rural Municipality of Ritchot Agreement.

Mr. Speaker I'm in the uncomfortable position of having to move this on behalf of the Committee because the Committee said that we did not concur in the recommendations of the Administration.

However, I'm going to be voting against that particular motion and urging Council to vote against that motion. I would like to explain why.

At this particular area on Hallama Drive just south of the Floodway system. It's in Councillor Steeves Ward now, it was in my ward. At the time when I read the report it looked like we were letting people off with 10% of the cost and it seemed to me to be grossly unfair because people inside the City who are getting the benefit of the Floodway are in fact paying 10% of the upgrade cost to do the improvement for flooding.

The Administration brought several things to my attention and have persuaded me that there is reasonable position for Council to concur in the Administration's recommendations.

The recommendation from the Administration is that we absorb the 10% at the city-at-large. It's approximately twenty some thousand dollar ticket if I remember correctly.

The reasons that they have given are three-fold. One, in good faith the Province and the Federal Government and the City entered into an agreement that said that the Province will pay 45%, the Feds will pay 45% and the City will pay 10%. This Council passed a motion that said, that 10% will be charged back to the property owners and we have been faithful to that particular position except in cases that are south of the Floodway where they don't have the same type of protection. People along St. Mary's Road when we bought out their homes we absorbed the 10% in that particular case.

In this particular case the Administration is saying, it is not the fault of the Federal Government or the Provincial Government who acted in good faith. The situation to do the work of flood protection arose simply because the opportunity to reconstruct Highway 59 was there. They reconstructed Highway 59 and did the dike at the same time. Fifty-two percent of the people voted against paying the 10% after the project was already completed for them on their behalf. I think that 48% said, wait a minute, a deal is a deal and this is pretty fair and we should be paying our fair share.

We are stuck in a position now of saying, if we say no, that money lingers out there in limbo someplace and who pays it. The Administration has said, there is precedent for south of the Floodway where they don't receive the same types of benefit because of the backwash of the Floodway on their properties. That the R.M. of Hallama Drive is dissected by the way, part of it is in the R.M. of Ritchot and the R.M. of Ritchot has picked up that 10% so we have eight or so homes that are being negatively impacted by this who frankly put common sense in their pocketbook ahead of the right thing to do in this particular case and said, why should we vote to pay 10% when the project is already done.

I am voting against the recommendation of the Committee and Executive Policy Committee. If that particular motion fails then I will be introducing the Executive Policy Committee recommendation that says, we concur in the Administration's recommendation.

Councillors the only other interesting thing is that we're in the process of dealing a $660,000,000 package on the Floodway protection with our senior partners and I would like to have those negotiations go forward on a positive note. I don't think it's the fault of our senior partners that the people on Hallama Drive rejected this, I think the right thing for us to do is to absorb this particular cost. Barry MacBride tells us that they have the money in the budget. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers. All in favour of the clause from Public Works? Contrary?

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker I'd like to move the Executive Policy recommendation that we concur in the Administration's report on this issue. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JULY 8, 2003**

Councillor Angus: I'm pleased to move the Report of July 8, and ask that Items 1 through 5 be passed as consent items, and that Item 6 be stood down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Item No. 6 – Boulevard Maintenance (By-law No. 5895/92)
File PB-1**

Councillor Angus: Item 6 has to do with Boulevard Maintenance. The Committee requested that we revert back to 1988 service levels for boulevards. Again as the Chairman of the Committee I'm obligated to move the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

Again, I'm going to be voting against this particular motion. Not because I don't believe the work should be done, and not because I don't believe we should be looking at the 1988 levels. But it's a budgetary issue. And Executive Policy Committee has said, has suggested that if we defeat the motion of the Public Works Committee that the motion be filed and that the issue of the funding be referred to the budgets in the fall. That's what I would be recommending Mr. Speaker. I'll be voting against this clause.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. All in favour?

(10:58)

Councillor Angus: I would move on the boulevard maintenance issue that the Executive Policy Committee recommendations that is the motion be filed and that the issue of the budgetary considerations be referred to the budget discussions be approved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Now you understand. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

I want to be recorded in opposition and Councillor Smith.

By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Angus: I'll move that By-law No. 125/2003 be read a first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Questions. Councillor Steek.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Chair. First of all I'd like to thank the Chair for his previous support regarding the speed hump policy that was introduced and passed through Public Works. I was wondering if he was aware of the preliminary reports that have come back relative to Centennial Street where 20% of all cars in the street were speeding. Speeding has been completely eradicated there is no longer any, and traffic has been reduced by 30% on Centennial as a result of the speed humps. I was just wondering if he was aware of that report.

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of it and I'm pleased about it. It's a policy that started in my ward and basically in my direction working with the Administration on Thatcher Drive and was adjusted and amended and brought forward by Councillor Steek on a specific problem he had. My colleague Councillor Clement has a problem, Councillor Eadie has had problems. I think it gives us an opportunity to introduce some serious thought and a process to allow neighbourhoods to fight back on the vagaries of through traffic. I'm pleased that it has worked out, and I'm pleased that Councillor Steek and his assistant are ecstatic about the results.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steek supplemental.

Councillor Steek: It's not really a question Mr. Speaker but just a continuation of the ecstasy. I would like to state publicly and on the record, Councillor Angus has stated to me, Steek, you beat me up on the floor of Council, how about acknowledging my good work. And I would like to publicly thank Councillor Angus as well as Councillor Clement frankly for the leadership that they showed in realizing the Kenaston Underpass Project in the Capital Budget. I don't think it could have been done without their support, and I thank them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Fiscal Issues. Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED JULY 8, 2003

Councillor Clement: I'm pleased to move the Report of the Fiscal Issues meeting dated July 8, 2003, and move Item 1 as a consent item.

Item No. 1 – By-law No. 122/2003 – To impose a licence in lieu of business tax on certain businesses

I'd like to point out that there was an amendment at Executive Policy Committee but I've been advised by the Clerk that it is still a consent item. I'll move it as such.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I would like to congratulate the Fiscal Issues Committee

on dealing with this item because you know there were, I was getting calls from ladies that were Avon ladies and small sales that didn't amount to much, and this clause this is finally a solution. It's a very good answer.

I wonder why it took so long to come about. It's a year. But at least it's a solution that I think is reasonable. I hope we all support this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. I just wondered if we could get some clarification on the financial impact on this. I think it makes sense but I'm just trying to understand the financial impact page here of what it really does to us in terms of a revenue generation line. Is it a wash or what are the issues that were trying to do.

This is a very significant kind of way dealing with home occupations and I kind of support this but I need to know what it means in the context of our revenue line for the long haul. At some point in time we do have to analysis. Once again, I'm sure the Mayor will be doing with his overall budget approach on whether we have business tax, whether we have rolling it in with commercial taxes and on and on it goes. We've seen the comparisons when we tend to stand very favourably when you roll the two together. But it does become an observation, what does this really mean in terms of our financial statement. If it's a wash that would be great.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I would encourage the Chair of Fiscal Issues maybe would take councillors briefly through some of the discussion we had on out of jurisdiction businesses who are coming in. It would be worthwhile that Council have information on the out of jurisdiction businesses that were operating sort of on a prorated basis.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you. First of all I'd like to say this. I'd like to thank all of the people not only in the finance area but in the legal area that had to deal with this. It did take a long time Councillor Smith, but it took a long time because there were Revenue Canada issues associated with all of this and there was a lot of discussion back and forth that took several months. When you ask for a reply they're not always quick on the other side of that. There was a lot of that type of thing that took place, and we had to be very very careful. It was actually pointed out at Executive Policy Committee by a gentleman representing the small sellers association that there actually wasn't some of the legislation associated with this that allowed us to actually get some of this information.

The fact of the matter is, it's not a lot different than I'm going to use as a (inaudible) is our home improvement plan. If you want to put new windows in tomorrow, you don't need a building permit to do that. If you want to get the heritage the rebate for home improvements you have to take out a permit. This was kind of the same thing. If you don't want to pay, you got to prove that your gross income wasn't $5,000. So the onus is on the people even though there isn't something specific within the provincial statutes that forces people to do that if they want to get the rebate from us, they do. That simple.

What the amendment was at EPC was is that they thought the ceiling wasn't reasonable and to be honest with you I thought the $2,500 number was a net number not a gross number so we bumped it at EPC to $5,000 gross and they were happy with that.

To answer Councillor De Smedt's question. In all honesty it's a bit of an unknown because the policy wasn't totally clear.

(11:06)

We didn't really know how many people were going to fall under this in the first place. I know in many cases there are going to be people that are going to be paying for the first time that weren't being caught up before and some of these people are not going to have to, but we didn't have revenue from most of them in the first place.

We really don't know where this is going to land. Because we have been pursuing licenses in lieu of business tax in a little bit more aggressive manner in the last two or three years, I suspect our revenue is up overall.

As for the issues that Councillor Steeves is talking about, I'm assuming what you're talking about is where people are doing business in Winnipeg that live outside of Winnipeg, is that what you're talking about? There are situations, I'm not sure that that's relevant to what we're doing here.

The problem is, is that we do have people that do business here in other centres they're charged. I don't have to go any further than my own business frankly. If I accepted a contract in Brandon to build a pool, frankly we actually have to become members of the Brandon Chamber of Commerce before we can get a building permit. It's a fact. Yet if a contractor in Brandon comes to Winnipeg, he just walks in and picks up a permit, ditto for electrical contractors and plumbers, and pick one. We've been down that path a few times before. I suspect the reason why we backed off on that is that I guess the good news is that a lot of those people still spend a lot of their disposable income in Winnipeg with suppliers and those other kinds of things. I don't think although it's an interesting discussion and we've been down that path many times it's specifically and germane to what we're doing here. There were some issues though that were raised around those kinds of things.

In any case I've moved the agenda. I certainly believe this is an appropriate thing to do and it will allow our people to operate within their policy mandate and will not be too restrictive on some of the people who are in this industry particularly some of the more senior people in all fairness selling pick one, Avon, Fuller Brush, Mary Kay is much for social activity as it is for revenue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions. No motions. Consideration by-laws.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 122/2003, be read a first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 122/2003.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 122/2003 be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 122/2003.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 122/2003, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Questions. No questions.

Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Vandal.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 3, 2003

Councillor Vandal: I will move Items 1 through 17 as consent items. I will move that Item 18 be referred back after a simple request by the ward councillor,

and there was no harm in extending or delaying this one month.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal moves adoption of Items 1 to 17, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 18.

Item No. 18 – Leave and License Agreement at 1717 Waverley Street – McNaught Pontiac Buick Cadillac GMC Ltd.
File ED (32)

Councillor Vandal: As I earlier stated there's been a request by the ward councillor to revisit a couple of issues on this. There's nothing pressing that makes this necessary to approve today. However I would like to approve it in September sometime, at the September Council meeting. I'll move referral.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of July 10, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 10, 2003

Councillor Vandal: First of all I'd like to layover Item 1 until the September Council meeting pending new information coming forward from the Administration.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Vandal: I will move Items 2 to 4 as consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.
Motions. No motions. Consideration of By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time, by-laws numbered 118/2003, 119/2003, 120/2003, 121/2003 and 123/2003.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 118/2003, 119/2003, 120/2003, 121/2003 and 123/2003.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that by-laws numbered 118/2003 to 121/2003, both inclusive, and 123/2003, be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 118/2003 to 121/2003, both inclusive, and 123/2003.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 118/2003 to 121/2003, both inclusive, and 123/2003, be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Questions? No questions.

Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, dated July 7, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 7, 2003

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I'd like to move Items 1 to 6 as consent items.

Point of Order

Councillor Eadie: Just on a point of order Mr. Speaker. I would just ask the Clerk to record me in opposition to Items 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Exactly the same.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further? If not, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report "A" of July 7, 2003.

REPORT "A" OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 7, 2003

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd move Item No. 1 as a consent item.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of July 10, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 10, 2003

Councillor Gerbasi: I don't expect either of these reports to be consent items. I think we'll just start with report one.

Just to check procedure, there is a motion on that, do I introduce the clause first?

(11:15)

Item No. 1 - Winnipeg Police Service - Four District Model File GF-2

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm pleased to move the Four Division Model Report. This recommended restructuring came out of the internal and external projestics review, the external part was projestics of the review of the Winnipeg Police Service several years ago now.

The purpose of this review was to find ways to get the most police presence and to put in place a more efficient structure. I don't think there's one person here, well there maybe one, who thinks we don't desperately need new facilities for the members of the Winnipeg Police Service.

Our buildings were built before we had a high number of women police officers and before we used computers extensively. These stations have been described by the Police and others as dysfunctional and unsuitable for modern policing. The world has changed since the 1950s and since Unicity. We have to change with it.

The report looked at all the different options to address the problem and the recommended solution of consolidating four divisions from six is the one that makes sense. It makes sense not just in providing the facilities that are needed but an increasing police presence and operating more efficiently. The administrative efficiencies result in six additional officers at peak times and in financial savings that will assist in paying for the new facilities. There's no change to the patrol car areas, there is still a minimum of 27 cars on the street per shift. Response times are not affected as the officers are not sitting around at the station during their shift.

Winnipeg has 270 neighourhoods. We cannot put a police station in each of those 270 neigbhourhoods. However, the Police have identified some additional service centres and beat officers that they intend to put in place to minimize any concerns about a change in police presence.

The Police Chief has notably committed to putting one in downtown Transcona. A report at the standing committee that was received as information that is fully public and available in the City Clerk's Office outlines these intentions very clearly.

How clear can that be councillors? Well apparently it's not clear enough for the Councillor for Transcona who seems to have an issue with trust. You would think that a commitment from Jack Ewatski to put a service centre in downtown Transcona would satisfy the local councillor's concerns. The problem is that Councillor Wyatt wants more than the Chief's word. He wants the power to politically decide future police operational decisions. I happen to believe that our police chief is an excellent and experienced professional who takes his responsibilities seriously. There is a reason we have some separation from

political parochial wishes and the ultimate decision about specific locations of things like stations and service centres. It doesn't serve the citizens of our city well to have politicians saying not in my backyard, or only in my backyard in deciding where police resources should go. That is the Police Chief's job and I would rather trust him to decide that than a newly elected councillor or any other councillor in this chamber. That's not our decision.

The opportunities to raise any concerns councillors or members of the public might have been numerous. Yet the openness of the process has been consistently raised as an issue unfairly. Everyone in this room knows that this was a very open and public process. This was not EPC driven. This was driven by the Winnipeg Police Service who want to provide better service and have worked hard to bring this forward. It came through the proper channels. It went to standing policy committee where it was laid over for several months where 11 public meetings were held. A full and open public debate has been held several times at standing committee. The informational report at PC&S showed the majority of the public were very supportive of a four division model. And the concerns raised there were incorporated in the Police Chief's commitment to additional police presence in areas of concern.

There have been two council seminars over the last few years on the four division model. Eleven public meetings and several standing committee meetings. There's been countless opportunities to be heard on this issue.

The problem for the councillor from Transcona is not that he hasn't had a chance to be heard, it's that most people do not agree with him. That is democracy, we don't always agree. I'd like to comment on the stunt that was held at EPC. It was staged very nicely and a very neat trick, it's making me almost miss Councillor Golden.

Russ waited until the delegations were closed and we were in the midst of the business of the meeting to jump up and claim his voice was silenced. Well it looked very good on TV but in the long run folks working together cooperatively is a lot more constructive than whipping up unnecessary fear in the public mind and cynicism in the public mind. I think that's destructive.

Support for the this model is there from the public. Most of us have received very few calls even with an intensive and expensive misinformation campaign going on.

The response of the majority of the citizens who attended the 11 public meetings was very positive once they understood what the four division model really means. Adequate facilities for the members of the Winnipeg Police Service and better police presence on the street. Safety is the number one priority of this council. For the whole City of Winnipeg as evidenced by our increased spending in our budgets and increasing the police complement. And for the people of Transcona if they haven't been told by their councillor there was a new police car stationed there with 18 new officers in Transcona and a commitment to a service centre. I guess you're not getting that message unfortunately.

We make this decision today because this is an excellent choice for our Winnipeg Police Service and for the safety of the citizens of Winnipeg.

In closing Mr. Speaker, this is what the four division model means. More police presence on the street, and decent facilities for our officers. That is all. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Wyatt
Seconded by Councillor De Smedt

WHEREAS the move from six police districts to four police districts is a substantial change in the policy direction of the City of Winnipeg and will have a

direct impact on police presence in many affected communities;
AND WHEREAS at eleven public meetings, the public generally supported the concept of a four district model and the need for better police facilities, but expressed concern over the lack of information contained in the proposal on the future police presence, such as the general location of police stations and police service centres, and the future of existing police service centres;

AND WHEREAS the report before Council provides information on police station closures, but provides few details on the community police presence and actually includes no information based on the feedback from the public at the recent public meeting, reducing these meetings to an exercise in public relations ;

AND WHEREAS the Mayor and the Winnipeg Police Service have given general support to police presence but yet these suggestions are not integrated in the four district model report now before Council;

AND WHEREAS the formulation of balanced public policy on this matter needs to acknowledge those community concerns with respect to police presence and the need for local police service centres;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the recommendations be amended to include the additional resolves as follows:

E. For 2004, in the proposed east district, a new police station, within 2 kilometres of Dugald Road and Lagimodiere Boulevard, prior to the closure of the existing facility in District No. 4 and in conjunction with the opening of the new police station, a new fully operational police service centre in downtown Transcona. A new fully operational community beat office, with a French Liaison Officer and Community Officer working limited hours of operation, located on Provencher Boulevard. There will be no closure or relocation of the current police service centre at 1086 St. Mary's Road or 1050 Henderson Highway.

F. For 2005, in the proposed west district, a new police station, within 2 kilometres of Grant Avenue and Shaftsbury Street. The current Police Service Centre at 2020 Corydon Avenue will be relocated to Portage Avenue within 4 kilometres of the existing police station at Lyle Street and Portage. There will be no closure or relocation of the current police service centre at 2835 Pembina Highway.

G. For 2006, in the North District (currently District No. 3), a new police station, within 2 kilometres of Redwood Avenue and Arlington Street. The Winnipeg Police Service is committed to keeping two fully operational police service centres in the north district. The Winnipeg Police Service will examine the existing locations of the two fully operational police service centres once the site for the new police station has been identified.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move an amendment to the said resolution before us. I'd like to speak to that amendment Mr. Speaker.

I represent a very strong and proud community Mr. Speaker that truly has been reflected in the fact that the community has responded to this issue. Made it very clear when rumours of this circulated during the last general election that this was going to happen and then it came clear after the general election that this was taking place and responded in kind with a 4,000 name petition, 3,000 I thought, it turned out to be 4,000 even bigger than I thought from the community saying, look, we believe police presence is important.

I realize that maybe that's hard to understand the uniqueness of the community that I represent, so maybe I'll just take a step back and say that I represent a community that has a very strong sense of identity. Indeed we are part of Winnipeg and we are Winnipeggers, but everyone in Transcona would be very proud to say that they're

also a Transconian and their proud of their community.
When we entered into Unicity it was pointed out by previous speakers today, when we entered into Unicity we brought in it with relatively new roads and new storm sewer system, a pool that was three years old, a library 10 years old, playgrounds and parks and a brand new police station. Yet after Unicity it seems that a lot of these services we've used them and we have not reinvested. In fact today we are looking at shutting down a police station without giving any sort of assurance or guarantee in this report of what the presence will be not only in Transcona but in communities around the City.

I speak of course because Unicity was only 30 years ago, so it's not that long ago. I agree we must move on. But let's remember that it was only 30 years ago where a community that was about half of the size it is today have four fulltime cruiser cars, had a police station, had officers there 24-7. Today we're lucky on a Friday or Saturday night or whenever there's a full moon to have a cruiser car in our community. Cruiser cars are regularly pulled out of Transcona as they are in St. James, St. Charles, as they are in St. Vital according to my sources in the Winnipeg Police Service, that they're pulled out and pulled in different areas of the City. Requiring service cars to respond from other parts.

It's been mentioned today that 18 more officers and there was one more cruiser car was given to Transcona, let's set the record straight here. It was prior to that decision two years before that, District 4 which now has a complement of four cruiser cars had a complement of four cruiser cars. It was reduced down to three cruiser cars, moved into the north district and two years later because of the concerns raised by the residents and the previous councillor it was brought back and restored. That is the facts. Those are the facts. It wasn't another car was added here. A car was taken away it was put back. So let's set the record straight on that Mr. Speaker.

I've been very very upfront on this issue from the word go. The first meeting I had with the Mayor after this election, this was discussed. It was a top item on my agenda, top concern. The first meeting I had with the Chair of the Standing Committee of Protection and Community Services this was discussed. At that time I was saying, no way to shutting our police station down. I was saying forget it. Four district model, don't even think about even planning it, don't even go there.

First concern I had about the whole process was, hold on Councillor Wyatt, we've been working on this, we're going ahead with this, we've got a four district model and we're going ahead. It was to push for public meetings. Which thanks to my committee supported that and public meetings were held around the City. There was a concern expressed at the public meetings over and over again regarding the need for police presence.

An interesting thing happened at these public meetings, I attended all 11 of them. An interesting thing happened along the way at these public meetings, I listened to the Chief and had discussions afterwards with the Chief, and I started to agree with his arguments for a four district model and the need for better facilities, and the need for reinvestment in our police service. That was something which I could understand where he was coming from. Indeed we need to have modern buildings because we have more female officers and male officers, we have to upgrade ourselves, it's important for morale, I said that. I came around and started to agree with a four district model.

I cannot ignore Mr. Speaker the fact that meeting after meeting after meeting the public said clearly, loudly, what is the police presence going to be in our community when this is shut down, when our station goes. No answers were given. Because it wasn't in the report. A vague idea, well maybe the station will be here maybe there we're not sure. We'll deal with that later. And the public said even in the school in West Kildonan in your area Mr. Speaker, how can you

support this without knowing where the stations are going where the service centres are going. How can you do that? I still have misgivings about the fact that we're taking $1.2 million from the savings and not reinvesting it into the service itself, rather we're putting it into capital.

The public said at these meetings over and over again, that this was a concern and that this was a genuine issue that they had. The logic and the response that we get back Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot incorporate the idea of having a police presence in this report. The reason we're told is operational. You're interfering in the job of the Police Chief. You're interfering with the Police Services, you're telling the Chief how he should be doing his job. That is in my mind Mr. Speaker absolute nonsense. This is a major policy decision we're making today. We are moving Mr. Speaker to simply shut down five stations around the City to incorporate the big concern a lot of folks have is that there's nothing been incorporated and the operation is what the argument comes back at. I will simply say this. This Council when we debate the future of fire halls we're involved. When we debate the future of public works facilities which we did two years ago and we had a document coming forward, not only did we know what we were shutting down, we knew where we were going. In other words we have an idea where we're going to be putting lawnmowers and snow plows but we can't have an idea of what our police presence will be.

You only have to go across the street here Mr. Speaker, and see the name scratched on the Public Safety Building, Steve Juba and other councillors, you don't think they were involved, that wasn't said, sorry councillors that's an operational decision. We can't be involved. They were involved in the decision of where to locate the Public Safety Building.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking here today to tie the hands of the Chief or anyone else. I'm asking for fairness, for a balanced policy, I'm asking for an amendment which would simply tell the community yes, you're shutting down a station in this part of the City or that part of the City, but we know that this is what's going to happen afterwards. If the Chief in the future should decide to come back and want to remove that service centre, he may do that and come to Council and do that.

I will tell you this Mr. Speaker, I was told at the beginning of this debate, sorry Councillor, you cannot have a service centre. Then I was told, sorry, yes Councillor you can have a service centre. Then I was told, no Councillor that's not going to be a service centre that's going to be a beat office. Then with my last conversation with the highest ranking officer we have, Councillor personally I don't believe Transcona deserves a service centre but you're getting one.

(11:30)

What am I to make of that? Six months down the road after all this is done and all the dust has settled, decision could be made to the otherwise, why? Because it's not policy. I'm asking Councillors here today to make that decision, make it policy, and to make it part of the report coming forward. I think it's balanced. I think it's fair. I think it's clearly something that addresses the concerns raised by the public at numerous meetings. Based on the fact Mr. Speaker, that if that can't be made part of it, I cannot support the four district model report as it stands without it having that balance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, at the Standing Committee I didn't support the clause. I supported Councillor Wyatt. I guess I supported him at that point because I really wanted to know the locations. It seemed to me that his point that this is not operational I agree with. I think it's a huge expenditure, and I think we should know the locations of the three stations.

I made a mistake. I'm going to be supporting the clause today. I'm going to be supporting it because I think that it's an improvement over what we have. It

puts more officers on the beat, it gives a better job of policing. I'm a little bit confused by Councillor Wyatt. I saw his campaign. I liked the fact that he had a campaign and he's standing behind what he believes in. But at the same time I saw a picture in the paper where it said, save the police station. You can't have it both ways. You can't go ahead and say, well you're willing to have a service centre but you really have a campaign on to save that station in your area. It's like hearing the people from West Kildonan. We would all like to have the police near us. You can't have a police station in every neighbourhood. It seems to me that it's not reasonable.

We're going to have modern facilities, better situation for our police department for our police officers. The only thing I'm not convinced it should be a four station. Why not two? Wouldn't that put more savings, more people on the street. I think four is obviously better than six and I think it's an effort to streamline the service and to make better response time for the people in Transcona and every part of the City.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Murray.

Mayor Murray: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. I guess I'm a terribly second class citizen in the City of Winnipeg Mr. Speaker because I don't have an administrative district office in Fort Rouge where I live. So I guess I'm not the same as other Winnipeggers. Mr. Speaker, I don't have a community service centre in Fort Rouge, and I have lived for a time as a councillor and I got re-elected with 83% of the vote. We do have a beat officer on Pembina Highway that's it. We do have cruiser car patrols.

I could have as a city councillor played my politics the following way in Fort Rouge. Woe is me, Fort Rouge was annexed by the City of Winnipeg in 1884 and ever since then it's been downhill. I'm a proud Fort Rouger and secondarily I'm a Winnipegger. I could still be in Fort Rouge when the police alarms went off and there was a murder in my neighbourhood, I would have the Fort Rouge police department responding with its probably one cruiser car and someone in a Buffalo coat. Or I could be in the City of Winnipeg where at the lowest point in the day there's a serious situation and someone's getting assaulted and 27 cruiser cars and often 30 or 40 depending on the time of day if a shift overlaps during premium times are responding. Because we're one city and we go where the crime is.

I've been very disappointed. I have to say in the 13 or 14 years now I've been in public life I have never seen anyone trying to drive a wedge between the citizens of this city with such nonsense as I've seen in the last little while.

When I became Mayor I don't know the whole history I can't tell you whether they had seven or three police cars in the old City of Transcona. I know there were three. I also know why in District 4 in May of 2000, 18 additional officers were relocated there and a car. It had nothing to do with the city councillor. Nothing to do with the Mayor, and it had nothing to do with the Deputy Mayor who's right next door who also represents that area. It had to do with the fact that there was a break and enter problem which I met with the Police Chief about the Councillor in the area met with the Police Chief about and the resident associations did. It was determined that a cruiser car in that area would be the best intervention for rising break and enters and they were added.

Let me just read you something from the Police Chief because I don't have a trust problem in believing Jack Ewatski. I'll just put it real simply. This is what he wrote to me. A five page letter which I should circulate to everyone in Transcona which explains this whole thing. He says, with respect to the Transcona area itself, we have publicly committed to a full service centre in downtown Transcona. Now someone said, they didn't know what full service centre meant. Well it actually it's clearly explained in his letter. It's open from 9 a.m. to 7 a.m., not just Monday to Friday but Saturday and Sunday. I think that covers most people's working time.

It also explains in detail all the things that this provides and because we're not allowed as Council to sort of say, we're going to deal with that 1622 Regent Avenue because the price will go up, and I've never seen anyone be concerned that we have to know the specific address. This is the biggest red herring.

Now why shouldn't it come to Council? Why don't we get the entire list of community service centres and bring them all to Council for a vote. Everytime we're going to reorganize or move a beat office, or everytime we're going to open up a community service centre, we're going to relocate it. We opened one up on Broadway and Sherbrook in West Broadway. That never came to Council. We do have a policy. I don't know what this nonsense is that we don't have a plan or policy. You have to be living in la la land not to know that. Walk over to the Police Service, go to the Standing Committee Chair. There's a wonderful thing. It's called a report. A report put out of the Police Chief every year, and all of us get it and citizens can get it, and it highlights all our policies on community policing, the good work that Councillor Steek raised, the police in schools, the pilot projects how they're doing, and what the objectives of the department are. It actually gives you graphics and charts on how crime is across the City. You can see it in Transcona and in District 4 that most areas of concern of crime are coming down. Which is a good thing. Why? Because the Police Service is doing its job. And in West Kildonan and the North End we have a partnership with the Federal and Provincial Governments, $50 million in housing renewal. And if you go to William Whyte or Spence it's moving north and adding neighbourhoods, Councillor Pagtakhan can tell you the kinds of improvements that he's seeing in his neighbourhood that he's been out with a hammer building houses rather than complaining and sending petitions around. I think that's pretty positive.

Transcona and the East Kildonan area doesn't have a district office in their neighbourhood. They will have one in their area but they won't have one in their neighbourhood. They're getting a full community service office.

The other thing I've been getting, I love this, this is a pre-empt. You've got to stop the cuts in the Police Department. Well, when I became Mayor, the Police budget was $106 million. Does anyone know what it is now?

(11:40)

When people phone you are you able to tell them what the budget is? $138 million this year. You can do the math and that's double digit increases in police funding. The number of officers in uniform as of yesterday according to my e-mail is 1,220 police officers in uniform.

What was the biggest complaint? I had 25 phone calls at home last night when I came home, my voice mail was full, it was all from Transcona. You know what they were concerned about, the biggest issue? Vandalism, activity in parks, speeding on neighbourhood streets and a lack of sense of safety.

Let me quote the Police Chief who went to 11 public hearings in addition to that. He says, "Police Officers are dispatched by the 911 Communication Centre". This is in response to how we should be approaching it. On the fourth floor of the Public Safety Building. The calls go to the patrol cars which are out patrolling and responding to calls more the latter than the former due to the high number of service calls that we're getting. The station is where officers go on and off duty to get their uniforms and equipment and receive their shift briefing. I really need that happening in my neighbourhood. That has a huge impact on safety, it does not. And the Police Chief points out that it does not.

Other than the times when they're bringing a suspect in for processing the cars are out on the streets and the cars do not go to the station for call. You can see and he goes on for a page and a half explaining his philosophy of policing, which is, more community service centres, more officers on foot patrol, more beat officers, the introduction of photo

radar and red light technology. We have technology capturing people who are speeding, killing children in intersections, creating havoc on our streets, and freeing up more officers to be able to work in community.

Now it seems like an innocent thing. Why not just put this in the formal report? Because then you're taking ownership as a Council of where every beat office is, and where every community service office is. You really just can't say the one in downtown Transcona has to be a special case. It has to be inscribed in this report unlike any other neighbourhood. Well you know what's happened in Fort Rouge since the community service centre went in West Broadway? It's grown because it's been demanded. The need is there. When councillors in that area have raised those concerns in the Wolseley and West Broadway in Councillor Smith's area, Councillor Smith has been very active on this, we've seen more police officers.

In Corydon in South Winnipeg where many of us live, we closed a community service centre there. We don't even know which councillor's ward that's in. Do you know why you don't know? Because the Councillor sat down and looked at it and said, there wasn't demand. People weren't walking in. It wasn't necessary here put it where they need it. This is going into Transcona because people in Transcona deserve it. I can't believe that someone in the Police Service said the people in Transcona don't deserve it. To me that's just another gross distortion of the record of the Winnipeg Police Service which isn't doing anyone any good. I know the Deputy Chief Menno Zacharias, he's been in the newspaper trying to correct this information.

Our police officers have a tough enough job. We all do. None of us are perfect, we all make mistakes, we all get stressed, we could all do things on Monday morning. But we need decent facilities. Women should not have to shower with men. They should have the dignity of that kind of respect. We have police officers who have to do shifts in the showers during change. They should have decent exercise facilities. They should have decent places to work. This is a $16.5 million capital investment. And it has been driven by the Police Service. The Police Chief has taken this through 11 public hearings through the process.

Is this a perfect plan? Is it the end of it? No. It's the beginning of it. I heard folks say, we're facing a huge challenge in the next couple of years. Right now we should probably be spending $120 million more a year than we are on streets and bridges to catch up with the repair bill.

It was interesting when Councillor Angus was raising that issue about public safety in my last 15 seconds, do you know almost all the reductions in maintenance and boulevards occurred prior to 1995. We went from 17 to 14 to 10.

While we've been cutting taxes and haven't raised them and there's no other city council in the country that's done that, we haven't been reducing those things. If you look at that public works report today because that deals with the safety environment, all those reductions happened in the '80s while we were raising taxes. There's been a huge investment of $32 million more in policing and we know already we're going to be raising the police budget by tens of millions of dollars in the coming years. And we're doing that without jacking people's taxes.

This is a good deal for Transcona. I would just like to conclude by saying, there are two people that represent the people of Transcona in this chamber. I get elected there by a majority. I'm happy they have a police car there. I'm happy they're getting a community service centre. I'm happy they're going to have a stronger policing program. I can't take credit for anything than working with you to raise…..I can give credit to the Police Chief and to our police staff for having a good plan, and I think we ought to support it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: And furthermore. Mr. Speaker this is either the as was proposed by one of my colleagues, either the greatest grandstanding expedition that this Council has seen or the biggest misrepresentation of factual information that this Council has seen and I'm not sure which.

I do know however that according to sources Councillor from Transcona has spent $6,000 on getting people to try and call the Mayor and Councillors about the vagaries of this particular proposal. I had two calls Mr. Speaker, two people who were worried, both of them were seniors. I had a third call from a younger lady who was more interested in a local issue on the policing. They were worried about their safety and worried about the closing of the police stations.

Mr. Speaker we did not do our citizens any justice in trying to communicate what was happening. And for an individual councillor to stand up and say, I have to vote against the four district model because you won't guarantee me a service centre in my area. They are separate issues Mr. Speaker and they should be treated as separate issues.

The four district model as is being proposed makes absolute common sense. We have a station in the Fort Garry area that was built in 1954 Mr. Speaker. Two times a day the police have absolute difficulty getting into that police station or out of that police station because Pembina Highway at McGillivary is absolutely clogged with university students and people going to work. Hopefully having some sort of a rapid transit system will help that.

Having a police station located south of the Assiniboine River and west of the Red River in some central location on a major artery will allow the Police to respond more quickly. The same thing Mr. Speaker if they look for a location there's going to be north of the Assiniboine River and west of the Red River. They're doing the same thing on the east side of the Red River. They're going to try and find a property where the Police can quickly and effectively get to the places where they are needed. Not only does it free up more people Mr. Speaker, but the actual cost revenue is so close because of the cost in maintaining the existing facilities and running these dysfunctional facilities. That it makes so much sense to do this district model that is being proposed.

(11:45)

The Councillor from Transcona and other councillors have concerns about having police presence in their area. Well we've got to address that problem Mr. Speaker, no question we have to address that. When Councillor Wyatt showed up with about 10 minutes left in the meeting in the Fort Garry area, 10 or 15 minutes left, the Police have already said, that the number one request they get to respond to calls is false alarms. False alarms. This Council has to get a grip on that. We have to get a grip on that. We have our police out checking false alarms and they're 10 or 15 minutes away from people that are being burglarized or watching their cars being stolen out of their driveways. We've got to find some way of doing that.

Do we need more police on the streets? Yes of course we do. Do we want to have a society that has a police officer on every corner? No we don't. Do we want community based policing? Yes we do. Do we want to absolutely entrenched in stone that there is going to be a service centre on the corner of every ward at a location to be determined by an individual councillor? No we don't. We want to be able to have our administration respond quickly, efficiently, and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the consultant's report the two years that we have spent looking into this, the proposal that is before us is adequate, it will serve the citizens of the City of Winnipeg much better than the former model did and I think that we should get on with it and let the Police do their job. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Deputy Mayor Thomas.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: Thank you. I'm highly irritated at this moment so I won't take the time to repeat the comments of Councillors Gerbasi, Smith, Angus and the Mayor to what their concerns are raised by this motion.

I want to point out the extreme irony that's coming from this motion that's here. There will be no closure or relocation of the current police service centre at 1050 Henderson Hwy. That just happens to be in my area. The councillor who wrote up this motion who was upset because he didn't think that a 11 meetings was enough consultation decides to put that in the motion without talking to me about the service station in my area. Isn't that ironic.

I would like to see the station relocated in my area. Do I have a particular place for it? No because I want to see the Police do an analysis as they do periodically and decide, that's why they're rental premises they decide if the service station needs to be moved. I don't want it set in stone that forever and always that 1050 Henderson Hwy. is where they have to live. That's not what police service stations are about, they're to meet the needs and the demands of the clientele that they service. They've got to be mobile, they've got to be flexible.

I'm insulted that someone would say 11 meetings are insufficient consultation but wouldn't even do me the courtesy of letting me see this before he submits this on the Council floor. That's bloody arrogance.

The Police once they meet at the service station are dispatched into the community, as many people have said before. They're not sitting in their stations like we have firefighters sitting in the stations waiting for a 911 call. They're out patrolling in the area. The facility that is being located is not where everybody is going to be sitting hanging around waiting for a call to come in.

But the real height of the irony in this Mr. Speaker that we're talking about a station that is moving approximately six blocks from where it is. You can see the circle on the map, it's a six block movement. People are talking like this station is moving to Tuktoyaktuk. I can't believe that six blocks is what people are upset about.

Irony after irony in this elusory campaign. I'm so disappointed that we're spending so much time debating giving our police officers better stations with more upgraded facilities, with the kind of basic washrooms and exercise equipment and the stuff that they need to do their jobs, and that this will actually reduce the number of upper management and get more officers out patrolling where they need to be patrolling. I'm close to flabbergasted that this motion and this whole cavalcade of events and parade of circuses has pervaded our agenda for the last couple of months. Highly disappointed is how I would describe my feelings at this moment because we're taking something that should be a positive step forward for the Police and the support that we should be giving our police chief for his initiatives in the fiscally responsible way in which he's doing it and turned it into the most petty politics that I have ever seen. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

Council adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

After recess

Council reconvened at 1:35 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Next on the list, a continuation of the clause that is before us, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I've got to learn to get my name in earlier, I'm always speaking after lunch when the gallery is sparse. I want the big big crowds like Angus gets.

I want to start off on the motion just by kind of echoing the comments of Councillor Thomas on the community, I think in the motion as well it mentions 1086 St. Mary's Road which I'm certain is mine, not mine but the community

policing station in St. Vital. We've actually engaged in some conversations in the course of the last little while with people in the community and folks who were running the community station talking about the possibilities of relocating that station in St. Vital and how it might better serve the residents of St. Vital.

My political instincts frankly Mr. Speaker are telling me that this motion may not have a very good chance of getting through. In any event, if it does I'm hoping that my friend from Transcona would accept that friendly amendment to remove that, to give me the freedom to help my citizens relocate that if that's okay.

There also is one other matter Mr. Speaker that I wanted to address, two other matters. The first of course is I don't know that the delegation is still present, but there was some comments made by delegation earlier in the day today with respect to the four police model. No one is mentioning anything at this point, but there were some in my opinion some very very unfortunate comments that were made with respect to the North End residents. There are folks that are present in the gallery that have the ability to spread information far and wide and I just want to be abundantly clear, and I think I can speak on behalf of all Council this afternoon when I say that the comments that were made in no way reflect the feelings certainly of this Council obviously. I was frankly mortified at what I had heard from that. I understand people have the right to come forward and say whatever they want but that was frankly pushing it.

With respect to the actual four district model and the motion the substance motion on the recommendation with moving to the four police station model, I do support it. For all the reasons that were mentioned I'm not going to drag everybody back through them. The one thing I would note I suppose with respect to the discussion, with respect to the delegations who have come forward. I can make the assumption Mr. Speaker, that everybody in the room in the gallery included wants the same thing, and they want the most bang for the buck and want the safest community as possible. They want people to have the greatest service possible to ensure that we have the safest communities as possible.

That being said, I think we have to at some point ask the question, where is the science behind a lot of the assertions that are being advanced this morning and previous. It has never been my knowledge in any way, shape or form that just because a station is located somewhere or not located somewhere that those places are in any way safer than anywhere else. In fact if I look at my own community of St. Vital where we have a community police office a perfectly fine functioning community police office great for the community where people go in and out and get information the police use as a base, while it works very very good in that function, I don't think I could say with any degree of authority that the immediate community around that community police station is any more safe or less safe than anywhere else in our community. I think if I look at Councillor Vandal's ward the Provencher Police Station, which also services St. Vital, I don't think we could say with any authority or with any certainty that just because that police station happens to be in that specific neighbourhood that those people are any more safe or less safe for any particular reason. I think that should be said.

If somebody is going to advance a contrary position to that, I think they have the obligation probably to produce some sort of scientific report that would support that assertion. If there is a reason for us to have our police stations located in certain geographic areas for safety purposes it certainly has never been advanced to me that there's a reason for that or that it makes sense. I've never seen that information and if somebody is not going to support the motion that is being advanced by our police administration, I would appreciate receiving that information. That is all Mr. Speaker, thank you.

(Councillor Eadie in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko on the clause and the amendment.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker I'll not speak too much to the amendment. I want to make my remarks specifically to the clause that's before us.

I would just like to make this very clear, I represent the area of the North End part of it, one-third of it and some comments were made by the delegation that was here before. Rude remarks were made that was uncalled for. To think that one segment of the North End is unique because it is West Kildonan does not blend in with the rest of the North End because beer drinkers or whatever the case may be. I regret to have to say this but comments like that as far as I'm concerned are not welcome in these chambers because it is not to say members of Council feel that way.

When this process took place I remember a number of years ago we talked about the issue of police matters. Downsizing, restructuring like what we did with the Public Works Department and the other departments with directions of the new city government. Consultants were hired to prepare this report. They met with the people. They met with the Administration. They went in some places from house to house. I know in the North End they visited the community centres to see what is it that really is needed to give better police protection for the citizens of Winnipeg.

This is not the Police report. It was the report from the consultant's that gave it to the Police, the Chief made a point of going and visiting and going into communities to have public consultation and this is what we had said before must happen.

To think that there is going to be a lack of police protection is not true. These standards that fall within the North American Continent police protection, there's a policy it's mandated that every police officer, every department have to adhere to. You can't just decide well we're going to do this and disregard an area of a certain segment of the City. That will never happen. It cannot happen. The Police when they take statistics they know exactly how long it takes to respond to a call and some feel that the Police are not handling their job, I'd like to see that on paper. How many minutes does it take for the Police to respond to one particular area. If it be Transcona I'd like to know if there's a lack of police response or not. And to think that one area is being neglected is so unfair even to say this.

We're talking about building new buildings like we did with the Public Works Department. We created new buildings where the staff and people can work in comfort. State of the art building. Why spend money rejuvenating an old building that is beyond repair. Look what it does to the morale of the people that have to work in there in the cramped corners. Women officers, lady officers have to shower in a former fault, or have a locker room in a former fault, it's uncalled for. Hell it's an embarrassment to the City of Winnipeg to have our police faced with a situation such as this. When they say that we want to better ourselves, for us to be able to give them the go ahead, yes we will allocate the funding if we can provide the savings to the Department then that means one thing we should proceed, not to try and kill this.

(1:40)

We're talking about police protection. Everyone of us that ran for re-election and those who ran for the first time all had said, better police protection for the citizens of Winnipeg.

When you're talking about an area that does not meet the standards, what does it do to the person that is working out of that area. I've talked to a police officer, the guy says, I don't know why the hell I got into the police force in the first place. Morale is low because not only what is happening within the Police, the accusations, the vigilante groups that are out there attacking every move that the police officer may make and there's not

that much protection because all of a sudden they're going before LERA and LERA rips them to pieces, this is why I presented a motion on the floor of Council to re-establish a police commission.

When you downsize any department we have people that are professionals such as the consultant's, they take a look and they know exactly what the criteria is, what the mandate is, what the need is. You cannot have one area that will have lack of police protection. The police building is not made for officers to sit in that building and wait for an emergency call. They are to be out in the field monitoring from their vehicles or if they're walking whatever it is, that's their job. And if a call comes in they are within seconds or minutes to the place of an emergency. Not to think that a new building is going to give someone better protection.

West Kildonan there was a massive murder a massacre only a few blocks away from the station. Did it help? No. There's nothing you can do. Crime will still be there. But to give people who are providing the protection to the citizens of Winnipeg we have to give them the support and to be supportive at all times because if we don't give them the support they're not that eager to do their job. Why is it so many police officers leave the Services way before their time of retirement? Fire Department sure they have a hard job too but they're not as high profile as our police. The Police are monitored not only by certain groups, they're monitored by the criminal element, they're monitored by the media. If a police officer gets involved with one thing right away it's a front page story. But for anybody else it's maybe page 35.

I know in the years that I have been here Mr. Speaker, first time I ran in 1971 the formation of Unicity, we had 11 municipalities and each municipality had their own police chief, deputy police chief, they had their own engineers, their own police station, it was established as such. In 1971, when I ran first time for Council in October, we ran on the basis that we downsize but we still retained all the administration from all of the other municipalities. Transcona had purchased supplies and equipment for their firefighting where our City of Winnipeg had to go and help fight a fire, they come there and they found that the nozzle didn't fit their nozzle because it was purchased through some other method. We went into the standard, it was universal, standards to give protection for the fire, police and everything. This is what Unicity did. Unicity was supposed to correct all this, but one thing we did not tap into was the Police. We tapped into the Public Works Department, the Fire Department.

I'm glad to see the Police are in favour, the Association of the Police are in favour of this model. The Chief has gone over backwards, the Chief has taken a lot of lumps that in some cases were not needed. I know you Mr. Mayor have received a lot of phone calls, an ad was placed in the paper or some ways or means which was very unfair. I know that Councillor Wyatt is trying to score points with his constituents and I don't blame him. Why not? He wants to get re-elected again. But you have to take a look, take a look at the vision of City Council. What effect is this going to have? Will this have an effect of all the other members of Council. I know I had about three phone calls. I had one person phoning my house about 15 times and they were from Transcona. I happen to know that person. That person gets into every little thing whatever there is and complains about everything, snowplowing whatever it is. I know this individual person because I used to work with him.

Overall, the calls I thought I would be getting, I did not get. You have to take a look at the process that is here and I would urge all members of Council. Look, we're making a major change here for the betterment of police protection for the citizens of Winnipeg. It's a milestone, we're creating a milestone that will be there for a long long time. Long after we're gone. But we're creating a formula now that is going to be created will be used for future members of Council and future administrators and the general

public will absorb this in such a way. My area, people want this. They are all for it. Hartford Street is not a place to have a police station. It's a solid residential area. One person told me since the formation of the station here, I've never parked on my street in front of my house yet. The police use the parking on the streets because there's no room for them to park. You cannot expropriate properties to make way for a parking lot, it doesn't make any common sense at all. Some people have said, I've never had a place to park, never had a chance to park in front of my place because the station works three shifts, 24 hours a day. The Police have to have a place to park.

This is the dilemma that's there. The residents will not complain because they don't like to rock the boat. Some will not do anything to go against the Police because they know the fine job they do in the area, the protection they provide. I had an incident on my street and I'll tell you within two minutes the Police were there. The car came from outside the area because the contact came in from a) b) c) and d) and came down to the street and corrected the problem immediately.

On this Mr. Speaker, I would say that Councillor Wyatt to you, you've made a lot of noise out of this, you've received a lot of publicity out of this, good for you, but please take into account, do not try and discredit or to do anything to provide some ammunition to say that the Police our police are not doing their job, they're hiding facts, the Chief is doing this. They've gone over their call of duty even the Deputy Chiefs, they've gone beyond the call of their duty to try to give all of us and the general public all the information that is provided. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal on the clause and the amendment.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The principle issues on this item have been debated and discussed at length by many speakers before me, so I'll be very brief. I'm on the front lines of this amalgamation. The station on Provencher Boulevard will be amalgamated with the station in Transcona on approximately Lagimodiere and Dugald Road. I can say very very clearly through consultations with the people I represent in North St. Boniface that they are largely in favour of this amalgamation. The reasons are really quite clear. If you turn to page 5038 of your report I will read verbatim what the report says.

"In the four district model the availability of community patrol members increases due to the efficiencies created. Under the model there are more members are available for duty." This part is underlined. "At little cost to the City there will be an additional six constables deployed each day during prime time holiday hours." There will actually be more officers on the street. Yes it's true there are five stations that will be closing but there will be three modern facilities constructed at strategic locations to better serve the citizens of our city and I think that's something that we as councillors and all of our citizens are concerned about is fighting crime, making our neighbourhoods safer and supporting our police service.

(1:50)

The bottom line is that this is a $16.5 million investment by the City of Winnipeg into the City of Winnipeg Police Services. There will be more officers on the street less officers behind desks which I think we can all agree is a good thing. And it's something that's going to boost the morale of our existing police services from the Police Chief right down to the patrol officer to the community officer on the street. All in all it's something that constituents I represent are supportive of and I look forward to moving forward on this in a positive manner. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt on the clause and the amendment.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. Let me be very clear at the outset that I'm supportive of the four district model. That's not what the real debate is about here today but we're all falling into that excuse to be playing out in that particular fashion.

I'm very supportive of the Police Service. I commend Chief Ewatski and his staff in getting an operational analysis done and coming forward with this particular report. Really what's at stake here is a matter of policy. It's a matter of interpretation about policy. I'm going to appeal to us all even though we've had a discussion here and people are saying, no, I'm not going to support the amendment, I'm supporting the four district model. I clearly said that at the outset, I'll support the four district model. But it is about policy and I'm going to appeal to you in the sense that Council has the authority, the accountability, the right to put general parameters on all issues respecting infrastructure, economic development, housing. I say that because any department head would like to say, hang on boss, leave that with me, I know how to do it. I know if I need a district centre there or here, and we're not telling them where to put the districts specifically though there are some specifics within the report and we accept those. But we're saying simply, you have to listen very carefully that as a matter of public policy it is important for the perception of the public for safety in communities that we just acknowledge and codify in our general agreement on reorganization that service centres are important.

They're already in the Police report that was filed for information, and as Councillor Gerbasi has indicated is sitting in the Clerk's Office. Why was it even written up there? It was important to have an informational report, surely we can codify that as the overall model in this reorganization, we can have it included in this policy structure. I mean I would ask every other councillor around here particularly the old timers, lo and behold don't come to me and tell me your infrastructure street project has got more importance than mine, they'll fight like heck. The Director is telling you which street is in worse shape, which regional street needs work on. We're going to bypass it and select another one on occasion, not often, but on occasion. There's priorities taken because it's the accountability of Council.

I would like to appeal to us all, to put this on a higher level. I thought I was really at the Fringe Festival this morning. The acrimony was really very bad. I mean accusing a new councillor for a lot of things that are really not appropriate. I'm going to support Councillor Wyatt not only in this motion but I've supported him in principle of what he was trying to achieve. We did not agree and I'm not agreeing with him today that if we don't pass this motion I'm not going to support the four district model. It's not about saving the Transcona Police Station at its location on the corner of 'x' and 'y'. It's not about a police centre at the corner of 'x' and 'y'. I would appeal to Councillor Steeves and to Councillor Thomas that I agree there was a little bit too much precision about those two police centres in the motion to amend, but that comes from the report that the Police Chief had put in, the one that was filed. They're saying they're going to retain those. They got the addresses, that's where Councillor Wyatt got the information.

The information in the motion to amend is not dreamt, it's in the Police report. The second report that the Committee heard that was filed. In all that was being said frankly by Councillor Wyatt, is that for crying out loud folks stand back. The remit of councillors of elected officials is to have broad constructive what the Department ought to be doing. And we're saying to them, it's important that police centres under the system we now have be incorporated in your new model the new districts.

I'm arguing that I want a police centre somewhere in St. James – St. Charles. That's a large area. All we know and the calls that I get and they've been going on for years is that police presence and visibility is important. I agree with all the other comments that a police station in

your area doesn't guarantee no crime. We want the most bang for the buck I agree with that. In fact if we had enough time we could have sat here and said, show me the analysis where a three district model wouldn't be more cost effective. Maybe we keep just one downtown and the rest of the guys should amalgamate up in Pacific Avenue where we have land and we could build and have one master centre. I can get to any part of the town particularly at 2 o'clock in the morning in 22 minutes and the sirens blaring in probably 18. So there are other models. But on balance the Chief analyzed the politics of it. He analyzed the politics of it and said, you know on balance east of the River, north of the River, south of the River, west of the River, three additional stations and the central one will work and it's acceptable, and it's probably before it even came to us was acceptable politically. I'm just saying that people have critiqued the Councillor who was trying to champion an important issue in his area. That a police centre would be acceptable.

The fact of the matter is, would you have done it differently or I, had I been Councillor Wyatt in Transcona? Maybe. Had he taken a wrong approach from time to time? Perhaps. But on balance look at what we're trying to achieve. We have the right, and it's not telling the Police Chief how to do his job. We're not into operations, we're saying, policy here is do we want this four district model supportive. It ought to be blusterous with a complementary action with police centres in these areas. Because these are the political circumstances we're getting.

Now, 2004, 2005 and 2006 is a long time away. If in that intervening time the Police Chief says, hey folks here are the facts, here is why we should change. He can come back to us and I know that without acrimony we would discuss that and change it. Easily done. I really find it very unfortunate that this has become Council the old gang against the new rookie councillor. What was said today frankly is inappropriate. Attacking his ward allowance the way he wants to spend it. His being late at a meeting. He's picked an address. He has done things that maybe you and I perhaps would not have done. On the same token he's representing his community. I think he deserves a lot of applause for that. You know it's easier to beg for forgiveness than just seek approval. That's an old axiom that probably many of you have used in your political life and what he was trying to do is to move something ahead and get visibility out of it.

(2:00)

It's for that reason that I'm supporting maybe an imperfect motion, with a friendly amendment, I think we can take care of it. It really just codifies one thing. Chief, thank you very much for your informational report and some of that is a policy issue, we'll put it all together and accept that and it will have no detriment into how the Chief will operate his service centre. I appeal to you for a little common sense.

If you don't think we dabble in policy, I mean all you have to do is go to page 5029. Here's what EPC said for the information of Council. EPC referred the disposition of 227 Provencher Boulevard to the CAO for further discussion and report back to the Standing Policy Committee on P&D including the possibility of declaring the properties surplus city's needs and the utilization of the site for housing and for seniors housing. How specific can you get about one property. We're doing a facilities review. But lo and behold, and I'm not trying to put Councillor Vandal in a bad light, more for him on this particular issue, but he's cherry picked one item and we're going to include it in a report that we're acknowledging today. If there isn't a policy statement being made here, what is. If you can make a policy statement like that, we should simply say, what is wrong with just codifying where our police centres are going to be. They weren't precisely located. I apologize they were on St. Mary's Road and Henderson Hwy., but the rest, a four kilometre area from the existing Lyle Street station. In downtown Transcona which is pretty big.

Come on, I think we should appeal to some common sense here. This is policy, this is our job and that's what we should be doing. It's just advancing that amendment. Yes, while we've seemed to have won, isn't that too bad. He beat the old timers. In fact he should win in this case not because he should win on behalf of Transcona because it makes a heck of a lot of sense. I appeal to those who have already spoken here, don't shut this aside very quickly.

Thank you to Councillor Wyatt. I thank the Police Department. We're all on line in trying to make some savings, make it cost-effective, and to get more police on the street, that's what it's all about. Thank you.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, the debate on this particular clause or the clause itself is highly important. It's a major issue that has been understudied by the Chief of Police and his administration for some period of time in terms of trying to develop a better model for a delivery of a better police service throughout the City, and I think the debate by and large since it commenced before the lunch break has been very good and I don't either degrade or belittle any of my colleagues who have participated in this no matter what their point of view is on the issue that's before us. Everybody comes to these debates I hope with thoughts and positions that are sincerely felt as elected representatives they're entitled to express themselves. So I'm not criticizing anyone for expressing opinions here. I'm going to be speaking on both the clause and the amendment, generally on the clause, I'm supportive of the main clause that is in front of us, Item No. 1.

I attended the public forum that was hosted by Chief Ewatski and his staff in my part of town on the 23 of June. There was about 40 people at that particular forum. My colleague Councillor De Smedt was also there. Chief Ewatski and his people did a stellar job in presenting their recommendations for a change in the organizational structure of the Police Department. And generally speaking at the conclusion of that forum there was broad acceptance from those who were there at least from the St. James-Assiniboia side of the City for what the Department was proposing.

I must say when I consider the feedback that I've been getting in my own office by phone or letter or e-mail, there actually hasn't been a lot of feedback pro or con but it's been generally pretty positive the feedback that's been coming in.

People are concerned about safety and about police protection in the City, and under this model Mr. Speaker if it's approved today they're going to be getting police protection and it's going to be enhanced police protection over time, and we're going to have an operational system in the Winnipeg Police Service that is being designed to better suit the delivery of police services throughout the City. From time to time we have to go through these organizational changes in all of our departments and it's been a while since the Winnipeg Police Service last underwent any kind of a structural change insofar as the way that service is delivered to the community.

Chief Ewatski and his crew who went around the City have to be complimented and I do compliment them, not only on my own behalf but on behalf of the people I represent here for a job that has been very well done. They made a very complete case for the reorganization and certainly at the meeting I was at they responded in detail to the questions and the queries that were asked by citizens who took the time to attend that meeting. I'm assuming but I wasn't there, those other forums, but I'm assuming that in all of the other forums that were held a similar practice was maintained by the Police Service.

We as councillors have had lots of information provided to us over the course of the last number of months Mr. Speaker. We've had a full blown Council

seminar in the last few months where before this report was made public it was vetted amongst members of Council number one, so that there wouldn't be any surprises to them, they wouldn't be reading anything in next days newspaper that would be a surprise, and number two to get some feedback, initial feedback on the initial proposals. Then of course it's been through the standing committee process and Executive Committee and now we're here today to either approve or not approve the final proposals that Chief Ewatski feels are necessary in order to give his department a more effective and efficient way of delivering police service to the community.

Of course I'm no different than anyone else Mr. Speaker, I have a police centre in my constituency on Lyle Street. Under this proposal it is planned that Lyle Street will be closed and a service centre will be located somewhere in the St. James-Assiniboia area and probably on Portage Avenue, a location not yet finalized but in a location that will be easily accessible to the community, and will provide better facilities for the operation of the detachment in that particular district. I don't have any concerns about the closure of Lyle Street. There were very few concerns expressed at the Sturgeon Creek High School forum in that regard Mr. Speaker. People certainly want to see a physical presence, and if it isn't at Lyle Street as long as it's somewhere in the community and preferably on Portage Avenue where access and visibility is easy that will be fine.

I'm going to be supporting the recommendation. I'm not going to be supporting the proposed amendment. I heard my colleague from St. Charles, Councillor De Smedt's arguments. I don't buy into the arguments Mr. Speaker. I do think that the amendment however well intended is a little more meddling than I think is necessary.

(2:07)

The amendment has some very finite words in it Mr. Speaker. It states in some of the location districts where stations or centres will be located that a place has to be within two kilometres of a certain address or within four kilometres of a certain address etc. In this process if Council passes a motion like this Mr. Speaker, and if six months from now it's decided or the Police decide that an 'x' location is going to be actually 2.8 kilometres away from 'x' marks the spot, that means that we have to come back to Council to get the approval for one eighth of a kilometre because that's what the charter says. When Council passes a motion like this it's finite and it's very finite. If for example you can't meet that particular specific two kilometre range from in this case Dugald and Lagimodiere, then you have to come back to Council and get approval for a quarter of a mile. That's the problem with a motion like this when Council passes it the words are finite and we have to live within them, and if it's slightly outside of the range that's been suggested here it means another Council decision which really is unnecessary for something so small and so innocuous.

I'm not going to be supporting this amendment because I don't think it's necessary. Over time as the Chief develops the locations we'll be dealing with them I'm sure in the committee process and all of us will want to make sure that the communities we represent have the kind of presence that was indicated during the forum would be there.

I'm not going to be critical although I think I have every right to be critical of some of the theatrics that have been undertaken by my friend from Transcona in this regard. I guess we all have to do things that we think are going to get us the publicity that we're seeking when we're trying to champion an issue, and I don't say that in a negative way or impugn any motive, because motive in not intended here Mr. Speaker. I must say that some of the theatrics were a little bit bizarre. Each member of Council receiving a stack of alleged petitions that are thicker than the yellow pages of the Winnipeg phone book is really I don't know how many acres of forest had to be cut down

for such a wasted effort Mr. Speaker but I know in my office that document didn't get read but the reverse side is going to make some very good scrap paper probably for the next six months because there was enough of it there enough material to fertilize a ten acre field in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say this. Theatrics can be very interesting and they can be a lot of fun. I've been here long enough as one of the so called old guys to remember another member of Council who was here for a while who in a particular difficult issue engaged in similar types of theatrics and really it became a joke. He made himself eventually look like an ass, he was an embarrassment not only to himself but eventfully to his own electors, because in the subsequent general election they booted him out of office quite substantially. And coincidently he happened to be the member from Transcona at the time Mr. Speaker. Those of us who were here in that 1994-1995 period will remember the shenanigans during the very difficult issue dealing with the Winnipeg Jets. I'm sure my friend Councillor Wyatt will remember that because he worked for the chap at the time, and would remember some of the silly shenanigans that we had to put up with in this chamber which eventually caused the people of Transcona such embarrassment that they decided they better have a new representative who would not only speak up for them but at least be respectful.

I just say that as a word of caution Mr. Speaker that sometimes these theatrics can be lots of fun but often the wind will blow the other way and you'll have some unwanted product on your face at the end of the day. Just a word of caution.

Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell, I am supporting the main clause and I reject the amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's always enjoyable to have a friendly chat in here. This Mr. Speaker has been a delicate issue that's been handled for quite some time. I think handled very well by our police department. They've conducted themselves in my view in an exemplary fashion throughout the community in a number of very public meetings, and I appreciate that they're not always well attended but I think in some cases they were. I know that they entertained a lot of questions and provided a lot of answers. The only thing that I'll say about that process is that the lack of response in any negative way from the people that I represent is virtually deafening because the people that did go out to those meetings got the answers that they were looking for Mr. Speaker, and were quite happy with them.

There's issues at our end of town. Clearly there is going to be a new centre that's going to be created, it's going to be in my constituency somewhere near Grant and Shaftsbury. I'm very pleased with that. No that's not policy, it's in the report. There's also going to be a loss in that same community where they're looking at that centre going of a community based policing office. There's also going to be a change from one that is directly across the bridge almost to something a little further west from the sounds of things. There's activity in and around my area.

We have a number of policing issues on an on going basis out our way. I know they do their level best to handle the calls as well as they can. It's not an easy job. It's also not always easy as an elected official to try and stay out of the process of police work. The fact is, is that for the 20 years that I've been here I've done that and I think for the majority most of the councillors I've worked with during that tenure have tried to allow the various police chiefs to operate their department because there's a lot of knowledge that they bear on individual issues where we don't get to share in that information or at least not at the same timeframes as they do while they conduct their work. I think it would be a very very delicate set of maneuvering for people like us to be involved in any meaningful way in what

they do. I don't think that we should be getting too strong in that area.

I guess it comes back to trust Mr. Speaker in the end. If I was dealing with a community based policing office in my area and I called Jack Ewatski and he in fact told me that there was going to be a community policing office built in my ward.

(2:15)

In fact he stated it publicly. I think that was good enough for me. I appreciate that everybody looks at these things in different ways and tries to handle them in different ways, sometimes it may be how you start an issue. On occasion you can get yourself backed in a corner and then you have to try and claw yourself out of it.

The bottom line is, is that sometimes how you handle those issues comes with experience and in terms of this issue and others like it I'm not going to apologize for being one of the old gang. By the way, gang was the group against negative government Mr. Speaker. Had a lot of meetings to continue on that path years ago. I don't mind being a little older because I've got a couple of great grandsons and I'm very proud of them and I wouldn't have them if I was a little younger. You've got to look at the positive sides of these things from time to time. I don't have a lot of hair so I don't have to be worrying like Harry is about how to deal with it. When I get to be his age.

The bottom line Mr. Speaker, is that I think that the Police Department has handled this issue very very well. I think they should be supported. I appreciate that some people have taken themselves down paths in this journey where it's difficult for them to jump on board. In some cases they're paddling against a fairly swift current. You know what, you kind of have to deal with those dance maneuvers on the floor when you get there depending on how the music has started, and which optima you decided to jump in and start dancing. Those things I think you learn over time. I think that's mostly what this is about.

I do intend to support the clause that's come forward. I don't intend to support the motion that's been put forward this morning because I don't think it's necessary. I think that Mr. Ewatski has this in hand, and I think that he is going to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that his word is his bond when he's been making public statements about certain initiatives throughout this process. I think that's all that's required. I would urge everybody to support it. I'm looking forward to the conclusion.

It's a very very difficult thing Mr. Speaker. If you could design a city out in the middle of a desert like they did with Las Vegas you could put things in a lot of really neat places. If we blinked away every library in Winnipeg I would virtually be assured Mr. Speaker that we wouldn't rebuild 23 of them. We would probably build 10 or 11 and have a lot more in them than the 23 had. Police stations are much the same. This is not something that you can easily do piecemeal. I think you have to do it, you have to know that you're doing it and work towards it. Put the money there and provide a good working environment for these people because they have a very stressful and tough job. Thanks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Final speaker I have on my list here is Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Mr. Speaker each time one of these major issues comes to the forefront a report usually has a cornerstone to it. This one interestingly enough is not one that's self-evident but those of us who have followed this closely will remember an outside audit of police department that came back in glowing terms saying, the Winnipeg Police Service was effective and efficient.

Councillor Wyatt talked about the importance of a need to have police presence and visibility in his ward. Nowhere has that been better shown than in the additional foot patrol officers we now enjoy in the Exchange. Why are they there? Because we had some

horrific crime. As we know from the glowing reports from the media that seems to have been stamped. Police presence is real, it brings about a perception of safety and Wyatt had every right to ask for it.

Let me say this though. I always enjoy these debates because there are always three or four bellwether commentaries, and this debate didn't miss them. The one I liked best was a reference from a speaker who accused Wyatt of "gross distortion". Well I remember being on this Council floor three years ago when we heard that we were over policed and the Police were too expensive. What did we do? We got an independent report. And what did the independent report say? It said they were effective, they were efficient and most important of all against a very stringent criteria they ranked in the top ten percent of the nation, period. Police service to be extraordinarily proud of. I dare say everybody around this chamber is.

I was particularly impressed by the fact the Mayor noted that in the upcoming years there will be tens of millions of additional dollars spent on police services. I intend to hold his feet to the fire on that when we go into the budgetary debates.

Furthermore the Mayor noted, that there is a five page document from Chief Ewatski saying point blank, that there will be a police service centre in Transcona. It's been referenced on the floor here clearly it's a public document, I think we should all have copies of it and I dare say I'm disappointed that the Mayor didn't pass it on to all of us.

The fascinating thing about all of this is that Councillor Wyatt has taken some pretty punishing blows here. And as Councillor De Smedt has well pointed out, everybody approaches issues in a different manner. One of the wonderful things about a democracy particularly a government by consensus which is what we have here is the ability to descent.

Councillor Wyatt asked to have a suspension of rules and he may have come to a committee meeting late, and some may not have agreed with the histrionics of putting down a group of signatures. I well remember being on EPC on two occasions where a councillor came in and asked for a suspension of rules didn't get his way and cried. Guess what, we suspended the rules. Don't talk to me about histrionics.

The fact remains is that Councillor Eadie had indicated that Wyatt without being referenced may have to be concerned about re-election. I'll take that bet. There may not be anybody around this table who's going to support Wyatt's motion but I'm willing to take the bet Wyatt will be returning. Because Wyatt was supported maybe by nobody around the table but he was sure supported by his constituents. That's who he was sent here by.

Whether I agree with his particular path or not, I'm here to defend what he did. Councillor De Smedt's point is well taken. Who facing the same scenario may not have taken a comparable approach. The wonderful thing about this debate has been the entire focus on police services. Why is that so important? I would suggest you have a police service that's understaffed. What underscores that? The Mayor winces and smiles. Why are we paying overtime for people in the Exchange District? Mr. Speaker, you bring forward an incredibly important point. Coming Autumn we're going to see the reports as extended as they may be about the validity of a police commission, and we want a police commission.

(2:25)

Because we want police services to be able to report to that commission and tell us exactly what they need without undue political interference.

I believe it's going to happen. We're going to have a bigger police budget than we have now and we're going to serve the citizens of Winnipeg better than we ever have.

Finally my last comment. You know I'm always amazed by the documentary that

comes out of here. One of our colleagues was shocked, dismayed, and astonished by Councillor Wyatt's approach. The fact remains it's probably a wonderful opportunity to have a person to have those motions for the first time ever, and I thank you for them Councillor.

The bottom line is, that I won't support the amendment because Councillor Eadie is quite correct. It is probably too definitive if we have to be bringing it back for review. I have faith that the Police Service will deliver a four district model with three new stations that will serve the citizens of the community exceedingly well.

Councillor Wyatt's approach though has brought this to the forefront. People are concerned about their community. Interestingly enough when you look at the crime statistics where did they not go down universally. Transcona. And so the fact remains is that Councillor Wyatt took the approach that he felt was appropriate. My guesstimation is that this thing will probably pass 15 – 1, that's about as strong as an endorsation as you can get. Those are my comments and I thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just a few points and I wanted to state my position publicly. The District 4 police station on Pandora also serves North Kildonan. I can tell you that there are times when my constituents are frustrated as well that there are not enough police to respond to the various calls for service. Albeit I've yet to hear of a serious emergency that wasn't attended to by any of our emergency response triage teams.

Ultimately I think we've had consensus for some time in these chambers I think since probably 1995, certainly by '96, that we wanted to decentralize police operations, and we did that by wholeheartedly supporting community based policing both as a philosophy and as an operational reality. With police service centres and beat patrol offices in various neighbourhoods where they were both required because of the stress within that neighbourhood and the risk in that neighbourhood and also because of the visibility and the opportunity for police to interface with the public to conduct matters of business and exchange that perhaps didn't require an emergency response.

This program has for the most part worked very well. I see the four district model as a natural evolution of that decentralization of police operations. I see it as an opportunity to move the functions of police and to create the dynamics of police operations because they are different because of the needs that are different in different parts of our city, and addressing those in a way that can't be done with a central public safety building ultimately operating as the mothership for some very small and in many cases outdated and under resourced locations in various communities.

I believe that as a government we have a role to play in developing the philosophy of the police operations. And we certainly have a role to play in providing the resources for those operations and ensuring that those operations receive the priority that they require in order to do the job.

I also believe that politicizing the administration of the Police is wrong. Ultimately it's wrong because political lobbying should not outweigh the merits of sound operational analysis and due diligence of police operations which is ultimately what we hire the Chief of Police to do for Council, for citizens. Ultimately what he or she and their senior officers are supposed to provide.

I'm concerned that if we become too caught up in debating where service centres are located, or where police stations are located, that we will lose sight of the importance of the operational aspect of the police and concern ourselves more with winning the day and providing to our electorate the ultimate

prize of a police station. We should no more be politicizing the placement of police stations than we should be politicizing the placement of libraries or schools or fire halls or ambulance halls or hospitals. These ultimately have to be decided on based on the merits of their individual cases, and ultimately on their demonstrated need.

For that reason I'm going to be supporting the four district model and I'm not going to get into a long protracted debate about whether it should be two kilometres or one kilometre or even in North Kildonan, period, because I know that based on the operational analysis that is going to be provided by our chief and his staff that North Kildonan will continue to be served well, as it is being served now with a police station in Transcona some five or six miles or more away.

I don't take issue with Councillor Wyatt's approach. I admire the stick-to-itiveness that he used in lobbying for his position, it's not necessarily the same tact that I would have taken but that's what makes us all unique and interesting as politicians. I think he's done a great deal of service both to his constituents and also to the rest of Winnipeg by making sure that we have an opportunity to debate this important issue here today. Certainly he's gotten a lot of people interested in the debate.

I appreciate the intent of the motion that he is advancing Motion 2 especially with respect to the protection of the location of the police service centre in North Kildonan at 1050 Henderson Hwy. A police service centre that I had the privilege and opportunity to cut the grand opening ribbon in 1996.

(2:32)

A police service centre that we're very pleased to have in North Kildonan. I would be loathe to stand in the way of the operational effectiveness of our police department and insist that that police service centre remain at that location when perhaps there are other areas either in North Kildonan or in Elmwood or in Transcona that may be more needy and more deserving because of their need of a police service centre at that location. I don't believe that my constituents would support maintaining police infrastructure or operations in a location where they are deemed to be less necessary or even unnecessary when they could be better used elsewhere. Either in the ward of North Kildonan or another part of the City. This isn't about making sure that we have the most fortified community in Winnipeg or that we have the most police stations located in our particular district as it is to make sure that our whole city is safe. If our whole city is safe then ultimately I think the various districts and pieces will take care of themselves.

I'm not in favour of hamstringing or handcuffing the police department to a commitment that may be at some point in time deemed to be operationally redundant or ineffective. I appreciate the intent and the effort that Councillor Wyatt and Councillor De Smedt have put forward in this motion.

With that Mr. Speaker I'll close just by summing up that I will be supporting the four district model but that I will not be supporting Motion No. 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers. Councillor Wyatt you can close on your motion No. 2.

Councillor Wyatt: Can I speak to the clause Mr. Speaker for 10 minutes?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No. You spoke to the clause when you opened your Motion No. 2, you combined them both together.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. It's been a very interesting discussion and debate. I want to just comment based from this process that I've been involved with, I found it very interesting and very eye opening as a new councillor. I think it's commendable what the Police Services have done looking at ways to rationalize and to use their resources their existing resources in a more effective way and I commend the Chief and the Police Service for that job, and the job that

they're doing on a daily basis with the City of Winnipeg in providing safety on our streets.

The use of better resources is always a good thing Mr. Speaker and existing resources is always a good thing. I also would like to thank the Chief for all the work he did going to the public meetings and having these public hearings around the City. That I realize was not originally part of the plan. I commend him for doing that and for hearing the public and listening to the public on their concerns regarding it.

Again I must appeal to common sense, and I come back to that again and again and again. That is what was the purpose of the public meetings? What was the purpose of the public hearings? If the purpose of the public hearings were just for the sake of public hearings and not really to gather information that we would then use towards an adoption of a new report based on the concerns raised by the public, then clearly the public hearings were just a relations, an exercise in public relations. That to me is unacceptable.

The idea that we go around the City and have 11 meetings in 11 different parts of the City in 11 different communities, and the public attends some of them in hot sweaty gyms because it's the middle of the summer already and people came out and spoke, a lot of them with concerns and a lot of them with passion about their community. As I said, fairly saying today that they can see the necessity and the need of having new police stations and the four district model but they want to insure that with that they know what the police presence will be in their community and this was said right across the City Mr. Speaker at the different meetings.

Why is that important, police presence, it keeps coming up over and over again? It's been mentioned that having a building may not deter crime. Well it's having a police service centre. It's having a police station. It's having a beat office. It's having cruiser cars. It's having officers walking the street. All those things which create a safer city. This has been recognized time and time again in other cities that have started to go towards community based policing.

I can talk about for example, we modeled our system I recall back two chiefs ago started with modeling community based policing based on Edmonton. Edmonton seems to be heading in the opposite direction as well. Ron Hader who is a long time city councillor in Edmonton and sits on FCM's Community and Safety Crime Prevention Committee, Municipal Finance, International Programs Standing Committee on FCM, quoted on his website at his recent budget debate in Edmonton. "I haven't been happy with the changes I've observed in the Police Service since returning to city council, but let me make one thing perfectly clear. I'm not knocking the quality and dedication of the force, I have the highest respect for every man and woman there. It's the approach that bothers me but it seems that community based policing model which was proven so valuable combating crime here and elsewhere, is being replaced by an expensive bureaucratic military reactor style policing in Edmonton which just won't work. I see more and more officers in patrol cars rather than on neighbourhood beats. Building expensive new police stations with new layers of bureaucracy doesn't reduce crime. You've got to get police into the communities and working closely with citizens on a day to day basis."

This is exactly what I'm speaking to Mr. Speaker. The need to have police in the community.

It's been said Mr. Speaker that some people may disagree with the fact of the media campaign and the advertising. I can assure you that if there was a way I could not have spent $6,000 and save that taxpayers money I would have definitely done it. I did everything in my power to try and influence the process before that before it had to come to that.

I spoke to the Chair of our standing committee on June 24, in my office asking her to include in the report coming forward the fact of a police service centre in my community and other communities.

Include that as part of the report not to receive it as information to be filed away. As one member of EPC told me that's just the same as filing it, and burying it but to include it in the report coming forward so the community knows what's going to happen.

Then on June 27 I wrote to the Mayor expressing my concerns again in an attempt to avoid the donnybrook that we have now. In the letter I offered a method that we could avoid what's happening today. I can read it, I only have 20 seconds. A copy of the letter was circulated to all the councillors.

It was there for the record, it's there for the record Mr. Speaker. It was a way to avoid what's happening today, it was clearly ignored based on what has occurred since then. At EPC to respond to that, I clearly spoke to the Committee Clerk ahead of time and told them I wanted to speak. Even one councillor indicated to me he didn't have a clue that you had to register 4:30 the day before. It's a common courtesy to let councillors speak at EPC and he was shocked to find out it wasn't allowed.

Mr. Speaker I've laid my cards on the table and I've been very frank about what we need. I've been very honest and I've said from the word go, the four district model is positive but I cannot support it without knowing what's going to happen in my community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. This has been a fascinating and interesting debate today, and I'd like to thank everybody for participating in it. I'm also glad it's over.

I'd like to particularly thank the Winnipeg Police Service. I know Jack Ewatski, Inspector Caron and Menno Zacharias and many others that have worked, they been working on this for years. The day is finally here that we can move forward with this, and I think their hard work is appreciated by all members of Council.

(2:40)

Just in response to a few of the things that were raised. The report Councillor Steek referred to the report that was at the standing committee. That report has been public since the agenda was published for the July 10 meeting. It wasn't included in the agenda but it has been distributed. It's certainly a public document and there's no secrets in it.

The issue Councillor Wyatt is saying is that, he didn't want to receive that as information, he wanted it written in stone. The appropriate approach in terms of responding to the public hearings, this report covers what was said in those public hearings. The Police Chief reported that to the Standing Policy Committee, which is the appropriate process. We heard those reports and that was public and that's available to everybody. I'm not quite sure what the concern is in terms of process. It's been very open and public.

There's been a lot of comments about the approach of Councillor Wyatt in this issue, and I think nobody is saying that alternate views can't be or shouldn't be expressed, we certainly had meeting after meeting and openingly expressed all those views. I don't think that's what's being criticized here. There is a concern that a line was crossed a little bit when the Mayor's home phone number was published and sent out to 4,000 residents. He does have a family and a life and I think that that's inconsiderate and going a little too far. I don't think anyone is saying Councillor Wyatt does not have every right to speak up at every meeting and in every other way that he has, nobody has stood in his way. Again he was sitting right there from the beginning of that EPC meeting and did not mention that he wanted to be a delegation until after the delegations were closed. I call that a tactic. I think those kind of tactics are going a little too far. That's not to say that there's no room for opposition, all these processes are about opposition and hearing both sides. I think that was a very open and fair process. I will defend that without hesitation.

Another point Councillor Wyatt raised in his closing was this letter suggesting and visit to his office. By the way, I don't think he likes the paint job in my office because I don't think he's set foot across there since he's been elected. I'm often stopping in his office. One time that I did, he was suggesting that we rewrite the report for the Chief of Police. I'm sorry his letter also suggests that he would help write that report. We don't write the administrative reports. The Administration does that. I think this is another example of understanding and the process around here and when it's fair for a politician to cross that line. Those are lines we just can't cross if we're going to have integrity. That's just going too far. I'm not going to write an administrative report for the Chief of Police.

Once that report is written we have every right to publicly comment on it and debate it, and we debated it and debated it, I think it's been a very good debate.

Councillor De Smedt talked about a friendly amendment that could somehow make this motion make sense, but I do not see a motion moved. Don't know how we can really discuss that. If you want to propose a motion that talks in general that isn't interfering with operational issues then move the motion. There's no motion here that does that.

I think everyone of us has issues of safety in our wards and we all care about this issue. I think none of us cares any less than anyone else here. That's really not what we're discussing today. We're talking about a system and a way to reduce bureaucracy, the comments about Edmonton. Well we're moving away from we're decreasing bureaucracy and putting more officers on the street, and I think that's the basic reason why the majority of Council is likely to support this today.

With that I'll close. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We'll deal with Motion No. 2. Recorded vote has been asked for. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors De Smedt and Wyatt.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko**.**

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 2, Nays 13.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's carried.

The clause Item No. 1. Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillor Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 1.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Clause is carried.

Clause 2 Councillor Gerbasi.

Item No. 2 – Community Incentive Grant Policy Review
File PR-2.6

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. As usual the July meeting is particularly brutal as it's the last meeting before the summer break.

Having said that, I'm pleased to introduce the report of the review of the community incentive grant program. I urge Council to support the two recommendations put forward by the Administration.

The first recommendation is to expand the criteria for organizations. And just to quote the recommendation is "if an organization is a non-profit community organization offering sport or recreation services or is a non-profit community organization that contributes to the health and well-being of the community through the development of a sport or recreation capital project that is accessible to the community."

This would cover off many of the grants that currently don't fit the criteria solely because of the organization that's applying. It makes sense that if these groups that aren't sports and recs organizations are doing capital projects that benefit the community at-large that they should have the same opportunity as other organizations.

The second recommendation is that we require a two-third vote of Council to waive the criteria. As you are all aware, two-thirds of Council is what is required to waive Council procedure by-law. There is nothing unusual or frightening about this two-thirds rule. We use it at virtually every council meeting as a standard to waive council policy, I'm not sure how many times if we've used it two or three times today. It is not something that is uncommon for waiving council rules.

It's been argued that the ward councillor knows best what is needed in his or her ward. And this is true. Compelling cases can and I'm sure they will be made and criteria will get waived in the future. A councillor need only convince two-thirds of Council of the worthiness of their cause.

It is important to remember the reason this decision is before us today clearly this program is being used inappropriately. Most of us are guilty of this and this is not about pointing fingers, it is more about getting our act together and behaving like a mature and fiscally responsible level of government. There is no level of government that has programs with effectively no criteria. That is how we are operating right now in reality. Up to now not one community incentive grant no matter how wacky has been turned down to my knowledge.

The reason we have criteria is not just to make sure that the dollars go to appropriate projects but to ensure fairness to the public. Grants should not be given without transparent guidelines or all fairness is lost to those who seek the grants. Many of us have felt increasingly uncomfortable with the current scenario.

(2:50)

It reflects poorly on our city government and gives a perception of a government that is not managing its finances well.

The key point here is that this is a capital program. More and more it is being used for operational expenditures. We are borrowing money for things that are gone within the year. That is very poor government policy and is frankly embarrassing.

I say it again, this is a capital program. It is also being used to fund things outside the City's jurisdiction. For play structures that serve the community at-large in partnership with school divisions, those things are part of the criteria, those are fine, but when you start funding the operation of schools that are something that is obviously within the school division budget, these are not things that the City of Winnipeg's budget should be covering, and we are.

We need to remember that this is not Councillors' money, this is the money of the citizens of Winnipeg. We as councillors have insight into the needs of our community and we should continue to have input into community projects.

However, all of our wards have needs for capital dollars to improve recreational facilities in our wards, and if this money

is used for other things then it is not available for this purpose.
When we as councillors identify needs in our communities that are outside of the CIG program, there are constructive options for us to turn to. If we can't use the per capita program, the rec reserve or the land dedication reserve, we still have a choice if we're prepared to work at it. Councillors can bring forward a new program or request a grant through the budget process.

To give one example, the multi-family tax credit program was created to deal with the problem of boarded up and vacant properties that were hard to make viable for development. I have heard some members of Council scoff at this idea and put forward the notion that no one would consider their proposal if they weren't on Executive Policy Committee. Well I don't buy that. If any member of Council wants to work together as a team and come up with an idea that makes sense, I'm confident this idea would get a fair hearing.

I see Councillor Steeves and Councillor Pagtakhan non EPC members working on all sorts of things and ideas and bringing them forward successfully through Council.

The problem is the nature of the game for some is to be a critic rather than someone who comes up with positive constructive suggestions and actions. It's your choice.

Another problem with excessive straying from following the criteria is that public expectations are being raised. There is an increasing expectation that all sorts of money is available. In fact we face serious financial limitations right now and we need to priorize carefully. Who can blame a struggling non-profit group for believing the City is loaded with available money for whatever worthy project they bring forward. All they have to do is come to City Centre Community Committee, well at least until the money is all gone.

In closing, I urge Council to make these changes, and once these changes are made, let's have some backbone and stick to these reasonable rules. Unless of course we can make a compelling case for a cause that makes sense to support. With that, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, I was on this Council and then I became an MLA and then I came back. When I came back I joined the Committee of Protection and Community Services. Councillor Vandal was Chair. Councillor Gerbasi was on the Committee with me along with Councillor Lubosch. After three or four meetings when CIG grants were coming up, I noticed the criteria were not being followed in a number of them. So I asked. I moved a motion calling for a review of the criteria.

We did have a thorough look at the criteria. The Department looked at it and came back. We ended up saying, look it, what we have now is not perfect but it will help.

Then I found out myself over the period of the term that there were things that fell through the cracks. You could not get according to Councillor Gerbasi, she refers to something that has been passed recently, no matter how wacky.

Let me tell you this. We found out very clearly the only way to get something happening to in effect help the needs in your community was to go ahead and violate the criteria. And I did it. Councillor Gerbasi did it.

Let me tell you this, an example of this, I'll give you an example that Councillor Lubosch has. He had loads of graffiti in his area. He wasn't happy with what was occurring, it wasn't coming off fast enough, it wasn't being dealt with. He in effect gave a CIG grant to deal with this matter.

I think it's important that the Councillor does know, he or she does know what's best for their community.

I think the real issue however is the fact that there's an attempt to centralize if EPC doesn't do it, hell with it, it doesn't get done.

If there were some other funds available, now there's a motion forwarded by Vandal and Steeves that could be an answer if it was more specific and gave amounts it might please me.

The fact is, there are things in our neighbourhoods in our wards that the individual councillor knows best. I would say it's a lot better decentralizing it in that fashion.

The big question too is, why the two-thirds vote? We have a budget, we don't require two-thirds vote. On this matter we require two-thirds vote under the proposed criteria. It doesn't make much sense, does it?

Now we've heard I think coming through loud and clear that in fact Councillor Gerbasi referred to this, that there was an effort to get one single councillor, I think that's part of it. I don't think it's the whole thing. I think people like Councillor Clement and Councillor Eadie are two that have firm convictions on this and voted every way never to allow the criteria to be altered. I support them, I think they have some principles. But I think it's important to realize that all of us could say no with a majority vote.

Councillor Gerbasi could say no. She says she has so many requests that we've widened it and she doesn't like to say no to all these people. Let me tell you this, I say no to a lot of things. I think she can learn to say no too.

The fact is, not following the criteria once in a while allows us a lot of scope. Allows us to have some weight in our community. To go ahead and do away with this to me is ludicrous. It dwarfs the role of the individual councillor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm going to be supporting the clause. But I want to put on the record that I'm also voting for the waive of criteria because I, too believe in time to time there may be things that where, a councillor could convince me that we should be waiving the criteria. I want to put that on the record just so that nobody is surprised in the future. I think the two-thirds vote does make some sense in that it might prevent us from spending too too much time debating rather somewhat small on a grander scale of things. Somewhat smaller issues.

(2:56)

I think maybe the two-thirds vote is a step in the right direction. I would like to make those comments just so everybody is aware of my position going forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers.

Councillor Steek you want to speak.

Councillor Steek: I said earlier on, traditionally any time there's an administrative report there's a cornerstone in it.

The ubiquitous hand of the Administration wrote this. Not only did it not have a cornerstone, it did not have a lot of mortar.

Let me point out a couple of things to you. Read through a ten page report and find out the rationale for the two-thirds. There's two lines. We think two-thirds would be good idea. Why not three-quarters? Why not 90%?

The fascinating thing about the three-quarter criteria of course is that Councillors Clement, Eadie, Angus and Thomas unless it's in her ward, traditionally vote against these things. So what you're asking this Council to come up with is 11 out of 12 votes.

It's stunning to me though that there is absolutely no rationale for the number two-thirds. My assistant took on looking

at councils across the country. With the exception of the suspension of rules to hear a delegation, there isn't a two-thirds vote required on anything anywhere. Is it within your purview to change the policy? Yes it is. What's the rationale for it? Certainly there isn't the rationale within the cumbersome document that we got.

The fascinating thing was is that the verb used to describe my interaction with the Administration was "that I grilled them". I didn't grill anybody. I just asked for some documented facts. I'm assuming all of you had the opportunity to look through this document which creates a CIG in the year 2000 through to 2003. I want to thank my EA who painstakingly did an analysis on this document.

So what happened? Over a span of 3 ½ years was a total of $4.5 million that went through the CIG account. $1.8 million of it did not meet criteria. But have a look at what does not meet criteria.

If you come up five percent short of the magic formula you don't meet criteria. Let me tell you what happened by ward. I'm happy to give this to anybody.

River Heights Ward - $227,000, out of criteria.

Fort Rouge - $86,000

Daniel McIntryre - $254,000

St. James-Charleswood – St. Charles all about $15,000

Point Douglas - $234,000 why? Because of the difficulty for the groups in the innercity in realizing funding.

Old Kildonan - $110,000

Mynarski - $43,000

North Kildonan - $253,000

Elmwood, stunning - $192,000. More housing, more school grants went through in Elmwood than in River Heights. I don't quibble with them for a moment because I think that Councillor Thomas knows her ward in the way I know mine.

St. Boniface - $53,000
St. Vital - $73,000

Even the venerable St. Norbert - $55,000.

Now, Councillor Gerbasi brought up an excellent point. She said look, this isn't about personalities and she's absolutely right.

Let's just speak to the merit of the issue. Many of the groups that come forward looking for cannot get matching funds. Many of them are special and unique to that particular ward.

When I take a look at what happens on Council regularly and this amount seems to be a staggering amount. I had an interesting conversation with Mr. Benham the other day. I was walking outside and I said to Mr. Benham, what the blazes are you doing with this policy? His response was, well Steek if you would stay within the rules we wouldn't have to do this. He said you know what, I watched the debate here for $16,000 for two hours. Well guess what this is going to do? Everytime something is outside of criteria you're going to go through that debate. A lot of it will be outside the criteria.

Why is this amount of money so Herculean for some people? Here's a fascinating thing that occurred. At the end of each year for the last half decade this council has carved up surpluses between five and ten million dollars. Was there a two-thirds polarity required? No. Why not? How many of you were elected with a two-thirds majority? Forget those of you who fell off the log and got in acclamation. The Mayor got 50%, Pagtakhan got 27%. Why don't we have two-thirds majorities when you have to be elected?

How about this one. One million dollars for an arena. We know the project was going through, and I'll recollect it went through with a two-thirds majority. I don't recollect that being part of the criteria. A million dollars. What you're losing is your

autonomy as a ward councillor. It's being usurped by EPC. Call it anything you want.

Last Councillor Smith has indicated, Councillor Clement, Councillor Eadie are true to their word on every vote, they vote against it regardless of where it's coming from. Two other councillors automatically vote against it as well. Councillor Angus said to me, well Steek why don't you bring in something relative to schools, I'll vote against it of course.

The question becomes, how much was impacted by the schools? I did a tally often what went into the schools. The totality of my projects out of that $4.5 million, less than 3%. That's what this is about. That's what this debate is about.

Here's the fascinating thing about it. If you don't believe that, I went back through Hansard. When other people break the criteria they don't go on the floor of Council and have to debate it, it's supported by EPC. Mine seem to be special because "they're associated with the schools". However, I suggest you go back through the criteria and take a look at Elmwood, and what went through here relative to schools.

Really what this is about is that some people don't support the idea that this thing goes through relative to schools.

If you really want to you can stop anything here. What do we hear all the time in this chamber? We want to grow the economy. One of the three touchstones that we hear all the time about growth. We need more population. How are we going to get it? It's an immigration policy, so it's clearly not within our jurisdiction. You have to have an economic climate that supports growth. We can participate in that.

Finally education. You want to keep the best and the brightest here how do you do it? You make it attractive for them.

Let me give you a small example of the importance of these CIG's. Councillor Smith and I collaborated on a number of CIG's. They don't meet criteria, never have, I don't think they will, because you can't get the joint funding for them.

One of the events that we did is we co-funded a sign for Mulvey School directly opposite the Misericordia Hospital, $5,400. It's not in my ward any longer and the constituents of that school are not in Councillor Smith's. Ninety-five percent of them are in Councillor Gerbasi's.

(3:05)

School population is 80% Aboriginal.

The school that had an enrollment of 221 up to 270 because people saw they had the opportunity to enroll. Should the school board be there in some capacity? Yes. But they're not. So in the interim period you want to hurt the people who are the most vulnerable, namely, the students.

The Mayor talked "about a famine of ideas". Well I don't know how many of you looked at the front page of the Free Press today, one of those famines is right here. This is the refuge, skateboard park. $3,000 grant. Go to page 10 of your documentation. Didn't meet criteria. Smith and I joint funded it for four years solid. A refuge in the innercity. A refuge for these people. It won't meet criteria. You're going to battle it out on the floor of Council?

We're in a situation here where we're making a mountain out of a molehill. As Councillor Vandal said, you're trying to kill a mosquito with a sledgehammer. There's no rationale for so much of what is coming out of this meeting relative to CIG's.
I respect the right of the people around this table to know what's best in their ward.

Was one of the beauties that you saw in the Free Press Editorial, that you shouldn't even do it yourself, it should be done by the Administration. Beautiful. Then they ran a front page article here about the skateboard park.

Let me tell you this one last little vignette. Some of you heard it at the Protection Committee. Councillor Smith and I for the last number of years has supplied $5,000 to a school. Books, the average longevity 10 years. You know what the fascinating thing about it was, theft was the number one issue in that school. Mulvey, isn't there anymore. So because of what we've done Smith and I were invited to graduation. When the graduation went through I go to Kelvin's graduation annually, they put 400 students through in two hours. At Mulvey School we put through 28 students in two hours. Why? Because it was such a special event for these families. Twenty-seven students, 22 of them were Aboriginal.

The fact is Mr. Speaker, if you offer a two-thirds vote there's no logical or rationale for it. If you want to do it let's have a two-thirds vote for everything. I'll support that. You want a budget that has to pass with two-thirds, let's do it.

Mr. Speaker I'm asking for 30 seconds only because the Mayor regularly speaks over and I want to conclude with something.

A little bit of diatribe in the question session to lecture the delegation. So my question is simply this. Councillor Smith was with me at this graduation ceremony. I told this story and it's worth repeating. There was a little guy standing outside of the gymnasium. The little guy repeats two lines over and over. And the lines are simply these. Some days are diamonds, some days are rocks. I said what kind of a day is it? He said, it's a diamond. I don't know where it came from or what it was. He didn't know either. So I ask my son Harrison. This is from the song Waltz from Tom Petty. The last two lines of it are prophetic. Some days are diamonds, some days are rocks. Some doors are open, some roads are blocked. That's what you're doing. You're blocking roads. You're doing something here that's not necessitated. Nobody knows the needs of a particular area the way a ward councillor does. You're giving up your autonomy here. Have the courage of your convictions to vote against this and vote.

Last thing Mr. Speaker, I'm requesting that this clause be separated and voted on by each of the two or three individual amendments brought forward by the Administration. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't sure if I was going to participate in this debate because I debated this at Executive Policy Committee and often feel repetitive when it gets here. I'm going to speak to this anyway.

There were a few of us who were here in 1985 Mr. Speaker when we adopted the community incentive grant policy. You were one, myself, Councillor Angus, Councillor Clement, we were there in those days when we and our colleagues at the time were trying to find a ways and means of assisting community groups in our community who were willing to go out and do some fund raising on their own and knock on doors and try to rejuvenate sports and recreational facilities in our community, and we as a government by the establishment of this policy established a limited amount of dollars that could be used to help them not to finance the whole thing but at least to give volunteer community groups some incentive to go out on their own and try to do some things to improve these facilities in their community.

I'm here to say Mr. Speaker after all that period of time, that I think by and large the community incentive grant policy has worked very very well. There are many facilities in each of our communities, in each of our constituencies that have had the benefit of community incentive grant dollars applied by keeping within the criteria of the policy. All of these things have to have some criteria. There have to be some rules Mr. Speaker otherwise it's really chaos out there. Rules were established in 1985 when we developed this policy in order that everybody out there would know in advance what the rules of the game are so that they were thinking of a project or a facility in their community that needed some help, they

knew in advance what the rules would be if they wanted to qualify for a community incentive grant. One of those rules is that the amount of grant would be limited to 50% of the total project cost and a volunteer organization would have to go out and raise the rest through whatever sources they could.

You know Mr. Speaker, most folks probably everybody understands that and appreciates that. Over time City Council has amended the criteria and the rules from time to time to conform or to change to changing issues. It used to be that every community incentive grant that was approved by a community committee had to go up the chain to the standing committee for final approval. But if the criteria were also out of whack it also had to come to City Council. Well Mr. Speaker a few years ago we changed the rules on that and said by Council order, that if a community incentive grant application meets all of the criteria that have been established by the City Government then the community committee approval is the final process, and it doesn't have to go any further. The folks that are out there wanting to get out and raise funds know in advance they've got their grant coming from the City if they meet all the other fund raising requirements. So that saved a little time.

Now the only ones that have to come to the floor of Council are the ones that don't meet the criteria. Mr. Speaker, as you can see from some reports, there have been a fair number of those lately. I have voted against a lot of them. I'm not pure, I've bent the rules from time to time where I thought it was a very gray or very close area. I'm not here to run a contest.

(3:12)

And to say, look at how good I am. It's never been my intention at all. But I have always tried to convey to people in my community, if you're thinking of applying for a community incentive grant, you've got to live within these rules because every other citizen is expected to live within those rules including me. So we've had a little discipline. Where we've said to folks look, don't even apply if you're not within the criteria because we're not going to approve it. The ones that don't get approved by community committee don't go any further, they end there. They die on the vine, there's nothing further that happens. It's only the ones that are approved outside of criteria that have to come to the floor of city council.

There haven't been any from me for a few years Mr. Speaker, but I have supported some of those applications that have been outside criteria where in my view the application was reasonably close to the policy and I thought it was worthy of suspending the criteria in order to let it proceed.

There have been a lot more cases Mr. Speaker where the criteria isn't even close to being met. It is illegal for the City Council to use capital dollars to pay its bills. We cannot borrow on our capital budget and pay the salaries of our employees for the operating expenses of this government. There's nothing in the Charter that prevents us from providing a grant out of capital funds to pay the operating costs of some volunteer agency. Somehow that's been missed in the Charter. But as a government we can't do the same process if we want to pay our bills, if we want to pay our employees or do any of those things, our operating expenses are paid from the current budget. The community incentive grant and this is where I think there's been considerable abuse and I use the term abuse, the community incentive grant has often been used in the last couple of years to pay operating expenses of some organization. I'm not critical of the organization. I guess I'm critical of Council for waiving the rules to allow those kind of things to happen which we cannot do by law when we want to pay the bills of this government.

There's an example of an abuse that shouldn't be countenance even by a simple majority vote.

There are others. We're buying uniforms. We're paying for travel. We're doing all kinds of things that have been approved

by a majority of this council. I accept the decision when it's made, but I think the decision is wrong. I think Mr. Speaker that there has to be some greater order of discipline surely amongst all of us to keep a much closer eye. I know there's all kinds of wants and needs out there Mr. Speaker, but you know in life we don't always get every single thing we want. Those of us with children I'm sure have had to say no to our kids every once and a while when they make a request that is simply outrageous, everybody gets told no once in a while. We have to do the same. There's limited amount of capital dollars available for these things, and there are very deserving community groups out there whose project would meet policy. They are the ones who should be given the priority.

In my view Mr. Speaker we don't need to change the policy at all, we don't need to expand the criteria, I don't really think we need to. I think the criteria that were established in 1985 with some amendments in the intervening years since then actually works very well or has worked very well until recent times.

I'm going to support the clause even though in my own mind I don't think that cultural centres and other projects like that are really in keeping with what I viewed as a very sound set of criteria when we developed the community incentive grant policy in 1985. But change does happen from time to time and I'm going to swim with the tide on that one even though I'm here to tell you right now that when I receive future applications from my community, I'm not necessarily going to be approving some of those applications because they meet some expanded criteria. I have a lot of community groups out there who have real needs and who are prepared to go out and live with the policy that we have today.

It doesn't just apply to areas of great wealth Mr. Speaker, I don't represent a overly wealthy area of the City, I have quite a wide diversity of income strata in my community. Just a couple of months ago we had a grant application from the Brooklands part of my constituency Mr. Speaker, now that's not certainly an upper income area but a $17,000 grant was approved to help volunteers in Brooklands who are going to go out and raise the other part of those monies to improve a community resource centre in Brooklands. My goodness, if people in Brooklands can do it Mr. Speaker, if people in the Linwood School area, if people in Stevenson Britannia area, the East End of St. James can go out onto the street and door-to-door and raise funds, why is it so difficult in other areas of the City that we have to keep waiving the policy all the time. It's only difficult if you tell people it's difficult. Or if they're always use to getting a yes instead of a no from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm supportive of this. I read the Free Press Editorial of July 12, a lot of it is silly. But Mr. Speaker, the headline the lead on the editorial is sound. It says, "halt grant abuse". That has been the problem. There's been abuse. All of us collectively have to take responsibility for that. We established rules, we established policies and then we just glibly ignore them all when somebody comes forward looking for a grant. The hell with the rules. What are the rules for? Well the rules are there for a purpose. The main purpose is to treat everybody in the City fairly. The rules are there in advance, you know what they are, live with them.

I think it's time to change the policy Mr. Speaker. I regret that some are concerned about the requirement for two-thirds. I think it's necessary because I think we have to have a little bit more discipline in some of these processes in order that we don't have any further headlines that say, "halt grant abuse". It's time we lived with our policies as often as we can.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Murray: Mr. Speaker I wasn't going to speak until I realized that the whole point from my perspective of this entire debate has been missed. I have the sense that no one quite gets it.

I was listening to Councillor Steek, I guess we're on different planets on this one. I guess we have to leave our phone on at night because I have a very sick relative right now. So I spent most of last night answering calls after my partner came home from working at the hospital from drunken louts who thought that since someone slipped by phone number under their door was appropriate to disturb my family life at 3 and 4 o'clock in the morning. It's tough enough on your partner. Some people have just made a comment that these campaigns were appropriate and not abusive. If your wife worked in a hospital or husband and came home at 3 o'clock in the morning and have to answer drunk phone calls at 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the morning get drunk phone calls they start to ask you why you're in this business. I was offended by some of my colleagues who couldn't recognize that one of your colleagues behaviour was abusive because none of us should do that. I leave my home phone number in the phone book for real emergencies including from family members who are elderly and sick. I don't mind it, I'm a big boy and can take it. I think we should create a respectful workplace, we have a respectful workplace policy. So I don't agree with you there, Councillor Steek but on most things I do.

On this, this is not our money. This was a council policy before I think I was even in civic politics. If I'm an old-timer Councillor De Smedt I'm not sure. Always viewed you as rather a young guy at heart.

(3:22)

I guess the point is this. Why do we have this fund? Why was this set up? Councillor Smith might remember. This was a fund set up because people in the community from community centres were always coming to us saying, our recreation facility our community centre was in really rough shape. I think Councillor Smith if I remember when I was a young pup I wasn't in politics at the time when you were, I think one of the things that you argued for was how do we protect the autonomy as Councillor Steek put it of councillors without creating abuse of funding. The solution that Council came up with of the day, was that you have a very clear criteria so that everyone is playing by the same rules. You meet a very specific need which was our community and recreation facilities, but then you let the community committees as long as they can play within those rules, have the final say.

When I was in Fort Rouge, there was moderate changes. Earl Grey Community Centre has new play equipment. Riverview Community Centre got new hockey boards. We put some money into Don Gerrie Park and into another park on Hugo and Jessie. That's where all the money went. Occasionally you waive the rules. We did a project with Councillor Angus' help way back then to get that river walkway built in Churchill Park. It was capital money on city land.

This is where the great disconnect is Councillor Steek, if I could just have your attention for a sec. They're all my constituents. From Orioles Community Centre to Gateway, these are my constituents. When I say I'm living on another planet, when I go to these community centres, I don't hear them saying, we've got enough money. We don't need another basketball hoop. We don't need to resurface the gym floor. I don't hear them saying, we don't need to repair the roof. I don't hear them saying, we need a stove right now at Freight House and they need to rebuild their kitchen because when I was making pancakes there half of the equipment which is capital improvements in that kitchen, it needs money. Freight House needs money.

Where in the budget do they go for money? Community incentive grants. It is money created by City Council, administered through councillors at community committee to fix city facilities.

Now if all of you were saying to us the onerous Executive Policy Committee that has some secret malicious plan here, all

of our community centres Mr. Mayor they've all got more than enough. All the roofs are fixed, the kitchens are fixed up, all of the stuff that this program was set up to do is done. We don't have this backlog of unfixed community facilities anymore. We don't have to fix our pools and rebuild our recreation centre. But then you're living in a different universe because everywhere I go. What do I say to these people look, if it's a big project go to your councillor, write me, we'll put it in a capital project. St. James Civic Centre, we're adding a pool through infrastructure agreement. We put $100,000 in for some community facilities in West Broadway and that area to rebuild it. That's what this program is for. That's all. So everything Councillor Steek said is true, I'm not going to disagree with him. Except for protecting the autonomy part. If every community centre in the River Heights/Fort Garry area is fixed and City Centre and Harvey if you're going to tell me that everything is fine in Daniel Mac and you don't need anymore money there, and Sargent Park Pool is in great shape and we don't need to fix the tennis court, I'm going to tell you, let's cash this in now and let's have a community incentive grant program for some other purpose. For historic walks. For marshal arts programs. For foot patrols. For sign enhancements. For religious groups. For knitting bees. Let's set up a program because that's where the money is going.

Some councillors have said look, okay, you want another program to fund these things, then develop a program. Take the time and trouble to develop a program.

The question I have with you, and I'm with Councillor Eadie, I'm a little uncomfortable extending it to community non-profits. When the Hindus and the Greeks and others wanted money for a community centre the Filipino Community did, we went out and found money in the infrastructure agreement. With Rossbrook House they did operating grants they get operating grants. When our city needs operating grants, they get operating grants. We have to bring it forward and we have to get a vote on.

Councillor Lubosch's proposal, I spent a whole afternoon with Councillor Lubosch. I'm sold on the value of the program. I said to him, the only issue I have is this isn't really a per capita land dedication thing. If you wanted to buy the park, this is the right money. If you want to run a kids cleanup program and youth oriented program we're you have some very fine young people, work with me and I've done it with Councillor Gerbasi and Art City. We have money in the budget for that because we felt that was a very important transformational program in the innercity. Let's put it in there.

If this money is spent on other things at the rate that it has been spent, then we're depriving all of our community centres of the only real source of money they have to fix their facilities. There's 77 community centres in the City never mind going to recreation centres and pools. All of them need help. Even the Dakotas and Gateways in affluent areas where they raise a lot of money, that's the intended purpose of it.

No one is going to take issue with the merit of many of the organizations that are getting funding in there. What I'm saying to you is the program has become a farce in the sense that the people who actually should be getting money aren't even applying for it anymore.

The litmus test Councillor Steek for me and I really sincerely listened to you, I understand what you're saying, and I'm empathetic, I'd even go as far as saying I'd work with you to try and develop some programs to do that. The issue of kids arts and culture came up. We've doubled arts funding. We're in the process of doing that. We're looking at making it more flexible for you. What isn't here is all the people who aren't getting money. I'm just looking at you and I think it's, I mean I know I've been in Councillor Thomas' ward, I know what the Bronx Community Centre looks like. I know that some of the projects that she and Councillor Lubosch are working on trying to do that. This is the source of money for that. That's all it's for. Quite frankly, it's inadequate to meet the existing need.

The demands from community centres for city-owned communitiy volunteered run community centres exceeds the capital available in the existing program.
What we should be doing in the longer term quite frankly, is keeping a tight criteria here, and if anything putting more money in. We're going to have a facility study coming out this fall, it's going to show the backlog of repair work that's required. We're all going to say, how are we going to come up with $300 million to fix our libraries, our pools, our recreation facilities. There's going to be a long pregnant pause and everyone's going to go oh. Well this is exactly what that funding is for.

I heard also by Councillor Steek, I'm sorry to quote you Garth every two seconds here, when we were on the radio the other day saying, we have a four or five million dollar it's been as much as ten million, but that's not really a surplus, that money goes in the economic development fund. It goes into housing, it goes into heritage, and it backfills projects that didn't make it into the budget because Councillor Clement goes to a list of all of those things that people had and we try to do one-time capital.

We operate with about the tightest margins of any city. In the five years prior to becoming Mayor we had deficits largely because of the assessment problem in that same range. This is a very small margin. If photo radar is $10 million under, we'll be $5 million in the can.

What's this new deal about? It's for exactly these things. Our administration has said, we need to spend $120 million more every year fixing our streets, replacing our buildings, fixing our sewage treatment plants, repairing our community centres.

(3:30)

And we know that's about a 30% property tax increase. Unless you want to go and jump off the top of the Administration Building that would be about as successful a career move if you're in politics as voting for a 30% property tax increase.

Since we only get 6.8% of that revenue for infrastructure we better protect those precious few sources of money where councillors do have autonomies sincerely to meet the real needs of their community facilities. This isn't to meet the needs of every worthwhile community group. This is a program specifically to do this.

I will conclude by saying I gave a lot of latitude in voting for these. To be supportive of you and other councillors that are coming forward. Expecting some modifications and proposals coming forward before this date and gave lots of leeway. I said to everyone, if you have a better idea get it in the mix early so we can (inaudible) about it. There's no new ideas in the mix except to waive the entire criteria which to me wasn't coming half way. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you. I decided pondering whether I'd bother or not this time.

I've been pretty consistent with how I voted on these things for the most part for quite a number of years. I don't apologize for that. Some of that frankly I guess is because I'm the Chairman of Fiscal Issues and I'm trying to lead by example a little bit in a few areas. Part of it is because although it's been altered some as a result of the last boundaries review. I had a very very large constituency. Borderline unfair frankly in terms of what it was geographically. But I got the same money as everybody else. I had a lot of people pulling at me. If I wouldn't have stayed within the guidelines, I wouldn't have had a chance frankly. I stuck to the rules. I said no to some folks or I said sorry, I can only go this far even though they wanted three times more and had the money to back it up and match with in many cases. I've said sorry, I can't do that I've got too many people tugging at this account and it's not a lot of money. I've tried very very hard to stick with it.

I saw the chart the other day too, it's not the one Garth has, I haven't seen that one, but we had one the other day and it clearly showed that I voted for a project I think it was two years ago might have been two and a half, provided some money to a cultural group way on the other side of town from where I am. When they came and made their ask, my comments back to them and a couple of them lived in my constituency was, you come back and show me agreements with the people in the area who are providing recreational facilities and that your facility is available to them and I'm on board. They did do that. In fact entered into an agreement with a soccer group in Councillor Vandal's area, we were just talking about the other day. Very clearly that soccer association gets to use their facility at this cultural site two evenings a week. They met the criteria of the deal. That was the one that I voted for that wasn't criteria. But in the end it was very much for youth in the community. Not in mine, but in the City of Winnipeg and we all represent all of Winnipeg even though we have much more in depth knowledge in a parochial way, I think we all care about the whole City most of the time and try to reflect that in how we handle ourselves.

This particular issue is not easy. Frankly, to be really honest with you I didn't think what we had as a criteria before was a problem. The only thing that was wrong was when something made it through community committee and didn't meet the criteria and came here, people didn't vote no. People kept making excuses and stopped looking in the mirror and said, okay I'll go for that one, so and so is a nice person so I'll help them out. Frankly, all it would have taken place is that if everybody voted no two or three times in a row the applications would have stopped coming because they would have known that they weren't going to get through if they didn't meet criteria or at least if they were a long ways from criteria.

Frankly in the last two or three months because many times a lot of these issues were reasonably close I think to policy, for the most part the ones that were being brought here, not everyone but for the most part the ones that were being brought here by everybody were reasonably close to criteria, notwithstanding they didn't meet it. It's only been in the last three months or so when some folks stood up and said, well, we're going to review the criteria until then I'll support everything that comes through here. It wasn't just one person who said that, there's been a few that have done that, is when some of the silliness started. We started seeing some pretty bizarre applications come through here in the last little while.

I don't have a problem with changing things, things always change Mr. Speaker. You have to change with them. I don't have any problem with what's here. I can tell you I could have lived with the old policy and had no difficulty whatsoever trying to adjudicate that based on what was in front of me. If people want to make this slight alteration and it's not much of one, it allows some other groups an opportunity. I don't know whether that's a good thing or not but it probably reflects fairness in some of the areas where some of the people can't raise funds as easily as people in some of the newer areas. I believe everybody can if they try but I'm not going to say that it's easy.

In the end though, it may be that this alteration to it will reflect on how money can be spent with different communities in the melting pot that we are. As for my own constituency and the types of things. I can tell you in that CIG area I'm already thinking way out into 2005 because I've got people and it's just the way things have gone. I had to John because I had such a backlog from the size of the community that I had before Mr. Speaker, that by the time that I finally got a little bit more concise constituency to deal with, I had a backlog from my community centres the very people that the money was actually intended for in the beginning, all of a sudden they started coming forward with projects. Several of them. That's who got the money this year. A community club and a school. Next year it's a community club and a different

school. The year after that I've got people fund raising for a skateboard park and doing very well. They've already raised over $40,000. That's where I'm at. I've had other groups that have come forward within that time, two of them have met the criteria and I've said sorry, I just don't have the money. There's other groups that got here first. I've got a different problem I guess than some folks have got in terms of that area.

(3:38)

I believe, I firmly believe that there are community groups out there who meet the criteria who need the money. I'm not opposed to new programs. I'm not opposed to looking at something that would create a pot of money for a broader sense of community if you like, but I don't think that you take money from an existing program and deviate and change the rules. I think what you do if there's a real need for something different then you create something different Mr. Speaker. I think that's the positive way. Councillor Lubosch has an issue in his area dealing with this Bunn's Creek area and the people who are working that community. It's a unique type of situation. It doesn't fall under this.

You know, I can tell you, I was there. All the Council work doesn't happen in this chamber all the time. This policy I can tell you started in Jim Ernst's basement. I was there. How it got there frankly, couple of people got fed up and invited a few people there and said, let's chat about this because frankly it started because people wanted to create a slush fund. That's what it was. There were some people who thought that there should be a pot of money that every councillor should have to do with what they want. There was some pretty hard feelings about that. That's how this thing got melted into what it is. That's how it started. I'm sure there's other policies that started the same way in somebody else's rec room that I wasn't at. I know where this one started. I was there.

There's probably some really really good programs that we could create. I don't think that you change what you've got and you know that it works well, and you know that it's created a tremendous number of wonderful opportunities within our community right across the board. We can all tell those stories of people who have gone out and done it. I don't think you change that to solve those other kinds of problems. I think what you do is you try and create and think outside the box and you try and create a new program I think is the way to deal with that. I'm prepared to work with anybody that wants to talk about that kind of stuff. I don't think that when you've got a policy that you abuse it, and I think that's what we've been doing by allowing this to happen in a collective fashion. Whether I vote for it or not doesn't matter, I'm in this chamber when the vote is cast and done and it's done. I'm a city councillor like everybody else.

It's a collective thing when these things happen. That's how I see it Mr. Speaker. It's not a matter of chirping about how somebody does their work, it's a matter of trying to find solutions collectively and I'm prepared to do that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. I won't take too much time.

My first intuition would have been to move a motion of referral really because there's not enough support for the bgic path leading to a two-thirds vote.

Also I really point something that's been referred earlier on which is Motion No. 1 from Councillor Vandal and Councillor Steeves on a very logical proposal here to look within existing programs how we can create maybe an add on to the per capita grant program. I think if we could hold back and allow this report to come forward, roll it in with a community incentive grant, we might have something that's logical because I think we're very close here to overreacting to a circumstance. In fact with that preliminary remark I will motion of referral. I'm

allowed to make opening remarks and ask for a referral.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor, you should have done that right from the beginning.

Councillor De Smedt: I'm going to say that in a very proactive way. Really what you're doing here with this particular report is an abuse of power.

Do you know what you're really trying to do here when you're changing to a two-thirds vote? This is about parliamentary democracy, procedure Roberts Rules of Order. The only reason we have a two-thirds vote for other than a procedural issue is for the sale of land. That's all. It probably came into this Council's policy because perhaps of potential abuse as the City was growing and how we would deal with that. Everything else we do with a two-thirds vote is to suspend a procedure not a policy.

What you're doing is setting ourselves up here and I will take from Councillor Steek and from Councillor Smith two of the points they made about why don't we have two-thirds vote for budget. That's not a policy, that's a policy we're having a budget. Why didn't I do it for the ward communication allowance increase from $48,000 to $70,000. Didn't do it for True North as Steek has mentioned. For Waterfront Drive. For economic development issues. For the housing initiative, we put $17 million into it. I voted for it and it was supported. It's out of context from a core service that this city's responsible for. We're trying to hold the line fiscally. But here we're now going to introduce a two-thirds controlling mechanism because the overall program is over by 3% if Councillor Steek's facts are correct. Councillor Clement has just said, that it's only in the last three or four months that we've had this problem. Well if we've had this problem we should be debating it at Council everytime they come on. And a simple majority vote could have turned off these things. If there had been a proper discussion. Councillor Eadie spoke very well, I support his thoughts. But he should be speaking like that everytime. Except you know what happens when you have the CIGP in the last three or four months, all of a sudden it's going to go through then everybody, oh, I vote against that. Stand up and speak and convince nine people that that thing is so well out of whack that it's putting the whole program into jeopardy.

Now we're waiting to the last and ultimate moment that we're going to change it. The end of this whole day when Councillor Gerbasi is going to stand up at the end of her committee reports and introduce a by-law. It will have to have a two-thirds vote suspension to get the third ruling in. That's a procedural thing. I hope there's enough of us here could delay it if we pass this particular motion, or clause before it even gets to the two-thirds suspension of rules to hear it the third time. That's a procedural issue, that's why we have that two-thirds vote. This goes against every common sense application of democracy. The only thing we have is in the Parliament of Canada we're going to have substantial change of constitution plus it's a 50% criteria for the amount of population that you have in that part of the country etc. etc. and on we go.

Everything is passed on a simple majority and that's what should happen here. Maybe we should spend a little more time at council meetings on these particular issues rather than trying to rush and get out of here. Council meetings probably should be two or three days with the Administration sitting here going over these items. But when I went to the Committee on Protection when this item came up, I was appalled to read the report and as Councillor Steek had indicated barely one and a half lines in support of a two-thirds vote.

This is frankly two issues here today. It's laziness on our part instead of council and look at some of these items that come forward.

(3:45)

If we implement it, it's an abuse of power. As I was accused of saying before, the good ol boys, the old folks, EPC would

like to have this. They're tired of several people theoretically abusing their power in their ward. So we'll kill it. Force them to go out and get the 11 votes. What a terrible shame that is. We should stand up and with the normal process that you have in just about every endeavour that you people participate in, in your private life, working with community groups you belong to associations and you have voting procedures, a simple majority pertains.

I never did mention the fact that we had several years ago with a simple majority vote, we had a councillor's pension plan introduced. Quite easy, wasn't it. Just get 9 votes. We can do things we want around here quite easily. Very unfair. I think it's very unfair that you're targeting that particular ward councillor on that issue.

I was educated quite well by Councillors Eadie and Clement when I came onto Council in '98. I failed pretty rigorously with one exception for CIGP grants. Because it makes sense. In fact we should reject this. The policy we have now is fine, it's working. Yeah there has been some exceptions. That's tactile democracy. But I was educated pretty well by these two characters. We supported each other, and I understand the policy. I'm a policy wonk. If you want to be a policy wonk and introduce this, I mean you're over compensating. There's no question about that.

We've had certain exceptions. In the case of Councillor Steek there's been some of his applications that I supported and some I didn't. You try at the last minute to read through as much as you can. But then I would appeal to our common sense that if we really want to make this program work, leave it as it is but spend a little more time on reviewing those applications that come forward and listen to cogent argument. It will take a little more time at the council meeting I'm sorry, but that's what we need to do and come here and be part of a democratic council.

We've certainly over compensated. I regret if we go down this particular path. It's unfair and it's an abuse of power. That's what's happened.

I think for that reason I don't see any reason to expand or separate the clauses. If we do if there's any other discussion I'll try and listen very carefully. While I would like to perhaps see other groups be eligible, other groups can come forward. We do allow them to come forward, it means they don't quite meet the criteria. But other groups come forward with matching money. If it has the general interest of community at-large even those two examples of prim rectitude and the Assiniboia Community Committee who I share offices with, will approve it. Will support it. So come to this particular council floor and argue that case.

Please rethink this before you vote. Please turn this down on the basis that it just does not make common sense and oversteps the boundaries that I think this council is entitled to do. We have significant procedural issues, two-thirds of a vote to change and avoid a particular procedure. In this particular case let's stay with the rules. They really in fact are working. So please support them.

Councillor Thomas I do remember at the famous council meeting when we had an out of criteria application in your area. I supported it because I could read through the context of it that it had a broad community need. It was not just for the school, rather and I was surprised that you did not articulate that.

There are tactile flexible reasons why we can support each other. It isn't a slush fund. I'm accumulating it now because I know there's going to be some significant needs in our community in the near future.

Enough said. Let's get back to practicalities and some common sense in our democracy here. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers. Councillor Gerbasi close.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you councillors for another interesting debate. It's nice when we have some substance and actually debate something here. It doesn't happen that often.

First of all I'd like to put on the record that I'm not an old-timer. There's a few others here who aren't either. Councillor Pagtakhan was just elected and not everyone who supports this is actually on EPC. I just want to say, this is not really an EPC driven thing. I know everyone is saying that because it's a good argument. It simply isn't true. I know we're all a ward councillor and I have issues in my ward that concern me in terms of fairness for the citizens in my ward, and fairness for all the citizens. That's why I support these changes.

In terms of the two-thirds rationale. I think we're making a bit of a mountain out of a mole hill. We have waived, we talk about the procedure by-law and waiving policy, we need two-thirds to do that in procedures in Council while we're waiving policy. This is also waiving policy. In fact it's going to take two-thirds of us to pass as Councillor De Smedt pointed out to pass the by-law to waive the rules to pass the by-law to make this happen. If two-thirds of us do that then it's in effect taking two-thirds of us to pass this today. I don't really see the fairness problem here.

This was brought forward, the two-thirds rationale was a suggestion of the Administration as a tool that we as council could decide to use in order to deal with a particular problem we're having of poor public policy.

I wanted to address the matching funds issue. The 50% criteria is really important. I have some of the lowest income neighbourhoods in the City in Fort Rouge, West Broadway, Mayfair, Gladstone School and Fort Rouge schools, and we found ways to do a whole lot of projects for all of those people. They have raised huge amounts of money, it's not easy for them but they can get money from other levels of government and the school division. We've done tons of things with these communities, within the criteria. As I've said, I've broken the criteria in other cases. But I think it can be done. I think it's really dangerous to throw out the 50% criteria as Councillor Steek suggested, because one of the best things about this program is the amount of funding we've levered from other levels of government. We really should not lose sight of that, and the Administration clearly recommended against changing the 50% criteria, so I think that's an important point.

The privilege of being councillors gives us many ways to make a difference in our community. I don't personally feel my autonomy is threatened in any way by these changes, in fact I think it helps to have a clearer framework for the public to come forward and for projects to happen without confusion about what kind of resources are available. If we're creative and come up with ideas and work together as a community, lots will be done in all of our wards. I don't think this is going to take anything away from us and I don't think we need to be frightened by it.

I think it's fairness, I think it's fiscally responsible. I think it's a reasonable change. It's not an attack on any one councillor. I really don't believe that. I think all of us are guilty of not following the criteria. All of us have some responsibility in this and here's a way that we can all fix the problem, and spend capital money on capital projects, and find ways to support community projects that make sense.

(3:55)

With that I thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Debate is closed.

We'll get into the clause. All in favour of the clause. Recorded vote.

Councillor Angus: I'll ask that the clauses be voted on independently, one, two, three and four.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that what you wanted Councillor Steek, 1, 2, 3 and 4?

Separate 1 and 2? Okay. On recommendation No. 1. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt.

Nays

Councillors De Smedt, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's carried. On recommendation No. 2, all in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal.

Nays

Councillors De Smedt, Lubosch, Smith, Steek, Wyatt, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Carried. For the clause all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that By-law No. 126/2003 be read a first time.
Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 126/2003.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that By-law No. 126/2003 be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 126/2003.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 126/2003 be read a third time, and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal.

Nays

Councillors De Smedt, Lubosch, Smith, Steek, Wyatt, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6, does not achieve two-thirds majority.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's laid over until September.

Let's continue. Question Period. No questions. Alternate Service Delivery, Councillor Angus.

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 10, 2003

Councillor Angus: Thank you. While I'm on my feet let me just acknowledge our compatriot Councillor O'Shaughnessy, who's at home, and I'm sure he's got nothing better to do than lie in bed let his heart get better and watch Council. Although Mike we might suggest that you want to turn the sound down periodically. We hope you're well and get better real quick.

Mr. Speaker I'm pleased to move the Report of the Alternate Service Delivery and move clause 1 as a consent item.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Before the adjournment I would just like to say Councillors, we'll be adjourning until the third week of September, I wish all of you a happy holiday. Be careful, watch how you drive and stay healthy. And to Mike O'Shaughnessy I've done your job close to seven hours. My behind is sore Mike.

Councillor Angus moves adjournment. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steek, Steeves, Thomas, Wyatt.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 4 P.M.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday July 23, 2003
CONTENTS

ROLL CALL 457

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS 457

Motion 457

MINUTES 457

DELEGATIONS 457
Ms Theresa Ducharme 457
Mr. Brent Leeson 460
Mr. Ron Schultz 463
Ms Valerie Wadepuhl 464
Mr. Peter Skakum 465
Mr. Edward Plozsay 467

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 16, 2003 469

Item No. 1 – Funding from the City Centre Land Dedication Reserve Fund – Corydon Avenue Business Improvement Zone Benches and Seating – File EP-2 469

Item No. 4 – Federation of Canadian Municipalities – Infrastructure Program – File GC-5.1 472

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JULY 23, 2003 472

Item No. 1 – Federation of Canadian Municipalities – Municipal Partnership Program with the City of Kampala, Uganda – File GC-5.1 472

Item No. 2 – Request for a Heritage Conservation Tax Credit of the Victor Fox Foods Building, 130 – 132 James Avenue – File G-3.1.5 473

Item No. 3 – Request for a Heritage Conservation Tax Credit for the Travellers Building – 283 Bannatyne Avenue – File G-3.1.5 473

Item No. 4 – Memorandum of Settlement Negotiations between the City of Winnipeg and the Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1505 – File GU-4.5 473

Motion No. 3 473

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 475
By-law No. 124/2003 475

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED MAY 13, 2003 475

Item No. 1 – Canada – Manitoba – Rural Municipality of Ritchot – City of Winnipeg Amendment on Flood Protection for the Community of Grande Pointe and the Area of St. Mary's Road South – Draft Amendment (March 2003) File PD 475

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JULY 8, 2003 476

Item No. 6 – Boulevard Maintenance (By-law No. 4895/92) – File PB-1 476

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 477

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD 477

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES
DATED JULY 8, 2003 477

Item No. 1 – By-law No. 122/2003 – To impose a licence in lieu of business tax on certain businesses 477

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 479
By-law No. 122/2003 479

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday July 23, 2003
CONTENTS

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 3, 2003.....479

Item No. 18 – Leave and License Agreement at 1717 Waverley Street – McNaught Pontiac Buick Cadillac GMC Ltd. – File ED (32).....480

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 10, 2003.....480

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS.....480
By-laws numbered 118/2003, 119/2003, 120/2003, 121/2003 and 123/2003.....480

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 7, 2003.....480

REPORT "A" OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 7, 2003.....481

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JULY 10, 2003.....481

Item No. 1 – Winnipeg Police Service – Four District Model – File GF-2.....481

Motion No. 2.....482

Item No. 2 – Community Incentive Grant Policy Review – File PR-2.6.....506

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS.....523
By-law No. 126/2003.....523

REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY COMMITTEE DATED JULY 10, 2003.....523

ROLL CALL.....524