COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday September 24, 2003

The Council met at 9:38 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 Councillor Wyatt.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: I'd like to welcome our Page for the Council Meeting this morning. It is Nicholas Plett of Transcona Ward who is home schooled, has been with us many times in the past and once again we thank Nicholas for taking the time out to work with us this morning.

MINUTES

Councillor Vandal moves the Minutes of the meeting held on July 23, 2003 and September 3, both of 2003, be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

We have a large number of delegations this morning. First is Sam Katz in opposition to Item 1 of the Report of EPC of September 17, regarding CanWest Stadium, Various Tenant Requests. Mr. Katz.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Sam Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The reason I'm here today is quite simply because I'm tired. This isn't the place to come to get some rest obviously. But after seven years of struggles which I have no intention of outlining here today, I'd like the journey of CanWest Global Park to come to an end.

In recent times there were some issues that were yet unresolved. I believe we brought most of them to fruition except for two.

The two outstanding issues, one, are the permit fees regarding CanWest Global Park. In 1998, 1999, which was phase one of the construction of CanWest Global Park, part of the agreement which was negotiated was that there were no permit fees.

In 1999, 2000, which was Phase 2 we did an addition down the left field line. There were also no permit fees.

In 2002, 2003, we completed Phase 3. CanWest Global Park is now completed. Total cost of $22 million. Contributions from the Federal Government, $3 million, Provincial Government, $3 million, and the City of Winnipeg, $2 million.

For some unknown reason it appears that the permit fee issue was not addressed, but the assumption of administration and myself, I'm referring to Mr. Don Armstrong, was that there would be no permit fees.

I'm here discussing a matter of approximately $48,000. I have no idea why it's being treated any differently than what took place in Winnipeg Stadium, where in '99 and 2003 over $9 million was spent, there were no permit fees. Same situation for True North through conversation, negotiation and dialogue there were also no permit fees. I guess what I'm asking is for us to get the exact same treatment. No more, no less.

Also I should point out that CanWest Global Park is owned by the citizens of Winnipeg. We have a 25 year lease, at the end of that lease it goes back to the citizens of Winnipeg.

The other issue is our property taxes. We have a master lease, and under that master lease after two years of negotiations we have come up with a formula with the cooperation of the Assessment Department, Mr. Brian

Moore, and that formula has been implemented.

For some unknown reason, 41 Westbrook which is the entry way into CanWest Global Park and is part of a master lease, has been pulled out and is treated separately. I have no explanation why. We're happy to pay the property taxes on 41 Westbrook, we just want it to be part of the master lease which it is, and the same formula to apply. Other than that, we're not looking for anything.

I think most of you know that CanWest Global Park is one of the premier ballparks in North America. You may also know that the Winnipeg Goldeyes got phenomenal support from the public. We are 14th in attendance, average attendance and that's for all of North America. This is definitely one of the most successful stories of a new ballpark and the support of Manitobans and Winnipeggers has been beyond ones comprehension. I believe that for one reason. We listen to our boss the citizens and we gave them quality and affordable family entertainment, and that's what we want to continue doing. We're happy to pay what has to be paid, we are not looking for any grants of any kind, we pay our own way. All we want to do is address these two issues so then I can focus my time and energy in making the ballpark even better and giving more quality and affordable family entertainment to citizens of Winnipeg.

Thank you very much for your time here this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. You'll permit a question or two?

Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Katz for coming in delegation. It would be frankly impossible for the citizens of Winnipeg to express their gratitude for what you've done for the City and its revitalization.

I'm mystified though relative to the issue of permitting. In view of the fact that Phases 1 and 2 did not, our permitting charges faced is $48,000, who notified you and how were you notified and when? What was the explanation as to why you were being expected to pay an additional $48,000?

Mr. Katz: I don't have a full and comprehensive answer to you. This was an issue that came up over a year ago. I have been dialoguing with administration hoping to have this matter resolved. Just recently actually last week we did pay this bill in full. It was done as a result of us, it was basically taken as an offset against monies that we were to receive. It has been paid. I can't answer the question because I don't know the answer. I can only tell you that I too am a little surprised to say the least that Phase 1, Phase 2 went that way, and Phase 3 is being treated differently. Right from the beginning it was put on the record that this will be done in three phases. There's no secret to that. That's the only explanation I have which is not an explanation because I'm not smart enough to know the real answer.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Has there been any effort by anyone politically or administratively to get together with you and have a face to face meeting and explain what the rationale is for the additional charges?

(9:45)

Mr. Katz: Actually believe it or not there will be, there hasn't been but I am going to be meeting in the very near future with the new CAO of the City to discuss this issue. Unfortunately it's before Council today so I felt it imperative for me to be here today. But I hope to have some dialogue down the road, and where that will lead I have no idea, but I'm ecstatic just to have the opportunity to have the conversation and the dialogue which will take place.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplemental Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Just a point of clarification then on the entry. You've got a formula and I guess one of the stunning things that has occurred here Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there has been a diminution of taxation on this property of 2/3rds which certainly calls into question the accuracy of the initial assessment.

Can you clarify for me one more time the issue of the taxation on the entry to the Ballpark.

Mr. Katz: The master lease that we have with the City of Winnipeg includes the lands that we built the Ballpark on. It includes the entry way which for those who don't know is the property on Westbrook, where you see its paving stone shaped like a ball diamond and depending on what happens here in Council will also include the island parking lot between, it's an irregular shaped piece of land that we just finished preparing at a cost of $250,000 which we paid for. Those are the three pieces of land that included the master lease.

Our original tax assessments seemed rather high. We obviously appealed it. We ended up going to court. In the end we got leave to go back and as a result of that we have met with the City of Winnipeg, and Brian Moore was very helpful in coming up with a formula. As a result of that, last year was reported we owed approximately $980,000 in taxes. As a result of our appeal it was decreased by approximately just under $700,000. Our taxes are paid in full as I stand here today. All I'm asking is what makes sense, is that 41 Westbrook being part of the master lease and I would say that our entry way is an integral part of the Ballpark. I know comments have been made that it's not necessary for that land to be there because you don't need it in the playing of baseball. My response would be, that you don't need washrooms to play baseball, you don't need concessions to play baseball. You don't need dugouts to play baseball. You don't even need seats to play baseball, but the realities are, and you don't need a restaurant to play baseball, but if you look at any ballpark in North America, these are all part of what is the construction of a ballpark.

All I'm asking for that, we'll pay, no problem, but why is it not part of the formula that we worked so hard with the Assessment Department and it should be put in that formula and we'll pay it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. My first comments are addressed to you. Welcome back, it's good to see you in fighting and trim shape.

Mr. Katz, could you just clarify for me that point on what the original assessment of your taxation was and what the current assessment value is. Did I understand, there's a $700,000 differential?

Mr. Katz: The original assessment, you have to appreciate, we never got our assessment until two years after we were constructed. And six months later we got our next assessment. It came in at approximately originally $10 million, then it came in just under $12 million. We're now sitting in approximately $2.7 million.

I should add that that's a result my apologies, is that even though that was a successful appeal, the sad part about it, there are no winners because in order to get there we expended approximately $200,000 in consultants and legal fees. You don't win in these matters.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: The impact of item three that the request pay the portion amount of taxes to Westbrook parking lot is what, what is the net result of making that adjustment?

Mr. Katz: The net result they're asking for is it's approximately $43,000 a year. We have paid for all the previous years. Once again, this year was taken off again as an offset for money that we were owed, it was just taken off. It's approximately $43,000 that we're paying every year on 41 Westbrook. All I'm

saying is, just put that in the formula and whatever it turns out to be no problem, we'll gladly pay it.

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker, my final one is really are you aware that the citizens are just delighted with your latest additions and the restaurant that you've included there.

Mr. Katz: We built it for them and I'm glad they're happy, and thank you for that comment.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Katz, we go back I guess right from day one.

Mr. Katz: I don't go quite that far back as you do.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Katz, what is it you want us to do here because this clause that's before us to make a final decision dealing with the $43,000 or $48,000? Would you want us to lay this matter over to give you an opportunity to meet with the Administration, and then it will come back to Council for a final decision?

Mr. Katz: I would appreciate that because at least that way we would have the opportunity to dialogue and maybe come to a conclusion that everybody can find palatable.

As you know there are four issues, there were four issues that we've asked for. One of them was including the island parking lot as part of our master lease which I believe is on the agenda today. The other one was a for a leave and license for part of our building which encroaches which I think is okay. Then there's the two issues that I addressed.

I'm not looking for an answer today, I don't think that's realistic and fair considering I just handed out some information today and I just made my presentation, but I certainly even though we've already paid it, I'm happy to let that sit the way it is, and discuss those issues, and maybe we can come to some common grounds. That's all I've ever asked for, is some dialogue on the subject and then let Council make the final decision, and whatever the decision is we will happily live with.

Councillor Lazarenko: So Mr. Katz you have paid your bill and all you're asking is for us to reconsider the clause that's before us to give an opportunity because otherwise you could have held back and not pay the bill, and give us an opportunity some of us who were not in with the negotiations that were going on, is for us to be able to have some input, ask questions with you being present with the Administration then come to a final solution?

Mr. Katz: That is correct. I was hoping that the other two matters which are on the agenda would not go back again, that at least you can approve those hopefully, and then the new matters that I discussed here, we could have some dialogue on in the near future.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek you wanted a second shot. You only have 30 seconds.

Councillor Steek: You talked about the fact that you incurred legal expenses of $200,000 to win an assessment reduction. You had to move $400,000 worth of goods at 50% margin to have that $200,000. This is something that's troubling Mr. Speaker in this chamber, and I think it's a case we always trot Mr. Katz out as a pre-eminent business success. How did you have to go, did you go through the Municipal Board or did you go through the Board of Revision first and the Municipal Board? Did you have discussions with Assessment beforehand? I think this Council should hear what's happening to entrepreneurs in this city on issues of taxation.

Mr. Speaker: The time for questions is finished, and Mr. Katz did say that he went all the way to court on it. We heard it in his original speech.

Thank you.

(9:55)

We have many more delegations today. The next of which is Mr. David Wolinsky in opposition to Item 1 of the Report of EPC dated September 17, the same item.

Mr. David Wolinsky: Thank you. Your Worship, Councillors. I know you have a busy morning this morning so I shall be brief. I appreciate you permitting me the opportunity to make my presentation.

I'm here not as Sam's friend or as the lawyer that represents him with respect to the CanWest Park, although I am both of those. I'm here as a businessman and as somebody as a citizen who loves this city. Someone since its opening has been at the Park in excess of 40 times each year, often with guests, other business guests from other cities across North America and Europe, all of whom have exclaimed the magnificence of this facility.

I've done battle with the City of Winnipeg three times in the past 10 years. For CanWest Global Park, 529 Wellington, and on the smoking by-law on behalf of Salisbury.

I'm proud of those battles and I'm satisfied that what we were fighting for was best for the City and we were successful and everything we did was good for the City.

Two of those battles I'm satisfied were totally honourable with each side expressing their opinion worthy of expression.

I never attempt to renegotiate a lease that's been fairly negotiated or agreement that's been fairly negotiated. I tell you only that in my opinion this was not a negotiated agreement, this was an agreement that was imposed by the prior administration. If you have any doubts as to that you need only know that any other facility of its kind in North America has a fifty year or seventy-five year lease and we were faced with a 25 year lease with the obligation to return it to the City after we spent some $15 million in the same condition as at the outset. This was accepted. We're not attempting to renegotiate that. That isn't the situation here.

Throughout the process I must tell you because I don't have Sam's patience, I was tempted to walk. We didn't renegotiate the lease, the few concessions that we got were from people of goodwill in this chamber, and from your independent attorneys at the time who showed extremely excessive goodwill in trying to make it possible to live with that imposed document.

Whenever I attempted to walk from any of these discussions, Sam always pulled me back into the chair and said, don't worry, ultimately there will be people of goodwill who will deal with these things reasonably.

We're not asking, or Sam is not asking today for special treatment, he's asking to be treated only as you treat others to be treated fairly to be treated with equity. I'm asking you as people of goodwill to treat him as such. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the delegation.

Mr. Wolinsky has a reputation in this community frankly that's without parallel. He's been one of the fairest and decent individuals that we ever have the pleasure of dealing with.

I hear clearly what it is that Sam's asking for in this clause as articulated by Councillor Lazarenko and hopefully common sense will prevail here.

I want to go back to the issue of the taxation on the Ballpark, and I find it offensive. I want to know, you were very kind in stating that the Assessment Department ultimately worked with you, to realize a 70% reduction was a long and arduous road. Why did the Assessment Department not give you this on the front end but rather make you go through the Board of Revision, Municipal Board and ultimately the courts? What's the message that sends to this business communitiy?

Mr. Wolinsky: I can't answer why the Assessment Department did what they did. When I say I'm here as a businessman, I mean that as somebody who loves this city and tries to have people move to the City and make this a place to do business, frankly, we lost the Jets, we lost direct connections with a lot of major cities, and we have a wonderful city and we have a few jewels that are exceptional and we have a great many people who are trying to make this a better place. All I'm trying to do is to ensure that we treat our own with fairness because if we don't treat our own with fairness how can we convey to others coming in that they will be treated with equity. I really don't know what the motivation was for assessment, maybe they were trying to just adhere to what they felt was a lease that they were imposed upon them as well. I have no idea.

I only ask that once again reason prevail.

Councillor Steek: Mr. Speaker one last question. What would the impact have been on the Goldeyes, on CanWest Global Park if you hadn't appealed that assessment, and you would have been drilled an extra $700,000 a year in property taxes? What would the impact have been on the ball team?

Mr. Wolinsky: I can tell you what I told Sam at the outset which was candidly, I don't know how he expected to recover his money in 25 years based on the fact that he wouldn't have had that assessment placed against him. Even without that assessment I don't know based on the lease that was imposed upon him how he can expect to recover his investment. Add those taxes to it, there's no possibility. That's what I'm talking about. I'm talking about reasonable negotiation. There was no negotiation, this was an imposed lease. If you have any doubt about that, ask your independent counsellors at the time as to what went into that. This was in my opinion an imposed lease, not a negotiated one.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We'll move from the order just a bit if Councillors will permit. Shelly Wiseman who was to be a couple delegations down the list has a medical appointment, so I've moved her up. Shelley Wiseman on behalf of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, in opposition to Item 2, Report of EPC September 23, 2003.

Ms Shelly Wiseman: Thank you for allowing me to speak early.

Before I begin I'd like to say that it's unfortunate that I had to come and be delegated as opposition to the issue of urban reserves. It certainly isn't the case that CFIB is opposing it, we simply have some questions that we would like to have answered before Council moves forward. That's why I'm here today is to ask these questions.

Secondly, I'd also like to recognize or acknowledge I recognize the role the City has with respect to urban reserves and how limited it is. I come to you with those two statements to start.

I had the opportunity to visit Muskeg Lake Cree Nation in Saskatoon last week with the delegation from Winnipeg. My reasons for participating in the tour were very simple. To gain a greater understanding of urban reserves, how they operate and the potential impact for business owners in Winnipeg should an urban reserve set up here.

Overall I was generally impressed with the operation and the integration of the urban reserve into the city environment.

I've also taken the opportunity to meet with officials from CCRA, the Provincial Department of Finance and Chief Dennis Whiteberg with the Manitoba Assembly of Chiefs to gain a greater understanding of what an urban reserve is.

As a result of my visit and my meetings, I feel I have a better knowledge of the process of setting up an urban reserve and how it might operate.

However I still have a number of unanswered questions that I believe must be answered before the City of Winnipeg

moves forward on the urban reserve component of its Aboriginal strategy.

Before I begin with my questions I would like to make clear that CFIB supports the promotion of Aboriginal persons in business, whether it be as a self-employed business owner or as an employee. The Federation recognizes that the City's demographics are changing and there is and will continue to be a growing Aboriginal population in Winnipeg.

Therefore the employability of Aboriginal persons is a key to Winnipeg's overall economic development success.

(10:03)

CFIB also encourages the City's continue on its path of developing an overall Aboriginal strategy for the future.

The following are a few of the things that I've learnt about urban reserves and I'd like to share them with you.

For one as I mentioned, the Federal Government is a governing body that determines whether or not an urban reserve can or will be created. The City has had very little say over that.

The City or municipality can enter into a service agreement with reserves that will cover costs associated with services provided by the City to the reserves. Such as fire, police, sewer, garbage collection etc.

This service agreement is in lieu of property taxes. Should the City choose not to enter into this negotiation with the reserve, the Federal Government can step in and order an arrangement.

The agreements with reserves can be different depending on the scenario that's created. Incorporated businesses on any reserve urban or rural must pay corporate income taxes, GST, PST and other business taxes similar to a non-reserve.

First Nations Peoples do not pay personal income tax if they work on a reserve. There is still some debate. I haven't had the question answered whether they pay personal income tax if they work off reserves.

All non First Nations Persons purchasing goods on an urban reserve or any reserve must pay full taxes, First Nations can be exempt.

It is unclear and this is a big issue, which jurisdiction an urban reserve would fall under. Federal, provincial or municipal. Therefore business owner on a reserve may be exempt from certain legislations and by-laws, the competing business owners would be subject to. There appears to be a limited concrete action municipalities can engage in to recoup revenue if an urban reserve fails to make payments on their service agreements.

It's my understanding that Muskeg Lake Cree Nation has arranged the following agreement with the City of Saskatoon. MCN operates as an industrial park with a number of different businesses operating on it. They've entered into a service agreement with the City of Saskatoon. The agreement ensures that the MCN pays an amount that is equal to what it would have paid in property taxes. MCN charges all businesses on a reserve full property taxes including school taxes but only remits the municipal portion to the City.

They've worked out an agreement with the local school divisions and keep the school division component of the property tax for the reserve. Therefore all businesses on the reserve pay full property taxes.

MCN collects PST and GST from the businesses on the reserve but does not remit the revenue to the Provincial or Federal Governments. The money is kept on the reserve.

MCN does collect tobacco taxes and fuel taxes and keeps the revenue again for the reserve. First Nations customers do not pay the full amount of PST, GST or tobacco tax, but do pay some. Both the City of Saskatoon officials and MCN stated they have worked very hard to ensure businesses on the reserve

whether operating on the reserve, are operating with a level playing field with non-reserve businesses in that community.

But there are a number of questions that I do still have that weren't answered during my meetings or the tour.

One is, do firms on the reserve pay WCB premiums which is a significant cost to business owners in the City? Is an urban reserve subject to health and safety legislation in the City of Winnipeg, the smoking by-law is a big question? Would a restaurant or a bar on there be exempt from the City's Smoking By-law? What authority does a city municipality have to recoup the lost revenue if a reserve stops payment as I mentioned? The City of Saskatoon did acknowledge they have not had this problem arise but it is still a question that I think it's prudent for the City to arrange to find out before they go forward with this. And what role does the Province play in this entire process in setting up a reserve and operations of it?

It does appear that with appropriate service agreement and concessions made by the reserve, unfair competition can be addressed. CFIB is urging the City to provide opportunities for business owners and residents to ask questions, receive answers and express their concern on the issue before moving forward. In addition, both the Province and the Federal Government need to state their role and responsibilities on urban reserves to help citizens make informed decisions on the issue.

Therefore CFIB recommends the City of Winnipeg place the issue of urban reserves on hold until further public consul can take place and can guarantee that any agreement or discussions on the issue will address unfair competition with business owners.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question. Councillor Steek.

Councilllor Steek: Thank you for your presentation and I appreciate the fact that you would have taken the time to go to Saskatoon.

Does the City of Saskatoon have an official urban reserve policy, in other words ensconced in a by-law or any other document?

Ms Wiseman: I'm not aware of that particular issue or whether they do or not. What I did come to understand is that they have a basic principle or guidelines that they would follow for the agreement, and whether they make concessions for certain reserves and others I don't know.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Meetings recently with members of the business community the question was asked of me and I don't have the answer so I'd like to know if you do.

If an urban reserve is set up in Winnipeg unincorporated, is that proprietorship responsible for provincial payroll and capital tax?

Ms Wiseman: It's my understanding that any unincorporated business would not be, and that is a question that I think, these are the types of questions that we would like answered before the City moves forward.

Having said that though, the City isn't responsible for capital tax and a payroll tax. While I recognize the business owners concerns, certainly I do representing CFIB, I also recognize limitations of the City in terms of addressing that concern. I think business owner's battle is actually with the Federal Government and the Provincial Government as opposed to the City. In my mind the City needs to make sure it has the best deal that it can negotiate for the City within its own limitations and try and lobby the Provincial and Federal Governments to ensure that when these agreements are made that these issues are addressed to help alleviate the concern of business owners .

Mr. Speaker: Final supplemental Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Are you aware of any reserve proposals before Saskatoon as we speak?

Ms Wiseman: For additional urban reserves? Nothing formally but it is my understanding that the Province of Saskatchewan has been moving forward on that agenda, and there have been more and more urban reserves created throughout the Province. City of Saskatoon, I'm not entirely sure of.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you. The question is this. Throughout the course of the discussion we've had some reporting anecdotal and I can't say that I follow it up personally with everything that I've heard. Have you had a chance to discuss or reflect with other parallel business organizations in Saskatoon as to how they feel post facto with the fact, the Chamber of Commerce, anyone like that?

Ms Wiseman: My colleague in Saskatchewan I have spoken with on the issue of urban reserves. Generally one of the biggest concerns that our membership faces…before I go forward, that was one of the things that was missing on the tour that we took of Saskatoon the urban reserve, was we didn't meet any business owners that are in direct competition which I think is an issue.

Usually what many of our members do say out there, business owners are not that they have a problem with the arrangement in the way it's set up, it's the enforcement of the by-laws with respect to PST and GST exemptions that the business owners on reserve are not abiding by the legislation brought forward, and non Aboriginal persons non First Nations Persons are getting discounts, benefits that they should not be receiving, or tax exemptions they should not be receiving.

(10:10)

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I don't know if you would have the answer to this Ms Weisman, but my understanding is a lot of the problems or challenges that exist would have to be I guess addressed to the MDSA, the Municipal Development Services Agreement that could deal with sort of a list of things that are outlined pursuant to the legislation.

I guess my question is this. At this stage given sort of the height in generality of the recommendation we're looking at today, is it possible without having a specific plan on the table to ever really address those specific issues?

Ms Weisman: I think that it is responsible for the City to take on an overall Aboriginal strategy as part of their mandate. Recognizing that a number of questions and issues need to be addressed before bringing in a particular type of agreement. And recognizing that it is, while it may not be a city issue on certain levels of taxation, but it is still a big issue for business owners here, so it is a responsibility of the City in my mind to help in this process of gaining a greater understanding, a greater knowledge to address some of the issues before they move forward with a firm agreement.

The proposal in principle to address urban reserves, I don't think there's a problem. Anything more concrete than that. I think what the City should commit to is further discussions on the issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ms Weisman you've zeroed in on one particular portion of the 15 point package that has been created. Do you have any comments on the other 14 aspects of this proposal?

Ms Weisman: At this point, no we have been focused on urban reserves. I think it's a responsibility of our organization to take a further look at that package. I don't know whether one portion can be exempt without the rest or not. I don't know the answer to that question. But I think we do need to start addressing

Aboriginal persons success and the City of Winnipeg success related to that.

Councillor Angus: Subsequent question. Are you aware if this council does adopt this strategy as a secondary plan that the instructions from Executive Policy Committee that we hope Council will endorse, are to have full consultation with and I will quote from here "consult with interested organizations, citizens, other orders of government, business and communitiy partners to ensure full community participation, respect jurisdiction and promote progressive partnerships". That once we have said, we generally think we have to look at these particular issues, get out, create a plan and talk to those people with some factual information, is that not what you're asking for here?

Ms Weisman: Yes, and I think that's something that we do support.

Councillor Angus: I think that we should perhaps move this along and allow those consultations to take place?

Ms Weisman: I think that we need to allow the discussion to take place. I guess the concern is, and this is a concern that's coming from the membership, is that, once Council adopts the policy in principle, then there's no stopping it and there's no ability to scrutinize and make any changes. And that's a fear whether it's real or perceived. The fear is out there.

I think that promoting that component of the plan is very important for council to do. That would probably put to rest a lot of the concerns raised.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thanks Mr. Speaker, and welcome back.

Thank you for your presentation, and I agree with a lot of the points that you raised. If I can just play the devil's advocate just for a moment in my question.

It could be said and argued that many ways right now we as a society, we as a government do things for the private sector to create unlevel playing fields. One only has to look for example at MCI and the $20 million that we handed out there provincially and federally, now we're losing all these jobs after the fact. Where we try and get involved with the economy and to subsidize certain businesses where others pay their full share.

Since we're providing corporate welfare to some and doing that, what's the difference when it comes to having an urban reserve and having certain advantages? We're doing it in the rest of society, so why not in this scenario?

Ms Weisman: We don't support, we didn't support the subsidization of MCI. We don't support business subsidies, we would sooner see government get rid of business subsidies and reduce taxes for everyone so that we could create a level playing field in that respect.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Murray: I won't ask your opinion on the Baseball Park. I just have one question for you Shelley and I want to thank you very much. The CFIB has been very constructive in this and very helpful to us, and you've raised some very good points, and I want to thank you for your participation on the trip. I think you've been a real help.

I know many people are concerned. I've had this document available to members of Council now for a couple of weeks. Only Councillor Smith out of the members of the Committee attended the September 6 hearing where we explained all of these things that some people seem to be confused about.

A lot of the questions that you're raising, Workers' Compensation premiums, payroll tax. Are you familiar with the framework agreement, Treaty Land Entitlement of Manitoba that was signed by Gary Filmon's government and the Government of Canada? Did you want to comment on that at all?

Ms Weisman: I can't actually comment on specifics of it other than I do know that it's in place right now and that we need to abide by it. I know that you have commented on it, and that the City is bound by that piece of legislation. The details of it I couldn't comment at this time.

It is my responsibility to read it, and to provide some further comment in the future.

Mayor Murray: I would ask you Ms Weisman, if you would approach the CFIB, and I would certainly support you in that, and ask them if they would be prepared to do a works hop jointly between the Federal and Provincial Government. I would like to assure you and as business women I'm sure you're familiar with this. The Provincial and Federal Governments have never been shy about getting their cut of taxes from First Nations People or anybody else. I think once councillors and most of First Nations Community understand this process, you'll see that the Federal and Provincial Governments have well taken care of their interests. If not in the interests of a level playing field business, I think in the interest of protecting their own revenues, I think that we as Canadians should not fear the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba's ability to get its fair cut of any good business deal.

I know that some people have been confused. It's really not my job to defend federal and provincial policy. But I want to tell you, if the municipal services agreement is half what the Federal and Provincial Governments have, we can all sleep well at night. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Was there a question there anywhere? I don't think so. Thank you.

Time is up. Point of order.

Point of Order

Councillor Steeves: Are delegations made aware when they're appearing that there's motions that appear as addendums to that motion? For example, Motion No. 1 that reads number five….

Mr. Speaker: No. The motions we have not considered yet until, they're not officially before us until they're read.

Councillor Steeves: That's fair enough. If that's the rule, that's the rule. The last delegation might have been interested in Motion No. 1, that's all.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: I'd like to on behalf of City Council welcome the students of the Aboriginal College Campus at the Old CP Station on Higgins Avenue. Welcome to City Hall on behalf of City Council.

Mr. Speaker: Welcome. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I'd like to move suspension of rules to allow two additional speakers on the Aboriginal Pathway?

(10:20)

Mr. Speaker: Who would they be?

Councillor Smith: I don't have the names, I just know that they're here.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, without names it isn't carried.

The Mayor does have a motion that we suspend the rules to hear Larry Wucherer. Christian Sinclair and Chris Henderson in support of Clause 2.

There are four others still, but this would be three more after that. Moved by the Mayor the rules be suspended, and they each get five minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Going back to the original order if we may. Mr. Nick Ternette in the 10 minute spot in support of Item 2 of EPC of September 23, 2003.

Mr. Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Murray, Members of City Council.

I'm here today to support the First Steps: Municipal Aboriginal Pathways document, to be honest I wonder why it took over a

year for the City to produce a 17 page draft document on an issue, when in fact all of us are aware that the Aboriginal population is currently approximately 70,000 and will likely rise to 100,000 which is approximately 10% of the City's population. This issue should have been addressed decades ago.

The Pathway document does try to address overall strategies affecting the Aboriginals such as employment, where the City will initiate Aboriginal Internship and help develop an Aboriginal employment network. But how many unemployed Urban Aboriginals become employed and in what timeframe, is something that needs to be looked at in the specifics.

In regards to safety. The City will initiate an Aboriginal Youth Ambassadorship Program, and create an Aboriginal liaison office. Unfortunately there's no mention under safety about the idea of having special Aboriginal constables who would deal with the so called aggressive panhandlers primarily Aboriginals with an addiction problem, who would see that they were taken to the Main Street Project not only for their own safety but as well as others.

It is under the quality of life section that the more concrete strategies are laid out. Such as creating a multi-purpose community facility specifically for urban Aboriginals to be located in the North End by January of 2005. Unfortunately, while there's a timeline set, there are no specifics on the financial funding for this facility, who will pay for this, the Provincial Government, the Federal Government, the City? How will it be structured? How much will the City contribute to it, how much will the Province contribute, how much will the Federal Government contribute?

There's also a mention of a partnership with the City to increase participation of Aboriginals in sports activities currently run by the City. In my opinion involving any young person whether they're Aboriginal or non Aboriginal, in sports, it's fundamental in giving them a purpose in life as well as keeping them off the streets.

As well there's a commitment by the City to ensure that future municipal housing initiatives are focussed on Winnipeg's Aboriginal Community. This is significant positive change. In the past the Mayor has been supportive of new housing initiatives, committing $7 million towards affordable housing. But this was never previously focused on the Aboriginal community, and I think that is significant.

The City has also committing itself to developing outreach and education initiatives that promote cross cultural understanding, and improve access to information for Urban Aboriginals on services available from the City.

It is of course under the economic development that the debatable strategy that we're discussing of creating an urban reserve is placed.

To be honest, I'm somewhat surprised that the degree of criticism in creating an urban reserve, that is the idea of an urban reserve for it's not a new idea. Approximately six years ago here in December, at this city council chamber, then under Mayor Susan Thompson, the North Main Street Project report was delivered to City Council. Under the leadership of Joe Bova and Mary Richard it proposed an urban reserve on Main Street. At that time it suggested the six storey building on the west side of Main Street to house Aboriginal businesses. There was little or no public discussion on this issue and it was passed unanimously by city council. In fact, the notion in principle of support for an urban reserve is already on the record.

Mayor Murray is right that the Federal Government can demand that when an Aboriginal organization wishes to set up an urban reserve within the City limits, that the City facilitate that process. If City Council objects to an urban reserve they could find themselves in a fish bowl. Some like those in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan where I'm told there the Federal Government is in fact imposing an urban reserve onto that city because that city wasn't prepared to do anything about it.

If an urban reserve is done properly by utilizing the Aboriginal population that lives and works in Winnipeg who could provide tremendous economic growth to the Aboriginal Community in Winnipeg. It could be sold I believe as a significant component of revitalizing the downtown. The only proviso I would have in this case is that you wouldn't want existing Aboriginal businesses moving from their present locations which are located in different parts of the City into this urban reserve because then it would create again loads of businesses in other areas of the City where they're doing very well.

But if a reserve outside of Winnipeg wanted to establish an urban reserve which is what we're seemingly talking about on Crown land in Winnipeg, it would have some economic spin-off for Winnipeg. But to be honest, the fear that I have and would really see is that the majority of the money if it came from the reserves would go back to the reserves and would not directly benefit Winnipeg's Aboriginal Community. This is what I'm somewhat worried about because Saskatoon has set up a land trust where they have over $2 million but that trust of any profits made in that business section goes back to the reserve, it does not go to the Aboriginals who live and work in the City itself. I think there needs to be some provisions when there's an actual agreement coming forth that the urban Aboriginals that live and suffer in Winnipeg right here in the centre of Winnipeg, benefit the most from this.

The fact is, there's no loss of revenues to city governments under the terms of an urban reserve, we know that. It's true that Aboriginals working Aboriginals that are treaty Aboriginals working on urban reserves do not have to pay federal income tax, nor consumption taxes such as GST, but those are not taxes that the City collects in the first place so ultimately the City doesn't lose anything on this deal. I'm more concerned about whether the City loses not whether the Federal and Provincial Government does.

No economic development project on its own could possibly relive the object poverty that is the reality of some Aboriginals in this innercity. What this Pathway document in terms of its total perspective including the urban reserve but urban reserve being only one small segment of the total policy in terms of education, in terms of recreation, in terms of employment which by far the more significant issues, what it can do as Saskatoon in some ways are doing is to generate some economic stimulus among Aboriginals in the innercity, which will then start to address the abject poverty and the horrible situation that the Aboriginal Community faces inside of Winnipeg. As I've said before, 10% of the population of Winnipeg, the number one growing population in Winnipeg, in the core area of Winnipeg is Aboriginals. And if we don't address them now which we should have addressed 20, 25 years ago, we're going to continue to have even more social problems to the point of absolute chaos in the innercity.

I urge you to support this Pathway document with the provisos that we look at some of the specifics of who we're assisting especially I'm concerned about the urban Aboriginals in the core area of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Question Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Through you. Mr. Ternette, what benefits, you mentioned a few but can you give a more complete picture of the benefits to the non Aboriginal population of Winnipeg?

Mr. Ternette: Mr. Speaker, as far as I understand urban Aboriginal businesses if we're talking just simply first of all.

(10:30)

We'll talk about two issues probably. The recreational facility. If we are talking about a recreational facility. As you know the North YWCA closed down and the North End community has been looking for a recreational facility. If we build an Aboriginal Community facility. I actually in Calgary worked for the Indian Métis Friendship Centre as program director, so I know that that facility while it may be an Aboriginal facility can be open to the

North End residents in terms of recreational activities. I think that would be a tremendous improvement towards improving the recreational outlets for the community in the North End which is lacking a good deal of the recreational facilities.

In terms of businesses. Well businesses will sell not just only to Aboriginals but will be selling to anybody who comes in the shops. We have tremendous Aboriginal artists and creative people in this community that have already set up shops. They're shops already in some of the various malls, so I know some of the owners who do that. That whole artistic impact will improve drastically, we'll have far more significant small businesses setting up in that area. They are also unique businesses that the Aboriginal Community could set up in terms of their own skills that we don't particularly look for in terms of the white community that will then attract businesses downtown. I see this as significantly part of a strategy for revitalizing the downtown which is what we've been talking about for the last six, seven years.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Next delegation will be in the five minute slot on the same issue, same side will be Gerry Grayeyes.

Ms Gerry Grayeyes: Thank you Mr. Chair, Your Worship, Councillors and friends of the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways.

My name is Gerry Grayeyes. I have been a resident of the City of Winnipeg since 1972. My original home is the St. Peter's Reserve which was illegally surrendered in the early 20th century and is now known as Peguis. We're not that very far away from this community. We're number 269 and remember that when you're looking at approaching our First Nations on discussions.

I've done some testing out at the bureaucratic level mind you but there seems to be interest there. I wouldn't dare to speak for the elected officials.

I owe an apology to the two authors of this document yesterday when I appeared before Executive Policy Committee, I kind of tossed this aside but please don't misinterpret that as I don't recognize all of the hard work that went into it, and I disrespect the document. I do in fact respect it but I was expressing my frustration because it was the first time I had had the opportunity to look at the document. It was handed to me about five minutes before going into session. I was completely frustrated with trying to digest all of the complexities of it. My apologies sincerely.

For many years prior to moving to the City of Winnipeg, and especially when I moved here, there has been an element of our First Nations Community, and I can speak of First Nations because that's where I come from, an element of our First Nations Community which has been neglected, overlooked, unheard, unrepresented when it comes to discussions such as this. The element I'm talking about is the First Nations Women's People.

I raised this issue at the R.B. Russell School session, and I raise it again. I feel it's very important. Nowhere in this document whether it's in the policy framework, promising practices, any of the various legs of the Pathway implementation. Specific types of initiatives strategic initiatives. Review the future of the Urban Aboriginal Municipal Aboriginal Pathways The Next Steps. It really concerns me that the element of Aboriginal Women, the identification of our needs. The role that we will play in this whole process hasn't been addressed. I feel it's very important that this be addressed, be taken seriously. You will find that if you look around at the established Aboriginal organizations, the same challenge exists there. **f** ever there was an opportunity to make some headway within the urban community to show leadership on the issue, this is an ideal opportunity to do so.

As mentioned before, Aboriginal women, and this comes from the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People. There was a presentation by women called the

Aboriginal Women in the Canadian Workforce.

In the course of their research it was found that Aboriginal women comprised over 50% of the population. Aboriginal women were undervalued, underutilized but nonetheless were well equipped, well educated, experienced and quite capable of taking on the challenges of our communities. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Next delegation will be Adrienne Batra on behalf of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation in the five minute spot in opposition to the same clause.

Ms Adrienne Batra: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Good morning Councillors.

Let me begin by saying that this whole debate on urban reserves has taken place in the media. I don't think that it should have been but unfortunately we live with the circumstances in which we're given so it has been.

The Canadian Taxpayers' Federation is not opposed to having Aboriginals working, living and existing amongst all of us. I think that's very important to clarify before I begin.

The social and economic problems facing Aboriginals didn't happen over night. For over 130 years they have been segregated from Canadian society through the archaic and paternalistic Indian Act. This Act was drafted when Canada was an intolerant and racist nation.

(10:35)

For example, women and Jews were not considered persons and did not have the right to vote. Visible minorities including my family and Aboriginals were considered inferior. Rather than treat all Canadians equal like we do today in the 21st century where women, Jews, Catholics, visible minorities have all the same rights and responsibilities as other Canadians, Aboriginals are still segregated from the rest of society, and it's all because of the ethnicity.

The myriad of programs, social programs, government programs available to any other citizen of a province are not available to Aboriginals living on a reserve land. Thus, the Federal Government has created a separate level of bureaucratic overlap.

Consequently because of the Federal Government many programs specifically for Aboriginals have treated the rest of Canada differently. In an attempt to compensate for the disparity between natives and non natives, politicians and bureaucrats have produced volumes of preferential legislation, preferential exemptions and benefits for Aboriginals.

The City of Winnipeg's plan to implement more education and training opportunities for Aboriginals to meet current employment standards already exists in many other levels of higher learning, and many other levels of government already implemented things like this.

The University of Manitoba for example has access programs. Access programs are provided at a degree level to persons who have traditionally not had the opportunity through such experiences such as social, economic, cultural reasons or lack of formal education to access these types of programs.

The policy specifically states and I quote from the University of Manitoba "preferences will be given to persons who are Aboriginal, status, non status, Métis and Inuit". These access programs are also available at other post secondary institutions across the Province and across the Country.

Every level of government has some sort of affirmative action program designed to favour Aboriginals with preferential hiring practices over non Aboriginals. The City of Winnipeg will continue to encourage Aboriginal people to apply for positions and identify themselves as being Aboriginal, yet it also states that the self-identification will not be a factor in the hiring process. So one has to wonder what is the point of even self-identifying.

These types of preferential policies are barely acceptable though no less discriminatory if they actually produce some results.

Unfortunately the result has been to make in many cases Aboriginals more not less dependent on government dollars.

We believe that not only does this destroy the motivation and pride of Aboriginal people, but it also creates a significant amount of resentment in the rest of society.

Most Native policies create new victims because they wrongly address group rights rather than individual rights. Canadians want what is just and equitable and feel a tremendous amount of guilt for some of the struggling conditions in which Aboriginals live. But the current system of awarding special treatment to one group of people while discriminating against another, only results in hostility and even greater long term inequality in our country.

Speaking specifically to the municipal development services agreement which is now of course been the urban reserves, in 1871, 1923, Canada concluded eleven Victorian treaties more commonly referred to as the numbered treaties. They cover the Prairie Provinces, most of Ontario, of Northwest Territories and parts of north eastern British Columbia. The purpose of these treaties was to open up the land for settlement, trade and agriculture. In addition they sought to ensure peace and good will between Indians, settlers and the Crown. As these treaties were signed the government began to establish reserves. The size of the reserves were based on population figures. In many cases some people were exempt.

We believe that the establishment of an urban reserve in the City of Winnipeg will create an unlevel playing field by providing certain tax exemptions for people based specifically on their ethnicity and to that we are opposed.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor question.

Mayor Murray: Thanks. That was one of the most interesting recollections of Canadian history, a little different than the one I learned in University.

Ms Batra: Also the one based on our Canadian Constitution Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Murray: I'm not going to get into a Constitutional debate but I'll you a beer or a cup of tea one day and we can talk about this in more depth.

Could you please explain what you didn't explain which is when a treaty is signed between two nations, it's between two national governments. Could you explain to me what you think the First Nations People who were on the other side of the table expected they were signing and whether you think what they got and what we committed to First Nations has been satisfied? Because when I talk to First Nations People, their view of the Treaty from their eyes was much different than just opening up the land in the west for us.

Ms Batra: When the treaty land entitlements began when they started to be signed and settlements were coming about, there's nothing in there that is saying, they can't buy land anywhere. Obviously it's the willing seller, willing purchaser, there's no question whatsoever, it's no different than a business transaction Mr. Mayor. All we're saying is that the creation of having the band whatever respective band it is establish it as a reserve is part of the problem. The negative condemnations that arose from the that word alone is where we are having some significant problems with it.

Mayor Murray: Ms Batra could you explain to me the difference between a business transaction and a treaty, and the obligations of local, national and provincial governments when it's a treaty, and how it differs from our obligations in a business agreement?

Ms Batra: The treaty land entitlements are by law we have to adhere to those and honour those, there's no question about it. Before I got cut off, I was actually going right into that, the very same question you were asked. I

acknowledge we have our commitments. When a business wants to buy another business they come with a plan, they come with a proposal, they come with a cost benefit analysis. This is also to the other point in which we want. And we hope that Council will recognize.

We as individuals and for the organization in which I represent as taxpayers, we would like to see some sort of dollar figure put to many of these things, and I certainly recognize that there is not a proposal on the table right now for a band to be purchasing land in Winnipeg. I realize that. I was at the meeting yesterday with the Native leaders.

However, we need to see where our money is going. When we talk about treaty land entitlements and we talk about business transactions, many of these things do have a dollar component to it, and I think we would hope that City Council takes this information, looks at it further, talks to the people more, Aboriginal, non Aboriginal, everybody, and does some more comparisons to what is in this municipal document and may be see what other levels of government are doing already that maybe some duplication or how we can work together. I think it's very important.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves had a question.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you for your presentation. I was going to ask you first, you acknowledge it's the municipality's obligation to enter into some sort of discussions, I think you've just done that. I thank you for that, which leads me to my second question.

Given that you've acknowledged our I guess obligation if I could use that word, enter into some sort of negotiations.

(10:45)

What it is specifically in terms of the wording of this document or the motions on the table today that gives you concern?

Ms Batra: Very simply Mr. Councillor, the concerns that we have are that many of the policies being put forward are simply based on race. They're not based on anything else other than that. That is our biggest concern.

Councillor Steeves: That's fine. I'm looking at the report itself and the motions that came out of Executive Policy Committee yesterday, and to me they seem to indicate simply a sort of acknowledgement of our obligation again to enter into these commitments. They don't seem to go into any real detail as to what they might be. In fact it seems to go overboard in terms of acknowledging that whenever something concrete does come forward, we have to engage in that whole process of consultation to try and get some of the numbers on the table as you stated. I'm just trying to get a handle through you and the other delegation as to what it is specifically black and white within this report that is causing such concern.

Ms Batra: Maybe part of the issue is because of significant time restraints. And again as I mentioned to the Mayor that's probably why there's no more need for consultation and more discussion on this particular paper.

For us as our organization, we are looking specifically at some of the training and employment practices that are being discussed, again, based simply on race.

With regards to acknowledging the TLE's, I've done that as I've said earlier. We need more consultation. We need to talk more. I think that everybody in our society would benefit from that.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplemental.

Councillor Steeves: You are aware though, I just want to make sure that you are aware that if, the way this is worded as far as I'm, and I stand to be corrected if I'm incorrect, the way this is worded as I read it, if something was to come forward i.e. a proposal, there's a requirement written in that with the consultation would then have to take place on that specific proposal and the MDSA would have to be written up.

Ms Batra: Absolutely, because we certainly realize that anything that comes forward has to be negotiated between the respective band and the civic government, absolutely.

I would actually just like to say one final thing. I did not go on the trip to Saskatoon but I'm from Saskatoon, I grew up there. I was born and raised there. And I've seen the urban reserve and I'm pleased to say that it seems to be a very effective system for the City of Saskatoon. What will work for the City of Winnipeg is a very different thing. We look forward to the future. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: We have another question. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you for your presentation. Theoretically we should be on the same side. I'm having some difficulty understanding the objection of the organization that you represent.

Are you saying that really throughout Canada where we have reserves set up in industrial parks for example in British Columbia there's about 20 of them where there are urban reserves as a function of cities growing out to reserve land. In the Province of Saskatchewan there were only two urban reserves, the other 13 out of 15 are those that have evolved as a result of existing municipalities growing out to existing reserve land. Are you saying that your organization objects in principle to a fundamental treaty on the basis of race for these as well, never mind creating new ones, that all these others are racist based? I hate to put you on the spot on this but that is the implication that you've left us with.

Ms Batra: Councillor De Smedt, I think I've said that we recognize that we have to acknowledge our treaty land entitlement agreements, there's no question. But the concern is that, we're not concerned with anybody buying any type of land in any city, there's no question about that. That's excellent and they should be developing businesses and they should have the opportunity to have jobs and create new enterprises. What we're saying, is that the establishment of that particular land as a reserve is wherein lies the problem.

Councillor De Smedt: There really isn't too much time, but are you aware that really the agreement that was signed between the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Authority simply asserts that a loss of municipal and school taxes alone is not a fundamental reason for a municipality to reject an offer and a submission.

Ms Batra: No one is saying that the municipality should reject an offer Mr. Councillor. What we're saying then, okay then on that point, there's as you and I discussed yesterday, there's something called the Municipal Tax Loss Compensation which is provided to municipality on behalf of the Province if there is a tax loss. If there is no resources or revenues lost then what's the point in having something like that.

I have to go back to this issue that I've brought up before. There needs to be more discussion on this. There needs to be more consultation and there's clearly no question that I and all the other people in this room have to have more information for resources at our fingertips.

Councillor De Smedt: Final supplemental. I understand there's an indemnification process that Manitoba shall indemnify harmless Canada or the First Nations for any challenges made for loss of municipal taxes, and I think I'm very pleased that you brought this up.

In that case, are you not aware that your argument is not with us for a level playing field but it's with the Province and with the Feds?

Ms Batra: I think that for today's purposes perhaps my argument is with you City Council because this is the document that you have put forward. When the Province and the Federal Government put things forward we also speak to them as well. We try to advocate on all levels of government. I guess today yes, my fight is with you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Next delegation will be Kerry Ward in opposition to Item 4 of Protection and Community Services dated September 8, 2003.

Ms Kerry Ward: Good morning. My name is Kerry Ward and I'm appearing before you today to oppose the proposed fine increases for the Pound By-law that deals with harbouring more than three cats or three dogs as pets.

First of all, let me state that I'm in favour of most of the fine increases that are being proposed, as most of them target irresponsible pet owners. There's nothing more annoying than trying to walk my cat on his leash in the greenspace near my home and being charged by somebody's off leashed dog with no owner in sight. I'm not opposed to stiff fines for allowing pets to run loose, defecate on people's property, chase people, give birth to unwanted litters and so forth.

However I am very much opposed to the section of the by-law that limits a family's ownership to three cats and three dogs as this rule makes no attempt whatsoever to differentiate between a responsible owner and an irresponsible one.

The family who owns five fixed vaccinated micro chipped indoor cats can be fined under this by-law, the same as an irresponsible owner whose cats run loose and give birth to a litter every year.

According to the City of Winnipeg website, the Pound By-law dates back to 1979. The restriction on the number of cats and dogs that a family may own was introduced in 1988.

(10:55)

At that time there may have well been a need for this to prevent owners from breeding litter after litter of puppies or kittens, since at that time there was no requirement to spay or neuter your pet and no requirement that cats could not run at large and be a nuisance to neighbours.

However, the Pound By-law was amended in 1997 making it an offence to run at large, and it was amended again in 1999 requiring that all cats and dogs over the age of six months be spayed or neutered, and that all cats have some form of identification.

In view of these amendments to the original by-law, the original restriction on the number of pets that a family may own now seems to be both unnecessary and unfair.

If the person is a responsible owner they will be violating one or more of the other sections of the by-law and/or noise or health by-laws.

In the absence of any of these offences why should a responsible family not be allowed to have as many pets as they choose. At the very least, if they're allowed to have three cats and three dogs, why can they not choose to have six cats and no dogs instead.

I have a volunteer job with the Winnipeg Humane Society helping potential adopters choose their new cats. Based on my experience, I would have to say that the number of pets that is right for any given individual varies widely and is based on many factors such as whether they live in a small apartment or a large house, their lifestyle, interests and how much time and money they have to devote to caring for their pet. It also depends on the pet itself. Some cats insist on being the only one in the household. Others do extremely well in large groups.

I would really like to know how it was determined that three is the magically correct number. Do all the people with four or five cats automatically become crazy old cat ladies? Last year the Winnipeg Humane Society saw over 5,000 cats pass through their doors, nearly 2,000 of which were euphanized, most simply because there were not enough adoptive homes available for them.

At the same time I have had people come in to the cat adoption room to look around and they have told me that they would love to take another cat but they already

have three and that is all that they're allowed. It is extremely sad to deny these cats a loving home with a responsible and caring owner simply because the City has decided that they already have enough.

When we were children we would bring home a stray kitten asking our parents, can we keep it, and we were told when you grow up and have your own place and you're making your own money, then you can have as many pets as you want. Well, not according to City Hall.

I'm sure we all realize that there are huge numbers of families and individuals in this city who do have four or five or six cats. If these people have their pets spayed or neutered, micro chipped or tattooed, receive regular vet care and vaccinations, and the pets are confined to their property, these people should not be breaking any laws.

The current by-law is old and outdated. There are not even any exemptions for the hundreds of city families who provide temporary foster care to shelter animals that are too young or too sick for immediate adoption. Many of the Humane Society's foster parents already have three dogs or cats of their own. When they agree to foster a mother cat and its litter for the eight weeks until the litter is old enough for adoption, technically they are breaking the law. They don't own the animals and they're merely providing temporary essential care that the Humane Society cannot provide at the shelter, but technically they are harbouring the animals.

There are many reasons why this section of the by-law should be revised and updated to better reflect responsible pet owners in the city today. Until it is revised, at the very least it is my opinion that City Council should not be raising the fine for something that really should not be an offence in the first place.

Mr. Speaker: Question Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: I just want to clarify one thing. You said that you don't think a citizen should be able to have as many pets as they want.

Ms Ward: As long as they're cared for responsibility.

Councillor Smith: Councillor Steek could have like 20 dogs.

Ms Ward: If Councillor Steek's dogs aren't violating any noise by-laws and if they're all under his control, if they're all being properly cared for, yes. In most cases, the extreme situations. If there's any kind of abuse or neglect the Humane Society can step in regardless of whether it's one animal or 20. It doesn't make a difference there.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Now the three additional delegations that were moved under rule suspension, and under custom of this council they will each be given five minutes and there will be no questions of these delegations.

First is Larry Wucherer.

Mr. Larry Wucherer: Morning everyone. Thank you for letting me speak this morning.

I've been recently elected as President of the Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg about 13 days ago now, so I'm new to this whole political process. Not a greenhorn per se but I'm just in the forefront. I just want to preface that in advance just in case I might offend anyone, it's not my intention. My intention is to bring forward the views of the Aboriginal Council and the Urban Aboriginal Community.

First off I'd like to thank you. The Mayor, all those that supported this document coming forward. I think it's incredibly bold. It's what we need in the urban Aboriginal Community. I just want to give you a round of applause for that.

I've been involved in the Aboriginal Community for a long time, and this issue came up as one of the first major things for the Aboriginal Council. I guess our position on that on the urban reserve portion of the 15 point plan, this is one of 15 points, is that whatever worked here in the community, there's so much need here, there's so many people, so many

people want to do things. People don't want to be on welfare. People want to work. People want to get educated. People want to participate in this economy. People want to own homes. I know you mostly know that but I just want to make sure it's clear that our community wants a place here.

This document is really a framework. It's a principle, an agreement of principle. All the rhetoric out there, all the media hype about this, I think John Angus asked a question earlier of that person Ms Weisman. Do you know that this is going to be out in the community. Do you know that everyone is going to be consulted. That has been brought up. Everybody's being saying the Mayor hasn't talked to anybody. Well the Mayor talked to the Aboriginal Community as his first step, and the next step is when steps come up. I think that hasn't been brought up. I'm not here to defend the Mayor. I think though on this Aboriginal document we need to support the Mayor. I cannot overstate that enough. That's why we brought the students.

(11:00)

The issue of ownership of this problem, responsibility, Lester Lafond if anybody heard him last night, incredible man. He's the most conservative Aboriginal guy I have actually met, I thought he was really cool, money, money, money, profits and we need that in our community and that's happening in our community. We have these people that want to provide business leadership.

Mr. De Smedt, Mr. Steek, called a meeting with some First Nation Leaders yesterday at the Fort Garry around 2 o'clock. I can tell you, Larry Soldier from Swan Lake, he's like a Lester. Like we have the people here, we have the leadership here.

That's all I'm going to say about the urban reserve. I think the major point that needs to be made here is this whole plan. The other 14 points that are mentioned here, these are all good first steps. This document is not pretending to be anything else than the first steps in trying to get these things going.

Through my day job, this presidency thing is a volunteer thing by the way. My day job, I work with the Community Services Department doing youth programming. One of our programs is in this document. We ran it for three years with Community Services Department. An incredible partnership. We've got 96 youth trained to be youth leaders. Your community centres hired them. They were role models for other youth in the community. It's an incredible program. The results, 65% of the youth stayed in school, got their grade 12. Twenty percent of those went onto university. These are the kinds of things that the other 14 points are talking about here. The urban reserve is a small component. There's 60,000 Aboriginal people, yes they'll create jobs. Yes some people those who have treaty cards will enjoy some benefits, no doubt about that. It's their right. But the main thrust of this document is for the whole community, the Aboriginal Community. The different areas. I don't think you can go wrong. Again I just wanted to thank those that supported this.

My last comment, is the City previously supported Thunderbird House. Thunderbird and the Aboriginal Centre. We're beginning to change the North Main. We've done a good job. And we want to keep doing that. We want to keep helping and find our place in the City, and I thank you for that, and I thank you for the time this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Next delegation, Christian Sinclair.

Mr. Christian Sinclair: In my own language of the Swampee Cree, I've said thank you to His Worship Glen Murray, to the councillors sitting here before us. Elders, ladies and gentlemen and the youth as we move forward on what's going to be a very powerful decision that you have before you today.

Before I carry on, I heard all this talk about cats and dogs, and I know it was raining cats and dogs on my way here. With that.

I'd just like to start off by thanking Mr. Speaker and of course greetings to our elders in the audience, chiefs that are present, His Worship, Councillors, ladies and gentlemen and the youth.

Quote by a famous man from the United States stated "the ultimate measure of a person or in this case a government is not where they stand in moments of convenience, but where they stand in moments of challenge, crisis and controversy", which I think we face and are facing today as we move forward.

The decision made here today will determine the final outcome of the future of the City which will have either lasting positive or negative effects for generations to come. We've heard all this talk about the issue of urban reserves that only affects one nation, that's the First Nations in Canada. We have five distinct nations here in Manitoba but we have many First Nations that come across Canada and United States that live and reside here in Winnipeg because it is a great city and I think that's reflected in the large Aboriginal population that's here today. In Canada alone we represent or when people say Aboriginal we're made up of First Nations, the Métis, Inuit, and the Innu and they all do reside in Winnipeg. So when we talk about urban reserve, that only affects the First Nations so please keep that in mind.

The lack of inaction by governments of the past has brought us to where we are today, and based on that has left a black eye on Canada because of its ugly legacy. Really that is towards the Aboriginal people in general because of inaction where we are still facing that today and have not moved forward to include us or to have an inclusion at the table.

By endorsing this plan which many of you have seen everyone has seen in the media for the last few weeks, it gives all Winnipeg and that's all members of society of Winnipeg an opportunity to plan an exciting and dynamic feature that we can all be proud of. The philosophy of Aboriginal people we've always ensured through the knowledge of our elders that inclusion is key to have a successful outcome that includes everybody in the community from elders, the youth, male and female balance, and in this particular plan going forward, the non Aboriginal community. To share those philosophies that differ but how we can work them together going forward. We know that a lot of government has been based on the European style of government, but I think we have an opportunity to move forward and have the inclusion of Aboriginal people to make a powerful statement, not only here in Winnipeg but across Canada and in the world moving forward.

As I'm talking here we're living side by side yet we as Aboriginal people are left out in many cases. We want to be a part of this process of building a better Winnipeg. If you look up right now they would acknowledge that we have a lot of Aboriginal youth sitting in the gallery probably their first time, I know this is my first time in this forum. I'm glad to be a part of it knowing that this decision here will effect myself and generations to come down the road. I would hope that many of those sitting up there will be sitting here one day.

By participating we can share first hand knowledge that we have experienced especially in the negative legacies and learning from those and how we can provide solutions that will make it a win win situation for all of us. And the key part of that was mentioned earlier today, was by educating each other. I've heard talk from the Canadian Tax Federation. Based on what they were taught in their education system written by one government, by one people totally neglecting the other side. If those treaties were not signed we'd probably be saluting the stars and bars today because it was a race to get the railway to the other side of the coast. If that was the case I know our brothers and sisters of the Native Americans are thriving in the U.S. right now.

With that, I know that Winnipeg is a great city. Many of you saw first hand what happened last summer during the 2002 North American Indigenous Games. I was fortunate enough to be the general manager for that event, and believe me it is challenging even to come to a balance

agreement amongst are own Aboriginal nations to have a final outcome based on consensus which we did. We went steps further it which was not done before which including the Métis, the First Nation, non Aboriginal community as well as our elders and our youth at the table male and female balance. We've done that. That's been a model that's been adopted and is being used for further developments across United States and Canada well into the future. What we did there was not take only an Aboriginal perspective, we took the best of concepts from Canada Games, North American Indigenous Games, other games from around the world including the Olympic Games.

(11:10)

And made what we did last year which was very successful and we still have good news coming out that. More importantly the intangible legacies that you will see years down the road, some of you may not be here, but your children, your grandchildren will see the effects of that going forward.

With that, I fully support the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways Plan, there are 15 components to it. Each of those components effect all aspects of a healthy society not just an urban reserve. Economically speaking, economically will provide a great vehicle for spilling off on those other benefits and we look forward to those.

With that, like I said I fully support the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways Program. Coming from a First Nation myself and living in an urban environment in Winnipeg I've had the opportunity to travel around the world and see first hand suffering in third world countries where there are no democracies but being here in Winnipeg and not being at this table in a so called first world country and not having that opportunity that's what we're looking for today.

With that, thank you very much and I hope that you'll include us in this journey going forward which is going to be powerful and have effects for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker: Our final delegation this morning, Chris Henderson.

Mr. Chris Henderson: Good morning. My name is Chris Henderson. Mr. Speaker, Deputy Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Deputy Mayor. For those of you in the audience again my name is Chris Henderson. This is what it looks like inside.

Again I had the pleasure of appearing before Executive Policy Committee yesterday afternoon, and from the bottom of my heart I want to thank EPC for beginning this journey, and for concluding hopefully the journey yesterday by accepting in its entirety the City of Winnipeg's draft Aboriginal strategy that is currently before all of you today for your acceptance and approval.

In particular I want to thank as I did yesterday, Councillor Vandal and Councillor Gerbasi who took the lead in drafting this strategy. I myself, I am here as an individual speaking to and in support of the draft strategy.

I know there has been a great amount of debate focussing on one issue and one issue alone. I just want to reiterate my comments from yesterday. It would be extremely unfortunate if that one issue would hinder the passage of this document. It would be in my view, it would be irresponsible, reckless and disrespectful to the worthy work that has gone into it. As Councillor Clement had commented yesterday during the EPC session, nowhere in that document does it say anything about establishing an urban reserve. Nowhere. You can't see those words anywhere. However, it only addresses the issue of entering into negotiations with regard to a municipal and services development agreement. That's all. That's all it does. That's the only thing it's obligating the City to do, is to sit down at the table with a First Nation who wants to purchase private land in the City of Winnipeg. All this hysteria around this issue is dumbfounding to me. It's extremely unfortunate but these things happen and we have to deal with them as they pop up.

In terms of the document itself, I do not share the comments that were echoed earlier by the CTF. I do not view the strategy as giving preferential treatment to one group over another. If anything it's giving opportunity.

I know last year almost a year ago, it's no secret that I campaigned on some of the very similar issues that are addressed in this strategy. I was very pleased and happy to see that some of those issues were being addressed in this strategy. That's why I have no qualms or no reservations about endorsing the work.

Again, in terms of having the courage, I would for those of you who are undecided in terms of supporting this work, I would implore you to have that courage to vote to accept it so we can take the next step. Obviously we're just beginning the first few steps. Let's not this one issue take us back two steps. Because as First Nation people whenever we move forward somebody whenever somebody objects to progress, our progress in particular, we move two steps back. That would be extremely unfortunate if that were to happen with this document. Again, it's only a first step. I strongly encourage you to support it unanimously. Similar to EPC yesterday who have adopted it and approved of it.

Again, I thank you for allowing me to appear before you all today and it's an honour. I wish you all well as you go about your day today. I know you have an extremely busy agenda, and I thank you for allowing me this brief opportunity to address you all.

Mr. Speaker: Move onto the Report of the Executive Policy Committee of September 3, 2003. Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 3, 2003

Mayor Murray: Thank you very much. On behalf of Council, welcome back, it's good to see you in such fine form and good health.

Mr. Speaker: Can I take a few seconds of your time which is not running. I will only be here 'til noon, and I don't think we'll get to the item you're here on. Just to say that I share Chris' sentiment and that I hope it will be a unanimous vote in support.

Mayor Murray: It gives me great pleasure to move Report "A" of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 3, 2003, Items 1 to 4 as consent.

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

Report of September 17, 2003.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2003

Mayor Murray: It gives me pleasure to move Items 1 to 8 as consent.

Mr. Speaker: Clause 1, Councillor Steek.

Vote on Clauses 2 through 8 as consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1.

Item No. 1 – CanWest Stadium Various Tenant Requests File FR-4.1

Mayor Murray: I won't repeat what's in the report, I think it's pretty straightforward Mr. Speaker.

The charge that's being levied here which is a rather small one is pretty straightforward. It's required by development. It wasn't in the second phase agreement. We do not as you know by policy right now and I think Council to its credit has been consistent exempt charges or waived charges.

If we want to undertake this, then we would give a grant to the organization so the department is not out of pocket. The other matters of taxation are consistent with the agreement. There is some dispute. It was reviewed by Executive Policy Committee with the Administration.

Having said that, I don't think there is anyone, it would be hard to say whether it be Sam Katz or Winnipeg Goldeyes fans, Annitta Stenning our Chief Administrative Officer and Mr. Finnigan are going to be meeting with Mr. Katz in the next week to look at these and some larger issues about the future development of the Park. I think that's been in the initial chat before, I think that's very positive. These are all property matters. If we do want to have some other remedy other than charging the fees, that would have to come back to the process, I wouldn't preclude that. But I think we should leave this in the hands of the Administration. I think Mr. Katz is looking forward to that meeting as is Mr. Wolinsky. This has been bouncing around a few times. I think we should proceed with the vote.

(11:20)

Having said that, we are very mindful of the concerns of Mr. Katz.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Mr. Speaker we're so mindful of the concerns of Mr. Katz that we're drilling him an extra $48,000 for permits.

The fact remains is the arrangements with True North waive permits. The fact remains is that the initial phases waive permits. The fact remains is that Mr. Katz has been under the impression all the way along the line that these permit fees would be waived.

When somebody of Mr. Katz's ilk who everybody wants to trod out is the arch typical entrepreneur and success story comes here and tells you that he has an issue with $48,000 to say nothing to the fact that they were savaged by the Assessment Department, and I don't have any problem saying that on the floor.

Anytime you have your property taxes reduced by 70% there's something fundamentally wrong.

You heard from Mr. Katz and from Mr. Wolinsky that had they not realized that this venture would not have been viable. Why do we continuously take people to the wall on measures like this. This is unconscionable that we would be going after this enterprise for $48,000 after phases one and two were permit exempt. To suggest that Mr. Katz is looking forward to meeting with the Administration is the height of irony. Mr. Katz came here to speak to Council because of his frustration on this matter.

I'm always amazed by the constant banter around here, we're so open for business. We're so open for business that we were willing to go along with an over assessment of $700,000. If they didn't have the kind of resources they have, they couldn't have challenged. If they didn't care they wouldn't be here today asking for Council to assist them on this $48,000. You've already heard they paid it out. So great, they're going to have a meeting with the Administration, the Administration is going to say to them, you know, thanks for dropping in.

Wrong. I can't support this as a clause. What's the message that this sends to an entrepreneur like Katz's as well as to the rest of the business community.

Quite simple. Mr. Katz came here out of frustration. Mr. Wolinsky talked about the nature of the negotiation was around the Ballpark that frankly when it went through and we'll never forget the words of Mayor Thompson at the time, they were so stunned that they acknowledged they would take the deal if the City offered with only a 25 year lease, and Mayor Thompson looked at everybody on EPC and said, can they do that? This deal is so bad can they accept it.

The deal would never have happened without the kind of entrepreneurial zeal that Katz and Wolinsky personify, and what they do for this community. This is the essence of what haunts the community. We're going to have a wonderful discussion here about the new deal coming up. You want to grow the tax base? Be business friendly in every sense of the word. What is the message that this sends out to the business community as a whole? The small guy

on the street doesn't have the resources and he doesn't have the wherewithal to come down and battle this kind of stuff on the floor of Council.
I'll be anxious to hear once this meeting is over about the largess of the Administration in recommending that this $48,000 be waived. I bet against it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move that Clause 1 of September 17 of Executive Policy Committee be laid over for one month for further consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Do you wish to speak against the layover Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Murray: Thank you. Sometimes one has to keep ones sense of humour here.

This is an agreement that's gone through. There has already been major concessions and contributions from the public sector to this project. This is an administrative process at this point. I think we can trust them. I have a great deal of respect for Ms Stenning and Mr. Finnigan. If when I conclude my remarks I will gladly address Councillor Steek's rather interesting perspective on this, but I think that we can't keep holding this up, this should go through and be voted through, and then if we want to make some adjustments, we should do that through the proper process of granting back money. We should allow the Administration to come back with a larger report. I think there's some agreement from Mr. Katz to do that.

Again, we're very empathic. I know Sam very well. With the situation I think there is some larger issues here as well that could be resolved.

Mr. Speaker: Question on Councillor Lazarenko's motion to table for layover for one month. All in favour? Contrary? Recorded vote has been requested. All in favour of the motion please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors De Smedt, Smith, Steek, Wyatt, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker, Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 10.

Mr. Speaker: The motion to layover is lost. Continuing debate, Councillor Lazarenko did you wish to take part in the debate on that and then on the clause.

Councillor Lazarenko: Yes. Mr. Speaker, it's kind of disappointing you know to have a delegation come here and present their concerns, and with the brief that was submitted presented to us with the history.

Going back a number of years, I was involved with this proposal quite lengthy. I was one that did not support the location of building a baseball diamond on that particular site. But Council had made a decision and said this is where it will go.

The problems that had arisen from thereon was with former Mayor Susan Thompson who was adamant of not proceeding not for this, not to succeed, went to the direction as what is outlined in this brief that certain members of council, and it states here, it has been reported by other councillors that one member of Executive Policy Committee, who is no longer a city councillor said, Katz surprised us by accepting our deal but we will nail him on the lease. This is exactly what happened Mr. Speaker.

What Mr. Katz had to go through to satisfy council especially with Executive Policy Committee was shear hell. Because some members of council did not want this deal to go through simple as that.

Riverside Park Management Inc., were given so many things to deal with, there was no way that Mr. Katz and Inc. Company would be able to succeed in such a manner to satisfy the investors, and to satisfy the City of Winnipeg.

When Mr. Katz came before the Executive Policy Committee In Camera, I was present, I met with Mr. Katz, prior to that he outlined gave me a blueprint of what the building was going to look like which I never saw before because we did not have the information before us, we were not privy to some of the information because of the so called so many secret meetings that EPC were holding at that time.

When I saw the proposal, it was all together different. I had mentioned to Mr. Katz, go to EPC and tell them that you're accepting this deal, sign the agreement.

(11:27)

As soon as this happened, EPC members froze including the Mayor. Any questions? No. Mr. Katz left to be surrounded by the media.

The Mayor asked me to come over and I went to her side, she says, what do we do now? Well very easy. You were fooling around with a bull and you got the horn you know where. What you do now, is you sign a deal is a deal, council had given instructions for the Administration to prepare a deal. Mr. Katz had accepted that deal and asked for the signatures.

From then on it kept on and on and on. We have a beautiful baseball diamond that's visited by hundreds of thousands of people. It is generating revenue to the City of Winnipeg, not as much as it does to the Province and to the Federal Government because of the tax sharing base that they have the authority to take all the taxes.

We proceeded to give our share of funding shared by the other levels of government. Now Mr. Katz had appeared here today to council like we've heard a number of delegations here this morning with a concern.

When Council was given the information from the Executive Policy Committee some of us we didn't like it. I didn't like what was happening.

I believe one thing, a deal is a deal and you stay with it. You don't like then you shouldn't have been here in the first place to vote, to vote on it whether you accept or not.

Since that time Mr. Katz has had a run in with the City Administration. We talked about Riverbank Stabilization which part of it was not even within their ownership or their right of a lease of the land that the City owns. Try that direction, tried other directions, it was so frustrating to the investors Mr. Speaker that some were ready to pull out. Same thing as what happened with True North. The same thing as what happened in 1995 of a new complex that was to be built, where there was so much massive confusion. Things were dealt with behind closed doors. The general public didn't even know what we were talking about. The issue Mr. Speaker, is openness to make sure that all members of council, the general public, the proponents, the investors know exactly what direction we're going. When you prepare a business plan you stay with that business plan, you do not include other commitments to be made by the City.

I will not be supporting this clause Mr. Speaker, simply on the basis of what is before us now. We've been provided with information by Mr. Katz. They're holding some table talks with the Administration. I want to be part of it. I want to know exactly have they been dealt a fair compensation or a fair package to say that they have something now to work with. Or do they feel, are they going to be coming to council each and every time that a problem arises with that agreement that they've signed, they wanted a 50 year, they signed for 25

years. As Mr. Katz had said, after 25 years, the City takes ownership. It is our land and location around with that baseball diamond, but there was no alternative. They had to go there because of the stalemate that was received by some members of the Executive Policy Committee.

When you have a number of politicians that start playing the role of being administrators, interference causes massive confusion. I have before council Mr. Speaker a motion that we'll be dealing with on the Municipal Aboriginal Pathways which is going to give directions proceed with public consultations but make sure all that comes back to council. I hope that council will support that to the satisfaction of everyone, give an opportunity for the proponents and also for the people that are paying such as the City of Winnipeg taxpayers and also those, we're spending money because we are allowed to go dip into the coffers with the City of Winnipeg for any kind of a project.

If someone feels that they have been dealt a bad deal, we should be open and Mr. Mayor I don't agree with you because this is what has to happen. You were very vocal back at that time when this was being dealt with, at the same time you criticize the mayor at that time, there was too much secrecy and all of a sudden wanted to ram a deal, try to kill the deal to make sure it did not go through. I stand for the record Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what was happening here at that time, there were a few that wanted to kill this project. They tried everything to try to dismantle, to try and put in loopholes, to put a stoppage to that proposal.

Mr. Katz and others of his company were adamant, they were stubborn, they stayed and they succeeded. But why should anybody be going through that road again. How many people get disappointed and they leave, they say the hell with it. I'm trying to make something for the City of Winnipeg and I have to battle this over and over again. We don't have that problem when a big box development is coming in. Some people have said, well the taxpayers are paying the bill. Some are getting tax breaks. I'd like to know is how many of the wealthy people that do not pay taxes because of the loopholes that have been invented and put in there by the governments. How many of the super rich do not pay their share of taxes?

All of these questions Mr. Speaker have to be addressed. If this would have been laid over for one month, let me assure you that most of us would have a better vision to see how did this deal come through, how was this deal handled, and what is the problem, let's try and correct it because others will be coming in for the same thing. You don't want to have something that there's going to be massive confusion. You don't want to have something that people say look, they didn't know what they were doing. We're talking about people invested millions of dollars. It's not talking about people invested a few thousand. It's so unfair.

The reason I'm standing here in support of Mr. Katz because I know what him and his company went through a number of years ago. The skulduggery that was pulled off over and over again. Sure some members of EPC are not here now. I'm sure they can speak for themselves.

Deliberately Mr. Speaker it was so unjust. It was not right. It was in violation of democracy. It was in violation of a persons right to deal with things and then come up in the open and say, this is what we want without consultation. Without having information provided like I had said, when Mr. Katz came to me, showed me the blueprint of the building, I was amazed as to what was being proposed. We did not have that come to us from the Administration or from EPC and say look, this is exactly what it is. We were just being adamant, we didn't want to deal. I hope Council takes that into consideration Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Vandal followed by myself, Councillors Wyatt, De Smedt and Steeves.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This issue is very very simple.

In July of 2002, two months before the election, we on the floor of these chambers approved the financing deal for the expansion of CanWest Global Ballpark.

(11:35)

We all spoke very positively about it. We all spoke very positively about the contribution that Mr. Katz has done, and how this was going to be an enhancement to our downtown. And I'm sure that we all still feel the same way.

The deal was structured as follows. From the Federal Government there was going to be $1.5 million towards the expansion. From the Provincial Government, $1.5 million towards the expansion. And from the City of Winnipeg there was going to be $1 million towards the expansion.

On the part of the City of Winnipeg in addition to our $1 million, there was going to be a lease signed with CanWest Global, a 25 year lease for the land to CanWest Global which belongs to the City. It was a value to that of about three to five million dollars. I really can't remember. I don't have the report in front of me.

At no point in the negotiations was there a clarification, a discussion or an approval of waiver of development fees and permits on behalf of the City of Winnipeg. It's really that simple.

There had been that discussion and that agreement in phase one and phase two, but it was simply not part of phase three. As much as I respect Mr. Katz, and I appreciate what he has done for our downtown, how do we approve this waiver of development fees and permits and then say no to every other application that comes forward. How do we say no to the Inn at the Forks which we also approved or all the big box stores which we also approve in these chambers?

It would have been a different story had we had this discussion before we approved the overall funding formula for the expansion, but I just don't know how we say no now after the fact based on a request, and really that is the crux of this issue. It's very very simple.

I'd love to be able to say, Mr. Katz, we're going to waive your fees and continue the positive development that you've done. But that was never part of the deal.

You know what Councillor Lazarenko was right on, a deal is a deal.

It's the part of governing that is not very popular, but it's the part of governing that takes some discipline if we are going to deliver on all the objectives that we have as a city.

It's very very simple. I simply can't support the request at this time.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: I'm going to do something here I would consider somewhat irresponsible, and that is to get my two cents worth in and then run. I am under orders not to be back here fulltime. I wasn't suppose to speak at all but I'm ticked off and I'm going to speak.

Traditionally in our city if you wanted something done government had to do it. We look at our present arena, we look at the Stadium, the Art Gallery, the Convention Centre. These were all completely almost completely government funded. We look at Thunderbird House. So many things. Heck at the tail end of things let's even look at a restaurant being contemplated on a footbridge going over the river now, and it's government money that's putting it in there.

There's been a shift in recent years. There's been this ballpark, Mr. Katz was a driving force behind, built largely with private dollars. There's the Bandstand at Assiniboine Park built with private dollars. Thanks to the Asper Family for the most part there. There's the True North Centre currently under construction with a great many private dollars, mostly private dollars going in. There's a Jewish Community Centre. There's the Asper

School of Business at the U of M. The Buhler Building at the Health Sciences Centre. So many projects new to this city being built completely or largely with dollars from the private sector.

Didn't come easy. The first of these I mentioned was the Ballpark. The fight that this was a terrible thing that they were going to screw the public. They weren't really going to put any of their money into it. It was going to be terrible. This is the finest most loved facility probably next to the hospitals, by the public in the City. The Ballpark works. It's the only thing almost that works completely, universally loved in our city. It provides cheap enjoyment. Cheap recreation for Winnipeggers. It brings tourists in. This is a winner.

Part of the deal was, they don't pay for building permits. As Mr. Katz said, it was going to be built in three phases. Here comes phase three and all of sudden, they got their building permits from the Administration for nothing, but then comes the bill later, oops, you shouldn't have got that, it was only the first phase. Remember they got the 25 year lease. Is True North getting a 25 year lease and handing it over to us? They're getting a lot more public money than Mr. Katz ever got. No.

I wish Harry's motion would have passed. I would like to see us all get a chance to see these presentations. It enlightened EPC so much that they said the heck with them. I don't think we should have that until after Mr. Katz has his go at the Administration. It seemed to work over at assessment. But now it's all your property but not this piece because we got it on a separate title, we can tax the hell out it. What if he gives it back? Take it, you pay your own taxes, then we'll get nothing on it. It's outside of the Ballpark. It's outside of the railroad tracks. What's the problem?

The private sector is taking an increasingly large and generous role in providing facilities for Winnipeggers recreation, entertainment and education. Let's welcome them, let's thank them. Let's not kick them in the shins.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. I think you have in front of you Motion No. 4, I'd like to have this report referred back to EPC and of course with instructions. I've been advised by the Clerk that although we already had a vote on layover, this is entirely appropriate as long as there's a written motion of referral with instruction. I ask my colleagues to reconsider what you had just discussed a few minutes ago and denied Councillor Lazarenko's motion.

I think we know that it's very important to our community that we're able to do business in a proactive way.

What bothers me of course is that I come to Council and I find out that I'm automatically without significant information expected to vote on an issue that's reasonably complex, although Councillor Vandal says it's simple.

I think we have an obligation to ourselves colleagues to get the information.

(11:45)

Indeed if EPC is entirely correct and concurring with the Administration that this is indeed fair and equitable, fair enough. But don't expect me and I suggest to you, to be bombarded in the last minute, here's a report guys, just do it. That's fair.

I don't think there's anything wrong with having this go back to the Administration. We've already heard that there's going to be some discussions with Mr. Katz and company. Get these matters itemized, and come back through EPC with members of Council there. Let's go back to the original concepts of municipal government and councils. We are to sit down and work together. I keep harping on that issue, and we get marginalized. I do not like that.

I suggest to you colleagues particularly those who are outside the group of seven, should not like that. I try not to say that

with acrimony to His Worship and to other members of EPC but simply to say, hey folks, we have to find a better way of doing business. I think there's going to be about three items today that will talk about this issue. You cannot keep marginalizing the rest of council. This strange concept that was introduced in '92 with a cabinet form of government, frankly no longer works in the best interests of the citizens of Winnipeg. I didn't get voted in to just come and rubberstamp everything. I've been asked to consider matters that come forward, but they ought to come forward in a manner that makes it inclusionary.

I'm trying to say that without acrimony, in the spirit of trying to say look it, this is an important issue. Mr. Katz has made a significant contribution as many others in the City have. I'm not just championing CanWest Global Park, in part yes, but for everybody else that may have issues, we need to have a more consultative process amongst ourselves.

So I would ask you to support this motion, at least several more of you to join us to say, take your time, it's not going to hurt anything to put it back. We're not having a fight with each other, and whose will is going to be tested here. You don't have to win Your Worship on this one or members of EPC, you can just make it a little bit more inclusionary. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'm just going to speak very briefly to Councillor De Smedt's motion.

Just a reminder for all of my colleagues that the substance of the clause that we're dealing with was on the council agenda in June of this year. My recollection was it was referred back although Mr. Katz was not here personally, I understand that he sent a communication, he'd like this referred back so there'd be more opportunity for him to negotiate some parts of the proposal with the Administration and Council in June referred this matter back to EPC, and it went to the Administration. The clause was on the Executive Committee agenda, and on the 16th of July and was tabled until the 17th of September. The entire clause and its contents was on the Executive Committee agenda last week, September 17. I wasn't here last week so I wasn't at the table for the discussion. As I understand it, there has been the whole reason it was referred back from City Council to EPC and the Administration last June was to give Mr. Katz more opportunity to try and negotiate something. Try and negotiate something that obviously he would want to have in his best interests, and we as a city government try to make sure that the public interest is well served.

It may very well be that negotiations didn't go to Mr. Katz's satisfaction, so now he's come here today to try and get what he wants through this particular process. I'm not going to support the referral motion Mr. Speaker, it's a matter if negotiations if two parties in negotiation end up not always being able to agree, and you go with what you can or not, that's the way business works. As I always thought anyway. You try and do your best to negotiate the best deal for you with the other party and at the end of the day when you reach a conclusion if you can't find agreement on every single piece, then you either go with the best you can or you walk away. So I don't know what's different here.

I'm not supporting the referral motion, this matter was on Executive Committee's agenda last week. If anybody and I don't know whether Mr. Katz appeared at EPC last week because I wasn't here, and I've not been able to find any reference to his being there as a delegation last week to try and make his case again, and certainly all members of Council would have the opportunity to be there if they wanted to raise some concerns, ask questions or indicate their support or lack of support for the proposals.

The matter has been negotiated as far as I know. This is the final result of those negotiations, somebody doesn't obviously agree with every line and every sentence of those negotiations. I think we proceed and either vote on the clause, either support the clause or not. Referring it

back is not going to be helpful Mr. Speaker. The matter has been on the public agenda since June of this year, and there's been lots of opportunity both for the proponent Mr. Katz, and for all members of Council to make appearance at Executive Committee when it's been on the agenda to make their case for either supporting this or revising it in some way. This last minute effort Mr. Speaker is not productive, I think we ought to be voting on the clause one way or the other but not sending it back for a backdoor attempt at negotiations that obviously haven't gone the way somebody would like them to go.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves followed by Mayor Murray.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you. I was on the speakers list prior to Councillor De Smedt's motion, I'll just speak to the matter and lay my feelings on the table. You can do with them what you will I suppose.

My preference for the method of dealing with this matter is to proceed with this motion today and I think as been suggested this should be referred back to the CAO. It should ideally I would suggest come back through the Fiscal Issues Committee. I'm speaking I guess as a member of the Fiscal Issues Committee at this stage, it seems to me and I have to say Mr. Speaker, I wasn't present for many of the discussions centering around the Ballpark although I share everyone's sentiment as to what a great facility this was, a lot of this was before my time.

Recently at Fiscal Issues, Councillors Thomas and Clement and I have developed something I guess of a protocol, not so formally but, we have been looking at applications for permit forgiveness, in the context of that committee so we know exactly what is being granted back. Especially in this instance given that Mr. Katz as I understand it has already forwarded the money that is in question to the City of Winnipeg administration, that's what I understood him saying. In fact if I could be so bold, I might suggest that the method that we are suggesting might even be faster if he needs to get relief I should say categorically that I may well be one of the people who would support it coming back through Fiscal Issues.

I do want to make this point. Each meeting of Fiscal Issues as it closes down coming up on the evening of our budget I suppose, in terms of what we're looking at, it's getting pretty tough. It's getting pretty snug. There looks to be some things we're really going to have to deal with as a Council here. When we find this $48,000, if in fact we do as a Council,

(11:50)

I want to be clear, the Fiscal Issues Committee is going to have to look at lopping something else off. I think we should as a committee have a chance to do that. I think that's the best way to do it.

Other permits, other forgiveness that has been requested through permits, has gone exactly that route. I think it's the best way because as elected councillors here in the City of Winnipeg, I think we have the obligation to sort of put these front and centre. We're lucky in that. This one has kind of come to the floor and it's been exposed and everyone knows exactly what's being requested.

There is the capacity I suppose that if we don't do it in that method, these forgiveness of permitting fees, could become sort of just wrapped up in very very large deals that people might not know.

The most transparent and I think the most fair way to do it to the citizens we represent, is to actually have the specific amount requested coming through the Fiscal Issues Committee, through onto EPC and onto Council so everybody knows exactly what exists. That's my opinion.

There were some comments made about the new deal and us perhaps not being as open for business as we should be, I would like to make one observation Mr. Speaker on this particular project.

I don't know all the details, I can't recall exactly how much this project is worth, if it's a $5 million project for the new expansion, if that's what it was, and if that's what the $48,000 permitting fee is getting, it depends a little bit I suppose on what deals have been struck with the Provincial and Federal Governments. But just for everyone's edification and knowledge here, if somebody is building an extension to a ballpark that costs $5 million, it's probably worth noting that within the structure of that deal they're paying contractors and buying material, within the constructs that $5 million that they're spending, only PST and GST again depending on what deal was struck, and dependent on the peculiarities of what's being purchased, it is feasible that at a maximum, the Federal and Provincial Governments could be receiving $350,000 back of that $5 million each.

What do we get as a City of Winnipeg if we're going to talk about this in the context of the new deal to get a request for an additional $48,000. Bona fide and perhaps perfectly prudent request. But if we're going to look at this in the context of the new deal, I did want to make that observation. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Murray.

Mayor Murray: Thank you. I'll try to get us back to what's actually on the agenda here.

This is a matter Councillor De Smedt that's been before EPC at least three different times with not one delegation. This is a matter that some people are apparently very taken with all of a sudden, as a very important issue. They've had several months to phone the Director of Planning, Property and Development, it's a four digit phone call from your office to say, we referred this back, what's happening with it? I can tell some people like to kick the crap out of some of our city staff.

(Inaudible)

Hard working tax dollars of Winnipeggers. Mr. Katz has been given $8 million in cash by the three orders of government on a $20 million project. Last time I looked that's about a 40% subsidy, not a bad deal. I don't apologize for it, I think it's generous.

We also gave him the land which isn't counted in that $22 million. Do you know what the value of the land is that the Baseball Park is staying on? How many people do you know have a dollar deal? I was down there for the opening, I think it's a good thing. Pretty generous deal though, a buck.

I also saw a comparative study that all of us saw of the kinds of deals that were offered to other similar baseball stadiums in the northern league, and we come out looking very good.

We just made an arrangement for parking in the median on city land which was paid for for a dollar, and he put a quarter of a million dollar investment in that.

There's another deal a side deal called Parcel B, which you may know, which is one of the most prime pieces of property in the City which is at the corner of Pioneer and Waterfront Drive. You know where that is. Right now it's a vacant lot.

Parcel B has been given to Mr. Katz for a dollar, all he has to do is develop it as a commercial site in the next two years. And why was that arrangement part of the deal? It was to secure an independent private sector source of funding to help support this team and the stadium. Plus that's layered with a number of tax exemptions.

I don't think that's bad treatment of one of our citizens. I think that's the celebration of private investment. I'm no big fan of the Assessment Act, I'm with my friend Councillor O'Shaughnessy, and as you know we're working very hard to get that changed. When councillors suggest somehow the City Assessor decisions should be the subject of a council debate, one doesn't understand the difference between provincial legislation, municipal legislation and arms length enforcement of the law. There are some sensitivities there.

There are huge frustrations that we all share around some of the assessments and some of the process. Some facilities are particularly hard to value. Hardly the subject for a motion on the floor of council unless we want to take over the responsibilities for assessment.

We wouldn't do a deal like this today quite frankly. The True North Agreement is 20 pages, the master agreement I think you've seen, it's a very small document. This runs into the hundreds of pages. I was down there with Councillor Steek when we opened it with a handful of councillors celebrating this. This went through a very difficult process. And Mr. Katz and Mr. Wolinsky were extremely patient with the City.

I've suggested to Ms Stenning our new CAO that she sit down and start talking to Mr. Katz about the length of the lease and the larger issues involved. Clearly we don't want to own this baseball park in 22 years. And clearly this is something that we want to deal with on a larger issues. You can't simply say, that all of a sudden if it's not in the agreement we're just going to add it on by motion. You can't say that we have these council policies that apply to everybody except when we like someone's proposal a lot, we won't change the policy, we'll just not follow it.

You've also heard numbers of councillors including members of the Fiscal Issues Committee and the Mayor say look, there's a proper way to do this. I've already mentioned this to Mr. Katz. You go through a grant process.

Point of Order

Councillor Eadie: Point of order Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we could suspend the rule and adjourn once the votes have been completed on these two motions.

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

Mayor Murray: I want to point out here, there's all kinds of tax concessions and free land. We're likely going to do that with the Human Rights Museum, and we've done that with True North and we're going to do that in other situations. I can make a long list.

We just had with the Municipal Services Agreement, a principle, you get the land you pay the full taxes equity. Everyone has had their knickers in a knot, not everyone, some people have had their knickers in a knot over the fairness issue with First Nations Communities. Now if the First Nations Communities came and built a Red River College, would we not give them the same deal? If the First Nations Communities built a baseball park like Mr. Katz, would we not give them the same deal?

Why are we always panicking that it's not a level playing field when it's First Nations People, but when it's not First Nations People for very good reason, we've had some excellent private/public partnerships including our own Millennium Library, and we celebrate that as a great thing. Standard Aero, New Flyer. They're all excellent deals. They don't follow all of the rules and it's not an exact science.

(12:00)

MTS doesn't pay us taxes on its infrastructure but Centre Gas does. I have one-third of my salary tax exempt. The CEO's of other corporations don't. The Chamber of Commerce don't pay certain corporate taxes where other businesses and organizations don't. The Franco Manitoban Cultural Centre doesn't pay property taxes but the Italian Cultural Centre does. The world isn't a fair place.

I think this is very instructive. Before we get our knickers in a knot, there are so many layers of government and rules that are bewildering to us and we'd all like to be white knights and level the field once and for all so all is fair and pure and absolute. I just think we should be a little bit more consistent when we wrap ourselves in the flag and get preachy about a level playing field. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt closing on your Motion No. 4, and then we'll have a vote.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. I won't really take too long. I'm not sure

how I got involved with our Aboriginal Pathways strategy in discussing a very simple issue here. But thank you for that Mayor Murray.

Councillor Eadie I also was out of town last week on an important matter called the Aboriginal Pathways in the City of Saskatoon, so I can add to this discussion as well.

I don't think I would be standing up chatting about this if we didn't have the importance of the entrepreneur in front of us. Yeah maybe it's his strategy and others may do that as well from time to time to try and influence council to just back off for a moment.

I'm not supporting necessarily Mr. Katz's point of view entirely. Otherwise we just have this yes vote no vote and listen to the discussion around here. I'm just simply saying that I don't think this discussion has been aired for such an important matter and such an important entrepreneur in the proper manner. Most often Your Worship and members of EPC, I'm very supportive of how you advance issues, I'm not here being cantankerous and championing minor issues.

What's the hurry I think is a good question. I do think we should offer ourselves a little bit more time. I appreciate the comments of Councillor Steeves, that on balance yeah we sometimes should sit back and just have a look at it.

I continue to implore and to ask my colleagues particularly those who sit outside the spectre of EPC to just stand back and look at this and say, hey, from time to time we ought to be engaged in a little different way. I suppose I can claim error, I should have seen the agenda item in July. I should have seen it for the 17th of November and cancel my trip to Saskatoon and find out whether Mr. and Mrs. Katz are coming, but didn't. But it's important enough that he was here today to make a case that let's pause is the way I read that. And that's all I'm saying. Let's just take some more time, sit down, interesting discussion with the Administration, with EPC, Chair of Fiscal Issues and others who have the expertise and wordsmith of how we do things.
We all know that municipal jurisdictions make investments in a variety of land development deals in this city and every city in North America. I'm just saying that in this particular case it's worthy of further analysis. I would ask you to support this motion and just allow this to flow for another 30 days or so. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On Motion No. 4 on referral, recorded vote has been called for. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 11.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion is lost. On clause 1 all in favour? Recorded vote. 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, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Wyatt.

Nays

Councillors De Smedt, Steek, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The clause is carried.

We will adjourn now to 1:30 p.m. When we come back we'll be dealing with the New Deal Initiative and the First Steps to Municipal Aboriginal Pathways.

Those of you in the Gallery would like to come back here for 1:30 p.m. this is what's going to be next on the agenda.

Council recessed at 12:05 p.m.

After recess

Council resume at 1:35 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Report of September 23, 2003. Clause 1, Mayor Murray moves the rules be suspended and that the report be considered? All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2003

Item No. 1 – The New Deal Initiative File FR-2

Mayor Murray: Thank you. I don't know whether people have many questions on this. I think everyone's seen the report presented by our CAO. We're going through what will be a historic change. If there's a consensus that develops in our community, this money is for research, consultation, to pay for what will be one of the most intensive public consultations and citizen engagement process in our history. We're working with TD Economics, Integral Economics. The University of Manitoba has volunteered. Conference Board of Canada. You'll all see them doing presentations. Canada West Foundation. To do research so that we know the qualitative impacts of different tax choices, so we don't end up making tax changes that would hurt the economy, reduce jobs, or reduce investment. We have a long road to hoe.

This is the Administration's request for what the CAO and our staff think is going to be required to do this properly. I don't think we want to nickel and dime this we want to do this well. I encourage Council to vote for it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Speakers? Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. I do rise in opposition to the additional expenditure.

We've just had a preliminary meeting amongst members of Council in an informal seminar last Monday, which was really our first introduction into many elements of the new deal. I do applaud the work of the Administration and is starting to bring things together, and bringing to our attention some options.

Again it was my understanding that this was the first introduction to members of Council about the new deal, about the specifics, about how we need to sit down and consider very carefully the impact of how we shift responsibility for a variation of taxes. I'm not sufficiently wise enough, I'm not an accountant by background, I'm not a tax expert, but I certainly know that there's only one taxpayer. And between ourselves this jurisdiction, municipal government, provincial and federal authority, it all comes together that we have to share and balance out with integrity and fairness where we're going to put the burden.

I don't object to the point that we have reached probably close to our limit on property taxation to pay for services. I only say that on a theoretical sense because I'm not absolutely certain of that. The reason is of course, that the enemy really happens to be the education tax. That component has been growing astronomically in comparison to our own taxes. There doesn't seem to be any way to check it. It started in the late '70s, accelerated late '80s through different political governments, both the New Democratic Party under Pawley and the Conservatives under Filmon. There does not seem to be anyway to hold that in check. We're shifting more and more the educational responsibility onto the property owner. I think that's an important point that we have to consider. Indeed we're masking the target that we ought be looking at here today, and during our consultations on this new deal. Because

when you make a significant adjustment to the education taxes, I think we ought to leaving perhaps only 10% or 15% on property to have some local input to the educational concerns of that community. Then I think we would find a different perspective about the burden of property taxes.

There is only one taxpayer and we have a cornucopia of ideas of how we're going to shift this. Let me tell you consumption taxes on natural gas and hydro doesn't turn my crank, and it isn't turning the crank of many of our constituents. It isn't a simple matter of investing at least $1,000 a window on a house. Full reinsulation and ask them and ask people who are at a different economic level in our community to make that significant investment to theoretically get a payoff on the energy returns. I don't know the answer to that. I significantly understand that there are an awful lot of people in this community who face some tremendous difficulties on having that shift.

I don't think there's anything wrong with having an academic analysis of all these issues. That's what we started into.

On Monday we sat down together and had a preliminary look at the academic analysis. Without time to consider the impact of it, to decide how we as a council can come together In Camera, out of the public eye before we thrash this out, we then have a press conference, we release the new deal, and indeed at 1:26 that day apparently an e-mail shows up saying, we're going to have on the EPC agenda a $500,000 kick-in to use about a million dollars of public money to convince the public we've got to shift our taxes around.

I think there's sufficient elasticity within our administration, within the professionalism of the people that we already have to kind of do this.

Without kind of a bit of an iteration of exactly how we're going to spend this $500,000, I can't really support this. Try to spend a million dollars to do an academic exercise which obviously is important. And I have heard that we do have the TD Bank of Canada has made an economic analysis. I'll be looking at that report. I've seen the report of the Conference Board of Canada. We will look at all those variations and how people may wish to shift the taxation structure.

It isn't as simple as just flashing out that I'm going to have a five cent tax on gas to be remitted to the City and imposed by the City while assuming the Federal Government will release five cents a litre and we have the Province not remitting anything.

We can go through a listing of all these new deal items that we're going to be analyzing and start to raise observations here today. I think it's a little more complicated than that, I understand it, and maybe playing into the hands of the Mayor see because it's so complicated we need to spend some money and get it examined.

On the other hand I do feel that we do have the elasticity within our administration. I kind of object to spending a million dollars of public money to convince me I've got to go in this particular route.

I can't say enough two other levels of government have a big part to play in the infrastructure deficit in Canadian cities. As they say, they've been hiding in the weeds. That's where the discussion ought to be. It's my view and I suggest that you think very closely, is that there is capacity within the leadership of the Administration in this city to reassign personnel to take on this leadership role. The reason it's not happening now, there's obviously an issue of perhaps the right competency level to handle that significant leadership role.

(1:47)

If that's the case you're avoiding the obvious. Although we've had our leader in waiting in the Liberal Party of Canada speak very effectively about this at the FCM Conference this year about committing to remit five cents a litre, until the deal is signed I really have some concerns that this will happen. It's also

our understanding that that particular deal would ask for our province to put in their share.

In fact when you look at some of the factors that have been presented to us in the new deal, you'll find that out of $120 million we'd like to raise in addition, this is additional consumption taxes paid by Winnipeggers, that some $44 million of that is ostensibly going to be contributed by the Feds and the rest by the citizens of Winnipeg.

That $44 million contributed by the Feds is really contributed by the citizens of Winnipeg anyway. They pay these taxes and have been paying them for years without getting significant remission back into civic municipal infrastructure.

Sure there's been some share programs and we're grateful for those and they've been well defined and articulated and postured as well.

Now I have no heartache with us going on a mission to look at options. But I do have some heartache in convincing my constituents that I need to put more money into it from within the resources that we already have here in the City of Winnipeg. We hire good staff, very professional, they have the competency, and we do have the ability to analysis this material and present it with options before we go off like Don Kioti punching at windmills.

I won't support the particular motion that we have in front of us.

(Councillor Eadie in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes I will be supporting this. I'll tell you the reason why.

$500,000 is what we're looking for additional funding to be provided to go to the general public to provide information to them, I call this is a mini referendum. The general public, the users of Winnipeg will make a final decision telling us which road we should be travelling on and where we should be going. The same thing, the message will go to the Province and itself, the Premier has indicated that no new taxes, he said, he never ran on the platform of providing or getting new taxes.

The reason I'm supporting and I think all of us should, this is small compared to what we've paid out in the past. I can't forget some time ago when we were dealing with the True North proposal all of the proposals came in through the backdoor. We had only a week, week and half to deal with this. We talked about $13.5 million we had allocated to the building of True North our commitment, one-third of the commitment which the other two levels of government provided $10 million each and we gave $13.5 million, later on followed by another $1 million which our commitment was a total of $14 million. I didn't see anyone on council speak or even anyone came as a delegation to say that they were opposed except some groups that decided to challenge that later on and held back the project for a year and a half. We had a delegation here today, Mr. Katz, the money that we had put in there, there was no outcry at all. $500,000 is not much for the benefit to the taxpayers to voice their opinion.

The proposal that is here before us now, some of that I could say will not even fly, it will get past the first page. User fees I will not be supporting. I made it very clear such as the $1 a bag for garbage. You know what kind of a scenario what we went through last time when it was being introduced. Frontage levy for a total of $5 a front foot. I said this at the seminar that if you have a person who has a front yard of 50 feet, the house is worth $40,000 to $50,000 and a person has 50 feet frontage levy, and their house is worth maybe a quarter million dollars or $300,000 so where's the fairness.

Water and sewer rate increases. That itself is a user fee. We have increased our water and sewer rates by 100% within the last 10 years. There's more of that to come. Because now we have to take a

look at the water treatment plant, we're looking at $225,000 will be our share.

The retail tax, that in itself I don't think the public will buy, they're paying enough. They are already swamped with taxes, and if you say that this is not a hidden tax, it is. It's taking out of one pocket and putting into another pocket. When you have a phone bill for each resident, each phone for an additional cost for each one that can use the 911.

Some of the taxes that are proposed yes, we can do it ourselves. The hotel room tax, the liquor tax, the gasoline tax, which I believe that we should have a hotel tax, other cities have that. The user fee, or hotel room tax, liquor tax and gas tax. But will the Provincial Government grant it to us. I would say no. If we have a negative feedback of say 80% of those who are canvassed, those who have been talking to the Administration with all the consultations that will be going on, if you have 80% that are saying no, shove it. I don't think anyone on the higher levels will say, we will give it to you because we'll follow down the road with you.

We got ourselves into a position we're in now with our capital that we've been spending, we have overspent our capacity of being able to pay for our bridges, our roads. When you take a look at some of the bridges we built for $35 million, $42 million, we didn't get any help from the Province, none from the Feds. But who's using those bridges more than anybody, are the vehicles the revenue goes to the Province for provincial sales tax, gasoline tax, the Autopac rates. What goes in as far as the PST and the GST to the Federal Government. Every time when we contribute our share the Feds will say, oh yes, we will give you some money now, we'll cost-share with you. One thing I've always argued, the Federal Government and the Province don't lose anything because like the Premier of Manitoba had said dealing with True North, we'll get our money back in three years. The taxation power. Every hammer, every nail, every two by four that goes into any project, the government is getting their share of taxes. Personal income tax. On everything. You get a bottle of water they'll pay. Every drop of gasoline, or fuel, lubricants, they get their share of taxes. So they're not losers. But we are the losers. Where is the equality to say that we're tri-level. There should be in case of some of this, should be funds provided by the Feds, by the Province, and the City. Who damages our roads more than vehicles, and big trucks and buses. It is those that are travelling right from across the country coming in through the City, we have to pay millions of dollars to restore our streets into a safe condition.

When you talk about the 2/3rds of the population is the City of Winnipeg. The Province is raking in billions of dollars from residents of the City of Winnipeg through the taxation system.

When I sat in these council chambers in the '70s former Premier Gary Filmon, used to sit in one of the chairs up there and he'd be standing and ranting and raving, we have to get our equality. We have to get after the Premier of Manitoba and Cabinet.

(1:50)

We have to get the government to pay their share. We want more money. When he was elected as a member of the Legislative of Manitoba, when he got to be the Premier, I was raising those questions, this is your problem. You see how the tide changes from every MLA that ran except Councillor Angus and Smith who are back from the Leg. to be here on Council. So I hope that they'll be thinking a little bit differently because they know what it's like on the other side to sit in those cushioned seats on Broadway.

Now each and every time those that went there they said, we cannot give you, do you think we're that stupid we'll give you our share, how are we going to fill the vacancy of the pocket that we've emptied to give to you. We have to tax the residents of Manitoba. What's the difference. Taxpayers are taxpayers. There's only one taxpayer. One Canadian dollar. One Canadian five dollars, you don't have different kinds of

dollar bills. The monetary system is all the same for everybody. It comes out of the pocket of those who are paying their share.

To have this implemented, and I would like to see Mr. Mayor what I had said at the conference. Each of us had presented our concern and that was marked down on the board, that is to go for public consultation such as the questions that were asked, the residents, the taxpayers of Winnipeg they would like to see some sort of cuts being made. I did not see on that survey including the Folks Arts Council, the Winnipeg Symphony, I did not see anything, the Winnipeg Convention Centre, Tourism Winnipeg, Take Pride of which we spent into the millions of dollars to include that also with the survey, and see what the people have to say about that. It's the tax dollar. So why would it be that certain parts are being used for a survey and then to give back to the consultation process.

What has to happen here is that, I'm supporting this, like I said before, but I would like to see these seminars and these will be going into each area I understand Lord Selkirk – West Kildonan will be sometime in November beginning of November, I thought it was October 22, I understand the date has been changed. I will be there, but I can guarantee you I will not be opening the meeting, to say look, because I don't believe in some of these. It will be either yourself Mr. Mayor but I would suggest that you shouldn't be there, it should be the Administration. They should be doing this. Some people will not understand what we're trying to propose, what you're trying to propose. They have the right to say no, I will not be supporting this. I'm against it. So you take it off the books.

What will happen? The Province will say no, so we're stuck with one thing. The frontage levy we can do it. Water and sewer rate we can do. The garbage fee, per bag, we can do that without getting the Provincial approval.

This is what's going to happen. The taxpayers of Winnipeg are going to be hit again. To say that they will lessen the tax load on each resident, they'll have to give out of one pocket and we take it out of the other pocket. There really is not much of a benefit to people if they do not understand. If you get legislation, yes, I could say that we could work with this. Such as the fuel tax and the rest of the taxes. If we don't have that, it'll be an exercise that will be done. It'll give the general public a mini referendum that they'll be able to go then and express their views and tell us exactly what they would like to see. They are the customers and we are the deliverers. We are the trustees of the City of Winnipeg corporation, we're not administrators. The administration will go out and they will do and they'll come back with a report, we make a decision whether we approve it or not.

In that case Mr. Mayor, I would just hope and it's going for the record, I just hope that these concerns that some members of council had, will be presented also for public consultation.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you. First of all I want to ensure that we're talking about the investment of some money to have some public hearings, consultation, make sure the people are aware and understand the issues that have been brought up by previous speakers. That's what we're talking about.

Secondly Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of a long process of discussing options that are available. We are all aware that my particular department goes into the hole about $70 million a year in trying to keep up with fixing things and maintaining roads and buildings and libraries and all of that sort of stuff.

We also know Mr. Speaker that it is very difficult to go to the property taxpayers and say, okay, we want more from you. People find that (inaudible) and to a certain extent so they should Mr. Speaker. If you have a single parent, an elderly parent perhaps as some of us do living in a home, the old homestead of taking the bus to the corner grocery store or wherever they happen to go, and right

next door to them in a house of a similar value you have an individual family with two or three teenagers with two or three cars in that house who put out four bags of garbage once a week Mr. Speaker, and you have the single parent who only puts out one bag of garbage every two weeks, well who should pay. Should the people that are using the system more pay their fair share of using it more? Should we be providing alternatives to allow them to reduce those costs, like recycling, like rapid transit system or a system that allows them to move around the City inexpensively and less expensively? Or should we be keeping more costs onto the property taxpayers? I don't have those answers. I'm not sure that every particular proposal that's been made is going to fly. I'm sure in fact they won't all fly. I do know that the Feds are talking about vacating five cents, that's not tacking it on top. I do know that the Province can give some consideration to that Mr. Speaker if they want to.

I do know Mr. Speaker that they probably won't be able to do something just for the City of Winnipeg without considering the rest of the Province. But I'm here to tell you that the rest of the Province has just as much problems in all the municipalities in Manitoba of raising money to fix equipment, to fix roads, to fix playgrounds and things of that nature as we do Mr. Speaker. There's nothing wrong with them considering it, getting input from them. I hope that they will.

Mr. Speaker I do know though that we the first time in all of the years that I've sat here, we have taken the bull by the horns and put a proposal on the table for dramatically changing the way we fund the operations of this city.

Imagine if we could develop a system that would give us a $120 million more dollars a year to reinvest in our parks, in our playgrounds, in our roads, in our bridges, in our transportation systems Mr. Speaker. And at the same time, give by far the majority of people that are paying property taxes have them pay less and give them the opportunity to pay less if they wanted to. If they wanted to recycle, if they wanted to cut back on their driving and take the bus instead of driving their cars downtown a single person in each car, each time. They would have those opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, half a million dollars when we have a possibility of raising $120 million is a small investment to try and find out what the general population in this community thinks about the merits of this type of an opportunity. And we have a job. We all have a job to go out there and say, okay, here's the problem, here are traditional solutions, and what do you think we should do. Some people will come out with good ideas and I welcome them Mr. Speaker. For heaven sakes I hope that nobody is going to go out there and just start dumping on the whole idea of the concept of not having public consultations, not spending this type of money, not going to find out what the people want in this community, without giving it a chance to succeed one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, I as one councillor am very tired of standing here on a regular basis and saying, the Feds should give us more money, the Province should give us more money, it's not our fault. Well let's take the bull by the horns, let's try and do something that we can actually do, let's try to roll something out and get the public opinion behind us to advise us as to what type of city they want in the next 10 years or 20 years for our children and our grandchildren, and how they want to pay for it.

(2:00)

Because that's what we're here to do Mr. Speaker, to try and find out how we solve those problems. I hope we can get on with it. This is a paltry investment in relation to the benefits we can derive of getting feedback from the general public.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I rise today not to support this allocation of money. I have a hard time understanding $500,000 for public consultation. We just went through a whole bunch of public consultations on another matter, we had

11 public meetings regarding the police station issue and we didn't require $500,000 to do that. I have a feeling the $500,000 we're talking about today is not for public consultations rather it's more for a sales program to sell this package to the citizens, or what better could be said than propaganda. To use the advertising dollars to buy advertising time to say that this is a great product, and please buy it. A very much glamorized snake, oil and potions road show for a few people here on Council.

I frankly think that $500,000 is outrageous. The Winnipeg Sun's reporting a million dollars, I don't know which is true. Clearly this is going to do more, not for public consultations but to try to sell the public. On something which I think a lot of us know what it is. It's a large tax grab. The old saying, rub dub dub three men in a tub, I think is very true. There's three men in this tub. We've got our political bosses, we have our big business bosses and we have big labour bosses altogether all backing each other up and all supporting this plan. This tax plan makes George Bush's tax cut look good. It's benefiting a select few. The wealthy, big business. It's clear. Let's talk about each item on that we're going to be selling the public $500,000 to say this is a good plan.

Frontage levies. Are inherently unprogressive. Property tax is at least somewhat progressive. It's based on market value of a property. If you have a property that's higher valued, you pay higher tax. Whether or not you have 100 square feet on the front of your property, whether you're in a $200,000 home or a $45,000 home, everyone is going to be paying the same for the frontage levy. It's not progressive. It's a hit at working people and small business.

Water and sewer rates. I could understand that when it came to our treatment plant, and the need to invest in a treatment plant Mr. Speaker, I have to question now, why we're going to be jacking this up. Again, it's a hit at working people. And seniors who are staying at home and on fixed incomes.

The 911 fee. This is something which general revenues which we all agree is part of the service we're providing for policing. And yet now, after the privatized MTS and the cost of the phone bills that have shot up, we're going to add another tax onto everybody's phone bill.

The sales tax. This will single handily do more to drive business out of the City, hurting small businesses and everyone who works in them.

The liquor tax. Again, maybe if the liquor tax exempted rye whiskey and beer I might be in favour of it. It clearly will not. It's going to be applied across the board.

Again, garbage fee. Natural gas and electric. We are literally scooping our hands into the people's pockets and pulling $2 out and with the other hand giving them $0.50. And we are spending $500,000, the Winnipeg Sun says a million dollars on selling it to the people. How great this is. Propaganda at its best.

The hotel tax. The hotel industry Mr. Speaker is now suing us, class action lawsuit, and now we're going to really kick it to them. No guarantee that this is going to be dedicated to going back into the hotel industry by the way, there's no dedication talked about in any of this stuff. It's just going back into our general revenues.

This is a massive tax cut for the wealthy. If anything they just got to hope that the school boards don't backfill all this. This year alone in Transcona, 15% tax hike. We worked hard at this council, I shouldn't say we did, previous council worked hard reducing the taxes 8% over four years, in one stroke alone the school board filled that tax break to the people of Transcona plus adding 6% on their tax bill. Wiped out. If you don't think that that's not going to happen again, in less than five years I predict Mr. Speaker, whatever we give back to the taxpayers on their property tax bill, the school boards, because they're totally out of control and the Province doesn't seem to want to be doing anything about it, is

going to fill that void and we'll be back up to square one, unfortunately.

If we look at the history and the reality, that's what's going to happen. This is not a good deal Mr. Speaker, and I feel very uncomfortable spending $500,000 to sell a bad deal to the people, to the working people who are going to take this on the chin and the small business people.

I find it ironic that the Councillor for St. Norbert is a councillor who's now going to sell it from what I heard, sell us this, he's told me that he's not running again in the next civic election so I guess he's got nothing to lose, and there's no consequences so let's give it to the people and he'll be down on a beach in Florida and the Baba's and Gigi's will have to be remortgaging their houses to pay for this tax. On this platform I encourage you, absolutely, please do. He's a great guy to sell it to us.

Let's give some thought here to some serious alternatives. We know Paul Martin has said publicly and we will hold him to it, and I think the entire nation will hold him to it, that he's going to give gas tax revenue to the cities. Five cents is what I heard, that would be $50 million to the City of Winnipeg.

He also said that he wants the Province to kick in a share. Whatever that is, those are extra tens of millions there. It would be tens of millions.

Provincial and municipal tax sharing program. We've looked at this year yet we haven't really seriously looked at it in my mind. Here the Provincial Government two or three years ago delate themselves from the Federal Government tax scheme, why? Not because they wanted to be nice guys but because they wanted to pocket more tax money in their pockets because they're worried about Mr. Martin's tax cuts bringing their taxes down. So they delate. And they got a tax windfall because of it out of our pockets.

Mr. Speaker I think we could improve the Provincial and Municipal tax sharing program on and above what it is today without effecting our grants and we should be pushing the Province to do that. It's a historic program that's been there for 30 years, and it's time that we benefit from the taxes of the existing taxes of the income and corporate taxes now being paid in this province, and clearly we're not receiving our fair share there.

School taxes. Get school taxes off the property tax bill. If we spent as much time and energy hammering that as we have on other things with the Province, we might have it off the tax bill today, that would in a single stroke make us competitive with many cities across this country.

Reform our assessment system. We have an assessment report that's sitting on the shelve for more than a year now, nothing has been done about it. We keep telling ourselves that the majority of our taxes come from the property bill yet the assessment system and the need for reform and the benefits of that would bring to us have not been followed up with.

I say this Mr. Speaker. If the Mayor and his staff spent as much time and energy researching new ways to do business as a city and find internal savings as they have looking for new revenues and new ways to tax us, we may have a more balanced approach here today. But we don't have that here today, we have a one-sided approach that basically hammers on new revenues and it doesn't look any better. I know that it's been thrown back that we cannot do that, we're already the most efficiently run city in North America or Canada.

(2:08)

Maybe that's the case. But why can't we be more efficient. Why can't we challenge ourselves to look at other ways of doing business. I know there's other ways of doing business. Two years ago in 2001 the Chamber of Commerce did an excellent report indicating all the different ways we could do business differently. We said, thank you very much but no thank you. That sat on the shelve.

There's other ways we could do business, and we can find millions in savings there. I dare say, based on what I've said on the gas tax from the Feds, the gas tax from the Province. Yes the Province should share the tax gas, we contribute the majority of the shares of the $120 million they rake in on gas tax, and they spend it on highways outside the City. The citizens of Winnipeg should have a share of that as far as I'm concerned.

MTS, the Provincial and municipal tax sharing program should be reformed to increase. As well we could do our own reforming down here when it comes to our assessment system. Combining all those things with our own internal savings Mr. Speaker, I dare say, we can save well over $120 million, we could bring in well over $120 million to the table today to invest in infrastructure. And not to mention, everybody's mentioning infrastructure, nobody's mentioned things like safety, policing, and the needs that we have there.

Mr. Speaker I'd like to wrap up by saying that there is a lot of work ahead of us. I look forward to the public meetings. There's seven of them, so you can take $500,000 and divide it by seven just to figure out the cost per public meeting. Then we'll know exactly what we're heading to. I look forward to that Mr. Speaker. I won't support this. I feel that this is not being used for just public consultations it's being used to sell what is a bad deal. I agree with what Councillor De Smedt was saying, which is, we had some input, we basically were included in the last meeting to show us that this is what it's going to look like, and now we're selling it. Thank you for your time councillors and now we're selling it but don't give us any input because we're now taking this out and this is what we're going to be pushing.

I realize how it sometimes works around here. Anyways Mr. Speaker, those are my comments and that's how I'll be voting. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith on clause 1.

Councillor Smith: I'm going to be supporting this clause.

First of all, Councillor Wyatt talks about the money just being for meetings. He hasn't looked at the clause which is only a few sentences, but it says, to support the public consultation program for the new deal initiative. It's more than just public meetings.

I want to say this, this new deal is really thinking outside the box. It's really revolutionary in nature. We don't want to make a decision on it without getting the public really engaged. I want to hear them arguing in the coffee shops just like they did the smoking by-law. That's what we require. We require democracy to work, people being informed of the options. People voicing their opinions what they like and dislike, and how much they want to see the City investment go. I've been making an issue over the last two years about the maintenance of the City of Winnipeg. I've said look it, you've got potholes, you've got street standards rusted from end to end. Back lanes are a mess, I've made a big issue of this.

Some people don't mind it quite truthfully. I talked to somebody who said, I'd rather have money spent on the arts. I can accept the potholes. Here is a fundamental change in what we're doing, and I think we need that public debate and the pubic discussions to take place.

By the way Councillor Wyatt, the amount we're going to be spending is $986,825.00. I think it's money that's going to be worth spending. We've never had consultation like this is being proposed. We haven't had it on any issue. But we haven't had any such wide sweeping proposal as we've had presented to us by the Mayor and management. It's worth doing.

An ideal democracy is getting people to go ahead and speak up for what they value, and how they'd like to see the tax dollars spent. I hope that this will be achieved through this consultation process.

I expect the communication people have some neat ideas. I suggested one to them by the way, I suggested they should use some spam.

The thing is, we need the discussion taking place. This is well worth money spent if you value democracy you value the citizens knowing fully about the deal, and having the opportunity to express their viewpoint.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Deputy Mayor Thomas.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: Thank you. This is a proposal for a new direction, and the person I'd like to talk to has just left the room. I think it's ironic that one of the previous speakers called about buying advertising time when he bought advertising time with little regard to the ethicacy of the information that was placed in the ads. I'd like to say that this proposes a consultation process where there's going to be public meetings and people are going to have the opportunity to have the facts placed before them, and not in a way that they can have interaction and question who's bringing forth the information and I think that that's a great thing. When we're proposing to go in such a new direction I would think that everybody would welcome the opportunity to debate the issues in a frank public forum, but I guess there are some of those who would not like to have all the facts placed before their constituents and would prefer to do it in another manner but I am not one of those.

I would like to tell you about some of the things that are in this document that I think are pretty exciting.

It talks about dropping property taxes going to the City by 50%, and it talks about establishing new sources of revenue that actually get at the source of the expenditures. This is something that I think we have to look at. People who drive big SUV's on the street and I have one, are going to spend more gasoline. The bigger the vehicle the more damage it does to the pavement. People who are riding on buses are being more ecologically responsible, people who are riding on bicycles are being even more ecologically responsible. They're going to be rewarded for that kind of behaviour. Their taxes are going to go down on their property so that they're not paying the same as the guy next door who's got twice the amount of income as they do and has two or three SUV's that they're driving all over the place. Their taxes are going to reflect the fact that they're a bus rider, or that they go everywhere they can on their bicycle and that's going to be a way of saying, way to go for doing something for our environment. Way to go for being responsible and joining together in a carpool or a bus pool or something that helps saves our road. And you know what? If people do that and maybe we'll get a little bit less in gas taxes because they'll make the decision to go into buses.

(2:15)

You know what will happen? Our streets will not be as worn down if people are on bicycles and buses so we won't have to be fixing them so much. Our costs will go down as the revenue goes down. Our costs will go up as the revenue goes up, so those who are causing the problem are going to pay for the problem.

I don't see a problem with that. Hey that's what the public consultation is going to get into. Where people can ask just those kind of questions and say, well tell us more about how this gas tax will work.

Liquor tax. It is well known that the vast majority of the calls that the police investigate have to do with crimes that are caused when people drink too much. That's sad, but it's true. Therefore the more you drink the more your taxes are going to pay for police services. Isn't that a good thing. That the people who are living up and down the street who are drinking responsibly and are not getting behind the wheel drunk or doing the myriad of things that people who have had a bit too much tend to do. They're not going to be paying for that service because it's going to go to the people who are causing the problem.

Those are just two of the tax changes that we're looking at. I can go into great detail and explain my point of view about what I feel is so great and positive about the new deal, but I'm not going to do that. Basically because this clause is about public consultation. Where we get an opportunity to go and talk with our constituents at one of the six community meetings that are being held at some of the workshops that are being held and explain our point of view, and get to answer the tough questions from our constituents. I feel comfortable in doing that.

That's why I'd like to see this money go for that sort of consultation. I think it's really important. I am baffled by councillors who wouldn't be on board with that educational dynamic two way street kind of process, I think this is a great idea and I think this is a great way to promote that new idea. Get in there and be prepared to talk to your constituents and tell them why, and get to answer the tough questions. If you don't want to do that and if you don't want to be there, I guess you don't have to. But I'm going to be there, and I'm going to be prepared to answer those questions because I feel pumped and positive about this new agenda. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: I have Councillor Pagtakhan followed by Councillor Gerbasi and I have no other speakers on the list.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you. Last night I had the good fortune of appearing in front of a small delegation Purchasing Management Association of Canada and I was accompanied by Gary Holmes from the Strategic Management Division and we did a speech and a presentation regarding the new deal. I must say that, was the audience sceptical? Yes. Did they think initially it was a tax grab? Yes actually. But after going through the presentation at the end of the evening it was very abundantly clear, once you spell out the principles, and once you spell out and show the graph visually to people, people are quite reasonable and very open to discussion.

The motion that's here before us today, I fully support it because it's not really an expense it's actually an investment in the public process and the ideas of Winnipeggers. It's an investment in our democracy, and it's also an investment in the future of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. One of the things I find a little frustrating about some of the criticism we're hearing today, is that the same councillors that are criticizing us investing in some public consultation are the ones that are always accusing us of not consulting with the public. If that's not a lose lose situation I don't know what is. That is a little I have to say, hypocritical.

The system we have right now is outdated. It's been around for over 100 years. It doesn't work, it's unfair to cities. We get six percent of the total amount of tax that's collected from citizens goes to the City and the rest goes to the other levels of government. That's not fair. If somebody sat down and thought about it now and was inventing a new system, they wouldn't invent it this way. That's why we thought, let's think outside the box, let's look at some alternatives. It takes some courage to go out there and do that, and talk about taxes with people because no one likes taxes. I think that the Mayor has shown incredible leadership and the rest of council that is prepared to stand up and talk about taxes because it's not fun.

What's also not fun is dealing with the conundrum that we're in, which is we can't cut services. I haven't seen a will to cut services from anybody here including the councillors that are criticizing this today. They're the ones that are always asking for more expenditures at the standing committee and every other committee. We all want to provide more services. We know that we've made we've reduced the size of this government to the point where there's really no more appetite for that.

No one wants to raise property taxes. No one wants to raise transit fares. This is a way to reduce transit fares by 50%. Do you know how happy that's making a lot of people once they hear what this means. I can tell you it makes my day, it certainly made my day when I understood what we could propose here as part of this. What we're doing is we're stimulating environmentally acceptable behaviour and rewarding that. It's about time.

The third problem is debt, we just can't borrow money. So we can't borrow money, we can't raise taxes and we can't cut services. Money doesn't grow on trees guys, we have to come up with some ideas.

This is an exciting opportunity to do something about this lose lose situation we find ourselves in every budget. Again, we're not getting into the debate of the specific taxes it could go on all day. The proposals that were going forward to consult with the public on are a package of ideas that diversify our revenue sources. They connect the taxes in some cases to the choices people make. They tax people who don't live in Winnipeg, who live out in the exurban area who come in and use our services who pay nothing. It's more fair. The whole purpose of this clause that we're voting on today is to provide some funding to go ahead and do a really meaningful and extensive consultation, and to get the message out because it's a complex topic to get out and discuss with people. Hence the expression, have a say in what you pay in the way of consultation and in the way of getting out there and having a say because some of the taxes are about choices.

I hope that councillors instead of standing up and nay saying and standing up and saying, looking for things to grumble about, go out and talk to the people in your wards and communities.

I congratulate Councillor Pagtakhan, the first day he's already out there talking to people. I'm going to be talking to the Downtown BIZ Board. I'm actually going to be talking at the International Downtown Association in Cleveland to the Canadian delegates that are there next week, and we're going to be talking about the new deal because they're interested all across Canada in what we're doing here. We're taking the lead.

(2:25)

Believe me they're watching us and they want to know because they all face the exact same problems.

I hope that councillors will try to think outside the box so that we don't have to come back year over year and have the same silly debate at budget time. We can come up with some new innovative ways to solve our problem.

I've been here five years and I'm tired of it. I'd like to see something happen and I think this is creative, it's bold and we're not telling the public what the answers are. We are really asking for their input and this is a great opportunity for Winnipeg to be a leader. I urge everyone to support this. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any further debate on the clause? Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you. It isn't often that Councillor Thomas and I agree. She said she was baffled by somebody who wouldn't support a million dollars. Not as baffled as I am by somebody who wants to spend a million dollars for half a dozen public consultations and a printed media blitz. I would suggest if we're to buy into this million dollar expenditure that it better be for a lot of research.

The other day or actually earlier on today in the Bay, the Mayor referenced the fact about people not staying for the entirety for the presentation. I'll be frank with you, I was one who didn't stay for it. I heard it, I took the information I had and I've done a lot of research. I will be rolling it out as we go into these debates.

I like the fact that a lot of councillors here are talking about debates because my colleague immediately to the right has suggested that he and I debate this in a public forum in his home riding, St. Vital and I look forward to it. As I do to

debating with anybody else. I'd like to meet with Councillor Thomas or Councillor Vandal, and for that matter with the Mayor to discuss this in an open public forum.

I think it's critical that these people get the opportunity to hear both sides of the coin. When I left the council seminar the other day what did I hear? If this is going to work we all have to go out of here on the same page.

Well you know what? I didn't agree with Mayor Thompson, I haven't agreed with this mayor in the past. My position isn't negotiable. If I don't believe in something, I'm not there.

When I was a kid growing up I was fortunate I could look after myself. But I also knew there was a lot of people who couldn't.

The issues that are going to come forward here and I'm going to talk very quickly to some of the ideas in the new deal, will punish the poor. When you get an additional $120 million in revenue, somebody is going to get hurt. Make no bones about it. This is about additional revenue.

Let's talk for one moment because there's going to be ample opportunity for debate and I certainly look forward to it. It isn't a case of being a naysayer, this is the democratic process Mr. Speaker. This means that even if you lose on this floor 15-1, you have the opportunity to speak your mind and represent a lot of people in this city.

Now I applaud this initiative. Is it creative? You bet. I don't come to the floor of this council ill-prepared. I'm not going out into this debate ill-prepared.

Let's just talk about some of the things that are being rolled out here for a minute. Number one, the sales tax. The sales tax that the Province is supposed to levy from the benefit of this city. And, an additional one half percent of their revenue. Round figures it's supposed to throw up a $125 million to $140 million. Ask yourselves a couple of questions.

Why would the Province want to glibly hand you over one half of one percent. Furthermore, how many of you around this table are aware of the balance budget legislation. Well if there's an increase in sales tax or income tax it has to go to a referendum. I don't know, I didn't see any references to that. If I'm wrong I'm sure somebody will correct me. But I think that ought to be in the front end of this debate. I don't notice it coming out in any of the packages. I said I will be well researched, I promise I won't let you down.

One percent sales tax. How many of you and around this table if you're buying an expensive item will drive outside of the perimeter on a $20,000 automobile to save yourselves a couple of hundred bucks? Of course you would. Do you really expect that the Province will come and lash the rest of this province with one percent? Why would they?

It seems to me that there was an article in one of the media releases recently talking about the popularity of the Premier. Why would the Premier want to come to the table on this? Why hasn't the Premier come here earlier? Why haven't we had provincial representation saying, we think you're on the right track, not we're watching and waiting?

Seven of ten new taxes being asked for are within the Provincial domain. How about the Hydro electricity consumption tax? Forty-one million dollar projection. Now one of the comments that I've heard is that when your property taxes plummet instantly by 50%, guess what? It's expected that the Province will then ask the Landlord and Tenant's Association to make sure you get a rebate on your rent. But will the landlord be allowed to pass on the increased costs for hydro and electricity consumption? I think so.

Tax that's going to generate an additional $41 million, and guess who lives in the homes that have the poorest insulation? You're supposed to go out and insulate and fix it up. I live in a 100 year old home. Let me tell you. The money you can pour in is endless. You live there because you want to. But the last thing

you need to know as you walk into a potentially another savage winter, is that you're going to be lashed with these taxes.

The question comes out we're hearing it's going to be a 50% property tax reduction. Well this 50% of everything works perfectly, 50% if all of the revenue projections come true, well let's just take a look at a microcosm of what a revenue projection is.

We were told photo radar would throw up $15 million. As Councillor Gerbasi knows, not quite. Maybe $9 million, maybe $10 million in a good year, where are going to find the extra $5 million just on that one? What do you do when the projections come up short? Well the answer is pretty straightforward. You go back to the same taxpayers.

The cry goes out, sorry, we underestimated, you've been conserving so well on garbage it isn't a buck, it's now going to be $3.

When was the last time you ever saw a user fee go down? If you take a look at the transcripts yesterday from the Legislature the Premier is quoted as saying, "we are the only province in the country that gives grants to the tune of $140 million. And other provinces are clamouring." In our infinite wisdom here, we say, we don't want those grants, we're going to take a shot at these discretionary taxes.

I see a million dollar expenditure and I guess I'm looking at all the projections that have come forward and I'm saying to myself, are these projections just wild out of the air figures?

(2:33)

Or is there something substantial to them?

The hotel tax, what a beauty. Councillor Wyatt's pointed out, I was admonished for criticizing the Administration. The Administration isn't a sacred cow anymore than anyone of us around here. If something isn't appropriate we have a right to make a commentary about it. If something's fundamentally wrong or we wouldn't be in court on the hotel scenario. And what do we do if we're found liable? Do you think we're going to cover off with this little tax?

The thought of spending a million dollars on this is ridiculous. What's the message that it sends to the public out there, that you don't know your stuff. Surely we have the expertise in the house as Councillor De Smedt has pointed out to give us hard cold facts and figures.

I find it somewhat amazing that we're willing to realize an expenditure here of a million dollars which is to generate taxes, $120 million of new taxes, but we can't take 30 or 60 days to work on our Aboriginal strategy that has the potential to generate indefinitely thousands and thousands of dollars for this city.

What did I hear here? The consultative process. But we don't consult on the other do we? But this is important. I keep hearing this is just the Pathway. This is just the initial consultation. I would suggest the Aboriginal document is no different.

In closing let me say this. The opportunity to debate this has been opened up and I appreciate the Mayor's offer. I intend to attend virtually every town hall that I possibly can and bring the other side to this going forward. I don't buy into the argument that the infrastructure is in such a dire state of repair that we're running the staggering numbers that we have and that we have to fill the gap in one year. It's fine for the Mayor to say the SURP report cites it, the Mayor knew about the SURP report four years ago. How credible are we when the Mayor says we're going to reduce your taxes 10% in five years, and we're at six, and now we're coming back and saying, we don't enough money so here's a new shopping cart full of taxes for you.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, and I very rarely run over the limit, but I think this is important.

There's a great story about a father who sends his son off to Harvard Business

School. And he says, there's just one thing I want you to know, don't trust anyone. Before the boy is getting ready to leave he says close your eyes. He takes a crushing wallop to the chin. The father's response is son I told you, you don't trust anyone. I guess what I'm saying here is, when you get a red picture like this that says close your eyes, keep your eyes open. The debates are going to be great.

Will I support a million dollars? I'd be baffled if I did. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. If I may take a speakers license just for a moment, although I'm certain she is not watching, if she happens to turn on the television a little bit later on, I'd like to wish my wife a happy anniversary today, if I may be so bold.

In case you're wondering who the hell I am here, I'm Gord I haven't seen you in three years. I'll be home soon I promise but maybe not tonight judging by this debate.

I'd also like to say that I believe there was a challenge issue by the Councillor of River Heights in terms of a debate. I would like to say I would be pleased to accept the invitation for a discussion in due course. I would follow it up by saying, I don't need home rink advantage. I'm prepared to come to River Heights in all my glory, I would even come to your house for Thanksgiving Dinner if need be. I would be pleased to do that. And post that, I am prepared to go into St. Charles or into Transcona to debate this matter with whomever is willing because I believe in it. I believe in the idea of the discussion which is the debate that we're having right now today and I think it's very very important. We have to appreciate it I think how big a debate that this is. We have really garnered a lot of attention here at the City of Winnipeg with what we've been doing over the course of the last few weeks I suppose and how we're trying to change things.

My recollection as we go around Council is that our first meeting nobody on this council stood up and said that I support every single thing within this new deal. But I didn't really recall anybody with the exception of potentially a couple of councillors saying that they are absolutely unwilling to talk about this. That was my recollection. Councillor Gerbasi and others have mentioned the dichotomy with respect to these things. It never seizes to amaze me as well. It doesn't matter what the issue is, it could be the teeniest, tiniest little nimby issue in your ward all the way up to the new arena that we're building downtown. It is always the same thing. If you have too much lead up time you run the risk of becoming accused of spending too many resources on it or taking up too much of the taxpayers resources with fair argument. But if you would all forego that process you are always criticized right up to the very end. I recall with respect to the rink debate. I could not believe when at the final meeting after I calculated, I listened to the opposing factions for what I calculate to be a full 28 hours, the last thing that I heard was there was no due process and that people were not heard on the issue.

I think we have to recognize that that's a reality and I share some of the concerns that some of my colleagues have voiced in terms of, it is an unfair dichotomy, I think we're doing the City of Winnipeg a big favour by rolling this out. I think the public costs of public consultations have to be acknowledged. This is an important issue for the City of Winnipeg and we have the responsibility I think to roll this out in the fashion that we require to be rolled out. We know that our friends in the media are going to do their own stories and present the issues as they see fit. But it should not be their responsibility to do it on our behalf. Obviously we're going to get some breaks in the media and we're getting some non breaks in the media and that's just the way it is and that's the way it should be frankly. We have a responsibility, if we are truly sincere about making changes with respect to the way we might do business in this city. We have the

responsibility, the responsibility to put some decent resources behind this.

I don't know exactly how these resources are going to be spent it's not included in the report. I would like to say that I'll be watching that, I think it's very very important that we all do.

I'm disappointed in my fellow councillors who've already seemingly made up their minds and are not going to support this in any way, shape or form. They're not interested in this. They don't even want to take the step of going through a public consultation process to listen to the public that they represent. I don't think any of us have that right. I don't think any of us have the right to have made up our mind already. It seems to me that a couple of us around this table have already done that. I would suggest that that is wrong and an incorrect way to do business if you're a city councillor in the City of Winnipeg.

To suggest that there are things that are not worth discussing, there's nothing worth discussing as far as a couple of people are concerned in this council. A gas tax is not worth discussing. The Federal Government, Prime Minister in waiting who has said in the City of Winnipeg, perhaps a little bit of scepticism has said, in the City of Winnipeg that he is prepared as far as I heard to give to municipalities a sizeable portion of the gas tax as existing right now potentially even new funding, we're not even going to pursue that. That is a key part of this new deal, one of the biggest revenue items there is as a matter of fact.

A liquor tax in the City of Winnipeg is not even worth discussing?

(2:40)

What is the end game here? What is being suggested by people if we're not willing to discuss new methods of taxation for the City of Winnipeg? Is it okay for a different level of government to be able to tax our citizens and we can't? Are we suggesting that not only should we not have the power to talk about taxation for gasoline, taxation for liquor, taxation for other things, but yet it's okay for another level of government to have that power? Or are we suggesting that they shouldn't have that power either? Should nobody have this power? Why should it not be us and not them?

Again, to use the word baffles, because it's come up over and over again, that baffles me that we would take that position. It seems irresponsible to me that we would just willingly hand over the power to another level of government when we are elected representatives in a such a large portion of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. Does not make sense, especially when you consider how hard a sell this is going to be, not only to our public, and it is going to be a hard sell, let's be honest, a very hard sell. As hard as that is going to be, it is going to be an even harder sell to our colleagues at the other levels of government, and we know that.

A lot of these funds that we are talking about this afternoon are going to be specifically delineated to provide research and frankly persuasion to other levels of government as Councillor Steek pointed out who have probably as much control over this new deal as we do. That is not going to be easy, it is not going to be quick, and it's going to take a ton of time and yes it's going to take some resources.

We should look at this also in the context of, and this has not come up today, when we talked about this, we have to acknowledge that this is to a large extent the City of Winnipeg's idea, we have to be frank, there are a lot of very very important people across the whole rubric of our decision-making society that are telling us that you better look at this. Not the least of which is our bond rating company that has looked at our books extensively and to my knowledge at least has said to us, you know, what you are doing here looks good right now but it is not in our opinion sustainable. We had the obligation I think to follow up with some new ideas and that is precisely what we are doing. At the end of the day if we cannot convince people, we better be pretty ready to say to them, well, we tried for a new idea because there's some

pretty grievous things that are happening in other cities that don't look very very seriously at this type of thing. The City of Regina for example had to get away from their promise property tax freeze, and they did have a hike. I think our friends in Calgary were around 4%, and I know that our friends in Edmonton passed this year a 5% residential property tax increase. That's my sense and that's what I believe happened.

If these are some of the realities that may exist at the end of the road if we can't change some of the things that we're doing, I hope we're going to have the opportunity to discuss these with the people we represent because they need this information. They need this information.

It's interesting the specific example of school boards came up prior in this debate. It is interesting because Councillor Wyatt mentioned and he's exactly right, it is really really difficult for us as city councillors to deal with constantly with I believe he said a double digit tax increase. In St. Vital the new Louis Riel I think I saw an 8% tax increase which is a very very big tax increase.

But a good example of what can happen to government organizations if they have limited tax levers that they can pull. The school boards have only one. They have only one. The residential property tax, and you see what is happening.

Far from becoming the school boards we want to ensure that whatever we do does not force us into that position. It is exactly what we are trying to avoid, and regrettably maybe the road that we're headed down if we don't do something to at least adjust things minorly.

I'm also going to say, a million dollars is a lot of money for public consultation. These things are very very expensive. I would suggest if I could that the City of Winnipeg should have an ongoing process of public consultation regardless of the issue, we should always be talking to our people. We should never not be spending money on public consultation. Regardless of what happens, and regardless of where this goes, regardless of what it winds up looking at, we have to recognize, there's an inherent value in doing this with the citizens that we represent. There really is. Because what is going to happen is we're going to talk a lot of differences will be solved, lot of things will not be solved, but at the end of the day everybody's going to understand each other just a little bit better. Not everyone will, there'll be some wounds but it's going to go a long way. It doesn't matter what we're talking about whether it's the new deal or whether it's the enviro strategy, whatever it is. Public consultation is always a good thing.

I look at this as an ongoing extension of what we're trying to do as a city, and that is engage our citizens. Let's be honest. Even though this has caused a little bit of riff, I couldn't help but notice over the course of this morning, we're again in the Globe and Mail on the front page. Last night CBC National News. Where do we wind up going with this? We have to recognize that this city is seen as a city that is doing things. Mr. Speaker that is very positive.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Gord because I think you captured what I feel pretty good.

I have a little bit of a problem with the flexibility of some people. When you start a discussion about any issue particularly one that's as important as this one, you have to have something on the table to start talking about. It takes intestinal fortitude and leadership to put something on the table Mr. Speaker knowing full well what's going to happen. Usually in the first 48 hours or so in particular, you're going to wind up taking a significant amount of heat, sometimes for all the right reasons and sometimes for all the wrong reasons.

We're supposed to be talking about the cost of rolling this out. I think that Gord has just basically put it very very well that there's a cost to doing business, and it

doesn't matter whether you're in business and you're trying to market your product, or whether you do what we do and try to market a lot of information because that's what we're trying to do.

Whether we like it or not we're at a bit of a crossroads budgetary Mr. Speaker. I think I know a little bit about that because I've been the Chairman of Finance for the last four years here, five actually. Currently we have a shortfall on this year's budget of about $7.3 million. I can tell you that at least $4.3 million of that is a shortfall in the projected photo radar revenues and next year they're projected to be even higher which means it's a bigger hole.

I can also share with you and in fact I did with my colleagues the other day, we're actually sitting on a $40 million shortfall in our 2004 budget discussions. Which is an 11% property tax increase. I almost feel like asking the question around this chamber, how many people would like to put up their hands if they'd like to support a 11% property tax increase this year. I can guarantee you that there wouldn't be one hand go up, nobody wants to do that. The reality is, Gord Steeves is right, if we've only got one place to go then it's going to have to go to the tax bills. Or you're going to have to start making some real tough choices. You're going to have to make some changes. They're not easy. Your phone will really ring then.

It's no different from trying to make a change in this type of way or if you try and make changes in a different type of way. Most people don't like change very much. It requires leadership to guide change. It's not easy. I can tell you it's not fun trying to build a bridge in this town. It's not fun trying to build some roadways either sometimes. But you have to deal with these questions in an appropriate way.

(2:50)

Frankly I accomplished both those things in a very very delicate way in my neck of the woods but I did it through public consultation. I actually had a localized plebiscite. Didn't mean anything legally but that's how I got where I got.

Bottom line is, we've got a $40 million problem folks next year. Notwithstanding that we've in last seven years we've had four zeros and three minus twos and we currently have a mill rate that's about the same as it was in 1990, and most people think we've done a pretty good job financially including the bond rating people by the way. They don't know whether we can keep this kind of stuff up. But I'm here to tell you that we're just about out of tricks. The revenue isn't there anymore.

We've had just in the last four years alone an increase in the cost of operating fire and ambulance of $51 million while we've cut taxes. Where did we get it? Well there was no magic to it, we changed how we did some of our business. We stopped borrowing money which is meant that are debt has been dropping like a rock. We have also cut 3,000 employees in the last five or six years. That's reality. None of it was fun, none of it was easy but we did it. We can't keep going down that path. You can find efficiencies here and there but if you can find any that are worth a million dollars or two million dollars please phone me. I am Chairman of Finance, I'd love to hear where that money is. I can guarantee you there aren't big numbers hiding in the trees anymore. We have a problem.

Now, how would you like to solve it? Would you like to vote on an 11% property tax increase next year? I doubt it.

Am I thrilled by everything in this new deal document? No, there's some things that I'm not fond of by a long shot. But you've got to put something on the table. The whole idea is to get dialogue. I trust the citizens of this city, I think most of them are pretty smart folks. The ones that phone me sure seem to be. I like getting their input. I want to hear what they have to say. They might not like some of these things. They might have a couple of other ones we haven't thought about. That's what this is all about. And you know what, maybe we can't put a deal together like this. Maybe we can only get half of this. Maybe the Province won't give us any of it. I don't know

where any of them are going to land. All I know is this.

We have a $40 million problem coming up in the 2004 budget, and that doesn't even speak about the infrastructure issue that's out there that everybody keeps talking about where we have a shortfall in what we should be spending in that regard. The answer is not borrowing to do it. You don't build streets and curbs with credit cards, we've learned that. That was a mistake 15 years ago or 20 years ago. That's not how you solve these things. You've got to find unique and innovative ways to do it.

Is this document perfect? No, I don't think anyone meant it to be. But it's not a bad start.

Is it suppose to get everybody's attention? Absolutely. Did it? Well based on the calls I've been getting I think it has. I'd like to assume that other people are phoning in other constituency areas, why are they doing that? Well it got their attention. Do they have all of the information? No. Because the information that they've been able to attain so far has been provided to them by the way of TV, Radio and the printed media who I'm sure are doing their level best with the time allotted given to them by their editors and producers etc. to get as much of their story out as they can. But I know from reading what I read that they've left some stuff out. That's not abnormal, I mean there's only so much room in a paper everyday. There's only so much time on a news broadcast.

Fact of the matter is, the only way that this is going to get portrayed in a way that people can understand it is for people like us to go out there and tell everybody the truth. You don't have to crap on somebody because they put forward a document. If you wanted to crap on the document go ahead, that's okay, that's okay to do that, there's nothing wrong with that. But at least bring some new ideas about how you think you can do it different. The issue is we collectively have a problem.

It always amazes me because we go out and we knock on doors to do this. We talk to people, we put signs up, we put forward ideas. I don't know what it is about this process, but people walk out there with you, they make phone calls for you, they champion your cause, they think your ideas are great. You get elected. Then somehow just about every time you try to do something it's like as soon as you get elected you have a lobotomy. I don't understand this process.

I really really like having input. I've been returning e-mails, that's new ground for me. However, I still prefer phone calls. I do those well into the wee hours it seems.

The bottom line here folks. This isn't personal. This isn't about whether you like my tie or whether you like the type of vehicle I drive, or whether you like the way that I answer a question here. This is about our city. It's our city, and we've been sent here to deal with all of these issues. We don't always all agree on all of them, but for goodness sakes at least open your mind a little bit and be flexible enough to at least go through the process before you crap all over it.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I didn't know whether I was going to speak to this or not, but I have listened very carefully and very quietly to all of my colleagues who spoke ahead of me on this particular clause.

I think we have to remind ourselves first of all what we are debating here today. First we are not debating the elements of the proposed new deal, let's make it clear that when we vote on this clause we're not passing a single item of the new deal which was unveiled the other day. We're not passing sales taxes, we're not passing gasoline taxes or any of those things. What we are being asked to do today is to authorize the transfer of $500,000 which is currently sitting in the City's general purpose reserve and transfer that money into the Chief

Administrator's Department in order that the research, the analysis, and the public consultation process for this proposed new deal can be enhanced in order that questions and issues that are raised during the process can be properly researched with information brought back to us the decision makers and to the public. That's what we're being asked to vote on today. The money is sitting in a reserve. It's been there for a long time, it needs the authorization of City Council to transfer it from that account to the Chief Administrator's Office Account in order that the full process of this new deal consultation can be undertaken in a meaningful way.

(2:58)

We're not dealing with some ordinary routine policy matter when we discuss this new deal Mr. Speaker. We are dealing with a wholesale change or a potential wholesale change in the structure of municipal government in this city and potentially across Canada. That's what we're dealing with. Although it's difficult to get out of the precise details of all the elements of the new deal I don't like sales tax, I don't like this, I don't like that. We have to try and lift ourselves out of the minutia of that detail and try to engage our citizens in a vision of what a newly structured city government in the 21st century could look like. With all the powers and authorities that other orders of government who haven't been around as long as municipal government have had since Confederation. That's what we're trying to deal with.

When we get down to the short strokes, when we get down to the nitty gritty of individual taxation or revenue measures, that will be another debate. Some of us will fall off the page on some of those things depending on feedback we've been getting from the public.

We're not debating those things today. Were not even trying to debate them in the forums that are going to be held, we're trying to say here's a package of ideas as Councillor Clement outlined. Here's a package of various ideas. They're not perfect and they're not the end game. They are simply the beginning of a process. Imagine a city government that for the first time in over a century is on the cusp of changing the way it does business. And changing the way it's able to operate. Imagine if we're on a clean page where we've never heard of property taxes before, where we've never heard of all the things that we've been encumbered with as a municipal government for over a century. Try to imagine what a city government could look like as we proceed into the 21st century, a real responsive order of government, the one that's closest to the people and now empowered with all the tools that are necessary to do the job that's expected of members of municipal government in this century.

I've been here for 23 years Mr. Speaker. I know that the face and the scope of municipal government today is a hell of a lot different than it was when I took my oath of office 23 years ago for the first time.

Municipal governments are expected today to do more and more things that were never expected of municipalities when I first came here. Certainly were never even dreamed of 50 years ago in most of our lifetimes. That's what's happening with municipal government today, not only here but across the country. We don't have the tools to deal with many of the issues that are now landing in our laps or being put in our laps by other governments or simply by the passage of time. We can't deal with many of them.

We've had phase one the City Charter come into effect in January of this year. We always knew, anybody that's been here longer than since the last election, we've always known that the next step is phase two. New deal is really the phase two process of the Charter. That is providing to city government the expanded revenue and taxation powers that are necessary to get away from the reliance on property taxes, and to enable municipal government to have those flexible revenues the growth revenues and all of those sorts of things that are necessary these days to meet public

demand for many services. Everybody seems to want more service. They want more police, they want more this, more roads, they want more fire, they want all of that but when the property tax bill comes they don't want to pay for it. They have no choice when the property tax bill comes Mr. Speaker because by law whatever is on your tax bill has to be paid.

The other revenue options that are available to the other orders of government have some flexibility in there. If you don't want to pay as much in gasoline tax don't drive your car as much, or find other modes of transportation. It isn't always that black and white but I'm being very simplified in all of this.

Our order of government has none of those options. And yet we are being faced more and more with heavier demands from the public to provide more and more service but don't raise my property taxes.

Folks there's no free lunch. If government is going to provide a service, somebody has to pay the bill. The only person around that can pay the bill is the taxpayer. I'm a taxpayer just like everybody else in this chamber, and just like the 630,000 odd people who are outside this chamber watching this debate today.

That's what we're trying to deal with with the new deal. I don't want to get mired and try to avoid it but maybe I've stepped into a bit into the various elements of the new deal package. Because we're not voting on any of those things today. I'm repeating myself, but I want to make it clear. We're not voting on any of those things today. We won't be voting on any of those things probably for a few months yet because we don't know what the public thinks. The purpose of this transfer of funds is to enable us to do a first rate consultation process and to enable our staff to do all of the research and the analysis that's required on ideas that are brought forward. So by the time we as the elected decision makers get down to dealing with the various individual items of the new deal that seem to have some public support, we will know the cause and effect of our decisions. We can respond to what the effect of a decision on this particular revenue source or that one will be or won't be.

We don't know what the final package will be. It may very well be Mr. Speaker when all of this process is over that we may not pass anything. That may be what we have to accept. I'd be disappointed personally because I've always been a strong believer in a strong and effective municipal government and one that should be ready to meet the challenges of a new century. But it may not happen Mr. Speaker during this term. I realize that at the end of the day. Or some of it may happen. I'd be happy with half a loaf if that's what it is Mr. Speaker.

We're not going to know, we're not going to have a clear idea about this until we are able to provide information to the public and get the feedback from them. As I said earlier, this isn't some routine policy discussion. This isn't some routine policy deal that we're talking about. We're talking about a radical change to the concept of municipal government in this city and potentially in this country. Let's look at that big picture, and let's try to get all of our citizens engaged in what a new form of municipal government could look like in this country.

Some of these forums are not new in the world. European cities and some American cities have much of the kind of powers and authorities that we're talking about here. This is certainly a new concept not only for Winnipeg but for Canada.

We have an opportunity here to create the Winnipeg model over time. Whatever that model may end up being. But we're not going to be able to get there and we're not going to be able to get the kind of feedback and provide the kind of information we want to citizens unless we provide solid evidence and can give answers and do research and give proper answers when questions are raised that we aren't able to answer instantly. That's the purpose of trying to do this consultation, the research and the analysis, that's why we want to have a

properly funded account so that we can engage our citizens in something that is really going to be the hallmark of this particular council when we get to the end of it and can decide on the policy measures that we want to take forward to other governments in order to enable us to meet the challenges of this century. I support the clause because I want to see this work continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Murray close debate.

Mayor Murray: I learned something very important today, I'm not as smart as Councillor Steek or Councillor Wyatt.

(3:05)

They don't need research and they understand this better than most of us. They've been able to come to the conclusion that this is a tax grab and we ought not to waste a million dollars researching this. Well we should all sleep well tonight. I guess that some of us have somehow become misinformed or very gullible and easily led.

I have a friend who lives up in the North End, a very smart wise guy, he's a lot older than I am. He watches council meetings, and he always has an expression for some of the activities that go on here, refers to the skeet shooters. I said, what do you mean by a skeet shooter? Well I notice there's two types of councillors, there's those that throw the ideas up in the air, and those who shoot them out of the air. The ones who shoot them out of the air I refer to as the skeet shooters and those are the ones I make sure I never vote for in elections.

I've been working on this for four years with my colleagues, the mayors, The Big Cities Mayors Caucus, with Jane Jacobs who I've gotten to know Octogenarian woman who is one of the most brilliant people I've ever met in my life. She's a huge proponent of a lot of what we're doing here.

I've had the chance to meet with Don Drummond the Senior Vice-President and Director of Research for the Royal Bank of Canada. We've had the benefit of Integral Economics who are one of the most advanced economic institutes in Canada looking at the qualitative impacts on the economy, on social equity issues, redistribution of wealth and how cities ought to price their services and cost their services so that the economic benefits to their residents and their businesses are captured both in smart expenditures and smart taxation.

For those of us that aren't quite as smart as some of our colleagues who feel some need to become better educated, I think this is going to be very instructive.

I'm also honoured to be invited every year by the Conference Board of Canada to their 40 CEO's Summit, and they invite 40 outstanding Chief Executive Officers of Canada's largest corporations, I'm one of the few who feels a little out of place because I don't come from the private sector and I don't have the education or experience of many of them.

Last year I was elected by them to be their recorder, these are the presidents of large banks. We spent two days and the theme was about inclusion and governance as it relates to cities. A lot of these people are some of our biggest taxpayers in this country.

The points that they've made about the TD model, because this isn't the Mayor's model, I'd love to tell you I'm so brilliant that I could have brought this report forward. They're talking about the tax shifts and the value bases of taxes and the impacts on flow through. The over reliance on property taxes and business tax and the negative impact that that has on the inputs into the economy. That's what we need to understand.

I also spent some time with Sister Bernadette and Sister Leslie and Dianne Redsky who are modelling a lot of this on their neighbourhood. What does this mean to the folks who live in the North End of the City?

We're also not working in a vacuum here on this, and this is why the research and the money is so important. In Ontario

Councillor Steek since you've done your homework, the rental tenancies branch actually instructs and requires landlords to pass the savings on or invest it in their properties. Our city staff who's quite smart Councillor De Smedt as you pointed out who are actually smart competent people Shirley Muir and Connie Walker are actually the people who are asking for this money, not ours, because they believe that as competent responsible staff they need these resources to inform the public not of some propaganda or PR campaign but to have high quality research so both our citizens and our elected officials can make the kind of intelligent decisions that Councillor Pagtakhan was out the other night inviting our citizens to become part of.

Quite frankly what I'm trying to say is, I don't believe any of us are that smart. I don't think the status quo is going to work. Councillor Steek said, Mr. Mayor I'm going to hold your feet to the fire, where's the tens of millions of dollars that you're promising for our police department going to come from. Well you know, the first idea is always the worst. The first idea out of the gates is the most imperfect, and the first person out of the gates with that idea is always the one that's most criticized. It's easy to be right the second time. It's even easier when you have the third idea.

All of you have ground cover because none of you are going to be criticized for being critics. All of you have a chance to take the imperfect ideas of Connie Walker, of Shirley Muir of a Don Drummond, of a Jane Jacobs and make them better. All of you have the chance to not just be yet another cynic in the long line up of cynics and sceptics, the people who see through everything and see nothing. But to be a real citizen here, to challenge me to have a better idea. To help us find the $60 million that we need to spend that we don't have every year to stop dropping sewage in our rivers every year because that's what it costs according to the Clean Environment Commission. I don't know where that's going to go.

Councillor Clement's right, when I first became Mayor we had a $35 million shortfall going into a budget. The best year we ever had was $23 million. Some of my colleagues on EPC and some of you and brilliant administration and citizenship were smart enough to turn that shortfall into a tax cut every year and into increased investments and infrastructure. But our bag of tricks is empty, it's time to come clean with the public, and it's time to evoke our greatest strength as a city. The underpinning of our civil society, our citizenship. The intelligence of our citizens, their creativity to find a better way.

For those of you who know the price of everything and the value of nothing and I hear that commentary all the time, this is a chance to really listen to people in a way we never have. This is the chance of what we're already doing which is becoming Canada's leading city. Today we're talked about across the country. We're on the front pages of national newspapers. We're taking a leadership role that neither Toronto nor Vancouver is taking. If we do this right and we do have smart taxation and smart spending, we will be Canada's city of choice to live in, and every Canadian will be looking to Winnipeg for its leadership nationally. That's because of all of you and 660,000 people out there who are pretty darn smart if we listen to them. Thank you.

(Councillor Eadie in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Debate on the clause is closed. We'll take a recorded vote. All in favour of clause 1 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors De Smedt, Steek, Wyatt.

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

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Clause 1 is carried.

Clause 2.

Item No. 2 – First Steps: Municipal Aboriginal Pathways
File No. CR-4.1

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor you're introducing.

Mayor Murray: No Mr. Speaker I would like to give credit where credit is due and ask Councillor Vandal to introduce his committee report and thank him and for Councillor Gerbasi's excellent work and to all the many citizens who have been involved in this process.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Mayor. In the continued spirit of boldness and courage it is with great pride that I introduce this document called "First Steps: Municipal Aboriginal Pathways" for Council approval today.

This document is the first of its kind of any city in Canada. Succinctly summarize it as a document which is proposes a new relationship between the City of Winnipeg and the Aboriginal Community of Winnipeg.

(3:15)

It's a document which proposes a new relationship so that we as city councillors and as leaders of the City of Winnipeg, together with the Aboriginal Community, so that we can meet the many challenges and the many opportunities which we all as Winnipeggers will face together over the next 50 years.

This document proposes that this new relationship be based on values of trust and cooperation and that the central theme underpinning the document is partnership.

Partnership between the City of Winnipeg, the Aboriginal Community, our non Aboriginal Community, and other governments be they provincial governments, federal governments, Métis governments or First Nation governments.

Once the document was put together there was a direct across the table consultation with leaders of all political Aboriginal organizations. Many community leaders within the Aboriginal Community and non Aboriginal Community.

On September 6 there was a six hour public consultation at R.B. Russell attended by myself, Councillor Jenny Gerbasi and Mayor Glen Murray where speaker after speaker after speaker spoke from their heart and spoke passionately about past experiences, all to often negative, about current realities and most importantly about hope for the future.

That my fellow councillors is what is important and paramount about our discussion we are having this afternoon, is hope for the future.

This is a high level policy document. But it is more than that. This document will be real for young Aboriginal people living in our city.

There are five Pathways which have been identified through the writing of the document, and they are employment. The City of Winnipeg will undertake initiatives to enhance the participation of Aboriginal people in our workforce. They are safety. We will build on current safety programs and services to promote the personal and collective security of the Aboriginal Community. They are economic development. We will use municipal tools to promote economic development projects with the Aboriginal Community. They are quality of life which is essentially talking about recreational services and housing within the City of Winnipeg. The fifth Pathway but certainly not the least important Pathway is outreach and education where we will develop outreach and education initiatives to promote cross-cultural understanding and improve access to information about what we do here as a city.

Within each Pathway there are specific strategic initiatives under each Pathway. There are specific explanations about who is responsible corporately for advancing the particular strategic initiative. There are timelines under each strategic initiative and ultimately there will be budgets.

Some initiatives are happening as we speak. We are very close to rolling out a training program for Aboriginal young people to become lifeguards and rec tecs within the City of Winnipeg. Some programs have already occurred. In fact about three weeks ago the City of Winnipeg wrapped up the WASAP, the Winnipeg Aboriginal Sports Achievement Program which delivers culturally appropriate sports and rec programming for young Aboriginal people in the City of Winnipeg, and that is the third year in a row we have done that.

Some will be rolled out very soon. The commonality between all of them is that they will all make a positive contribution to the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not speak to the issue of the treaty land entitlements. I want to begin by talking about language because I believe language is so important to lay the groundwork for how we communicate to one another.

Nowhere in this report will you find the words urban reserves. It is treaty land entitlements. Nevertheless if you've read and heard the media reports on this initiative in the last month, you would never read the words treaty land entitlements, you would hear the words urban reserves or hear the words urban reserves.

Now the media has been relentless concerning this issue. Some media have been deliberately confrontational and demagogic concerning this issue frankly.

Let me be crystal clear. Treaty land entitlements are about jobs jobs and more jobs for young First Nations and Métis people in the City of Winnipeg. They are about attracting millions of dollars in First Nation investment in what I hope will be the heart of our city. Dollars which would not otherwise be attracted to the City of Winnipeg. They are important economic development tools to convert First Nations poverty into First Nations prosperity in the City of Winnipeg.

Let me be even more clear. I will read for the benefit of councillors the text directly from the report on municipal development and services agreement. "The City of Winnipeg will live up to its Plan Winnipeg commitment to encourage self-reliant Aboriginal communities by participating as mandated by the Federal Government in the treaty land entitlement process. Though the treaty land entitlement process is primarily a federal responsibility the City will work responsibly to facilitate the fair and equitable resolutions of the process by negotiating comprehensive municipal services agreements with eligible First Nations. All municipal service agreements will build a framework for the provision of municipal services including payments equivalent to city taxes and utility charges. It adheres to all city by-laws. It adheres to the authority of city planning and zoning regulations. It adheres to eligibility requirements for city programs and general alignment with all city policies".

That is our commitment to the treaty land entitlement process. We will go forward and bargain in good faith with entitled First Nations as they come forward with real treaty land entitlement projects complete with business plans, with budgets and at the end of the day we are talking about an important economic development tool which I hope we will welcome with open arms in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker I've touched on the main points of the report. I'm now going to sit down and listen and take notes to the concerns that certain councillors have within this document, and I will attempt to summarize and answer those concerns as I wrap up. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: We have an amendment to the clause identified as Motion 1 which was moved by Councillor

Lazarenko and seconded by Councillor Vandal to add a new recommendation five. You all have it so I won't read it. Let Councillor Lazarenko opening debate on your amendment.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Lazarenko
Seconded by Councillor Vandal

THAT Item 2 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 23, 2003, be amended by adding the following as Recommendation No. 5:

5. That after public consultation on the action plans, the Administration be requested to report to Executive Policy Committee with further recommendations and for final approval by Council.

and renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, when this was first introduced some time ago it caused a lot of confusion the way it was introduced. Not too many of us were involved in the participation, it was what we heard through the media.

I've introduced this motion to the fact that any major decision such as this that is being made here today on Council will reflect on the community, The City of Winnipeg for the next hundred years or more.

(3:25)

I was very adamant, I said that I will not be supporting the proposal as it stood without having some input and having the public participation on the process they'd have to follow.

I had spoken to some of the members of EPC especially Councillor Vandal, I said that I wanted to make an amendment which he agreed on and he was a seconder. And it states, "that after public consultation on the action plans the Administration be requested to report to the Executive Policy Committee with further recommendations and for final approval by Council."

We have some of the delegations are here today, I don't think they understood that this was not a fait accompli deal. This is a matter of going before and getting both sides together, the general public of the citizens of Winnipeg to talk and to communicate and negotiate on what we're trying to do.

I, as one have always been leery of the word reserve. I think that reserve should be changed, there should not be such things like a two tier system it's like people living in isolation in one community while others are not. That's something up to the Federal Government to decide.

Some comments were made here also about that they will not have to pay taxes. My question at that time was, how many corporations do we have that do not pay taxes. Nothing is being said on that.

The clause that is before us now is to promote self-reliant Aboriginal communities not reserves, communities.

The five w's that I've always been preaching for many years the who, what, why, when and where. Will it be addressed at this public consultation? People want to know who, for what reason, why, does that mean a tax break on reservations that there is on the community would be, they would not have to pay taxes? Whichever way. Why? When? And Where?

About eight years ago Mr. Speaker when we were dealing with the issue of trying to take a look at the possibility of having something like what they have in Saskatoon. Then Mayor Thompson called for a seminar which I was present at that seminar, there was about five councillors who were there.

We discussed the whole issue with the representative from Saskatoon. The representative had said, they're working on this, it's a long process, the number

one is to try and get the people on both sides to understand what it is that both parties are trying to do with the blessing of the government.

At that time it was decided we could not proceed because we did not have enough information and would have caused massive confusion to the general public. The public consultation that will take place Mr. Speaker and I hope, I understand that I had talked to some, we will be out of the picture, it will be up to the proponents to make the presentation, sell the idea to the people of Winnipeg.

In Saskatoon when this was introduced a number of years ago, they had developed the partnership, the City of Saskatoon and Muskeg Lake Cree Nations are not adjacent communities, however, in 1984 they began negotiating to establish an urban reserve. The first time a new reserve was established within municipal boundaries in Canada under the TLE process or the treaty land entitlement. The urban reserve was to help economic development for the Muskeg Lake Cree First Nation. Then in 1993, the City and the First Nations signed a service agreement for the urban reserve, under this agreement Saskatoon provides garbage pickup, water, sewer and fire protection. The Muskeg Lake Cree First Nation collects property taxes on urban reserves to pay for these services in an amount equivalent to what the City would have received if land had remained under its jurisdictions.

Now the success that they had with that, the land was designated urban reserve has evolved from what was once vacant land and tribing business area. Muskeg Lake Nation has diversified its economic and now manages assets of close to $17 million including $2 million infrastructure such as water, sewer and roads, and $15 million in buildings leased for the office space in industrial park.

Now the challenges, I'm just reading briefly Mr. Speaker because I will not have the time to have what I have here.

The challenges. Establishing an urban reserve is a complex process. Some difficulties arose from the lack of information on the TLE policy, especially how it affected the City. The First Nation direct approach to the negotiation helped overcome these early difficulties.

Saskatoon's main concern was to maintain a level playing field in taxation where tax in the area would be harmonized to reflect competitive retail prices on and off the reserve. Local businesses off reserves were concerned that the tax exempt status of businesses on reserves would give them an unfair advantage and draw business away from lower retail prices especially for tobacco and fuel, say they did not have to charge provincial sales tax. Off reserve business preferred, on reserves businesses charged the same prices and kept the money equivalent to the PST for their community. This issue has not been resolved. It's still ongoing between the two communities.

Now they plan for the future. They have talked about lessons learned and the lessons learned Mr. Speaker on this motion, public consultation will take place once you have all the information that is provided, and you will get more information to the concerns, the questions will be raised. Especially those who will not understand. Some will not want to understand. I would just take it by the wayside because people like that are very negative and will be negative forever. If you have information that can you have to be a super salesperson, sell the idea. It does work.

You have to understand. When I had said, I was quoted in the paper I said that, that the word reserve and Indian people have a tendency of reflecting it in a negative way because of what happens in a community, you have the Indian Posse. You've got the high crime rate, prostitution and so forth.

Hopefully this is going to correct it Mr. Speaker. I was the author of a motion four years ago that dealt with the issue of prostitution, exploitation of children and that committee that was formed under my motion and Councillor Smith was a seconder of this, was to provide public

consultation and to deal with this committee had provided information to use enforcement, to stop this because the judge at that time had said, that the children were being exploited to a point that they were just used as dishwashers. People were dissatisfied as what was happening. Nothing has been resolved from the Province. Nothing. There are people still waiting. We had people appear as a delegation from the schools. We had the Aboriginal principals came out and said, please help us, because look what is happening. Exploitation of children is huge. Nothing has happened Mr. Speaker to the point because to me I think there's too many people believe in the status quo of all the agencies. Some of the others, each ones got a job. If I correct this I'll be out of a job. I'll be on social services correct the problem. Some of the people will be out of a job. So they'll say just go on social assistance.

What they don't realize, it's not curing, it's causing an ailment that is hurting people. People regardless whether they happen to be of the First Nations or people that are living here in Winnipeg have to understand we and all of us are human beings. You have to understand what is being dealt with.

When this clause will be approved by Council, and I'm sure it will be unanimously approved, my message to those, is use the five w's. These are the concerns.

(3:32)

We as politicians should keep our noses of that. Mr. Mayor I'd say, no more of these comments made it would hurt some people because the comments were taken out of context, then what happens the media has a field day.

It's easy for someone to sit behind a microphone and make accusations and challenge someone, but get out here, get out in the real world. Face reality what we have to go through because you have to address the issue, you have to address the concerns that each and every one has.

The area that I live in Mr. Speaker, I've been living there for most of my life. I see what is happening. I've seen the role of prostitutes walking down the streets. I've seen drug pushers, drug users because I live in the core. I'm mighty proud to live there. I live in a community where people said, why are you living there? This is not the place that you should be living. You're a councillor. Well I've been there for many years and all the years that I've been on Council the first time I was elected was in the '70s and I'm still there and I like being there. A community that is beginning to grow. Selkirk Avenue was depleted to such a point Mr. Speaker that there was nothing left. It was not like Selkirk Avenue used to be before. What happens? Some of the businesses that want to come on Selkirk Avenue, they want to take away what Selkirk Avenue stood for. People walking down the streets. People talking to one another. You have establishments of houses, they want to put in used car sales. A high eight foot fence to box the people in. Now what kind of an attitude, what kind of atmosphere are we creating that people want to live there?

We have programs within the community Mr. Speaker that takes in all kind, everyone. When we approved Higgins and Main, it was My Place, yes and you will respect it as your place as well as I respect my place. We are neighbours. We have to work together.

Being negative to a point of not understanding or not wanting to understand is not easy and it's a hard role to try to correct. Some people don't want to listen. I have here that I've been on the Internet getting all the information, I have about 100 pages of problems that they've had in other areas but it was corrected through public consultation. It's so important, is not to have anything that would be coming in through the backdoor and say you want to take it out the front door. Like I said the way this proposal was introduced, Councillor Vandal was on the right track. Councillor Gerbasi was along with Councillor Vandal on this, and then somebody comes along and tries to say a few things and it disrupts it and what happens? You're back down at

square one. You're trying to correct something that is not fair.

Mr. Speaker I just hope that Council will see fit and don't forget this will come back to council for final decision for a discussion and final decision. It's not a done deal. It will be worked out but it will come back to council. This is what my Motion No. 1 means.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Debate is now open on the clause and the amendment. Deputy Mayor Thomas.

Deputy Mayor Thomas: Thank you. I would like to thank Councillors Gerbasi, Vandal for taking on this initiative. I'd like to thank Councillor Lazarenko for his well considered amendment. I'd like to applaud Councillors Gerbasi and Vandal for a well done report.

I want to give my personal commitment to do all I can to facilitate consultation regarding this report. I intend to listen. I intend to ensure that positive steps are taken to prepare an appropriate series of action plans.

I intend to ensure that this document is more than words. We can do this if we are sincere, committed and focussed on positive consultation based on respect.

This is a first step. Let's take it.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any further debate? Councillor De Smedt and Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. I'm going to rise in support of the amendment, and in support of the clause.

I think there's been some misunderstandings about what had happened following the major consultation at the R.B. Russell School on that famous day.

I think it is truly regrettable as Councillor Lazarenko has related to that particular incident that I think comments were taken out of context.

I think at the same time what has been taken out of context by some members of our community is that perhaps I, and another member of this council or others were against the Pathways proposal. Absolutely not.

I want to assert and to indicate my support that this is a very important document. In fact I frankly think this is the most important document we've had in front us in five years. I think it evens transcends the document that we talked about a few moments ago, the new deal. Simply because we're trying to identify I think a very important opportunity to bring another element of our community together with the citizens of Winnipeg into a growth model for their own selves and for the benefit of the City of Winnipeg. Indeed for Manitoba. If the model succeeds in all its elements in all 15 particular points in the five Pathways, that it could be a template for others to use.

I'm supportive particularly of the amendment because it brought to light I think the importance of bringing council into the final decision-making process. Not to say no, but to say yes. Or to offer additional considerations that would strengthen the particular pathway or action plan.

Now we will have some troubled discussions no doubt I think in the years ahead on certain parts of the action plans. Not because the proposals may be ill-considered but probably because they have not taken into account all the factors that we ought to be interested in.

If we're going to change our society, if we're going to change our outlook, we need to have a plan. I applaud the initiatives of the two councillors that were involved, members of the community that gave advice, and all those who participated in this.

Let me say that, one element of it always became an immotive issue which was the context of urban reserves which is inappropriate and I understand it's a treaty land entitlement. But it's very instructive to understand and I think I alluded that this morning, if people get

concerned about whether the municipal jurisdiction is going to get its due, I'm sure it will because we are to enter into good faith as is the proponent of a particular plan if we're going to be looking at "a land entitlement within the City boundaries of the City of Winnipeg". We look at it in good faith. And if there's some residual items that cannot be negotiated, it's rather instructive that the agreement between the Federal authority Her Majesty the Queen in both in Canada and Manitoba said, that Manitoba shall indemnify and say Canada and the Entitlement First Nations (inaudible) from any claims and liabilities and demands of any nature whatsoever brought by a municipality.

(3:40)

There were others words. I'm not a lawyer, not a constitutional lawyer. But I think it's instructive to take that to indicate that there may be an opportunity for us to negotiate with the Province if there are certain costs, not taxes, certain costs that we would face that would be difficult for both parties that it ought to be the Province that should say harmless the applicant the First Nation and do that by compensating the jurisdiction that's trying to make it work which is the municipality. I say that because there's a parenthetic, para three in Section 14 of 1401 that says, nothing in this agreement shall create any right of any municipality or school division to make a claim for any loss of municipal and school taxes resulting from setting apart of land as reserve in this agreement.

In other words if we can't come to a proper agreement on an MDSA, Municipal Development Servicing Agreement, we can't come back and say, we're not getting our due taxes and claim it upon the Province. But it says taxes. It doesn't say costs.

I think there's opportunity to have a major partner with us on these things, and some of you may recall when we had our seminar on this that I said it would really be instructive if sometimes when we do these things we could have that other big partner in this province of ours those representatives of the Province of Manitoba sit with us in Council and are obviously In Camera to discuss these issues of how we would approach it. So that we could get rid of the emotiveness of people jumping off on the wrong bandwagon of what we are trying to create, the image of an urban residential reserve in the middle of the City of Winnipeg that looks like 'x' or 'y' or 'z' what we're trying to talk about is something that allows an opportunity for growth.

One element of the five pathways in all of them, and the fifteen points of course is this servicing agreement. The opportunity for an economic development initiative which I think is very important for us to understand and consider in the future. I'm very supportive of that particular process that it would be instructive for us to listen very closely to any proposal to try and facilitate it, and to articulate the importance of this to our constituents of what it may mean for them in the longer term.

I look at the migration into this city from the reserves of people from First Nations lands as a positive attribute. I can't help but criticize from time to time our federal authorities and probably not having dealt with sufficiently the support mechanisms and funding to those reserves and to those people. I really think federal authority owes this city and any other city with these same relationships that we have a huge financial input to assist us with housing and education.

Now I know we've had several agreements over the years. From time to time they address some of these issues. But the bow wave and as our friend Mr. Lester Lafond who was in town the other day has said, the bow wave that we're facing deserves much more significance report.

This is not a critique or an acrimonious critique over the other level of government, it is a critique though. I don't know how we get at that as municipal politicians, as a municipal authority to sit down out of sight out of mind but get together and say look it, we face a huge challenge. We need to do it together and we think this is a

tremendous opportunity to promote our city and to promote the welfare of a significant group of people the First Nations people.

For those who may have taken umbrage or misunderstanding about our visit to Saskatoon simply standing up and saying, we needed a little bit more time. I regret that. We're not against the policy. I do want more time, I'm not going to stop this. I think it's instructive that we are going to have some more public consultation.

We really should have done it that way. Give us a little time for those us who are I keep saying, marginalized outside the circle of influence. I was really going to say that you know in a weeks time we have a phenomenal display going to be happening at the Winnipeg Art Gallery, the artistry of the Group of Seven. I only wish that the artistry of the Group of Seven around this council can paint a few other pictures for us who are outside.

I think this is an important document. Thank you for bringing it forward. I will support it. I will support the amendment. Let's move together in a very positive way that will promote the aspirations of every Canadian in this country.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. To speak to the amendment and the clause.

I rise today, a lot of my comments I think a lot of the comments we'll hear today are directed towards the so called issue of the urban reserve.

I think technically there's no, it's quite right in the document, there's nothing referred to an urban reserve, but let's be realistic and frank with everyone, the reality is the treaty land entitlement process is there in place for Aboriginal, for Bands and Aboriginal groups to reclaim lands and to establish reserve lands where they technically have a nation. That is why we need to sign municipal development service agreements because it's part of the TLE process to ensure that the tax revenues that we are losing or won't gain because technically a reserve does not pay taxes, is paid to us in lieu of that.

It's quite right, technically it's not in the document, but in reality this is what we're discussing.

I want to first of all thank Councillors Steek and De Smedt for organizing that meeting last night, it was very well attended by the general public and by other councillors, and I congratulate other councillors who attended it as well. I found it very useful, and I wish there was more public meetings because I know there was a lot of questions that still had to be asked that there just wasn't enough time to ask because there were so many questions and people were lined up at the mic sometimes five, sometimes 10 deep to speak. I think this was a concern that was expressed early on that this was something which we could have taken 30 days out to talk to people about in our communities and through public consultations. Economically reasonable public consultations. It would have made sense.

I learnt two things yesterday actually that were very important at the meeting. Firstly I learnt that going into these negotiations we're not negotiating with just another interested third party here. We are negotiating with an organization of group of people who consider themselves a nation. We are negotiating to set up a nation, nation to nation. Well actually not nation to nation, we're not even recognized technically as a level of government. We'd be kind of a government of some sort to a nation negotiating. That's the first thing I learnt.

The second thing I learnt, is that only one party can dissolve that contract once we've entered into it and once the Federal Government has agreed to set up the reserve on that so called land.

(3:50)

One party. That is the Band itself to vote. It's very permanent Mr. Speaker. What we're establishing here is very permanent and very long term and of course there's

going to be a lot of discussion and controversy over it I think that's natural and a lot of people have a lot of questions. There is fear, fear of the unknown, fear is quite often based in ignorance and a need to know. But I think the general public of the City definitely want to know. I know we started the debate off bad and there was a real sense of this being rammed through. The tyranny of the majority was a word used, sometimes I wonder if we have the tyranny of the mayoralty. I have to wonder, we don't have to head down this process. We've got things happening where we sometimes wonder what's waiting in the wings. Is there a proposal out there over here we're waiting to jump out the next 30, 60 or 90 days. Maybe to set up an urban reserve at the Kapyong Barracks. I think that's a good idea. I think Kapyong Barracks is a natural site for something like this or downtown.

Councillor Smith is always joking about Transcona succeeding, maybe this is a way we can do it. We can declare Transcona as a urban reserve, be the reserve in Transcona and we would have our own nation.

The strategy, we have to wonder what's the strategy here. Sometimes I wonder if it's involving a federal run at an inner seat by a member of this council.

All these issues aside we have to wonder Mr. Speaker, I have to wonder there's a lot of questions outstanding. The document itself refers to the fact that when we negotiate an MDSA it talks about adherence to by-laws, adherence to our zoning regulation. Reality is, is that possible? At the end of the day after it's negotiated it will be a separate government, a separate nation that can set its own zoning, change zoning, change by-laws. That's clearly the case. These are questions I don't have an answer to. There was the question raised regarding Workers Compensation, health and safety, payroll taxes, capital taxes and the list goes on. What are the costs going negotiating the TLE's. There's no cost on this document Mr. Speaker. There's many questions outstanding. We don't know what the costs of implementing this is, or what the costs will be down the future. There's no idea of what it's going to cost the City. Clearly we had a big debate just recently about controlling our costs and concern about future costs. Well there's no costs tied to this document. We don't have anything coming forward here with costs on it Mr. Speaker. When something comes from EPC, quite often it doesn't seem to have any costs included, but when somebody else brings something forward we have to have every nickel and dime accounted for it seems.

In a sense this has been rushed. I had a chance to sit in the EPC meeting where Ms Grayeyes came forward and said quite rightfully, women were left out of this. Aboriginal women were left out. She criticized it. Had we taken maybe a month or two to discuss this with the public that maybe could have been added, and I hope it will be.

Then there's a sense Mr. Speaker that we have to remember our history. Anyone who reads history will realize the crimes and I call them crimes committed in the past, Treaty One and Treaty Two, Treaty One we negotiated hard nosed with a guy named Simpson. Then Treaty Two came along we took even more land away. The whole idea at that time remember of course this is now 1871 and the end of the nineteenth century, we were agrarian economy. So the push was to drive a hunting gathering society into an agrarian society. A lot of the Aboriginal community at the time said we'll do our best. Only to find out that after we negotiated the treaties with them and successive unity commissioners that came along, finally with a guy named Mr. Read decided just simply to, we're not going to allow the sale of products to market from reserves for wheat or barley or whatever products. Some reserves were producing actual product. Then we set up a permit system to make it impossible to sell to the market.

We are now reaping Mr. Speaker what we have sowed. We have driven a group of people who rightfully whether anyone likes it or not were the First Peoples in this continent to the wall. Now you can go to certain parts of our city and see

what we have done, a product of maybe five or six generations later. We should not be scratching our heads.

No one likes a handout. Anybody who says, that anyone likes a handout, is dead wrong. The Aboriginal population and individuals that I know in the Aboriginal community refuse to accept that. We must Mr. Speaker find ways to break that cycle. I believe the whole issue of the urban reserve is only one way to break the cycle. I think it's been over emphasized, there's been a lot of politics played with it, but it's only one way to do it. There are many ways to do it and there's a lot of things in the strategy which address that and things to do.

If we were really serious as a nation Mr. Speaker, this country is extremely rich. If we were really serious, we could wipe out the poverty that exists now in the Aboriginal community, not just in this city but across the country. The reason why we were downgraded by the way folks recently in the United Nations reports from number one to number five or whatever we were as a country, was largely because of the way we treat our Aboriginal population. And the condition that many of the communities face today and rightfully so.

The greatest challenge Mr. Speaker is not how to raise our (inaudible) we could do that as a country if we really decided to do it, and the Federal Government was really serious about doing instead of treating the Aboriginal population with disdain and paternalism as they historically have. If we were serious about it, it means changing the attitudes. That is the greatest challenge. That's what I found frustrating and I expressed this to other councillors about this process here, I wish we had the 30 or 60 days to start working on the attitudes, not the attitudes of the Aboriginal population of the City, but the attitudes of the non Aboriginal population in the City who have to come with us on this journey.

Not everybody's going to come with us on this journey, there's going to be many people out there that are going to refuse to accept this, and refuse to accept change because there will always be the rednecks and the rednecks will be there no matter what. The reality is at the end of the day Mr. Speaker, if a majority of the people, the non Aboriginal people, the whites like me, come along on this process and see the importance of being able to end this division that exists today in this city a divide that's so clear, I think Mr. Speaker we could have done ourselves a service. I hope we will be able to do this now through the consultation process that's in here. I hope that we can mend whatever fences that have been damaged in the last month or so. I welcome it because I think it will be a great opportunity.

Indeed in many ways you could look at it, we are creating another level of government or the new governments in the City. I always felt we sometimes as a city don't have enough competition. I know that there's some feelings that the surrounding municipalities take business from us and compete from us, now we're going to have new governments right in the heart of the City competing with our city and offering new competition. I think that's a good thing. I think that's great. It will keep us sharp and it will keep us honest when it comes to the services and the taxes that we charge our own citizens.

I welcome this Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting this. I would like to thank Councillor Vandal for doing the work on this matter. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I'm not going to repeat a lot of the things that Councillor Vandal spoke very well in his introduction covered much of this.

I would like to congratulate the councillors that took the time to go to Saskatoon and took the time to hold meetings and talk to people about these issues. I think that was a valuable process and helpful.

I have found it frustrating that so much of this has been focussed on the treaty land

entitlement process, although nobody seems to want to use the word.

(3:58)

I think the other parts of the document have been kind of lost in some of the media discussion.
I think the important thing is, is what we're bringing forward today is historic. It is important all of it. The treaty land entitlement is an important piece of it too. It's not the whole thing that we're bringing forward and that sometimes it's gotten lost and that's unfortunate.

We've been a city without a policy. No other cities in Canada have one either have an Aboriginal strategy as a city. We also have an accessibility policy. The point is we're Winnipeg and we like to do things well and we like to be a city that cares and we like to be a city that is for all the people of the City. That's what this is about today. It's a first step.

I'm also a little frustrated by this calling for delay, delay delay. That always seems to be the call of the opposition councillors, let's delay it. How about let's take a first step and get started. For God sake it's been delayed long enough. We've had commissions, we've had the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry. We've had studied for years and years and years. We've got recommendations, we've got reports stacked on shelves everywhere. I think people are ready to see something a little more tangible. I think the fact that this is called the First Steps in Municipal Aboriginal Pathway we're talking about. What can we do as a city?

Yes we need partnerships. Yes we need to work with all the levels of government. But what we can we do and let's stand up and take some leadership and say, here's what we're going to do. And we're going to go out and with those partnerships we're going to make these things happen and with the community.

I would briefly comment on the treaty land entitlement process. For God sakes they're treaties, how can you argue with that. If you don't think we should keep them, you want to give the land back. Give Winnipeg back and we'll go back to Europe. It's silly, it's absolutely ridiculous that we're even debating it frankly.

All we're saying is that we're going to do our part in the process that's there, that's fair and that is agreed on by everybody. I just don't get it why it's so scary to people.
The information is there. Yes it's a complicated process, it's complicated for the Aboriginal people to negotiate as well as our side. It's a difficult bureaucratic process. But it's a fair process and it's there for a reason.

These things are going to come forward, when I talk about action. It's a policy paper so we say these are the things we're committed to do. These are areas we want we're going to act in. But we also get into somewhat this is how we're going to do it. Those things will come forward in action plans over the next few years. It's very important that council doesn't delay and doesn't give the impression that we're not committed to this today.

The public meeting at R.B. Russell I just wanted to say, we were there for six or eight hours, and it was an amazing feeling in that room. I wish Councillor Smith was there and Vandal and the Mayor and myself, I wish more of you had been there. I know you've been to other meetings and so on. It was really an uplifting experience. I think it's the beginning of things to come in terms of the public consultation we're going to be doing on this going forward.

We are a very accessible government. We are talking to the people and we're partnering with the people. I think it's very exciting, I'm proud to be part it, I'm proud of the work of Vandal and others in this council. I hope we will all support this unanimously. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: You ready to close debate on this clause? Councillor Lazarenko closing debate on your amendment. I have no other speakers on the list. Well get on the list if you want to speak councillors. Councillor Steek if you wish to speak now.

Before Councillor Steek speaks, are there any other councillors who wish to speak on the clause? Councillor Steek, Mayor Murray, anyone else?

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all let me say this. I'd like to thank Councillor Vandal and Councillor Gerbasi for bringing this document forward. When Councillor Vandal opened his commentary on it he said "this is a high level document in policy". And he's absolutely correct.

I have stated publicly that I believe there should have been a consultative process before this came to the floor of council. Mr. Speaker there was an initial meeting at R.B. Russell School, very well attended. The document actually was at that meeting prior to arriving at council. The document was actually out in the media before that.

It's understandable that people would be sceptical about the way it started to evolve.

I have no problem in saying that I did not know a great deal about TLE's like the vast majority of my constituents and I believe like so many people in Winnipeg.

That was the reason that Councillor De Smedt and I first met with Oscar Laflan and when I asked Mr. Laflan his take on it he said, what's your position here Steek, and I said well Councillor De Smedt and I are going to Saskatoon. He said to me, why wouldn't you be going to OCN? I have no problem in telling you that I said to him, what is that, I don't know.

I try to make any of the decisions I make on the floor of Council based on information and research. In order to make an intelligent decision here my assistant researched extensively, spent a great deal of time on the Government of Canada websites. Came to the conclusion that the benchmark was clearly in Saskatoon. Councillor De Smedt and I went to Saskatoon. We spent an extensive period of time there. We didn't go out with a media circus. We went with one idea in mind to learn. Frankly we learned a great deal.

We spent four hours with Mr. Lafond and as a result we brought him back here. We toured not only Muskeg Lake, we toured Whitecap which is not an urban reserve.

As has been mentioned by Councillor Gerbasi, the situations here are unique and distinct. In Saskatoon which is at the forefront of TLE's urban reserves. They have no policy. Every application that comes forward is case specific.

One of the wonderful things about the consultative process and the opportunity to talk to people in advance of a vote is to learn Mr. Speaker. We met with some of the extraordinary success stories there including Kosics Transport. One of the fascinating aspects of this was a young gentleman who started a trucking firm that employs a hundred people and frankly 75 of them are not from First Nations or the Aboriginal Community. Which are an economic engine.

(4:05)

What was most important though were the discussions with Mr. Lafond and he said, to us point blank, why are you negotiating this on the front page of the paper, and I don't think we can take responsibility for that. I think that there were some things that happened here without being specific that were needless.

There was no reason to be on the front page of the paper as he said particularly where there was no specific application coming forward.

We brought Mr. Lafond to Winnipeg and as has been indicated we ran a townhall meeting yesterday evening and was scant modest notification, 275 people came out.

The calls that came through to our office and the people that were in attendance came for one reason, information. And they have an entitlement to it.

Councillor Vandal had stated and I'm in agreement with him, he said we're

elected every four years and that's the referendum. I don't want to see a plebiscite or a referendum, I didn't want to see the Mayor dead. But the fact remains is that when you realize that referendum you're elected to act responsibly. To bring about a major document of this nature which Councillor Vandal has acknowledged without appropriate public consultation frankly is wrong. That's flawed.

Many of you have spoken to the fact that there will be additional public consultation. As Councillor Wyatt has noted from the public consultation yesterday we learned a lot. We learned First Nations can reverse the treaty status, no one else can.

There were a myriad of questions that I dare say I can ask that nobody around this chamber can answer. I would like to know. I hope Councillor Vandal will answer this in his closing remarks.

Why were we not given a case study showing the municipal taxation aspects, the Provincial and the Federal and I would argue that we need to know the other two levels of government because if we do something here that impacts on businesses here it isn't just a municipal issue it's how they're impacted overall.

The Mayor said in the seminar that I attended on no fewer than six occasions, this is a complex document. You bet it is. And knowing that, why didn't we take the additional time for consultation.

Mr. Lafond said something that I thought was absolutely critical. Some of you may or may not have heard the interview that he did with Charles Adler. Frankly I thought that Adler did an excellent job and I was tremendously impressed by what Mr. Lafond had to say. You know what he said? The key to this issue and its success will be leadership.

When we attended the meetings that we set up in the afternoon we had no problem on short notice getting thirty plus leaders from the First Nations, Aboriginal, Métis communities to come out and discuss it, along with 12 leading members of the business community. The exchange was fair, it was frank, it was open. It could have been done here in advance.

Mr. Lafond reiterated at that time, why are you negotiating this on the front pages of the papers. Now unlike the Mayor I wasn't as knowledgeable and I had to go to Saskatoon.

Some of the other interesting things that evolved from the consultative process today, I was very impressed by the young gentleman that came forward here from Community Services and said, were you aware that we've had nine or ten people trained in a specific program here in the City. No I didn't know that. Councillor De Smedt and I went to Saskatoon with an open mind.

People were concerned in the community because they did not have information. They have an entitlement to that information.

When we were in our meetings yesterday, one of the things that came forward totally unsolicited and it was in a room with 45 people, was the fact that yes, although the process may be arduous one of the Bands has made application relative to the Kapyong Barracks property. And we were told that, there was nothing clandestine about it. We were told that. That was the importance of consultation.

We were also told by Mr. Lafond, and I guess this is why I have trouble with the idea of moving this thing with such rapidity. Mr. Lafond, said in the public meeting last night that even the most perfect document would take a minimum eighteen if not 24 months to get through. We heard about the timeframe here. But the fact was that this document and a slide show was prepared back in May. It's dated May 29. Why didn't it come forward earlier? It came forward two weeks ago and it had to be on council on the 24 and it had to be approved.

I believe that there is a potential within the First Nations, the Aboriginal and the Métis community that is without parallel in this city. We know we have 60,000 to 70,000 members in this community and it will be

over $100,000. This policy is totally appropriate. So much in it is laudable.

I want to emphasize one thing though and I think this is absolutely critical. The document that is in front of us and I'm supporting it because of the amendments brought forward by Councillor Lazarenko, seconded by Councillor Vandal, and I think there's a safeguard in it. But bear one thing in mind. This city is obligated to listen. This city is not obligated to sign on to an agreement that's not to its benefit as well as that of the First Nations. That is clear cut. And to support that Mr. Speaker, and I'm asking for a minute on this because I think it's important, is the fact that right now in Saskatoon two of the applications relative to Aboriginal reserves aren't going forward because the Province is not there on education taxes.

Furthermore we know that there wasn't support for casinos so let's not get left with the impression that everything that comes to the table passes, it doesn't.

Finally, I think most people, you know what you give the Mayor and other people latitude, 30 seconds will tie this up.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would suggest one thing. The issue of leadership was absolutely critical here.

Point of Order

Deputy Mayor Thomas: This is the third time that the representative from River Heights has gone over his time limit and keeps asking for latitude that he's not willing to give others, and I object to him being allowed this additional time.

Councillor Steek: I have never denied anybody the opportunity to speak longer.

I think something that would be of immense benefit to the First Nations Community, Winnipeg as a whole. Mr. Lafond was asked the other day (inaudible) he said no. Mr. Speaker my comment is, I would urge this community to speak with Mr. Lafond when they bring forward an application. Thank you.

Mayor Murray: Thank you. For many of us this is not a new issue.

(4:15)

When I was elected in 1998 I made a public commitment when I ran for Mayor that my first week in office, the first group of people that I would meet with were representatives of the First Nations community, Métis, and the other Indigenous people who often didn't get into the Mayor's Office. I heard a lot about treaty land entitlement and many other things and urban reserves.

I talked to my friend who was the Mayor of Saskatoon, and was succeeded by a very fine fellow named Jim Madden who's the current mayor I think who many of you have met talking about this. Bill Smith the Mayor of Edmonton. Pat Fiaco the Mayor of Regina have been working in trying to engage the Government of Canada along the lines that Councillor De Smedt is suggesting. I became very familiar with treaty land entitlement.

Before I get into that because it does deserve some very brief comment. I want to really commend Councillor Vandal for an incredible level of mature leadership, inclusion and I'm very proud to call him a colleague and a friend, and have been very impressed. When people have talked about the kind of leadership that's required to deliver a transformation in the relationship between First Nations and Métis people and the rest of us, I can't think of too many people who are more qualified to do it than our friend Councillor Vandal.

I also want to acknowledge the very hard work that Councillor Gerbasi did. I was very honoured to be the tag along member of their team. She's worked tirelessly on this. I think her work on the accessibility policy which was another Canadian first, this will be a Canadian first that when we pass it today gave her a great sensitivity for what it means to include people who are not normally included in the process and mechanics of city government who often see us as trespass.

This is an integration of many old commitments that many of us have promised as a city government. Things that make sense to do. Words that were not honoured in the past. This is a fulfillment of commitments that were neglected and forgotten.

It is about so much more, it's about so many things but what it is really about is ensuring that the next generation of Winnipeggers and the next generation of young First Nations and Métis people grow up with a very different world than the ones that their fathers and their mothers and their grandparents grew up with.

It surprised me not one iota that the treaty land entitlement became the controversy. It has five times before. The private conversations I've had with people who have come to my office over the years with different proposals. Created a huge amount of anxiety about the divisiveness of what putting your basic property rights to a referendum mean.

As I sat through six hours quite willingly listening to the pains and the disappointments of people, their hopes, both First Nations Métis people and other Winnipeggers who care about this issue, who want a new partnership, who want things to be different.

There were not a lot of politicians there. John Loewen was actually there the member of the opposition of the Legislature and Harvey Smith. This was a very well publicized meeting, it was on the front page of the paper, it did mean giving up a Saturday. There was huge leadership from the First Nations Community and from the Métis Community, from the urban Aboriginal community from groups like Urban Futures. There were over 300 people there. And that was a very good consultation. I think to characterize what Councillor Vandal and Councillor Gerbasi led is not being consultative. I'm not sure that there's that many times in the history of the City of Winnipeg where politicians have sat and listened for six hours where we had staff who wrote down absolutely everything that was said. And initial changes were made to the document.

It also surprised me about how many commitments were taken out of context, and how words play very differently across two solitudes that unfortunately still exist.

I would like us all to pay attention to Councillor Vandal and Councillor Gerbasi's words, where they say highlighted boldly in the document. The City of Winnipeg will develop an outreach and education initiative that promotes cross-cultural understanding and improve access to information about civic services.

The first strategy in that is ongoing public consultations. On the municipal service agreement what we're committing to do today is to work with our First Nations partners to develop a framework that we can all support and allows for a meaningful investment in our economy by the wealth of the people who came here before us.

It also means respecting that process, and I commend Councillor De Smedt and Councillor Steek for their initiatives. I'm very familiar with the situation in Saskatoon and very familiar with some of the proposals that have gone other places.

I also realized in that one of the things that I learned were two things. One, I'm a treaty people. Most Winnipeggers have come from immigrants, hard working people who came here not speaking English dreaming that this country could be something so extraordinary. A personal freedom that they didn't have. And people have used words like and I'm not the only one tyranny of the majority, what does that mean? It means when people deny Chinese people under the Chinese Exclusion Act the right to vote. It means when I was born First Nations people had no right to vote, and John Diefenbaker changed that when I was about six years old. It's not a frivolous comment, it's not saying that the majority's will doesn't dominate in a democracy but that's what it means and

it's a powerful statement. If you were my age, if I was a First Nations person I would have been born in this country without such a fundamental right as that. That's not a level playing field.

What's the tyranny of the minority? It's the FLQ not respecting the long tradition of democratic resolutions. It's Osama Bin Ladan or Timothy McVeigh blowing up buildings when democratic institutions don't suit them. It's extremely serious. It's what happens when people's democratic rights aren't respected. When one group is thrown into poverty and no longer believes that there is proper resolution through democratic institutions. Maybe because I grew up in Quebec and the October crisis in 1970, I've seen how fragile our democratic institutions can be. When they are systemically ignored and peoples rights are truncated, people are left with few choices.

We're not talking about light things. We're not talking about whether or not we have a plebiscite on something. We're not talking about a rezoning here. We're talking about the stuff that I spoke about here on September 11.

I hope that's clear to people because that for me is very heartfelt and something that I believe quite passionately.

What about the other comment that people have made veiled? Veiled remarks about. Let me put that on the table in context because when I said it over 300 Aboriginal and non Aboriginal people applauded very strongly. What is this about? People should know about this. We're professionals, we're politicians. This is a government document, 1997, the treaty land entitlement agreement. Len Strijack our lawyers briefing on our responsibilities under TLE's. All of this went through a public process when we were all of majority age and it's a very fundamental document to our relationships with the Government of Canada.

We are going to respect these documents, that was the foundation of what I said, that a treaty is an agreement between two nations that's honoured. Whether it's the Kyoto Protocol or whether it's treaty one they're agreements between nations. And they have clear application. There is a detailed process. There's no mystery. Through this entire debate the Federal and Provincial Governments could at any time explained this process. There are few questions that go under answered. I gave the same speech that I gave at R.B. Russell on National Aboriginal Day a few months ago.

The point I was making was very simple. We will not subject any Winnipegger. If Arnie Thorsinson comes down that has a development agreement and a rezoning that's the deal, you vote on it, there's democratic public hearings, it's over, that's Mr. Thorsinson, Shelter Corporations property rights, whether it's Shindico or Harvey Smith or Mike Pagtakhan trying to get a deck extension, those are rights. There's laws that are not discretionary. Treaty law is pretty clear. This process is pretty clear. That's not for us even if we disagree with it and I don't disagree with it.

(4:25)

First Nations people in coming into agreements have to come up with a municipal service agreement. One layer of agreement that no one else has to go through which has certain additional rights which are equitable as many people saw in Saskatoon. Then they are layered over with all of the other public hearings and applications, they have to have a vote here. Very democratic. If anything First Nations people already have additional layers of public accountability which is the great irony of this.

I also saw what happened in Brandon. I've seen what's happened in four other communities, and I said to my friend Dan Vandal, someone is going to have to take the bullet on this one to stand up and say it. Because we're going to compete for this investment when a First Nations community gets a $50 million cheque. They don't have to spend it in Manitoba. They can go to Saskatoon or Calgary to economically booming economies and make their investments there because

their primary concern is lifting for the First Nations leader lifting people out of poverty and getting the independence that was owed them 137 years ago when we started exercising our treaty rights to build dams, schools to farm the land. We just didn't come in and win a war, it was a respectful treaty signed in peace. It's been long overdue in the honouring.

I think that it took a strong set of words from the Mayor of this city to First Nations people to break down over a century of distress, because I'm just another white guy with a promise. After 137 years of saying the cheque is in the mail, excuse a few people for not taking that seriously. I know it rebounded not as positively because it was somewhat manipulated by some people who had other agendas.

I had a commitment I made when I received this. There's a certain tradition and honour that needs to be respected. I just wanted to conclude by making a commitment to my friends Dan Vandal and Jenny Gerbasi and all my friends here in the audience and others who have been involved in it that I will honour this, and I will honour that eagle feather. I will honour on behalf of the citizens of the City this commitment. And I do turn over the leadership of this to my friends to Dan and Jenny who I think will serve us well. I want to thank all of you who did go out and try and get the input from your constituents and did it so well. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any further debate on the clause and the amendment? Councillor Lazarenko closing debate on the amendment.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you. I would just like to emphasize a bit on the motion that I had moved seconded by Councillor Vandal. I think that this amendment should give this decision and a vote here today on the clause that's before us.

This is the first steps that we're going to be taking. It may take one or two years. This is not final but at least now we have a mechanism in place or will be in place that the Administration be requested to report to the Executive Policy Committee with further recommendations and for final approval by Council. That is so important because I know some members of Council felt relieved to have this motion here which we'll be voting on.

I would just like to emphasize just for a brief moment Mr. Speaker what is happening in other parts of the country.

As you know the Federal Government's recent termination of full reimbursement of provinces for social assistance payments to offer reserves status Indians has gone bad. Offloading by the Federal Government has already cost Saskatchewan hundreds of millions of dollars. To give an example. The Federal Government at one time has offloaded $3.5 billion and to be followed by a further $2.5 billion. It's a total of $6 billion. The Federal Government are not carrying out their commitment and it's offloading to the Province. The Province may take a look and say, the City has got a responsibility also.

It's the one thing Mr. Speaker that something during the deliberation and the discussions, this in itself both parties will be able to take into consideration and ask those questions and try to get the answers for it.

Mr. Speaker I will close and I welcome all the discussions. We had a very good discussion here today for the past few hours dealing with this very important matter that's before us. I hope that Council will vote on Motion No. 1 unanimously also with the clause.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal closing on the main motion.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker I want to applaud Councillors De Smedt and Steek not only for going to Saskatoon last week but for also bringing Lester Lafond into the City last night and holding the public meeting. I believe that Mr. Lafond was instrumental in demystifying a lot of the controversy which was attempted to be manufactured by some of the media outlets on TLE's. I think he's gone a long way to making sure that we are for the

most part all on the same page with treaty land entitlements.

I also want to thank Councillor Smith, Councillor Pagtakhan for taking the time going to Saskatoon and Harvey coming to the September 6 public open house. I know the communities that you represent are going to be greatly impacted by the report that we have in front of us.

I want to thank Councillor Wyatt for his strong and thoughtful comments on the history of this issue in our city. I'm sure that Councillor Wyatt and his constituents have a very important role to play in bridging the cross cultural gap which currently exists.

The treaty land entitlement process was signed, the framework was signed in 1997. In 1997 by then Minister David Newman and the Federal Government, and it's important to note that every province in our country has a framework agreement which basically sets out the rules on how treaty land entitlements are going to be negotiated.

We have our interests covered in the map document, and rest assured that when a real treaty land entitlement application comes forward, it will end up on the floor of this council for a vote. I can only hope that if this process has served any purpose relative to the TLE issue in the last several weeks, is that I hope that when we get a real live TLE application come forward to the City of Winnipeg that that individual First Nation will not suffer the ignorance, the insensitivity that was demonstrated towards this issue by many people in our city. If people simply do not want to recognize that intolerance and racism exists in our city, I would like to share you some e-mails and some phone messages that I've archived on my phone.

I want to thank Mayor Murray for his courageous, bold and unwavering leadership on this issue. In the face of insults and in the face of ridicule. You've mentioned that a couple of plebiscites which have occurred in the City in the Province of Manitoba on very important issues that basically were all for not I think because of lack of leadership at the top, and you have certainly demonstrated in the face of insults, ridicule and all sorts of other unpleasantries that you're unwavering in this and I think that will pay off in the long run. I want to thank Councillor Gerbasi for the energy and the time she's put into this.

(4:30)

And the rest of City Council for your support.

Administratively I'd like to thank James Allum who penned the majority of the report. And a special thanks to Lorraine Desjarlais for her heart and her soul that she has demonstrated.

This is a first step. There will be many many more steps in implementing the policy which we are adopting I hope unanimously this afternoon. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: We vote first on the amendment moved by Councillor Lazarenko, seconded by Councillor Vandal. All in favour of the amendment? Contrary? Carried.

On the clause as amended all in favour? Contrary? Carried as amended. It's shown as unanimous.

Clause 3.

Item No. 3 – Public Art Policy
File FG-1

Mayor Murray: I know this is going to be a let down but I'll move the now much read public art policy.

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

Clause 4.

Item No. 4 – Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra Funding
File FG-1.1 (W)

Mayor Murray: I would just move this. It's $165,000 next year and $75,000 the year after. This is our very modest partnership with the Province in the

saving the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra.

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

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Vandal,

WHEREAS on February 26, 2003 Council referred a motion to the Executive Policy Committee which requested City Council to consider the re-establishment of the Winnipeg Police Commission;
AND WHEREAS on March 5, 2003, the Executive Policy Committee referred the motion to the Chief Administrative Officer for report back;

AND WHEREAS on May 28, 2003, Council granted an extension of time of 60 days for the Executive Policy Committee to report back to Council;

AND WHEREAS in accordance with Rule 16.4 of the Procedure By-law, any motion which is automatically or otherwise referred to a Committee, shall be reported on, in writing, within 60 days unless Council grants some other period of time in which to report;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council grant a further extension of time of 120 days for the Executive Policy Committee to report back to Council with their recommendation relative to the re-establishment of the Winnipeg Police Commission.

We have motions. Motion No. 2 moved by Councillor Gerbasi seconded by Councillor Vandal. Extension of time. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motion No. 3
Moved by His Worship Mayor Murray,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS the Board of Directors of CentreVenture Development Corporation on June 24, 2003 met and approved recommendations for term renewals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council approve the following term renewals to the Board of CentreVenture:

Mr. John Hodgert – Term renewal for 1 year until June 30, 2004;
Mr. Jim Burns – Term renewal for 3 years until June 30, 2006;
Mrs. Ginny Devine – Term renewal for 3 years until June 30, 2006

Motion No. 3, moved by Mayor Murray, seconded by myself, the appointment of CentreVenture Board. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

By-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Murray: I'll move that By-law No. 830/2002 be read a third time, and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Mayor Murray: I would move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 138/2003 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 138/2003.

Mayor Murray: I'll move that By-law No. 138/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 138/2003.

Mayor Murray: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 138/2003 be read a third time, and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question Period. None. Move to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection

and Community Services of September 8, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED SEPTEMBER 8, 2003

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll move items 1 to 5 as consent.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: If I may raise a point of order. I'd like to be recorded against 1, 2 and 3.

On the report, 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 third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Councillors Steek and Wyatt.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 139/2003 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 139/2003.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that By-law No. 139/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 139/2003.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 139/2003 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question period. None.

Committee on Public Works. Councillor Angus.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2003

Councillor Angus: I'll move the report in its entirety.
Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Question period. None.

Standing Policy Committee on Fiscal Issues. Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2003

Councillor Clement: I'll move the report of September 9, 2003.

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

On the addendum, Fiscal Issues By-laws.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 140/2003 be read a first time.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.
Clerk: By-law No. 140/2003.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 140/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 140/2003.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 140/2003, be read a third time, and the same be passed, and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions. Councillor Steek.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair of Fiscal Issues.

In view of the fact that we removed $500,000 from one of our reserves, my question to the Chair of Fiscal Issues is back to the question I asked earlier and I yet have received information on, namely where is the administrative report citing when reserves are ample? In other words, are they tied to 10%, 12%. If the Chair wants to take it under advisement but ensure that we finally get a report back, that would be appreciated.

Councillor Clement: First of all this particular reserve that was just cited here is the balance of the money we got from the pension fund overpayment, and the $500,000 was actually interest that was accrued on that account.

The other information as far as I'm aware is on our financial management plan that this council passed. If there's something that's not there I'd be happy to try and find it.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Supplementary Councillor Steek? No. Any other questions? None.

Property and Development Committee Report of July 10, Councillor Vandal.

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

Councillor Vandal: I will move that this be laid over for another 30 days.

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

Report of September 4, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
SEPTEMBER 4, 2003

Councillor Vandal: I'll move Items 1 through 29 as consent.
Councillor Gerbasi: Nine and 13 have to be done separately, or can they be as consent.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: I'm advised by the Clerk they can be in the consent agenda, but I want to be clear, did somebody want clauses removed from the consent?

8 and 9. Any other clauses?

The balance of the Report of September 4, 2003, approved. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 8.

(4:40)

Item No. 8 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 1847 Grant Avenue
File DASZ 13/2003

Councillor Vandal: Clause 8 is an issue that was denied at community committee. It was overturned at Planning Committee and at the Executive Committee. That the recommendation before us today is the recommendation of Executive Committee to approve the subdivision and rezoning of the commercial development at 1847 Grant Avenue.

I'll wait to hear comment.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steek you wish to speak to Clause 8.

Councillor Steek: Actually Mr. Speaker I will speak to them both because they happen to be bookend issues. One on Academy Road and one on Grant Avenue.

I've actually brought them forward because I'm hoping to hear from Councillor Gerbasi who had certainly voted against it at community committee but had this thing held up at EPC pending an administrative report. Frankly the administrative report supporting these rezonings was completed in the first week of August. All I had to do was pick up the telephone to find that out. I'm wondering why it was stood down.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi on Clause 8.

Councillor Gerbasi: There's a number of issues that relate to this matter that will be dealt with In Camera at the Property Committee, so it's inappropriate to get into debate about other matters at this time.

I myself will not be supporting Clause 8 and 9 and I'd like to be recorded in opposition. Other issues related to this area can be dealt with later on. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: On Clause 8.

Councillor Steeves: I, too, will not be supporting Items 8 and 9, and would like to be recorded in opposition.

The reasons for my non support were that I was hoping to address some of these issues pursuant to some items that have arisen at my last environment committee meeting. I was bird dogging this and it came to the floor fairly late in the day, and there is an In Camera item that I obviously cannot comment on. I would simply like to be recorded in opposition.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith on Clause 8.

Councillor Smith: I'd like to be recorded in opposition as well.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any further debate on Clause 8? Mayor Murray.

Mayor Murray: Part of the problem here and it's a significant one, if you're going to decide not to do something, then you have to decide what you're going to do.

This was originally and had been in Plan Winnipeg a rapid transit corridor. It was put there because it was a rail line which was a pretty heavy transportation use. What was going to be a fairly narrow bus right-of-way was removed from the plan based on concerns by councillors from that community, and that's an understandable and fair process that went through proper process, we decided to remove that.

Transit has been looking for an alternative route as part of the master transportation plan with streets. They haven't landed on one yet. There is a CPR line a couple of blocks away that has a much wider right-of-way. That was the subject of discussion. Then there was a proposal that this become a housing subdivision and that went through a process and failed. It wasn't going to be housing.

Then Harry Finnigan and previous to him coming, it was bouncing in negotiations between the City and CN. There's an attempt to come to a master land transfer agreement with the potential that this could be transferred for some other purpose.

There's some assessment that is being done to look at the amount of greenspace in that area potentially attracts for park and other things.

When this came to EPC a week ago or so, there was quite a large discussion because we knew there was a report imminent. There was also a great deal of feeling to be mindful of the time involved that we wanted to make sure that this report wasn't going to conflict with the rezonings. It was laid over until yesterday, I unfortunately couldn't attend the meeting, so that there would be no injury to the proponents of the rezoning but we could make sure that the plan was sync with the rezoning. That we weren't

rezoning a property and then would cut off a future recreational trail proposal or a number of other things.

A presentation was made In Camera because there's other property matters involved. I think most of Executive Committee was satisfied that there was nothing being precluded here, and I think that was a thoughtful process and a prudent process. There was an agreement by most, certainly one I've been supportive of to bring this forward, to pass it, we're not closing off future options. And clearly out of concerns from the City Centre councillors and I know Councillor Steek you've raised this issue as well, that we've asked the Administration to continue their research to look at parks, recreation, transportation uses on this land and on other rail lands in the area. I'm hoping and I'll say this because councillors often say, well things come at the last minute.

Everyone now on council knows this is going on. Mr. Finnigan has said that he would welcome input from councillors and to meet with any of them. If people have suggestions about this they should go to their standing committee, if they don't want to go directly to the Director and raise that.

I think we are now in a process to resolve that. I think there's generally an understanding now on the basis on which rezonings can proceed. Mr. Finnigan is taking a very active role with Canadian National as you know we have the Fort Rouge Yards and many others in Transcona, Archibald and other lands which are now of importance transportation projects, road, transit and others and parks.

What I would like to do with the consent of Council, is we try to do a master agreement with CN and all these properties, look at what we want, what they don't and see what we can do in the swap business if I can sort of put it that way. It's not very professional land use planning but I think you know what I mean.

I would be very happy and I'm going to make this offer Mr. Speaker to open my door to any member of Council who has concerns about these particular properties, whether it's the Fort Rouge Yards or has some particular interest in it on the record in Hansard, please make an appointment with me. I have a personal interest in this because I think this is a significant impact to a lot of our residents on how these lands are disposed of. I don't think we should be holding up valuable investments in our communities, but I don't think we should be precipitous either and compromise some future transportation parks and other planning needs. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any further debate on clause 8? Just before I call the question, I believe there were three councillors who wished to be recorded in opposition. Councillors Gerbasi, Smith and Steeves. Are there any others? All in favour of the clause? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 9 Councillor Vandal.

Item No. 9 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 624 Academy Road File DASZ 14/2003

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any discussion on Item 9? All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Same three in opposition.

By-laws.

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

Councillor Vandal: I'll move the following by-laws be read a first time, by-laws numbered 127/2003, 128/2003, 129/2003, 130/2003, 131/2003, 132/2003, 133/2003, 134/2003, 135/2003, 136/2003 and 137/2003.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 127/2003, 128/2003, 129/2003, 130/2003, 131/2003,

132/2003, 133/2003, 134/2003, 135/2003, 136/2003 and 137/2003.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that by-laws numbered 127/2003 to 137/2003, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.
Clerk: By-laws numbered 127/2003 to 137/2003, both inclusive.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 127/2003 to 137/2003, both inclusive, be read a third time, and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Questions? Councillor Steek.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steek: Mr. Speaker through you to the Chair of Property.

(4:50)

Two and a half years ago this council passed a clause wherein the MarWest Corporation would get a five year extension on their lease on 395 Main Street. Everything has been completed for two years and four months. They have requested on no fewer than six times in writing, the extension document.

Will the Chair undertake to find out why they have never received it?

Councillor Vandal: I will absolutely do so and share it with Council.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Any further questions? None. Councillor Lubosch moves adjournment. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 4:55 P.M.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday September 24, 2003
CONTENTS

ROLL CALL 531

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS 531

MINUTES 531

DELEGATIONS 531
Mr. Sam Katz 531
Mr. David Wolinsky 535
Ms Shelly Wiseman 536
Mr. Nick Ternette 541
Ms Gerry Grayeyes 544
Ms Adrienne Batra 545
Ms Kerry Ward 549
Mr. Larry Wucherer 550
Mr. Christian Sinclair 551
Mr. Chris Henderson 553

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 3, 2003 554

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2003 554

Item No. 1 – CanWest Stadium Various Tenant Requests – File FR-4.1 554

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2003 566

Item No. 1 – The New Deal Initiative –File FR-2 566

Item No. 2 – First Steps: Municipal Aboriginal Pathways – File CR-4.1 589

Motion No. 1 591

Item No. 3 – Public Art Policy – File FG-1 606

Item No. 4 – Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra Funding – File FG-1.1 (W) 606

Motion No. 2 606

Motion No. 3 607

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 607

By-law No. 830/2002 607

By-law No. 138/2003 607

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED SEPTEMBER 8, 2003 607

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 607

By-law No. 126/2003 607
By-law No. 139/2003 607

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2003 608

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2003 608

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 608

By-law No. 140/2003 608

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES QUESTION PERIOD 609

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JULY 10, 2003 609

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 4, 2003 609

Item No. 8 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 1847 Grant Avenue – File DASZ 13/2003- 609

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday September 24, 2003
CONTENTS

Item No. 9 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 624 Academy Road – File DASZ 14/2003- 611

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS..... 611

By-laws numbered 127/2003, 128/2003, 129/2003, 130/2003, 131/2003, 132/2003, 133/2003, 134/2003, 135/2003, 136/2003 and 137/2003 611

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD 612

ROLL CALL 612