COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday December 17, 2003

The Council met at 9:36 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, firstly I would like to say a prayer for my sister who is seriously ill in the hospital due to a fire in her home on November 24, 2003. At that time she had a survival of 5% chance of living, as of today nothing has changed much. My prayers go with you and may God speed your recovery.

I'd also like to ask God to help the doctors, the nurses and staff at the Health Sciences Centre Burn Unit in their efforts to try and save her life.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Lazarenko.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have a Page with us. We have Brittany Perija from Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute who resides in the Old Kildonan Ward. Welcome.

We have some very special guests with us today and I would ask Councillor Lazarenko if he would come to the podium to introduce them to us.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It gives me great privilege and honour to be standing before Council today to welcome the Ukrainian delegation. Also with a present that they had given me last Tuesday evening, this is called a mace is the sign of authority.

Long time ago when Ukraine had the civil wars they use to use this to see who was the better person. You get one hit with this and I'll tell you your argument is all over. This will be donated to you Mr. Mayor to hang it up somewhere here. First you'll be able to use it here today. In case you may need it.

I would also like to ask to assist me is Andriy Mudrievsky, the translator and interpreter to introduce the delegation from Ukraine.

Mr. Andriy Mudrievsky: Good morning everybody. I would like to introduce to you the members of the Ukrainian delegation today. We have Mr. Igor Sokolov. Mr. Sokolov is the President of the Ukrainian Construction Company, International Construction Company Ukraine Canada.

Mr. Vitaliy Rybalko, is the Director of the Ukraine Construction Company, "Dneprecentrstory".

We have another Igor Sokolov. Igor Sokolov is a Chief Architect of the Dnepropetrovsk Region.

We have Ivan Kaminsky. He is the Mayor of a town of Yuvileyniy.

We have Vitaliy Sereda. He is the Director of the Construction Company, International Construction Company, Ukraine Canada.

We have Ivan Pereginets. He is the General Director of the International Construction Company, Ukraine Canada.

We have Mr. John Birch, who is also one of the directors of the International Construction Company, Ukraine Canada.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Andriy. I want to thank you. I was representing you on Tuesday and I did make a commitment on your behalf to help the organization because they'll be building around one thousand homes in Ukraine that will be energy efficient, economically viable. We have and I've spoken also to Annitta Stenning our Chief Administrative Officer, and any information they may need from our department from particularly the Planning Department they will ask for that

information and I've said that we will be able to provide them with whatever we can.

The delegation is here, and with this.

(Ukrainian being spoken)

With that Mr. Mayor while you're still here. This is for you from the delegation from Ukraine. That is a sign of authority.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

MINUTES

Councillor Lubosch moves the Minutes of the meeting held on November 26, 2003 be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

We have one delegation this morning. Cindy Sciberras on behalf of Heritage Winnipeg, in opposition to Item 14 of the Report of Property and Development, dated December 2, 2003 regarding the listing of the Cadomin Building, 280 Main Street.

DELEGATIONS

Ms Cindy Sciberras: Good morning. Thank you for taking a brief moment this morning to listen to me.

I'm here as Executive Director speaking on behalf of 21 board of directors of Heritage Winnipeg. I'm here to hopefully appeal to your judgement with the Cadomin Building as far as the recommendation from the Property and Development Committee on November 26, not to designate the building as a Grade III.

Just to go over very quickly. The Historical Buildings Committee, their recommendations back in July to designate this building as a Grade III is because of its age it's put into its age. It's a 1912 building, but more importantly the prominent architect John Atchison. We recognize, Heritage Winnipeg recognizes the worth of this building, it is of moderate historical value, it's not a landmark building. But nonetheless it as indicated in the report bridges the Victorian Style heritage south on Main Street between the towers on Portage and Main.

It's an infill building but we feel as an organization and we've sort of been engaged in the community the last week or so. We haven't had a lot of time unfortunately to talk about this building.

We think it sends a strong signal out to the community that City Hall should be making a concerted effort first to work with the building owners, Heritage Winnipeg would be willing to do that with designation, would bring the incentive for heritage grants, heritage tax credits. We spoke with the owner and quite frankly they do not want the building demolished. Their hopes are the building if it's purchased by a potential owner will be renovated. The significant architecture on the upper floor on the exterior Grade III building designation is not a death sentence. What it will do is just make the building owner whomever purchases the building cognizant of alterations on the exterior that go through the Design Board at the Historical Buildings Committee, but there's free reign virtually inside the interior.

There's adjacent parking on Main Street. There's another option for the owners to potentially lease the building. But ultimately we think the Grade III listing would help the new owner in applying for tax credits and grants that are available. The unfortunate part is we are cognizant as an organization of some of the maintenance problems with the building. There's leakage with the roof. There's some heating problems. There is monies that will have to be spent in the building, but that's also an incentive for the organization to work with other levels of government to start putting some money into buildings on a regular basis so that a lot of the heritage stock within the Exchange and outside becomes a problem where there's a lot of repairs because they're not maintained.

The owner would like to see the building saved. She feels unfortunately that the designation at Grade III level is a deterrent to sell it, because ultimately if a buyer would like to purchase the building

and use the land instead of actually renovating the building to build new, she feels the designation is a deterrent. But as an organization we feel we can work with the potential building owner to see that that building can be reused and recycled. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Would you permit a question?

Ms Sciberras: Sure.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Are we talking about the original owner that appeared in delegation in front of the committee earlier this year?

You're talking about a particular owner of this building. Is there a new owner or is it the same owner that appeared in delegation in opposition to having it listed?

Ms Sciberras: Well I spoke with a member from the Wilson Family, and I know this past summer the only thing we're cognizant of is this past summer there was a potential deal going through which was subject to the building coming down. Unfortunately it fell apart. But the building owner, I don't know what happened last year but I know they only applied for the demolition permit then revoked it because the deal fell through. The demolition permit was applied for specific to that real estate transaction going through this past summer.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Just for clarification. Are you representing the Historical Society, or are you representing the owner?

Ms Sciberras: Heritage Winnipeg is a non-profit charitable organization mandated for the preservation of the built environment. I'm representing as the Executive Director the decision by our board of directors. I'm not here on behalf of the owner. I conferred with the owner but I'm not here on their behalf. I'm just reiterating recommendations from the Historical Buildings Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the delegation. Ms Sciberras, you spoke to the need for reparation relative to the mechanical and also structural elements of the building. Are you aware of what the potential expenditures would be to bring that building up to code and to put it into a fashion where it would be beneficial for somebody to come in and take it over?

Ms Sciberras: I spoke with one of the owners, we didn't have an actual figure from the owner. Unfortunately we didn't have a lot of time to go over a lot of the specific elements. I know that they are modest repairs. I don't believe they're structural. I think some of them are to do with the heating system. She wanted to make me aware there's some type of leakage on the roof. But as far as I am aware of to date the building is structurally sound.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental.

Councillor Steek: This is somewhat puzzling about having Heritage Winnipeg here today in view of the very modest nature of this building and you acknowledge it's only level III.

In view of the fact that the owners wanted demolition to be realized for new construction earlier on, what would make you think that it would be advantageous to save that as a building if we had the opportunity to bring something that's new and would enhance the assessment base dramatically more so than trying to retain the building that's at best, okay?

Ms Sciberras: I think it has immense historical significance even though it's only being given a Grade III and I think there should be a concerted effort to try and reuse the building and put some of that money that ultimately could be used for the cost of demolition into renovation and to send a signal to the community at large who we've conferred with not at length, time didn't allow us to, but most

feel there should be a concerted effort and that designation is not a death sentence to try and sell the building and to renovate. And given the good parking and the close proximity to the Forks, we still think there's enough historical significance for the building to be saved.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. One of the things that have been raised is that one particular owner what they want or don't want about designation.

I guess my question is. Do you think we should make these decisions based on the concerns of one individual property owner and their preferences, or should we base it on the heritage value of a building that's lost forever if we made a decision to take it down? Should we not look at the needs of the overall community or should we look at whether the person who owns it is a nice person and ought to do what they want to do with it?

Ms Sciberras: Absolutely. I think Heritage Winnipeg takes what the Historical Buildings Committee does one step further. We look at the value of the historical significance of the building but we also debate the economic viability. I think you're right, I think that we should be making a decision as what's best for the community at large with some long term vision instead of looking at each building and saying, well let's tear it down because it's easier for the building owner.

We're not here to try and make it easier for the building owner, what we're looking for is trying to find some common ground to work with building owners and if there are flaws in the system which there are, there's not enough money, there's not enough incentives and that sends a strong signal to our organization that if heritage designation is a deterrent for people to buy these buildings, we've got a big problem. It should not be a deterrent, there should be incentives in place that are strong enough it should actually work in favour to have a building designated within the downtown.

Mr. Speaker: Move onto the Report of the Executive Policy Committee, dated December 3, 2003. The Mayor is having some health problems involving his voice or lack thereof, and asked Councillor Vandal to introduce it.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED DECEMBER 3, 2003

Councillor Vandal: I will move Items 1 to 5 as consent items.

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

Report "A" of December 10, 2003.

REPORT "A" OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED DECEMBER 10, 2003

Councillor Vandal: I will move Items 1 through 4 as consent items.

Mr. Speaker: Item 1. Items 2, 3, 4 as consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1.

**Item 1 – Budgetary Implications – The New Deal
File FR-2**

Councillor Vandal: This is in response to a motion that was tabled by Councillor Steek and Councillor Wyatt. It is here for information. I simply would like to hear the concerns of Councillor Steek and will sum up.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the comments of the Deputy Mayor stating that this is here for information purposes only. As a result I'll certainly be asking for some clarification on the information. I'm delighted to have the Deputy Mayor here. We rarely have the opportunity from hearing from anyone else on Executive Policy Committee about the new deal and about the significant expenditures that the taxpayers of Winnipeg have undergone.

Accordingly I would draw the Deputy Mayor's attention to Appendix B. I'll let him get a chance Mr. Speaker to have a look at that.

There are a couple of items here very significant concern. As we know the budget on this will be well in excess of $1.2 million by the time staffing costs have been factored in. We know from the report in front of us which is to the end of November 30 only, that half a million dollars has already been expended, $220,000 are committed and there remains $277,000 still in the City's coffers and that's exactly where those funds should stay.

I'd be interested in hearing from the Deputy Mayor, when you take a look at Appendix B under the line item "committed" we have a commitment of $71,000 for direct citizen engagement. What is that? We have internal and external communications for another $60,000. What is that? How much of it is internal? What is internal communications?

Finally I would draw your attention to the balances outstanding yet to be realized. I guess the major question on everything that's committed, do we have to go through with this expenditure?

Finally with reference to the balances though. I see we have an additional $13,000 committed for polling plus another $30,000 yet unexpended. The amazing thing was that when the polling results came in, we were told that there was resounding support for this deal. I'm just wondering where was the accuracy of that polling? I'd be interested to know if that's the same pollster.

Furthermore, I draw your attention to direct citizen engagement. $71,000 committed. For what? And $140,000 in abeyance. The totality of those numbers alone, $42,000 for polling, another quarter of a million dollars for direct citizen engagement, and the question begs to be asked what are we spending it for? The Mayor declared the new deal dead. We now know the son of the new deal is coming back. We have had millions of dollars of free exposure from all media forms.

Why do the citizens of Winnipeg have to bear anymore of this burden Mr. Speaker? If there's something that's coming back in the form of the son of the new deal that we're going to embrace, the decision will be made here on the floor of Council. But to suggest that we have to go out and expend $220,000 in commitments and another $277,000 in a balance fund for almost half a million dollars, why?

I see that the Mayor is back but of course when the Mayor was absent I directed my questions over to the Deputy Mayor and hopefully both of them will speak to this as an issue. I think that is the question that rages for so many of us in the City of Winnipeg. Why another half a million dollars on this fiasco? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: I move that this be referred back to the Executive Policy Committee with a detailed summary of what is before us here today. The Administration can provide that for us.

Mr. Speaker: With instructions. It's debatable. Anyone wish to debate the motion? Referral with instructions has been taken not in writing many many times in this chamber.

Point of Order

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker on a point of order. Is this a motion with instructions? Councillor Lazarenko maybe clarify or is it just a referral?

Mr. Speaker: There were instructions given in his talk asking the Administration to provide more detail. Those are instructions.

Councillor Lazarenko: My motion was that this be referred back to the Executive Policy Committee for further deliberation with the Administration to give us a full financial detailed report on the spending.

Mr. Speaker: Those are instructions. It would have to be seconded and in writing. Is there a seconder for the motion? Seconded by Councillor Wyatt. You'll have to put it in writing immediately. Anybody wish to speak against the motion? Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker I will rise against the motion. There's a five, six page report that's attached to the recommendations that it be received as information.

For Councillor Steek's edification there's two pages on pages 6 and 7 that talks about public consultation where those dollars went.

This is here for information. If anybody has concerns about whether or not we should live up to our commitments or spend what is left in the budget, they know as well as I do that Council is supreme. If they write up a motion saying that we should not do that, then we will debate the merits of that motion. Right now this is here for information, and the information is in the report.

Mr. Speaker: This motion has to be in writing before we vote on it.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker to the fact what I'm hearing now, I will withdraw that motion and I'd like to speak to the clause.

Mr. Speaker: Does the seconder agree to have the motion withdrawn? The motion is withdrawn.

Councillor Lazarenko did you wish then to avail yourself with the time available to speak to the clause?

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what Council what are they trying to get, when all of us supported except two for this to go for public consultation. You don't get public consultation for nothing. Direct citizen engagement was $228,000. The balance is $137,971. It's there.

When we were dealing with this proposal back in the mid '90s and I've said it here so many times, and what do I have to do to explain to the members of Council who did not speak or vote in opposition what we were dealing with the CUFF Report, the New Directions, Reshaping of the City Government also special operating agencies. And that report did give directions to the Administration from Council to consult with the Provincial Government or if not look for other ways and means of raising additional revenue for the City of Winnipeg. What else do you want? It's there. The public consultation did take place. I voted for that, and I would vote for that again. It was money well spent because the first time that the citizens of Winnipeg were able to participate on a move that Council was going to make and do with this new deal. They participated through the public forum through public consultation. I've said before, it was a mini referendum. That's how I look at it.

The public has spoken. I'm not defending the actions of any individual member of Council or the Executive Policy Committee. It's on black and white. Those who are so adamant of defeating this, why didn't they do something back in March 19th of this year when all this was presented to us with a direction given to the Administration to hold table talks with the Province. To consult with the Provincial Government or if not, to look for alternative methods to raise funds. User fees or whatever the case may be and this is exactly what has happened. It's unfortunate that Mayor Murray got on the bandwagon and he went to every town hall meeting and he took the rap for it along with some members of Council who went to the town hall meetings caused massive confusion to the citizens. I had said before that I will not participate in any town hall meetings and I did not. I said give the public the opportunity, let the Administration carry out their responsibilities, their commitment, their mandate to say, this is what we have on the table before you for it to come back to Council for Council to make the final decision. This was not happening.

Administrators went through sheer hell with comments that were made from some of the general public that were

spearheaded by individual members of Council. That was so unfair. How could you have a process done in such a way that would be the democratic way to say, look, here is what we're dealing with, you tell us whether you like it or not. We know for a fact, look we do have a budget problem. But you cannot correct it within one year. It may be a process that will have to take 10, 20, 30 years.

The City of Winnipeg is not falling apart. Quit using that as a way of getting into the media saying, the City is in sheer trouble.

Number of years ago when we had a serious problem with the challenges from the Assessment Department challenges, that some lawyers in the City of Winnipeg took the City to task, we were faced with finding $250 million. We did it. With the help of the Administration. If we would have gone to the general public, none of us would have remained. All of us would have been hoofed out. I think it would have been lowest in the totem pole of the elections of the history of Winnipeg. The Administration proceeded to take us step by step, here's what you can do to get out of the problems that you have now and we did it. We went into the reserves, we have reserves for that. The City didn't fall apart. Cars are still driving down the street. The bus is still running. The Police are there. The Fire Department is there.

I'm asking some members of Council why keep harping on something over and over again, it's a dead issue. The new deal will come up in a different forum, a different format. But not in the way that it was presented to the citizens of Winnipeg through the public consultation.

I was glad to see that the public consultation took place. Nothing happened in my ward. The Administration said, we can't have it in your ward. I know for a fact why because on the table talks was elimination possibly the autobins. You know what happened in the North End. People that are using the autobins system they'll never part with it because it's cost-effective, it's clean, sanitation. There's no sanitation problem. No compensation costs. One person operation. Now that was implemented back in 1990, it was introduced in 1992, I just about lost the election. I'll tell you, I went through a judicial recount by some members that ran against me said that this was unfair, especially those who used the campaign of saying, if you want this huge bin in the back of your yard vote for Lazarenko. You'll have dead cats dumped in there and everything. You wouldn't even see across your back lane of your adjoining property owners. That in itself Mr. Speaker, six days of judicial recount. Ten hours a day was like six elections for me. Nobody from Council helped me. When I was threatened by some people, my life was threatened. Nobody came out to help me because they said hey, Harry got himself in real hot water why should I be in there to help him. But it was implemented and it's worked Mr. Speaker.

This is what Council, this is what politics is about, you work together as a unit, the oath of office that we have taken abide by it. Work together. You don't have to attack each other on the floor of council because you're not gaining anything. There's no popularity gain in this new deal. That's dead already. It's a dead issue. Why do you want to relive yesterday. Live for tomorrow. Live for the future of Winnipeg. Work together. What do we plan now. Do we look at some other ways and means of providing better services to the citizens of Winnipeg. Leave the essential services alone, don't touch them, you increase them. Police, fire, ambulance increase it. The citizens of Winnipeg, we have more crime in the City of Winnipeg, I think more than any other city as what is happening, so many damn criminals we have in place here now are getting more protection from the judicial system and some lawyers than the victims themselves.

My poor sister who may not survive was home invaded two times. She was faced with a massive fire. My heart bleeds for her. My heart bleeds for every person who's gone through that. We sit back and say, we don't have to police it's okay. Get the hell out there and see what they have to do. You'll see what they're faced with. The Fire Department. I think to me that's essential services, this is a must.

When we ran for public office Mr. Speaker, each and every one, better police services, safe streets, all of a sudden we're forgetting about it, we're saying we need skateboarding in the North End. I've had people call me what the hell's the matter with you. I said, I'm not introducing that. We need the things that I mentioned just previously, this is what the people want. They want safe streets. They want to get their money's worth what they're paying their taxes on.

I commend the Executive Policy Committee for proceeding with this to provide us with this report. I commend the Mayor what the Mayor had to go through of getting attacked by some members of the general public. Sure they didn't like it. Some parts of that too Mr. Speaker I did not like, but I've stated to the Mayor and to the seminar that we had that I will not be supporting any user fees without a bona fide reason. That's just outright. You've got to introduce your program a step at a time. The process has to be followed. People will buy that. People will understand.

We have more costs each and every year. School boards they raise their taxes by 6%, 7%, nothing happens to the trustees. When I put up an argument in these chambers many years ago, the school trustees told me like this, Harry you know what, you guys are the ones that are holding the bag, you do the work for us. We don't have to do it because the Provincial Government and all the other governments refused to change the Winnipeg Act, now it's the Winnipeg Charter to have them collect their own taxes. We are 50% of the tax bill that comes out to the citizens of Winnipeg. What happens? We get raked over the coals. We get condemned. We get accused of stealing. We get accused of being bandits. We get accused of being Jesse James. Nothing is happening. The members of Council who are now in the Legislative Assembly all agree said what I did. Now they're saying, hey, just a minute, if we take from the left pocket give it to you who's going to fill in that pocket. It's a vicious circle.

The question is who's responsible for the services in any municipality compared to what the Province and the Feds have to do. This is why part of the new deal, Paul Martin who's the Prime Minister now had said, he's looking at it. But looking at it is two different things. Make a commitment and say, I will give you so much money and that's it. And you run your own affairs. The Province will not do it because there's an election coming up sometime soon Federally, nobody's going to go and dig into the purses of the people and say, that I'm going to lose my election. You'd be a blatant fool to do that. So you kind of go on a thread mill. Go on a thread mill of confusion. Say this is what we'll do, this is what we'll do, no we're not doing this. This we wanted to do. I guess sometime later on we'll do. We'll plan for the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker I just hope that Council, this is the last meeting of Council for this year. We're getting into the holiday season. I would just hope, let's get together and work together and try and come up with something that will be suitable for the citizens of Winnipeg and all members of Council.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Appreciate the acknowledgement. I want to thank my learned friend from Mynarski for that. I always worry that we're going to go through one of these and not hear the election story but he never disappoints. I love that stuff.

For the record Mr. Speaker, if you're ever in trouble in Mynarski, Mr. Lazarenko, I'd be there at your side. I want to promise you that. I might ask for the use of that little mace that you presented earlier though.

I'll rise in support of the report. I think it's an adequate report for what we requested. I understand there's going to be concerns about it. There has been concerns raised. For my purposes I looked through it. I think it gets to the point of where generally speaking the

money is going. If folks aren't satisfied with that, I would recommend they take the time to talk to the Administration, and I'm certain they could get that out.

One thing is for sure I guess is, a councillor who's supportive of the new deal or the idea of a new deal for the City of Winnipeg, I'm reluctant to spend any more time going back with our administrative time to flush out the numbers even further. I have the confidence in the integrity of our administration that the money is being spent appropriately.

We made a hard decision I guess some months ago, some in favour, some against. We were going to spend this money to try and advance the idea of a new deal and new set up for the City of Winnipeg and pay. We didn't all agree but it was the decision of Council. Absent any grievous statements of where the money is going, this is the money we agreed to spend. I think far from having to I guess reclaim that money for the general coffers, as far as I'm concerned the real work in this project has yet to be done. I think we're only a small percentage of the way in terms of the work that we have done so far. We're going to face huge obstacles in getting what we want to see through, at least what some of us want to see through in the City of Winnipeg. I think we're going to need those resources and potentially we may have to look at augmenting some of those resources to do some different things with respect to the different levels of government. I don't see any other way that we could do it.

My impression Mr. Speaker is that the new deal is not dead. I understand how people may feel that way and how it may be frustrating for folks as we move through this. When I voted for the allotment of monies, and when I declared my support for looking at a new regime, a new setup for the City of Winnipeg, I knew that this was going to happen. I had no doubt in my mind that when we laid out the 14 new revenue levers that we might propose to deal with in the City of Winnipeg, I knew that what would happen is, we'd have our town halls, I knew there'd be a vocal group of people who would come out and voice their opposition on a regular basis, saying they didn't want this, they don't want any changes, we all knew that, that came as no surprise to any of us.

My reflections based on the town hall that I hosted in St. Vital, was that yes, people had some concerns about the new deal. People were worried about it, and people were concerned about certain aspects of the new deal. You'd be hard pressed in my opinion to find a single person in that room which was by the way packed, that couldn't find at least one thing about the new deal that they liked.

That of itself I think means that it's been resources well spent well directed. But if we look at where we're going from here and what we're going to do from here, I think we have to look at what we've achieved so far. It's probably worth celebrating I think. We have to this point spent a good deal of time working with our population.

One of the things that I said when I voted for when I supported the resources going into this, is that we run over a billion dollar budget for all intents and purposes here in the City of Winnipeg, it's probably worth our while to consider the idea that we should be dedicating resources from our budget on an ongoing basis. Regardless of the issue, regardless of the timing, regardless of what it happens to be that we're up to consulting with our public.

It's been tough over the course of the last few months no doubt in every single one of us with the exception of a couple who perhaps have laid their cards on the table and they have every right to do so. Every one of us who has sort of kept our powder dry and stood back and waited to hear from the people on this issue has taken some flack.

What gives me I guess some satisfaction, what I take some strength from Mr. Speaker on this whole process is the end of the day my impression is that the City of Winnipeg population and our constituents are now at this stage in my opinion among the best educated, the most knowing and I think the savviest

when it comes to civic government probably in the Continent of North America. And that can never be a bad thing. We have had a debate of epic proportions over the course of the last few months. It's been a credit to everybody. I think everybody in this chamber deserves to be congratulated at least to some degree on the idea that we have gone out and we have engaged these people our people in a debate that involves them and that's going to affect them.

I still believe that even though the proposed new deal and we all knew that the new deal that was proposed, we all knew there was going to be changes. Not a single person in this room who didn't understand that what we were proposing on day one was not going to be the final one.

I still believe that we're going to come out of this with something different from what we started. In terms of revenue, in terms of fairness to our population, in terms of growth revenues associated with the economy, I am certain it's going to make the expenditures pale in comparison. I have every confidence in that.

I guess I speak in support and I rise in support of the expenditures. I think it's been money well spent. I've had an opportunity by the grace of all my council colleagues to have some exposure across Canada on this issue, and I've spoken to different people in different municipalities across Canada. Every single one of them, and I'm not exaggerating when I say this, without exception is looking to the City of Winnipeg, looking at what we are doing. The esteem and prestige of this city by virtue of the fact that we've taken on this debate, has risen immeasurably across this country. If we can work with the citizens of Winnipeg, if we can come out of this with something that everybody to the largest extent possible can agree upon. We don't know what that's going to be exactly. There's problems that I have with the proposed new deal. There's changes that I'm going to want, no doubt. If we can work together and take this over a finish line that we can all agree upon, it's going to be a great day for this city. If people here are discouraged which I'm certain they are, and I've seen the various snippets and the popular media about councillors losing faith, and elected people losing faith in the process.

I expected to be at this stage. I don't know what you expected, but I expected to be here on some stage in this development. I expected to have to go back and look at some new things. I don't know what is going to be proposed, I don't know what the Mayor's Office is going to come back with. I remain committed in good faith bona fide to look at something that will change the way that we do business in the City of Winnipeg because I do not think that the old way is the best way.

I would encourage my council colleagues to follow suit if they are at all able. I acknowledge that it's tough on everyone of us as elected politicians and the temptation to bail on this no doubt is there and is going to be there throughout this entire process.

What we proposed was never perfect. What we're going to come up with may not be perfect as well. Everybody, us, and everybody in the community has to recognize that not every single person in this city and not every single politician around this table is going to get every single thing that they want at the end of the day. It's like anything else, we have to do the best compromise available, I for one remain committed to the idea that we can come out with something a little bit better than what we had. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Murray.

Mayor Murray: Thank you Mr. Speaker. When I was in Ottawa at the Conference Board of Canada, I spent several hours with them. They described what's happening in Winnipeg as history making. They point out that most cities only have revenues growing at less than 10% over a decade and that's not annually, that's totally.

They are really impressed with the partnership and they'd like to extend it. They were very disappointed because they've been doing a lot of work for us

which we have paid considerable amount of money for, to continue that. The several hours I spent with them was looking at how they expanded.

They point out that money taken out of the economy is when you take a block of money and you go and spend it in some other part of the world. Money reinvested in the economy in the public sector could be very very critical to economic growth.

If we don't proceed and continue to redefine a newer deal, we'll never know what that is. They are very engaged as is the Canada West Foundation, as is the TD Bank, as are most of our citizens in a process that is really unprecedented and very difficult. We have parallel processes going on around research with the best economists in the country looking at the impact of all of these, to create a government that is sustainable.

I don't often agree with my friend Councillor Lazarenko but let's just look at the order of infrastructure. It's $188 million a year. Matter of fact we know that may be conservative and we'll have an idea when we start to see the assessments on the state of our buildings. That's a huge gap between what should be spent and what needs to be spent. We're only spending $800,000 this past year and only a $1 million on lanes. We have $738 million required for sewer and water. I don't know where that's coming from. The Administration has a proposal before us right now for a 53% rate increase. I can't support that. And borrowing $274 million which will take our consolidated debt back to what it was about year two when I was mayor. I don't want to support that.

I have some news. I'm not smart enough to come up with better answers on my own. I don't have the experience as the Conference Board of Canada. Also believe in the basic intelligence and interest of our citizens which I think we've heard from. We haven't even seen the Administration's consolidations of all of their input, all the briefs we got when we sat here for two days listening to business organizations and community organizations. There's a lot of money that's required to process and to analysis that material and to pull out recommendations. Once I get better most of my schedule for the next couple of weeks is filled up with delegations wanting to see me one on one with their proposals for what they think the newer version of the new deal should be. This all costs money. A million dollars is not a huge amount of money for this level of research and citizen engagement. When you look at what Vancouver went through with its downtown and Plan Vancouver, it was about a four or five million dollar exercise to do something that was less complex.

Also any changes we make are going to have real impacts on people's lives. The sales tax is obviously off the table now and that was very unfortunate, I was very distressed and discouraged. Why? Because it was taken off the table before we even saw the economic analysis by the Conference Board of Canada of what the implications of that would be versus the elimination of the business tax and cutting property taxes by 50%. I actually got briefed on that. Do you know what it was? If we had adopted the newer deal, the new deal, we would have seen greater job creation. We would have seen faster GDP growth and we would have seen huge spin-off impacts from having higher quality infrastructure. When I went to the Conference Board of Canada they said look, do we continue down this model with the sales tax because it's clearly not part of it, or do we work with you. So they've come back with a series of suggestions to us as alternatives that may fit the no new taxes statement that the Premier made. It made our job a lot harder.

What I want to say, is I want to thank a lot of you. Councillors Gerbasi and Lubosch and Pagtakhan and Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Eadie and Angus. I want to thank Councillor Clement because it took a lot of courage to hang in. The cheapest kind of politics is just simply to bail to attack the process because the process can never be good enough. God knows, I don't think there's been a mayor who's spent more time sitting in town halls listening to people as I did in the last two

months on a topic. On top of that I was involved in dozens of workshops.
I'm not going to speak about the amendment because if I do then I will preclude my chance to speak later.
Just simply say, you know the magnitude of the problems we face, three quarters of a billion dollars in sewer. Those are just what we need in streets and bridge repair. What's it going to cost to build Kenaston and Chief Peguis Trail, all the new stuff that we need to build. The magnitude of what it needs to rebuild our convention facility to get it caught up to others. To contribute significantly to the Human Rights Museum or the (inaudible) Hartley Richardson and the Asper Family respectively or do we. To rebuild our zoo back to something that we're proud of again. To drive our economy with quality of life institutions unprecedented. We've done a pretty good job there, we've leveraged. We have $14.5 million in True North and $130 million project. We have $2 million on the land on the baseball park. We have $21 million next door in Red River College. We have $4 million on what will be a $20 million library project. We have leveraged ourselves out. We don't even have that kind of money to leverage anymore.

When I sit down with Barry MacBride as I'm sure you do and Jim Thomson and they go through that gap where we should be spending twice as much on streets as we are right now.

The Conference Board of Canada also looked at what would happen if we didn't introduce the new deal. Which means billions of dollars of debt or an absolutely irretrievable conditions in our infrastructure in the next 20 years.

It's interesting that for $500,000 which is basically the balance all in, to actually come up and complete a process that is being editorially endorsed from coast to coast that other mayors when I meet with them from Larry Campbell to David Miller to Jean Tremblay are saying, we want to do what Winnipeg's doing because we have the same problem we have to find a better way to do it.

We don't even know what the impacts of these things are. I've only had a cursory first stage briefing of the very raw data from the Conference Board of Canada which I'm not even supposed to share because it's raw data at this point. They have several more weeks at least to analysis it and double check their statistics and look at different indicators and then they look at some case studies to make sure it's verified. It's very important that we do have a newer deal. It's hugely challenging. Look at the problem we're having with frontage levies. Which by the way I got less than five calls in my office. And actually as many in support of that. This great avalanche of resistance was about amusing.

We can't even adjust those to create the kind of fairness in that system we want without going back to the Legislature for changes. Which I think is somewhat frustrating. We can't make changes in the Assessment Act to make it more fair without the Provincial Government. We can't change our sewage and water rate structure to deal with some of the issues we'd like to deal with large commercial users as we raise rates, where that can become toxic to a large jean manufacturer or a tannery.

I only got up to speak today because I hadn't planned on it because I think this is one of the most important thing we're dealing with.

I think it's fine to participate in the debate but you know, I've been watching who has come up with better ideas. There's a dearth of them from some people. You would think that you would at least wait until we finish this public process that people wanted openness. You got a detailed account of that. And Shirley and Connie are working their tuckasses off to try and pull stuff together. They had to stop everything, go back and do a recounting of everything which put quite frankly in my mind was a pretty great waste of time, they get it down as best they can, they spend lots of time on it, they write you a detailed report. The first reaction is, let's send it back and have them do more useless work so we can score political points. I don't find that

helpful. You've got to remember there's a morale issue with our staff. They're very proud of the work they're doing. They see this as groundbreaking. I don't think it's been poorly conceived. I think it's been courageous. I think it's been intelligent. I think they've said we've got to go out there and listen to people, we can't go out there with bad answers, we know some of these things won't work. We know the Canada West Foundation and Conference Board of Canada will come back and say that's a bad idea, this is a good one. But you've got to start this dialogue somewhere.

Quite frankly, I expected a little bit more. Yes the new deal is dead. How could it exist without a sales tax, it's $127 million driver. It grew by 6% per year. It would cover off all of our inflationary costs in police and fire/paramedics.

The last question I got was that, we're probably going to have to spend $55 million more over the next five years just to keep our ambulance service and our police service and firefighters in the kind of condition that we need them to be in. Every $10 million is more than a 2 ½% tax increase. Where's that money going to come from? We could cut out a whole lot of things, we could drop public art, we could get out of arts and culture, we could stop funding all our agencies, we could close pools and libraries, that doesn't make up the hundreds of millions of dollars required to cover off that infrastructure. I think we should at least be honest about that and at least support our administration when they come out and say, you got a two billion dollar infrastructure problem council, not get into a debate that it's not really there like the purple elephant in the middle of the room. Everyone pretends doesn't exist at a family meal or some dark secret the family has, they don't want to deal with. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor De Smedt. We have an amendment before us. Would you like to introduce your amendment.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor De Smedt
Seconded by Councillor Steek

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the item be received as information, but that the Chief Administrative Officer be directed to not incur any further expenses in regard to this matter.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. Not to dwell on this issue. I was really just taking up the challenge by the Deputy Mayor, he says, if you don't want to do this get a written motion out here for some discussion. This is the challenge accepted.

This is not about castigating the Administration or the Mayor or others about the new deal public consultation process. Sure we could all chirp away or sharp shoot as the Mayor likes to say, and snipe. This is simply saying, if there are some residual money at this point in time I think I've heard in fact Councillor Steeves opened up his comments saying, he doesn't want to waste anymore time on this we've done so much effort on it. But then he goes into a full explanation about how wonderful the exercise has been.

I'm not going to throw a lot of cold water onto the particular public consultation process. It's been rather useful in many ways. It's really highlighted the issues and the lack of flexibility by some jurisdictions to respond to our new deal challenge. The Feds haven't got a written piece of paper yet to support their five cents a litre gas tax remittance that they indicated that would possibly be coming by 2005, it would be nice to have a written record on it.

Our other major government in the area, the Province has not yet given any indication whether they would like to remit some gas tax because these two areas are probably the most logical contributions of money taken out of this economy back into infrastructure of any municipality. I'm hopeful that the Federal Government will continue to do this. The Mayor says he's not getting any other ideas but that's really not so.

Really what we're saying is, the idea is not to take more money out of the economy and I don't believe the Canada West Foundation or the Conference Board of Canada, or the Toronto Dominion Study are saying, take more money out from the three levels of taxation that already exist, get a share of that money. I don't doubt that reinvesting tax money that's taken out of the economy back into our economy is a good thing. Obviously it is. There's spin-offs on it.

What we're just saying is, that there is not so much flexibility anymore in how people are taxed in this particular country and this particular province and city to take more out. We have to be a lot smarter of using the money that is already taken out and to be aggressive and persuasive and convincing the other two levels of government its time to assume their responsibilities of contributing back a huge amount of money that they're taking out.

We'll hear some soft cell remarks out of the Federal Government about they're now up to the limit in trying to contribute back for Medicare and other things. The fact of the matter is there is always surpluses coming through. This province has a challenge but I think it's time for them to get their act together and to control municipal taxation which really is the education tax lever that exists right now, that is the greatest burden to our municipal tax bill.

Let's be clear. I don't like bringing up these points of differences that we have. It's not to just slam automatically what's going on, there's been some utility in the public consultation, but enough is enough. We have the Administration and I think I recall the Mayor talking earlier this year in September I believe that you know the staff have been working on this for almost over a year going back to before the last election. I don't mind strategic initiatives doing that, that's very utilitarian. There's nothing wrong with a utilitarian city by the way Mayor.

The fact is that what we have to do is to use the staff wisely and just not every time we think there's an extra expense just flow it through.

I think enough is enough at this time. We do have the resilient staff. We do have the capacity within the organization to use their staff time and their staff allowances to complete this process and let's see how we can develop the next phase which is a strong aggressive consultation process with the federal authorities and with the Province to try and lever from them a rightful share of the money taken out. As I mentioned to the Mayor the last time we sat around this council table that I think pursuing aggressively with the Federal Government a share of GST on behalf of all municipalities would be a wonderful leadership role. I have not questioned the Mayor's leadership on the issue when he was working with FCM and the Big City Mayors Caucus on bringing attention to this very important matter. We have applauded that and we have commended the Mayor and others around this table for so doing.

Let's be clear there are other points of view. I think if we try and sit here and take every issue as I listen to the Mayor talk and spread it out and discuss it we'd be here I guess for about three or four days. Unfortunately I don't think we have to do that, we have enough evidence right now to get some summative evidence from the Administration and now let's develop an aggressive strategy of how we're going to approach the other two levels of government to say, time has come for them to step forward.

'04 will be a challenging year. I agree with that. I think it's within our capacity to handle it, we've tightened our belts before. If we have to reduce some infrastructure spending until we can get a clear picture of where we're going to go from '05 and beyond. I do have to comment that yesterday in the capital budget when we were quickly trying to approve a frontage levy for $10 million we were committed in '04 but lo and behold we weren't committing the same amount of money in total to rehabilitation of roadways in years '05 to '09. That really belies a commitment in trying to expend what I think are the priorities for the

citizens of Winnipeg on infrastructure renewal. I'm sure there are answers of why that particular those line items were deleted from '05 to '09 on roadway repairs, presumably it was waiting for the Federal Government input on sharing, however I think it just underscored the lack of total commitment to outline why we would go to our community to the residents and say look, here's a simple way of getting some more money we'll do it through frontage levies and see we're committed to do that. And that's the last step.

In fact I think we got a big message yesterday when we discussed frontage levies. Which points out to I think some weaknesses in our process. I'm sure we'll all say that gosh, you just can't snipe away a process all the time. We went to the (inaudible) moment of 20 minutes before council meeting and say gee, we can't do this. But we spent the last three months in public consultation talking about frontage levies without a fundamental basis and understanding of what the rules of the game are. We've made some errors. This is not the staff's fault I don't believe, I think this is a political leadership problem.

In any event, this may not go anywhere, I'm just saying enough is enough, we've done quite well in terms of the public consultation process. We have the staff resources in place. I don't think we have to spend anymore money externally on this. Let's get the report in from the Administration and have a consultation amongst ourselves to see where we will go. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: I'll first speak to the amendment and then I'll speak to the clause.

If you think it's a waste of time to listen to people, then support this amendment. If you feel that things just can't get any better Mr. Speaker, then support the amendment. If you have decided that pothole filled roads and rundown back lanes are okay, then support this amendment.

If you can't imagine a high speed rapid transit system, then support this amendment. But I do want to hear people's ideas. And facilitating that takes some time, takes some effort and it takes some money. I believe that things can get better if we try and this motion gives up. I have decided that we don't need to be a city of potholes and crummy back lanes that we can think beyond that. I can imagine a high speed rapid transit system and I won't support this motion right here.

I value and support an open public process, and the dollars spent supporting democracy, are dollars well spent.

To the clause, it's information. You wanted it you got it. Thanks.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor O'Shaughnessy you're next to speak.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through the good fortune of bad health I haven't had to speak on the issue of the new deal. I suppose it's time to come out and give my thoughts on it. I think this motion is the perfect place. While I have a great deal of respect for Councillor De Smedt as he's aware, I think this motion is about the worst thing at the worst time that could ever happen.

The idea of the new deal is at the bottom right now, is at the low point of any cycle it could have. The courage to put it on the table, the expenditures in time and money to piece it together have I would say, 80%, 90% been expended.

Where are we now? We're nowhere right now. But the work that's gone into it, the money that's gone into it, and the money is the minor part, may still bear an awful lot of fruit. The yelling and screaming over, I'm going to be in big trouble for this, but the nickel and dimming in this city compared to the

interest generated in the rest of Canada, I find somewhat amazing.

Introducing the motion that was called, two things jumped out. One, this was too ambitious. It is too ambitious in a way, but we can come out with the same results over a longer period of time, just not as quickly as maybe was originally envisioned.

The other comment was really what made me make up my mind to speak was, there's nothing wrong with the utilitarian city. There's a lot wrong with a utilitarian city. I would rather go back to my cabin in Winnipeg Beach thank you than live in a city where the only focus was on paving the streets and boring out the sewers. I think the quality of life is the key to a city in the future of cities, and I think what's before us in this whole new deal scenario is the future quality of life in this city.

To abandon the entire program now which this motion is saying, no further expenditures, would lead to, would be a terrible defeat and would throw this city from daring to step forward getting one or two tomatoes in the face would throw us back pre-Unicity. I think it would just be terrible.

We've got to press on. Maybe all the items in the new deal won't happen in the short run at least, maybe all of them shouldn't. But many of them should. We could have a much better city for it. This is the time to suck it up and move forward. This is not the time to bury our heads, to run away and say, oh dear oh dear we shouldn't have done this, we've exposed ourselves. Well we're exposed, let's make the best of it and let's make this a better city not at all an utilitarian city, let's improve the quality of life for all Winnipeggers and take that chance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support the amendment that's been put forward, Motion No. 3. I feel that it's worthy not to spend anymore good money after bad.

I want to first of all preference my comments Mr. Speaker with the fact that I think the Mayor did an excellent job with regard to getting a discussion going in the City with getting people thinking about ideas, discussing ideas, discussing the future of this city and talking about some things which quite frankly would normally bore the pants off. Most people seem to engage the citizens of the City and indeed the entire province and parts of the country.

I come back Mr. Speaker, this was not just a simple purpose of having a discussion paper, this was a process of serious policy setting that was before us. If it was a sake for having a discussion in a simple throwing ideas out getting feedback from the public, great. The process we were set upon and we set out with this new deal, well the Executive Policy Committee set out with a new deal, was to establish policy for the City without really coming first and foremost back to the very council in my mind when it came to the development of this deal.

I cite process and I realize the Mayor indicated in his speech that process is just process, let's not get hung up on process. The reality is Mr. Speaker, that in a democracy means are more important than the ends in my mind. The means are crucial on how you do things and how you go about and how you can consult not just the general public but the people that you're supposed to be working with.

That's where I guess I get very disappointed and very angry Mr. Speaker, if there's a little bit of anger being expressed today. The fact that back in May we sat down in the emergency measures room and up on a big screen was shown us a whole bunch of new fees and rate charges and everything, and we were told councillors don't worry, don't let that bother you we're going to come back to you, but we're just throwing this up for you to have some info. We're going to come back to you before we do anything.

The next thing we know, we're now back in September the next meeting down in

the war room as it's commonly called, and now we have a whole new deal, it's done, it's ready. It's here, thank you for your consultation councillors, we really appreciate your input, here's the new deal and yes the press kits are ready they're going out this afternoon. By the way, you better support it because this is what we think is the best thing.

Well Mr. Speaker, if the citizens of the City didn't like the process which I think a lot of them expressed or the actual new deal itself, neither did this councillor at least.

Ironically I think we could have contributed quite a bit had there been a more inclusive process coming forward before we spent this kind of money on a public consultation process.

Ironically I think we could have had a better deal, we could have instead of a new deal we could have probably had a balanced deal.

There were aspects of the new deal that I think I support, I think many members of this council support. The idea of getting a share of the Federal gas tax. I think that has common support. The idea of the provincial/municipal tax sharing arrangement. The fact that we've seen very little growth in the grants from the Province if not many of them have been frozen and that the provincial/municipal tax sharing, which by the way, we're the only major cities in Canada that have something like this where we're sharing income and corporate taxes with the Provincial Government. A unique thing unto itself to expand that and enhance the formula so that we have a share of future revenues, that was a good thing. The fact that other ideas could have been thrown into the pot though Mr. Speaker it disappoints me that we lost that opportunity. I'm hoping we can regain it.

The idea of getting a share of the GST, an excellent idea, and pushing for that and long for that.

I think the Provincial Government in this new deal was quite honestly left off the hook when it came to gas taxes, the share of the gas revenue. Yes we want a share of the Federal gas revenue, but the reality is the Province raises $180 million a year in provincial gas taxes, we get very little back compared to what we actually pay into. The majority of citizens in this city pay that $180 million gas tax and very little comes back. I think we could have had a new deal that said to the Province, look, we want you to pay for a share of regional street repairs, regional street renewal. No different than you pay for Main Street Manitoba regional street repairs. That could have been part of the new deal.

There was many different things that we could have included Mr. Speaker with regards to this new deal or a balanced deal.

One of the other criticisms that I heard over and over again at the public meetings, was we never came forward with anything looking at our own expenditures. The response given to residents and the citizens of the City, well we've done all the efficiencies we can, we're efficient enough. Well I don't buy that Mr. Speaker. You show me a business that says we're efficient enough we're not going to do anymore efficiencies find anymore efficiencies. I'll show you a business that will be out of business in less than five years. We always constantly have to find efficiencies. We always constantly have to try and improve ourselves and find better methods, and we should always be working for excellence in the areas that we target to work for excellence in. I think that could have been part of the new deal.

We needed a balanced deal Mr. Speaker, and the process was flawed. The fact that we're hyping about the process. The reality of the process is crucial. It's important because if you have a good process you have a good deal and you have buy-in.

Would the majority of councillors bought into if they had been involved inclusive, if we had an actual real heart to heart with regards whether we'll be included in the new deal? Probably not. There wouldn't have been complete buy-in. But there

would have been a majority. And those who chose not to would have been on the outside, and the fact that the majority of council would be in agreement with a new deal coming forward would have sent a positive step. A step Mr. Speaker that they were included in the very formulation of something like this. I don't know.

I think Mr. Speaker that we're elected by our constituents to participate in these discussions. I realize that EPC is charged with formulation of budgets and maybe that's why this occurred this way. At the end of the day we were talking about a radical alteration of how we collect revenues in the City and it was mainly revenue side, it wasn't too focussed on the expenditure side. In light of that fact I think all of council should have been involved in its formulation and that was not the case.

However as I said in the onset, and I'll say it again, I do credit the Mayor because to be quite frank, he had a lot of guts to go out there and to face the crowds like he did, and I was at some of those meetings and I saw what he faced. However, I think it could have been a lot better and it could have been a lot more efficient and much more effective and I think we could have had something that was a little more balanced. The very fact that I stand not alone here Mr. Speaker, but I stand if the Premier was in this chamber with the Premier on the very fact when it comes to part of this new deal being rejected tells me that we did not do our proper homework without rolling this out.

So let's stop spending more good money after bad money. Support this amendment and let's start anew. If there's a new initiative coming forward then great. If there needs to be new money allocated, fine, we'll deal with it at that time, but let's stop wasting money on a process that is completely flawed, not only from this councillor's point of view but from people in the other house across the way. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I've never gotten into the habit of reading any of my old speeches that I've made in this place and I can assure you that I'm not doing so now. I think it was Councillor Steek who's probably now busy on speed dial with the radio shouter but I think he indicated that he's never heard from Executive Policy Committee before on this.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated very clearly when we debated the issue of transferring some funds to the new deal initiative back on September 24 what I thought about the whole process, and I haven't changed my mind one iota on that. If anybody wants to know what my position is on the whole prospect or the notion of the new deal, it's here in Hansard of the council meeting of September 24, 2003. I also know what others in this chamber that day had to think about it and I also know what the final vote was. That result has carried on through the whole process, there have always been the naysayers and all of that but nobody ever comes up with any other ideas.

Mr. Speaker we're not really dealing with the new deal today, we're dealing with a report that was asked for by a motion that was referred by Council to Executive Committee a couple of months ago, the motion asked for information and the clause that is in front of us provides that information. It's there for everyone to see and I don't apologize for one bit of it. I'm quite happy to have this information in the public domain so that it indicates what the City Government has been spending and on the whole new deal initiative.

As others have said before me Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg has been put on the map across the country in the municipal world in particular for coming forward with this kind of a discussion package. This new deal and the ideas behind it is not just for Winnipeg. This is of interest especially in all of the major cities in Canada. All of whom have been going through the same problems that we have been going through insofar as legislative restrictiveness, proscriptive provincial legislation, the inability to meet rising costs through the archaic property

tax system, every city in Canada has the same problem. Every city in Canada is interested in the discussion that's been going on through this new deal process that was initiated here in the City of Winnipeg.

Good money after bad. I don't think so Mr. Speaker. I think this expenditure has been well worth the price. The discussion alone, the raising of public awareness of the issues that face municipal government in Canada today has been worth every penny that has been spent to date on this process. I don't apologize for that. I don't hang my head in shame for that, I'm very proud of the process. It's worthy of note that many many citizens of Winnipeg whether they agree with the package or not avail themselves of the opportunity to attend the town halls. They've availed themselves of the opportunity either to go on line or to request by phone or letter or whatever more information.

Somebody said, I think it was Councillor Steek again, well the media would give this for free. Really. Which media are we talking about? Are we talking about the Winnipeg Sun? It's not a paper I read very often Mr. Speaker, but from time to time when I scan it I know the kind of information they're providing, and it certainly isn't balanced and objective, it's very one-sided. Everything is wrong, everything is trash, we should look to our own expenditures first and let's just carry on financing municipal government the same way we'd been doing it for 100 years. That's basically the editorial stance of the Winnipeg Sun. That's free I suppose Mr. Speaker, and it's worth the price you pay for it too.

Or we could maybe talk about Charles Adler, there's free information Mr. Speaker. I know what his stance is and he's entitled to his opinion by the way. I don't disrespect him for expressing his opinion, but he's not providing any objective information, he's giving his opinion, that's what he is and that's what he does.

Mr. Speaker, we as a city government have spent this kind of money to provide information. To give people the facts. To have our people doing research on the ideas that have been raised at the town halls and in the other sessions the workshop sessions that have been held by various groups they didn't want to be in some big hall with four or five hundred people, they wanted to sit down as a special interest group I'll call them and get the facts and get questions asked and try to get answers.

Imagine if we didn't have any resources set aside to provide all of that. The purpose of this is to initiate discussion, to get feedback and from that feedback do all the research that is necessary to provide the detailed answers. It's not only education for the public, it's education for the elected officials who eventually have to make decisions on some of these policy processes.

Was that good money after bad? I don't think so Mr. Speaker, I think it was money well spent. I defended that process back in September and I wasn't lonely that day.

I just want to speak for one moment on city expenditures. Some media wags will say, we're doing all this and we're not taking care of business in-house. That Mr. Speaker is blowing smoke. Everyday we are challenged as a government to look at our own expenditures. Every single day. It's done every single day. We've made a lot of changes in this government in the last seven or eight years a lot of changes. We don't do business the same old way anymore Mr. Speaker. We have to remain competitive as a government. Yes, we still continue to monitor our expenditures and to look for newer and better ways to be a more efficient and effective government. No government can ever stand still on that and this City of Winnipeg's municipal government is not standing still on that. It's a challenge that we face every single day, it's ongoing work, new deal or not it's work that has to continue always. Yes we will make mistakes and there will be slip ups and all of that, we try to correct those things when they come forward. None of that work ends because we're talking about new deals.

To the amendment. The operative part says, that the CAO be directed not to incur any further expenses in regard to this matter. Well Mr. Speaker, if you pass this motion that means all the work that has been done today that is underway right now in terms of research ends because that's the literal translation of this motion. It means anything you're doing now you stop, everything stops. There's no more research, there's no more response to the public on questions and looking for information because this motion says, don't do anything more. It's not just town halls, it's not just workshop sessions, that's over now. Now the staff are doing the slogging and the research so that they can provide us and the public with the information and the feedback as to what came in during the town hall meetings. So if you want to pass this amendment Mr. Speaker, that means you are saying, all work currently underway stops. We do nothing further. We don't do research, we don't do responses to public enquiries, we stop. Close the books get on and do other business that other routine business and the orders of the day that you have to do.

I'm not supporting this motion. It's ridiculous because I want to see the results of the town halls, I want to see that information. I want to know as one elected official whether there's stuff in there that we can work on as future policy for this government and for this city. Why would I want that to stop? I'm interested in knowing those kinds of things. If for nothing else we build a database of information, so if it isn't the new deal in 2003 or '04, maybe four or five years down the road its time will come. I can tell you Mr. Speaker, that its time will come. Not only in Winnipeg but across the country. We will eventually educate provincial and federal governments to the importance of cities in this country. Cities will become the primary government in this country. And if it isn't today, it will be before the end of this decade that something like a new deal in whatever form it may take, is going to be the primary goal and responsibility of municipal governments.

I don't want the research to end. I don't want the work to end. I don't want all of that information that's come from the town halls and other workshops to end. I want our staff to carry on doing this work and to present a package of ideas and responses to us and to the public so that we as a government will have some ideas as to how to proceed in the next year or two with regard to policy.

I'm not supporting the amendment. It will be interesting to see Mr. Speaker if the amendment fails, how many members will vote against receiving clause 1 as information. Will those who wanted the information vote against receiving it. That it will be an interesting recorded vote too Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's difficult to say much more falling on the heels of such an eloquent and passionate speech by my colleague from St. James, but I'll do my best.

Taxation Mr. Speaker is one of those tough issues that separates substance from form around here.

The new deal as it's been cited this morning on at least two occasions, received national significance. This wasn't just something that people were talking about at the water cooler here in Winnipeg, this wasn't something that was discussed in the back rooms or the catacombs of government buildings, this is something that just about everybody regardless of gender, regardless of age, everybody in Winnipeg and in Manitoba and across Canada has talked about the new deal. In the Winnipeg context and also in the context of other local governments on a national scale.

This has been all about process. And for those of us who are keen about process, for those of us who are policy wonks and want to understand taxation and learn more about it. For those of us who believe in grassroots politics and want to take government back to the people, back to those folks who elected us, in some

cases term after term after term, this is and has been our best opportunity to engage those people, engage their matter, their grey matter and our grey matter in trying to develop a better way to raise the money that government needs to ultimately provide this city.

The new deal and talking about the new deal and challenging ourselves about the way we tax ourselves ultimately took guts. The process has been from the beginning as open and as inclusive as it could possibly be. And yes, there was difficulty and there were challenges. It was no cakewalk.

What the entire premise of the new deal is about, is that here in Winnipeg the place where most Manitobans live and work. The local government our city council must have jurisdiction to chart its course. In the same way our city council has led the way to provide better public health to most Manitobans, the smoking by-law is a recent example, in that same way Mr. Speaker, our city is also going to lead the way in Manitoba and show by example to other provinces and to other cities that there are better ways to fund what we do here.

This has been the first round Mr. Speaker. I don't consider it a loss. I consider it a tremendous victory. Never have my constituents been as interested in everything from user fees for athletic fields to frontage levies, to property taxes, to comparing their property taxes to their school taxes to just about any other discussion on taxes. That has been the best possible outcome that we could expect, that people are actually talking about how their money is being used and how they see this city. The people that are living in Winnipeg now are people that have made a commitment to the City. They are people that are staying because they like it here.

To suggest at this time that all the work that we've done the educational process that we've undertaken, the things that we've learned, to suggest we should shut it all down kind of like taking a kid out of high school, there's no point in you going any further, you've learned what you're going to learn, it's time you get a job and get back to the basics. They've never said that to me Councillor Steeves, no.

This is a process that should be engaging all of us in life long learning. Ultimately even if the new deal didn't succeed in its present form there is a better deal around the corner. I'm for one not going to give up at this time. I have three years left in my mandate Mr. Speaker, I was elected by my constituents in North Kildonan to find a better way to run the City and to work with the Mayor and Council to do the same. I for one am not going to fold up my tent or take my toys and go home and be content with the way things are. The way things are is certainly not the way things could be. I believe that the new deal and the discussions even the blue skying and dreaming that came with the new deal discussions, imagine a city that looks like this, those kinds of discussions Mr. Speaker are important. Ultimately as politicians we have a fundamental responsibility to not just tell it like it is, but to tell it as it could be. When someone shows us a glass with water in it, we should be able to show those people how that glass is half full and not half empty. We should be the inspiration for our city and not the ultimate naysayers, doomsayers, the harbingers of bad news. There's a lot of good news going on here Mr. Speaker, and it's time that we start looking for it. It's time that we share it, and it's time that we continue on our quest. We didn't build the City in a day, it took us a long time to get to where we are and we're certainly not going to fold this city and walk away from it.

Ultimately I'm for pressing forward. I'm for continuing the research. I think it would be a travesty at this time to cut our staff off at the knees and tell them to go back to whatever they were doing, that this entire process was meaningless because somebody on Broadway decided they weren't going to allow the City to have a say in a sales tax. There are many other ways that we can diversify our taxation administration and our revenue streams. Economic development is a big part of that, and we haven't even touched on that yet in the better deal.

I'm not going to give up Mr. Speaker. I would encourage the rest of council not to give up. To stand up and criticize is easy, but what I think we need to do is regroup after the new year and start working on the better deal and move forward. This is no time to shrink away and whither on the vine.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Quickly on the amendment.

I rise in opposition to the amendment as forwarded by my friend Councillor De Smedt. I put my name on the speakers list because of the comment that was made with respect to the utilitarian city. I noticed that Councillor O'Shaughnessy picked up on it. That's become a bit of a buzz word surrounding this debate. The Mayor has certainly used it in the opposite context, certainly from the opposite side. I want to thank Councillor De Smedt for his candour because I think that is at the crux of this issue really the basis of this debate is what do we want to become as a city. I recognize, I fully respect the Mayor's right to move away from the idea of a utilitarian city, as much as I respect Councillor De Smedt's right to hang on to the idea of a utilitarian city.

What is difficult I guess for us sitting on council who are decision makers here, we have to sort of sift through everything that's said in this chamber and try to come to an informed decision, is that the formal debate in the context of the debate on an ongoing basis on a yearly basis doesn't seem to really match up with anyone's idea of utilitarian city. There are people on this council who have taken themselves regrettably in my opinion out of this debate at too early a stage with the idea that we're already doing enough, we can't do anymore, taxes are the main issue which is fine. But when you look at the history of what we've heard in this chamber, it doesn't seem to match up.

We've heard from various councillors and I'll start with myself, and the reason I can't lay claim to a utilitarian city and the reason why I can't put my name under that idea is because I look at the projects that I've done, little things, like the skateboard park in St. Vital which receives probably more than its fair share of attention around this table. If I was married to the idea of a utilitarian city that would in all likelihood be the last thing that I would do. A skateboard park in St. Vital and elsewhere is the furthest thing from a utilitarian. I can tell you Mr. Speaker if I was to retire tomorrow it might be the thing that I'd hang my hat on as one of my most proud accomplishments because the kids in St. Vital and elsewhere absolutely love that thing. We heard the same thing in the arena debate. Far from utilitarian in my opinion. We've heard Councillor De Smedt himself argue passionately about the Conservatory in Assiniboine Park. That project does not meet my definition of utilitarian. It just doesn't meet that.

I heard Councillor Steek on different occasions argue passionately for the forgiveness of certain obligations for payment on the Ballpark. That's not utilitarian. Nor is for example Councillor Steek's motion at Protection and Community Services one year where he argued for half a million dollar safe house for prostitutes. None of those things seem to match up with the detractors of this debate and their overall philosophies. If the philosophy is to get away from these expenditures and things that are not city core services, I as a councillor have a difficult time following the congruency of those debates. I think that's a fair question that I hope at some point will be answered. I don't ask it in any disrespectful fashion.

I think we have to get our message a little more on point and a little more congruence so people understand precisely where we're coming from. It seems to me as an observer in this chamber that everybody has their projects, everybody has the things that they want to do for the City to enhance it, not just to remain it as a utilitarian centre. We think of the cities across Canada and we compare the various cities, the cities that we might strive to be more like in some ways, Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver. I don't think they would meet

those are the cities that I would set up as cities to aim for, cities that are doing a great job, cities that are exciting, certainly cities that attract and hold young people. I don't think that they would meet that definition. There are other cities that would meet that definition, they wouldn't be cities that I would try to strive for in terms of where the city may or may not be going.

I can tell you in my estimation from what I've come to learn and it's been an evolution process for me Mr. Speaker, I didn't start off with this, in fact prior to me becoming an elected member of council I may have been more likely to support the notions of utilitarianism than I am right now.

As I look at some of the research, my estimation is when we're talking about young people and where they may choose to reside on an ongoing basis, where they might choose to raise their families, they look for housing and we've got that in spades. They look for safety and in my estimation Winnipeg is a very very safe city. But more and more and more and this is scientifically held up, look at the MacLean's survey, look at the other surveys that are being done by Angus Reid right across Canada. Young people are more and more they're looking for places that are progressive, that are tolerant, that are sustainable and that are fun.

We have to talk about how we're going to get from here to there, and the new deal is part of that that's why it's so regrettable that some folks have taken themselves out of this debate at a very very early stage, in fact I recall the first meeting.

I guess a friend of mine from Portland described and I guess we could all think about shooting for at some point is that, if we stop thinking of the City of Winnipeg as simply a place that provides services, and more think of our city as an event, a place where people might want to be to spend the very very precious time that they have in their lives, we might come to a different notion as to what we might want to look like as a city. That's why when we talk about the growth revenues nobody at least not me in context of the new deal, nobody is talking about spending money like a drunken sailor. When we talk about the new revenue strings, what I am talking about, what my notion of economics is, is that we're going to tie the revenues that we need with the growth sectors of our economy so that as our city economy grows our revenues will grow. We'll be better able to service the people that we represent. That's all that we're really talking about.

Again just to finish off Mr. Speaker. What is regrettable is that there was I guess a catalogue of ideas that were laid out to the citizens of Winnipeg at the beginning of this debate. There were as I said 14 different revenue heads. Nobody ever said that that was the limit of this debate. If people disagree in this chamber, if people can't buy into any single thing on the list, if they can't even support the Federal gas tax, they can't support the Provincial Government doing different things with us, even if you can't buy into any of that, this arena exists for new ideas, so feel free to bring in new ideas. I'd be willing to consider them. I'm not only willing to consider the Mayor's list of ideas, I'm willing to consider everybody's new ideas. And the process is not yet over. The door is wide open. I would invite any of my council colleagues to come forward with new ideas. I can't speak for anyone else in this chamber but I can promise you as an elected member of this chamber I will consider them. Thanks.

(Councillor O'Shaughnessy in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko speaking to the amendment.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, one thing I must say, I want to thank the mover and the seconder of what is before us here today to get the information, to get a breakdown. We do have that. The concern I have is to stop the freezing now, it would be unfair to the research team, our administration that have not finalized a report. There's more work to be done.

The new deal as I said before Mr. Speaker is not the deal that was before for public consultation. This is just a wrap up. It would be very unfair. I voted for the expenditures for the continuation of public consultation.

You talk about the comments that were made here they talked about the Arena. We have by-laws we put into place. Cannot enforce them. The other day we had a punk rock concert there was more smoking marijuana in there, the people couldn't even see each other, and nothing was done because how do you enforce people there was about 6,000, 7,000 people, try and tell someone to put that weed out when they're weeded out of their mind. It's actually impossible. These things do happen. It takes time for change. It takes time for implementation. It takes time to fine tune any by-law or anything we want to do.

I guess the concern and question that people would have here and even the general public, they want to see the final analysis as to what has happened in the closing of this important debate and these important town hall meetings. The first time in the City's history that anything such as this has happened. It's opened the eyes to a lot of people. A lot of people understand and realize now we are in need of additional financing.

I welcome the challenge of anyone who challenges the process because it is their fundamental right to do so. Take away that right and we take away the rights that we have also. Democracy is very important to believe in democracy and practice and preach it. This is something that all of us at least I know when I started in politics, I ran for the new Unicity back in 1971, that's 32 years ago and I've been on the scene ever since. Even when I was elected in 1974 along with you Mr. Speaker.

Times were different, times were not hard to find additional funding because all we did we just increased the taxes by 4%, 7%, 8% and people bought that. Now financing is different. The economy is different. People need answers and they're saying, enough is enough.

This new deal that was introduced through the CUFF report and the other directions that we had with the New Directions, Reshaping the City Government, has finally come to a head and that is gone to the public. I have talked to other people in other parts of the country, they know about this proposed new deal. I talked also when I was in the Ukraine we talked about the new deal and they said they would like to implement but they have a long way to do that.

We have a hard time trying to convince the citizens of Winnipeg because it is hard to sell an idea that has been implemented for so many years. Take a look like Edmonton, Alberta, they do not plough the sidewalks in the wintertime. The residents have to do it upon themselves, if they fail to do that then they get charged through the taxation system. We don't do that. If we ever tried to do that in Winnipeg I can tell you right now, we wouldn't succeed. People would reject it because people have been so accustomed to getting that service provided to them right from day one.

We had talked about changing the services. People had said look, we're not going to clean the sidewalks, and I had said okay, if that's the case we're not going to be cleaning the windrows from people who have their own driveways because the big windrow is left behind people can't shovel it.

We talked about work that had to be done on back lanes during the wintertime. We have gone through this so many times. With the public consultation that had taken place at that time Mr. Speaker, was through public involvement on motions that were presented to the various standing committees and also to council. People had objected people had bought some of the plans and bought some of the ideas we had in place at that time.

I understand that there's about $178,400, am I correct Annitta, that is left in the, $278,000, around there anyways, that is left. All this will be accounted for Mr. Speaker, and I have my commitment from the Chief Administrative Officer also from our administration and along from the

Mayor that everything is going to be accounted for. Any additional spending that will take place will be accounted. It would be so unfair Mr. Speaker to stop this dead in its tracks when it's gone so far.

The public consultation has taken a lot of wind out of the Administration. Some were just about ready to quit because there was confusion. When you try to change the direction, it is not easy. It's easy for someone to sit and to criticize, I've been doing that a long time since I've been on council, I've been doing it a long long time, a lot of times I've been doing that. It's easy to play the role of the offence than to be on the defensive role. When you have to face reality and as I see now to what has been happening, I wanted this public consultation. Really did. I would vote for it again. It was money well spent. First time the citizens participated in a mini referendum. I don't want to repeat myself over and over again, even if most council members don't agree with it. This did happen.

The amount of money that's left behind will be accounted for. We have to finalize this deal that is more or less dead than alive now. Any new deal Mr. Mayor that will be coming forward will have to be coming on a different format. Different proposal will have to come. We just scrapped the one dollar a foot for frontage levies yesterday. Shows you right there something was wrong. People were not going to buy it because how do you work to have it even with people who do not have sewer or water. There would be a challenge through the court system. That was scrapped.

These are the things that we have the privilege of doing that. We did that yesterday. And I voted for the capital budget. We have to look at the long term plan next 20, 30 years. A lot of us will be gone from that time on. We have to lead the pathway the road to say what council did back in the '70s, '80's, '90s and in the 2000's they did well. Just like we're saying our forefathers what they did with our waterworks system. A 97 mile distance of having water flow coming in from Shoal Lake. We had the Winnipeg Hydro put into place which was very successful until our infrastructure started to fall apart with the hydro stations. Then the Province took it over. We have a good transportation system with transporting people in Winnipeg. One of the best. We have buses running at 10 o'clock, 11 o'clock, 12 o'clock at night with two passengers on board. We try to cut those routes and we get hell delivered to us in saying, you're not doing this because this is our right we want the bus services.

We do provide services to the citizens of Winnipeg way above our mandate. Mr. Speaker when things and changes have to come about, reality has to be real. Is to know exactly which road, which pathway we're going on. What is it we want for Winnipeg in the future.

This in itself Mr. Speaker, was the right way to go. I was proud of the Administration. I was proud even with some of the politicians that were involved in it even though some of them had a different format to work on. The process went through very well. We haven't been crucified, at least not yet I don't think we will. People know that we are in a pinch. The Provincial Government has opened their eyes and they know what we need and what they have to give us. They have to give us what we've been asking for.

The Federal Government, I'm summing up, the Prime Minister of Canada said that he is in favour of the new deal, they're talking about themselves now just to have a new deal. It's a long process. It has to go in stages. Step at a time Mr. Mayor. I plead with you and Executive Policy Committee a step at a time, that the general public will know exactly what we're trying to do is to raise more funding. But leave the essential services alone. I ask the Executive Policy Committee and all members of Council we have to work together, we have to provide better police services, better fire and ambulance. Essential services we have to have that in tack and to provide them more.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt summing up on the amendment.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

On my motion I think if you'd listen closely to the discussion that I had in support of it, I suppose there ought to have been one other word in there and that the Administration do not incur any further external expenses in this regard. I did indicate in my comments that I would expect that they're going to come forth with a report, the analysis and the contracts that have already been issued would have to conclude. There are still some unexpended monies and that was really the point of the motion.

However, I'd like to thank everybody for the discussion this morning. I think we have really allowed ourselves to form a true council. We have council seminars which are very utilitarian. I mean they're guided very quickly by the EPC, the Mayor and the staff and then it's over and done with. They never get to the end game here which is an open discussion about the merits of various issues. It was that way with the new deal. When we had the opening seminar in September very quickly we concluded before lunch and then the Mayor had a press conference. The deal was unfolded. Today through this particular process of a motion that some do not think is appropriate and in some senses I could probably agree, but it allowed us to have a discussion where people are standing.

I thank Councillor Steeves, Councillor O'Shaughnessy, Councillor Lazarenko talking about a utilitarian city. You know my definition of utilitarian is pretty broad. I did not first bring up the concept of utilitarian city, it was brought up by the proponent of the new deal to kind of excite people, gee do you want to be just blaw. The implication is we are blaw. Or do you want to look at the future and create a new city.

Let's go over really where this city has been in the last 33 years since unification, since Unicity and very quickly. I very seldom claim any personal issues here but you know, my family and I have chosen to retire in Winnipeg. I'm not from Manitoba. I spent a lot of time in Manitoba through various careers. We've chosen to retire here and I'd lived in just about every city in Canada and many overseas. We've chosen this city for good reason. It's a balanced, diverse, creative, fun city. I take exception in our discussions about the new deal that we have not been a fun city. That we have not done very interesting things. We have wonderful neighbourhoods. As the Mayor so often says and I support him on this, we're one of the most diverse cities in Canada. We celebrate culture. We do it all year.

I take exception to the fact that we've only been utilitarian and if that's all you want to do, this is going to be your end result. We have not been a utilitarian city in that context but we've been very focused about quality of life. About safety. About paramedic service which is not our responsibility. The Province and health authorities should take that over and they could save us $15 million, $18 million a year or more, it's growing. It's not our mandate but we're doing that in some negotiated process with the Province.

In a personal sense this city has achieved a lot. We like our city. All the people that I talked to like this city. They are offended by the comment that gee, if you just want to be utilitarian go down this path, don't look at new ways of getting revenue. Don't invest in public art. The record would show that since I've been here that I've been a very strong supporter of public art in terms of the arts community in general of new ideas.

What's been useful this morning is that together we have shared different points of view and we are merging as Councillor Steeves had indicated there is congruency in this debate. It's not incongruent we're all talking about the same thing, trying to move our city ahead. Trying to find the best way possible to engage other levels of government in looking at what we take out of the economy and reinvest into it.

I have welcomed the new deal debate. I'm not sure I understand why we would have done it in this particular way, I think we could have accomplished a lot more. That's past water. The cup isn't half

empty or half full, our cup overfloweth in this city, we're very fortunate in comparison to many others around the world and in Canada. We have a community of people who've moved in from the rural areas to form families, to be educated, to create businesses and they stay here because we create very interesting and diverse neighbourhoods. There are nothing wrong with the suburbs.

Often I have to say to my colleagues at the Province, St. James-Assiniboia existed before Unicity happened. We haven't built anything out there since. We were a city, we had everything we needed. When I argue to try and get a little bit more money for our streets it has to be based on a competitive way with the amount of streets that are going down the tubes in the innercity. I asked a simple question. What the heck did Juba, Norrie do when they got a huge tax base from the suburbs sustaining every year, not just some cash and didn't reinvest it at that time into what really was a driving force of having Unicity saving money and reinvesting in a unsustainable city at that time? I don't know what they did with the money. We can go over history.

In any event it's time to sometimes just think back that we do have a lot. I've welcomed this debate. I'm not going to try and answer all the issues. It is useful that we have different points of view. We're going to get there, but I certainly ask you all to try and think broader in terms of how we can engage the other two levels of government.

If you look at your municipal tax again the enemy is not the municipal tax. It's a very fair one when we compare it to other cities. I'm not worried about Edmonton and Calgary. They have other diverse ways of getting revenue. Edmonton's tax is going up 5% this year. We're getting closer and closer to being competitive.

In any event thank you for the opportunity to exercise a little bit more democracy and engage in the different points of view about the new deal. We are not naysayers, we are representing what our people are saying, what the heck is going on downtown. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal closing debate on the clause.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It amazes me the level of discourse and communication and feedback that the new deal has elicited. If you just look at the discussion we've had here this morning, that's a prime example. I can't remember the last time we've had this level of discussion as a council. Probably pre 1998.

Mr. Speaker whenever somebody aspires to affect change, profound significant change in any system and any organization, it is always difficult, very very difficult to say the least. It involves putting yourself out on a limb. It involves taking all sorts of political risks. And frankly it involves exhibiting the courageous to stay with the risks because you believe in what you're doing, you believe in the battle you're advocating for.

What the new deal aspires to achieve is simply a fundamental shift in the relationships between the City of Winnipeg and the other levels of government. I dare say there's not one politician in this room that would disagree with that. Regardless of your political ideology, regardless of your political party, there's not one politician who would not advocate for a fundamental shift in the way the City of Winnipeg is treated by the Provincial and Federal Governments.

All we have to do is look at our challenges. Our infrastructure challenge. With all the money we have approved in the capital budget for infrastructure yesterday, we are still $188 million short on an annual basis. That is only to keep up our infrastructure challenges, to make sure that things don't get worse. $188 million short on an annual basis.

The Provincial Government just sent down a directive that we must clean our rivers. That's going to cost about $500 million over 10 years. It's going to cost closer to $800 million over a 25 year period. It's unprecedented in its magnitude. That is the challenge that we have to face.

We are building a state of the art water treatment plant upwards of $400 million. That's going to be done within the next five to ten years. Something that's obviously very necessary. We do not take our environmental responsibilities lightly, we have to do that.

We talk about new police stations in the amalgamation and we all want to do that, but that's going to cost money. Money right now that we don't have in this year.

We talk about our collective agreement responsibilities. We know we have the best civic workforce in Canada. Whenever they get a cost of living increase which they all deserve, that's tens of millions of dollars on an annual basis.

We talk about our debt. Twenty cents of every dollar that we collect from the taxpayer goes to service past debt. That leaves us with eighty cents of every dollar to provide our services, to pay for infrastructure, and meet all those challenges.

Now we look at our funding sources. Property tax. The basic issue here is that we're fundamentally relying too much on our property tax revenue to fund all the services of the City. What have we done for property taxes? We have cut taxes close to 8% in the last six years. On top of that we've eaten the inflation each of those six years at approximately 2% a year. We've provided quality services while doing that. That is not sustainable. That is why we need a new funding relationship with the Province and the Federal Government.

We talk about business tax. Who here wants to raise business tax? Councillor Steek wants to eliminate it. We all want to do better on business tax. But raising business tax is not a very attractive option right now.

We talk about frontage levies. We had that discussion yesterday and the height of irony occurred last week when Councillor Steek appeared at Executive Committee and said, don't raise frontage levies because there's new deal money coming. Mr. Speaker, don't raise frontage levies Councillor Steek said because there is new deal money coming. You can't crap all over a deal on one hand and then expect to benefit from the good work that Council has been doing on the other hand. Doesn't work.

Let's go to the Province. We had the transit debate not even a month ago. The Province's support for transit has not grown more than 5% in the last 10 years, while expenses have grown at least 50%. Our subsidization of transit has grown over 100%. That's not sustainable.

Mr. Speaker that is why we need a new relationship with the other levels of government. That's why I'm not going to be supporting the motion put forward by Councillor De Smedt.

I want to close by talking about the benefits. We have absolutely every city in Canada talking about the great work that the City of Winnipeg is doing. You open the Globe and Mail, the National Post, there are stories about the City of Winnipeg.

I was channel surfing the French National News about three weeks ago and they were talking about the la nouvelle donne pour la ville de Winnipeg. It's excellent exposure and people are talking about what we are doing here.

We have cutting edge economic research done through the Conference Board. Research that is beneficial right now obviously, research that no other city has. We are working with FCM. We are working with Big City Mayors. We have developed an Internet tool unlike any that's ever been developed across North America where our citizens can actually log on to the City of Winnipeg website and calculate how the changes affect them in terms of taxation. That is our property and it will be for a long time. We've engaged thousands of citizens to come and talk about the future of their city.

Mr. Speaker I'm not apologizing for that. We are on the cutting edge of a new relationship with other levels of

government. I agree with Councillor Eadie. Within the end of the decade cities are going to take their proper place in this great country, and we are going to be at the forefront of that issue. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote has been called for on the amendment.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors De Smedt, Steek, Wyatt.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Murray, Councillors Eadie, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 3, Nays 11.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is defeated.

A recorded vote on the clause. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Steek.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 1.

Mr. Speaker: Clause is carried.

Motions. We have one motion before us that was projected under Property and Development. Motion No. 2. The second resolve would come under the jurisdiction of Executive Policy Committee. The first would go to Property and Development. It is automatic referral in any case. I'd refer it to both Committees. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: I'd like to move suspension of the rules we go into Committee as a Whole to discuss this.

Mr. Speaker: Suspension of the rules first of all to deal with it, if we were dealing with it it would then be properly go into Committee as a Whole if that was council's wish.

We have a motion to suspend the rules and deal with Motion No. 2 now. All in favour? Contrary? Motion is defeated.

Motion No. 2 is referred to both Property Committee and Executive Committee.

By-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mr. Deputy Mayor: I'll move that By-law No. 141/2003 be read a second time.

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

Mr. Deputy Mayor: I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time, by-laws numbered 166/2003, 175/2003, 176/2003 and 177/2003.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 166/2003, 175/2003, 176/2003 and 177/2003.

Mr. Deputy Mayor: I'll move that by-laws numbered 166/2003 and 175/2003 to 177/2003, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 166/2003 and 175/2003 to 177/2003, both inclusive.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I'll move that the rules be suspended and by-laws numbered 166/2003 and 175/2003 to 177/2003, both inclusive, be read a third time, and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question period. Councillor Steeves.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Probably the question would be best answered by the Mayor. I'm not sure, depending.

My question is, given the conflicting messages we seem to be getting from the Legislature, for the purposes of the new deal discussions Mr. Mayor, from your opinion given that you're probably the only person who could answer this. What in your opinion is the lay of the land, vis-à-vis the Provincial Government and the Provincial Sales Tax because we've been getting some mixed messages?

Mayor Murray: We had a number of discussions with the Province, both the administrative and political level over the last twelve months. They looked at the entire presentation as did Cabinet. Their view of it was, they thought general the principle they understood where we were going, the challenges that we were facing, they were very empathetic. They asked what we wanted from them, and we said look, we need the latitude to go out and consult the public. They said, they were fine with that. We said we'd like you also not to comment on that, and not to take anything on or off the table. They said, they would review each of it, they would take the same time and look at that.

Since then I met with the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Minister Mihychuk, and I think they are taking this quite seriously now. They are now quite busily working over the next couple of months looking at what they can do as opposed to the obvious thing they feel they can't do. I mean the Premier's position I think as most premiers are, is if you want some sales tax go after the chunk of the GST. I think we want to avoid getting into the game that got us nowhere, for 40 years mayors have been trying to get a better deal for cities. They've gone cap and hand and said, Mr. Premier please give us some revenue, and that usually hasn't been successful. We go to the Province the Province says, look, we're the poor government, Ottawa has all the money, they're much wealthier go ask them for money. You go to Ottawa, Ottawa tells you well, we may have some money but go and talk to the premiers because you're a municipal responsibility, you're the creatures of the provinces.

I think that's changing right now. The other piece I think is very important is the appointment of Mike Harcourt the Chair of this committee. It's about more than just a gas tax I think, I think it's about a larger new deal. John Godfrey the new Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister was interviewed, I caught up on the news being home at 6 p.m., been watching hours of News World. He was yesterday speaking about the three different aspects of what a new deal for cities would be. It was quite comprehensive.

I think there's real opportunity there, the Federal Government, I don't think it will happen all in one year, I think it will be phased over a couple of years. My sense is that there is some opportunities with the Province as well in the next coming months.

I still think believe it or not, that it may be that the public better understands the magnitude of the infrastructure crisis in this country than the provincial governments do. I think the Federal Government well understands it. I think this provincial government is more empathetic than most. I think that part of the reason, this is just my analysis why the Federal Government is moving so quickly to put $2 million into health care, because I think until the sorry, $2 billion, until the Province's get their $2 billion for health care, they're going to view

anything coming out of the mayors and out of city councils in a large cities, a threat to that money. Strategically, my personal view is, health care probably needs $2 billion more, I don't think anyone would disagree with that.

I think also we're still in competition with health care dollars and we've always lost that. I think once the health care issue is settled, Minister Alcott right now is out going through budgets and we've been reading about trying to find money to do that.

I think in the interim, I think there's some possibilities for a number of very positive announcements. I think we'll see more access for infrastructure dollars to cities more quickly. I think some of the projects, Kenaston and other things we've been looking forward to will happen I think more quickly than might have been thought a while ago.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Not the new deal Mr. Mayor. Our end of town needs your help Mr. Mayor. We have an issue regarding the potential expropriation of a school in which the Police Department is housed in their training academy. It's in my ward. It's in our ward, St. Charles, St. James-Assiniboia. I find it a little disturbing that a particular school board might be using an extension of what legally might be entitled to them on expropriation from land now into a building. I know there are probably some wise heads looking at it, but the latest reports seem to indicate that they're going to move ahead and try and get a vote at their meeting tonight.

I would like you to insert yourself, certainly yourself and Councillor Thomas into the debate with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I think this is important to the City. We don't need to move a training academy and go through that expense because a board for 40 students is trying to get accommodation. Not trying to be disrespectful of their rights, parent rights, we probably would need our own legal opinion on seeing whether this is appropriate because we don't want to be dislocated. I can tell you that, we're very sensitive to others who have obviously a right to education, get the right location but at the same time, I don't think we should be discombobulated in this particular way, so I find it ironic how this is evolving without any formal discussion around this table.

Mayor Murray: I'm certainly not up to speed on the issue. Councillor Gerbasi and the Standing Committee I think have been handling that. If there's something I can do with that I would be happy to. I'm aware of the general parameters of the problem and the displacement of the police academy. But if you want to spend a couple of minutes with me after the meeting. I'm not up to speed on that file, I've been a little ill the past few days. I will try to get up to speed on it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi did you wish to answer first.

Councillor Gerbasi: If I could just clarify for Council that the French School Division is making a decision to consider expropriating Allard School where our police training academy is located. We're just in the process of signing a lease with them which has all gone through, all the processes. The Police Service wants to stay there. The St. James School Division adamantly wants us to stay there as well. There's basically a dispute that the Provincial Government and the School Division need to work out among themselves. At this point they need a little bit of time to try and work that out. I think the Police are well aware of it, and on top of it I think our position is really really clear that we want this space. We're certainly monitoring the situation closely as these school divisions are going through their processes.

If they do go through an expropriation process it would be a long process which I've been assured by the Chair of the St. James School Division that they will be fighting tooth and nail. Beyond that it's certainly a facility we don't want to leave it, we want to stay there, that's the position of the Police Service and it certainly makes a lot of sense.

As new information unfolds we'll be bringing it forward to Council, and the Standing Committee as appropriate if there's a policy decision to be made. It's not something that we asked for to happen at all. It's something between the two school divisions, and it's really a legal matter that's going to have to be sorted out and fought out between the various players. I hope that helps.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Just a request by way of a question. Would the Mayor consider sending some correspondence to the Province indicating our support from our position that we would like the Academy to stay there? And secondly, could our legal department present a legal opinion to me on the apparent debate that's going on? I mean, according to the Province the expropriation laws for land not for buildings, whereas the Ecole Secondaire is assuming that it could be buildings. I need to have a legal opinion, would our department analysis that for us please?

Mr. Speaker: I don't think the Mayor could order a legal opinion anymore than you can. But on the first part of the question I'm sure he'll answer.

Mayor Murray: As I said Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the details about what appropriate role would be for the City. I'm certainly empathetic to Councillor De Smedt's concerns, and I'll look into once I have an understanding. I would rather have a better understanding of the issue before I said anything.

Mr. Speaker: 12 noon and we'll go to lunch. You're all invited to our Christmas party. We are adjourned to 1:30 p.m.

Council recessed at 11:53 a.m.

After recess

Council reconvened at 1:38 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We'll move to Public Works.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED DECEMBER 9, 2003**

Councillor Lazarenko: In the absence of the Chair of Public Works it's my privilege and honour to do this for the Chair presenting the Report of the Standing Committee on Public Works.

Firstly may I get Council's attention. It's this time of the year that we are going to be recessing soon to start off a new year beginning of January.

I'd like to thank the staff of the City, the Clerk's Department, people that we've worked with very sincerely for the hard work that all of you have been providing us. I know it was not an easy task. Also to my colleagues all of you I wish you all a Merry Christmas and a happy new year. To those who are celebrating the Julian Calendar, my Ukrainian friends.

(Ukrainian being spoken)

With that Mr. Speaker, I will be presenting the Report dated December 9, 2003, and submit Item No. 1 as a consent item.

**Item No. 1 – Recycling Activity Status Report
File WT-1.3**

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I stand this item down to speak to it because I think it's a significant item. We've reached a milestone here with regards to target on recycling. I think it's worth noting I think the citizens of the City should be complimented and credited for this and for the environmental awareness of many of our citizens today.

We have now reached the 34,000, over the 34,000 tonnes of recycling material target that was set on May 23, 2001. We've definitely improved as a city. In 1997 we were at 23,000 tonnes, in 2001 we rose up to 28,000 tonnes, in 2002, 32,000 tonnes, and now in 2003, it's estimated that our tonnage of recycled material will be 35,842 tonnes of recycled material. I think that's a credit to all citizens of the City. It's a credit for those

who work very hard on the Standing Committee on Public Works, the Chairman who's not here today. Councillor Lazarenko, I know he was very involved in that debate with regards to garbage cleanup and the garbage fee issue at the time in 2001. The very fact that a target was set I think is credited to the Council at the time. And the citizens of the City who have definitely worked hard to participate in the recycling program.

I think it's a positive thing. There's no doubt in my mind the recycling that we have today is a first step that there's more that we could be doing with regards to recycling for commercial establishments and institutional establishments. I hope that we look forward to that and we work towards that. But definitely the fact that we've reached the target that was set on May 23, 2001 in approximately 18 months is a positive thing and all the citizens of the City should be commended for it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I appreciate the comments from Councillor Wyatt, I think it certainly is something to be proud of that we're increasing our recycling.

It did bring to mind a point that I wanted to raise. Is that maybe a more important question is, are we reducing the garbage we're throwing out? My guess is that we probably aren't. That was the last I heard in looking at these in detail. I'd like to get the answer from the Administration on that. As every school child knows it's reduce, reuse and recycle, and recycle is number three.

I'm not convinced that we're actually reducing the amount of garbage we're producing and putting in the landfill. I'm totally supportive of a recycling program. I'm glad we've expanded it to apartments which may be some of the reasons for some of the increase. Plus making it easier to recycle by throwing everything out without having to sort it. Those things have made it easier to recycle.

We really haven't yet tackled the issues of reducing the amount we throw out which would reduce our costs to the City. I frankly believe that part of that is that we don't have an incentive to limit what we're able to throw out. That's another debate for another day. But I think it's important to mention that until we start reducing the amount of garbage we're throwing into the landfill, we really aren't being as environmentally conscience as we ought to as a city. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you. I think I can sort of partially answer Councillor Gerbasi's question. If I'm reading this report correctly. It looks to me like for the first three quarters of '02, we were about at 170,000 tonnes. It looks like for the first three quarters of '03, we're a full 4,000 tonnes higher than that, if I'm reading that correctly.

I guess the answer to your question is no we are not reducing the amount of garbage that we're throwing out regrettably.

The 35,000 tonnes of garbage that we were hoping to get to, that's an estimate if I'm reading that correct. It hasn't yet been achieved so we should be careful about being too self-congratulatory. Though the goal itself is worthy.

I guess what does cause some concern about this report is a couple of things when you look at it. We probably went from 173,000 tonnes in '01, down to 170,000 tonnes in '02 because of the high density recycling that we did. That was when we opened it up to the 90,000 new units that now have recycling available to them. That would no doubt explain that.

It looks like now we're kind of regrettably back on the same path again if I'm reading this correctly in terms of increasing residential garbage tonnage. I think I can take that as a matter of course because it looks like the recycling is increasing with the amount of garbage. I don't see the diversion rates by percentage on this chart. It would be simple to figure out and maybe it's in the

report and I just don't have it in front of me.

In any event, it's great that people are cognizant of the targets and I congratulate Councillor Wyatt for being cognizant of the target and that in some ways we're where we want to be. I think to be perfectly clear the fact is, we're recycling more but also throwing out more.

One thing that disturbs me about this report and I don't know if the stand in Chair of Public Works can answer this. I don't see any real impact on this report nor do I see a specific mention in this report with respect to the commingled recycling. Has there been any to your knowledge and if you don't have the answer that's perfectly understandable, do you or anyone else on the committee have any information as to how the commingling has effected the recycling rates? I see you shaking your head so perhaps that's a question that's going to have to wait.

I appreciate the reports. I think they're valuable. Please to see that the target may be on the verge of being reached but we have to be a little bit careful about the celebration. That's all.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: With all due respect to my colleagues here Mr. Speaker, it's well documented in Hansard we were told by the Mayor who unfortunately isn't present, also by the Standing Chair, that under no circumstances is there documentation in North America of any city to realize the kind of targets that were set for this city without the punitive action of a dollar or two dollars a bag. You met it, and you met those targets without charging anybody anything. There's a message there. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lazarenko did you wish to say anything in closing.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The report that is before us here you have to really read it to understand more. They talk about autobins. The autobins are not producing. Too much waste is going through the autobin system.

What is happening right now is that there is illegal dumping that is taking place with the autobins. Non residents of the area or even of the City are coming in and dumping their solid waste and garbage.

The one thing that I've been raising off and on is that we do not have enforcement to the point of what we had before. I've always been saying that we should have more enforcement and use the autobin by-law for enforcement because it is there.

When the autobins were implemented August 24, 1995, that was implemented right in my ward because the autobins were introduced in 1990, and the first autobin that was delivered to the households in the Mynarski Ward was at that time.

You must understand since 2000, 23,995 metric tonnes, right now in 2002, we are close to 33,000 metric tonnes that goes into the landfill site.

You must also take into account, we are getting garbage from five other municipalities, such as Kenora. We had said we were looking for additional revenue because we had a shortfall of the new waste disposal that was implemented by BFI in the R. M. of Rosser. We had lost the revenue from $10 million, we went down to $3 million. We lost $7 million of revenue by the garbage going into the private sector because we were tipping ourselves out of business when the tipping fees went from $20 to $30 up to $40 a metric ton, now we put that back down to $25 a metric ton trying to recoup some of the business. It's not easy because we at that time thought that garbage was gold, that it was ours. We found out that it was not the case.

The challenge that we had given to the City to challenge the Clean Environment Commission not to issue a license to BFI and the R.M. Rosser we lost, it cost us

like something $225,000 we lost that challenge and they do have a landfill site.

Garbage is one question that has been raised by so many people. I would ask the Administration not as an acting Chair here today but I'll keep doing it along with my colleagues on Public Works is that we have to start enforcing big, because people are abusing the present autobin system. The by-law is not being enforced.

We do have an increase of the recycling. It's a lot better than it was before. We spent a lot of money in educating people also we've changed the format of how we do the recycling, we've now added different cartons that go into recycling, not like before they had to be separated now most of it is being put in the recycling bin that is being picked up.

That's my comments Mr. Speaker and I'll move that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question on the clause. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions, none. I will slip in a motion here moved by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Gerbasi, that Councillor Smith be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Question Period. Councillor Steeves.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steeves: Just not to lose that point. If I could ask the today's Chair of Public Works, perhaps in the future if you could make a request to the Public Works Committee that we for the next report that there be something about the commingled recycling and how that is or not affecting things? Someone had mentioned that there is garbage coming in from other jurisdictions and how that affects these numbers. Neither of those things were clear in this report to me. If you would take that on my behalf or are on behalf to the Administration.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker I will do so. The Clerk has taken note and I'll pass it onto the Administration, and hopefully maybe by next council meeting we should have the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Fiscal Issues. Report of December 4, 2003. Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED DECEMBER 4, 2003

Councillor Clement: I'm pleased to move the Report of Fiscal Issues dated December 4, 2003, and I'll move Item Nos. 1 and 2 as consent.

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

By-laws. Questions.

Property and Development. Report of December 2, 2003. Councillor Vandal.

Items 7 and 14. We'll wait until he introduces them. 12.

Councillor Vandal moves Items 1 to 6, 8 to 11, 13 and 15 as consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED DECEMBER 2, 2003

Mr. Speaker: We have stepped down Items 7, 12, and 14. Item No. 7 Councillor Vandal.

Item 7 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 550 Kenaston Boulevard File DASZ 23/2003

Councillor Vandal: Item No. 7 is a subdivision rezoning, 550 Kenaston Boulevard. This is along the CNR Oak Point Subdivision. It was heard at community committee. It was turned down at community committee, although I understand the ward councillor was supportive of it. It was turned down at community committee because of its potential as a future transportation corridor.

We, back in 1999 during the last Plan Winnipeg hearings had the discussion on the floor of this council on the future use of this CNR Subdivision piece of land, and we decided back in 1999 that it would not be a transportation corridor for a high speed busway.

Mr. Speaker, subsequent to '99, we've rezoned a couple of other pieces of land along the north side of Grant, along the CNR Oak Point Subdivision, and the south side of Academy Road. This is the third such private rezoning along that line. If we did the first two I see no reason why this one should be held back. There's a positive planners report. I'll wait to hear the concerns of Councillor Gerbasi and try to answer the questions when I sum up.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify one thing. It was turned down for the reason Councillor Vandal just mentioned, but also as part of a public hearing process with the residents. There were other reasons that this particular application was turned down in relation to the impact of the expansion, the Superstore. So I just wanted to clarify that.

Another point I'd like to make is that the decisions of Council being maybe consistent on this matter, but in my opinion they've been consistently bad. I don't think you necessarily continue to make the same mistake over and over because you've consistently done something a certain way. It's never too late to do the right thing.

I'd like to speak against this clause, and ask that Council listen to the Community Committee and listen to the community, people who live in River Heights.

I'd just like to note, Lee Haber is in the audience, he's been here all day, as a young fellow who is one of the many hundreds of people that have been out to speak to a community committee on the various issues. He is in the audience here and I appreciate somebody taking the time to come and sit all day through our council meeting and a young person. I think it's significant that he's a young person because he's concerned, he's here today because he's concerned about the future of his city that he's going to live a much longer lifetime than many of us here in this city. And he's concerned about his future as I am today which is why I'm speaking up against a lot of people on council here today and having to fight against the tide that wants to move ahead with this because I believe it is truly the right thing to do.

This is the third in a series of rezonings that have been overturned, the Community Committee's decision has been overturned. This issue has a long history and it is somewhat complicated. It is also surprisingly simple in some ways. It is important to point out that the use of these lands as a future transportation corridor makes absolute sense. Transit has said that this is the ideal spot for a bus only corridor as a 100% of the buses can conveniently be rerouted off Kenaston providing relief from traffic congestion, speedier transit and a bike path to boot. The other rail line that has sometimes been thrown around off of Renfrew would serve less than half the buses on Kenaston and is hardly a solution as sensible as the Oak Point solution.

The history on this goes way back to the last Plan Winnipeg Review which I was part of with Councillor Vandal. The local councillor who adamantly opposes rapid transit corridors particularly in his own backyard, has lobbied successfully to get these potential future lands out of the official Plan Winnipeg document as part of our long term transportation plan for rapid transit. All of this was against the advice of the Transit Department at the time, and still is in conflict with what our experts believe is best for the City in terms of transit priorities. This has been discussed more as a property matter than a transit matter. It is a transportation matter.

The other thing that Councillor Steek did, was to send out information and hold meetings with residents telling them how bad a transit corridor would be for them. There was no transit experts present at

those meetings and residents had the be Jesus scared out of them that they would be bordering on a noisy truck route and all sorts of things like that.

Councillor Steek: That's a ridiculous comment, scare the be Jesus out of them.

Councillor Gerbasi: It was in the paper today.

Councillor Steek: I don't care if it was in the paper or not, let's be fair here. I understand I have the opportunity to speak to it, but that should be withdrawn, that's ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: I know Councillor Gerbasi has been tiptoeing down the line, I don't think she's crossed it at this point.

Councillor Gerbasi: The fact that there would be bike path, noise attenuation and a bus only corridor was not properly explained to people, and I heard this from the numerous residents that were calling me in my office. That's who I heard it from. If that's not accurate, I'm sorry, that's what they're telling me. I wasn't there.

Councillor in a shortsighted and ill-thought out effort to garner support for Plan Winnipeg, went along with taking this out of the Plan. There maybe another reason. Perhaps they thought that it was so far in the future that it was not really a pressing issue. I heard on the radio this morning that this is priority 'G' on our list of transit corridors so we shouldn't worry about it right now. Well even if it's 20 years from now or 30 years from now or 50 years from now we have to purchase the land now and get this thing in place otherwise we're blowing the opportunity.

Once the rail lines come up for sale, once this happened but the rail lines came up for sale, the City went through a long process of negotiating with CN. But because it was taken out of Plan Winnipeg as a transit related priority, it was very difficult for the Administration to justify purchasing it. That's the fundamental problem.

I'd like Council to note that the Federal Government has recognized the huge importance of rail lines for transit infrastructure so much that they are developing a new federal program to assist municipalities in acquiring abandoned rail lines for transportation corridors. Yet this council doesn't seem to grasp that even if this is 20, 30 or 40 years from now we should be working towards this goal.

In the Administration's recent report on this matter, they recommended studying this as a future transportation corridor because I quote "future development will increase transportation demands on Kenaston (Linden Ridge, Waverley West, and Kapyong Barracks). The options to accommodate transportation demand grow solely by the additions to the roadway capacity on Kenaston Boulevard are limited".

It doesn't take a brain surgeon to figure out that we need to address these future traffic problems with an alternative route for buses to remove them from the traffic jangle and encourage more environmentally friendly options. The world is changing, and we can't live this way forever. That's why we had this long term plan for rapid transit for all these decades. That's why we are making a terrible mistake today if we let this opportunity go by. I realize that people would have to eat crow and back off on decisions they made before but if they're a bad decision then stand up and do it. So what?

Property and Development Committee even refused to support a motion that I convinced EPC to support, but there were two people there and they voted it down. That the Administration maintain an open dialogue with CN regarding potential future uses of the residential Oak Point Subdivision properties. That future transportation options in the Kenaston area be explored during the next review of Plan Winnipeg. Holy cow, two members of the Committee defeated a motion just to have an open dialogue with CN and to even discuss future transportation options in our Plan Winnipeg. Talk about shutting the door

and closing their mind to even discussing it. That's what they did. A housing development was proposed as you all know and was defeated, rightly so as it really didn't fit on the land, and now as these piece-meal rezonings have been coming forward one by one Councillor Smith and I have opposed them consistently because they are a detriment to the future transportation needs of this city.

River Heights residents have come out in droves to numerous meetings, and have expressed a huge frustration in feeling that their voices were heard at community committee and then disregarded as this thing was flipped at other committees that weren't there and didn't hear the resident's concerns. They didn't hear how they feel about a Superstore expansion. It's very rare we overturn community committee decisions. But here we're doing it without really knowing what happened at that meeting and I think people who were at those meetings are very frustrated and do not feel heard today.

Many residents are now learning the truth about what a bus corridor would mean, and they're writing letters as the one in the paper today explaining that they would have supported this if they had better information. In fact I got an e-mail today which showed a survey in the neighbourhood an informal survey that 70% of the residents would support a transit corridor on those lands today rather than the development that's happening there. If they had a choice. And they have legitimate concerns about the Superstore expansion and its impact that the store already has on their neighbourhood.

I'm frustrated and discouraged by council's short term thinking and lack of willingness to deal appropriately with these long term issues that I believe are really crucial to our city's future. This is why we are here to leave a legacy of a well planned city not haphazard development with no thought to future transportation needs. It's time to change this way of doing things. It's well passed the time to change. Perhaps councillors are swamped with work and their minds are to busy and anxiously wanting to get to the Christmas season, but we are making a mistake today by allowing these rezonings to go through. Please take the time for some sober second thought and reverse this decision. It is never too late to do the right thing. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you. Upon further thinking about this item and as a member of the Standing Committee on Planning, Property and Development, it concerns me that the views of the residents relating to this item are having very little impact on what seems to be a foregone conclusion.

From rereading the information contained at the decision-making history of this item it seems unclear to me the level of consultation and information gathering that took place with area residents to come to some consensus on some acceptable level of development that ought to take place along the decommissioned CNR rail line.

What is clear though, is the fact that several residents took the time to vehemently oppose the proposed development that is before us today. Furthermore, the final decision at the public hearing on November 4, 2003 recognized the opposition of the community to the proposed development. From my part I think it is paramount and incumbent upon us to initiate a larger discussion a participatory dialogue with the community about the smart usage of this property. There needs to be a master plan for future use at this decommissioned rail line. This is not only a ward issue but this is a city-wide issue. There are opportunities that should and ought to be explored.

To be certain, there are other opportunities for a Superstore, the applicant. However, consider the fact that under this proposed development the back of the wall of the Superstore will be 100 feet or less than 32 metres from the rear walls of the area resident's homes.

Clearly, this is a very imposing development. I think it is important to keep in mind that the City Centre Community Committee provided the following supporting reasons for its recommendation on November 4. I quote the report. "The City Centre Community Committee recognizes the opposition to this application by area residences".

So Council colleagues, I hope you will also recognize and be mindful of the concerns of the area residents and concur with the November 4, 2003 decision of the City Centre Community Committee by not supporting the recommendation before you today. I think it's important that there be a master plan for this decommissioned rail line with active communitiy input. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you. Mr. Speaker it's a pleasure to have the opportunity to respond to commentaries frankly that have been rife with omissions and errors. Let's get one thing straight. There were no fewer than three motions brought forward by myself to purchase the land. Councillor Gerbasi did not support any of them, at EPC nor did she attend at PP&D to purchase.

Furthermore, let's get something else straight. There were no fewer than six public meetings prior to the first rezoning on this property even coming forward. All attended between four and six hundred residents. The message was loud and clear. No infill development which was supported by the Community Committee, no transit corridor. The fact that a limited number of people have now come forward and said, well, I'd love to have buses running through my backyard is their priority and prerogative, and I respect that. I also would suggest they're wrong.

The fact remains is we took out of Plan Winnipeg in 1999 the plates that this was allocated as a transit corridor Mr. Speaker. We've had numerous opportunities to purchase the land, this was stopped by the Mayor and EPC, let's get it straight.

Councillor Gerbasi also indicates she wasn't at the meetings, and she wasn't at all the public meetings by any stretch of the imagination. If you run a transit corridor through this narrow strip of land which is 90 feet wide, it's tantamount to expropriation for these people.

One need only look at the article in today's paper, and take a look at the line drawings. Miraculously guess what the line drawings don't show? Any back lanes. They show the greenspace going right up to the back of the people's homes, miraculous. I guess we're doing away with the back lanes on both sides.

Let's cut to the issue at hand here about this rezoning. We have already rezoned two pieces of property, one on Academy Road, one on Grant. Why did we rezone them? Well frankly because half of the property was already zoned "C2" and they could have gone ahead and done development there whether we rezoned or not. Let's not suggest for a minute that a bicycle path or a quarter was going to happen automatically. The City wasn't interested in expropriating, as a matter of fact, if the Mayor and this Executive Policy Committee were so concerned about this as a transportation corridor, they had the opportunity to buy it and buy it dirt cheap. I would suggest that Councillor Gerbasi go back and have a look at the documentation in PP&D which outlines very clearly the options to buy as a matter of fact the recommendation from the Property Committee to buy. And it never happened.

The rezoning on hand relative to the Superstore is well documented. When it was turned down by my community committee as the other two were, as the ward councillor I supported it. But I will also tell you, that if you go back to the first two rezonings Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Smith never ever mentioned a transit corridor. They simply talked about a greenspace and cycling opportunities.

Well let's get one thing straight. This property runs for seven blocks, and it's not as if it's uninterrupted. If you want to

cycle through there, if you want to walk through there you cover major thoroughfares. You walk across Grant, you walk across Academy, you walk across Corydon Avenue. They're not greenbelts through there, you walk across busy corridors. I don't know, maybe Councillor Gerbasi hasn't walked through there, but the fact remains that the lands that she's so concerned about are owned by CN. CN came to the City of Winnipeg and said, we'd like you to buy them. Here's the offer. The City dilly dallied around endlessly on it to the point where CN said, sorry we've had it with you, we're going to put them out in the marketplace. That's exactly what they've done.

Now CN also has a vaunted challenge in front of them because of the fact Mr. Speaker those seven blocks are encompassed by residential on other side only 90 feet away. These are by River Heights standards modest homes. These are homes though that many people have been in their residences for 40 years plus. It is their major investment. You run a transit corridor down that backline or even promise you got one coming, you devalue those properties.

People do not want a transit corridor. Are there some? Of course. There's no such thing as unanimity on anything. The vast majority of people do not want a transit corridor they want it to stay greenspace, and it may well do that Mr. Speaker for the simple reason that these lands have to come forward as they are sold off on an individual basis for rezonings.

The rezonings in front of us here as has been pointed out by the Chair of PP&D have the total support of the Administration. We have a good corporate citizen here. These homes are 100 feet away, 100 feet away. With all due respect to Councillor Pagtakhan who I dare say hasn't been there, maybe he wants to go and visit the site. Hundred feet is as large as most city lots in the innercity, that's the distance you're away from the Superstore.

There's going to be significant light proof fencing. There's going to be significant landscaping. The people that came in from Superstore met the letter of the law in every requirement that was put in front of them. That's the reason that we have the support from the Administration. That's the reason it was supported at PP&D. That's the reason it was supported at EPC Mr. Speaker.

Let's get one thing straight here. Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Pagtakhan, he's a recent convert. I dare say maybe he's been to see the site, I certainly hope he has. But here's something that's fascinating. We saw a motion come forward here that was referred. Does Councillor Gerbasi not realize in this motion the very property she is talking about has been sold to the private sector? Do you not realize that? This property is gone. The property between Wellington Crescent and Academy Road has been sold. As a matter of fact Councillor Vandal as have I, seen the proposals for development. They're spectacular. Somehow we're supposed to include a transit corridor.

Finally think about this one. Has anybody taken a look at what the traffic is like coming off the Academy ramp? Seventy-five thousand cars a day and you want to put a transit corridor into that merge. Get a life, get real. There is no request in my area for a transit corridor. There is no request for high speed transit. Are there a half dozen people that are wagging the tail of the dog? Sure, there always are. This administrative report is thorough. Everything that has come forward relative to rezoning has had administrative support. The Administration turned down the various things that Councillor Gerbasi was concerned about, infill housing. It's a tough piece of property to work.

You know what the irony of it is Mr. Speaker? It's likely you won't see something happen there for a long time. The people that now walk their dogs there, the people that now walk there and cycle there will probably be able to do it indefinitely. They also wanted a transit corridor going through there. It was the wisdom of this council that took those plates out in 1999.

I would suggest to both Councillor Pagtakhan and Councillor Gerbasi, go back and check the record, then come back and talk to me about it.

In the meantime I'm urging all of council to support this. It was supported unanimously at PP&D, supported unanimously at EPC. I take that back, I assume Councillor Gerbasi voted against it there. Although she certainly didn't come out anywhere along the line Mr. Speaker and offer to buy this property. It sure makes for great political hay in somebody's else's ward. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal. We have another request. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Just a couple points of clarification and just for the record, I think I've spoken on this before. I guess Councillor Steek and I like to part just a little bit on some history here. The PP&D Committee of course had been given some recommendations or options by the Administration. Of course one of the ones was an outrageous option to purchase by CN some more bridge structure. We need more bridge structure in the City like we need a hole in the head. Of course that quickly was rejected. It was really the nature of the rest of the offer to buy the space that is now considered greenspace from Academy to Taylor, was frankly not at the price that was representative of a good corporate citizen. I'm not here to bash Canadian National Railways, but on the other hand they've been given huge benefit and opportunity in this city to grow. We last year gave an extraordinary $220,000 credit for them to move out of the Kenaston area with their intermodel centre which is something that I didn't support and thought it was a ridiculous request from a large corporate entity that has the capacity to make their adjustments in business plans.

In any event, I think the option that is available and has always been available to us is to allow the discussions to continue with CN, and the point that should be made is that we should fully expect that CN will at some point in time contribute this land to the City for a tax receipt. I think that would really be a better corporate citizen than I've seen demonstrated today. They have had the opportunity which we will approve I hope today as the rezoning and this particular piece adjacent to Grant. They've already sold one piece of land on Academy, we've been supportive of that. They have the opportunity to market and get some generation revenue generation capability from this property. I don't think they need much more. We have to respect the citizens in that area. It isn't a transit corridor, it ought not to ever be a transit corridor considering the width of the property. The interruptions that you would face on three major intersections. It ought to be perhaps greenspace. I'm waiting really for the Administration and CN to come to us with a report that says, we would be willing as a good corporate citizen to donate this land for greenspace, and the City of course would recognize that with some form of tax credit receipt.

The record is clear. PP&D Committee were not anxious to just acquire more land from a corporate entity just because it was there. To acquire some more bridge structures and abutments that were in a state of decay. Let's be clear on this.

I think a lot has happened in the last five years. I think the decisions made in the past were acceptable. Plate B does only show a transit corridor crossing the River to Academy. It does not show itself through to Taylor Avenue along that Oak Point right-of-way, and it ought not to. I think the local community have been heard on that.

The greenspace issue is another one. Can we have some innovative way of dealing with it? I hope so. Ought we to buy it on behalf of the community? Perhaps. As they say if the price is right I guess anything can happen. I'm waiting for CN to step up and say look it folks, we've made a tremendous, we've had a tremendous role in the City in developing it. We got blinds that bisect and create a lot of interruptions in our traffic. I think it would be worthwhile for them to

contribute in the spirit of the season and hopefully this continues on through the springtime to offer to the City this piece of land as greenspace. I think that would go a long way to satisfy the community, then we could buy in and create the trails and we could create the bike paths and have some linear park stability for that area for the long term. I think that's the kind of long term thinking that Councillor Gerbasi is thinking about. It certainly can't be a transit corridor right in people's backyards. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you. The key issue relative to this rezoning is one of clarity. I hold up Plan Winnipeg 2020 something that was approved in these chambers in 1999 near unanimously. Included in Plan Winnipeg 2020 are a couple of policy plates on where the transportation high speed busways will be. Not included in Plan Winnipeg 2020 is identification that this piece of land will be a high speed busway. That decision was made in 1999. Subsequent to 1999 we've dealt with two rezonings a few months ago on this very same piece of land where we have rezoned parts of those lands to commercial. Something that was a right of the existing owners on the adjacent pieces of land. Councillor Steek is right when he says that.

The land south of Portage Avenue between Portage and the Assiniboine River has been sold to private interests. There is an exciting development to go on the actual train bridge that is in the very very preliminary stages.

The issue is clarity. When we're dealing with a parcel of land that is not city owned, never has been city owned, we need to take away the risk and be clear with the people who actually own the land. We made the decision in '99, there will be no transit corridor here. We did negotiate early on possible acquisition and Councillor Steek is partially right, I remember Councillor Steek coming into the room and saying, hold off on negotiations I'm working on a housing development with CN and we know what happened to that. Now however CN are well within their rights to sell off their pieces of land and develop them, and that's the issue we're dealing with this afternoon.

We have a positive report from the Administration. Let me just read one line. "The proposed development is appropriate given the site location at the intersection of two regional streets". If you've read the report you'll see it's a positive administrative report.

I am very reluctant to overturn a decision of community committee but in this case I think the facts speak for themselves and the area councillor who let's face it, in the jobs we do here we're all very busy. We have to place a certain amount of faith in all of us as area councillors to manage our wards to the best of their ability. We rely on the long term plan, and we move forward with decisions. That's what we're doing here this afternoon. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Recorded vote has been requested. All in favour of Item No. 7 please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Steek, Vandal, Wyatt, Lazarenko and Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 4.

Mr. Speaker: The clause is carried.

Clause 12.

Item No. 12 – Extension of Time – Subdivision and Rezoning – southeast corner of Inkster and Brookside Boulevards
File DASZ 7/2001

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker the information we've received for this item we'd like to warrant an extension of time. I'd like to move automatic referral to the Committee.

Mr. Speaker: It's not automatic, but you're moving referral back to standing committee. There's been some developments concerning possible development there, and the Councillor for the ward has asked that it be referred back to Standing Committee. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 14.

Item No. 14 – Historical Building Listing – Cadomin Building, 280 Main Street
File G-3.1.1

Mr. Speaker: Did you wish to introduce the clause Councillor Vandal?

Councillor Vandal: No. This is one that's been here a while. I think we all know the file so I'll try to address the concerns in summing up.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi. Before you start and before your time starts, Councillor Lazarenko could you take the chair please.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you Council for your indulgence in allowing me to continue to perhaps go down in flames on another important issue.

When I believe something is right and important, I believe it is my responsibility to stand up and speak to it. Please have patience, we are still working today. Thank you very much for your attention in advance.

I'd like to speak against the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee that would deny the recommendation to designate the Cadomin Building as a historic building.

The Historic Buildings Committee which I'm the Chair, with objectivity and expertise and I wasn't there when the experts on the Committee made this decision, they have deemed through their objective criteria that this building is worthy of designation.

I'd like to point out that this is an Atchison Building that is perfectly viable and is located on a major intersection on one of our signature downtown streets.

What puzzles me is I've yet to hear one good reason why we should deny this recommendation. I wonder once again if Council is simply so swamped with other business that they can't see the forest for the trees? I really think we're falling asleep at the switch once again.

A number of questions have been troubling me regarding this issue. Have people forgotten that once a historic building is gone there is no bringing it back and that means forever? What is the rush to make it effortless for people to take these buildings out? A designation can always be removed if a compelling case was made in the future. If there was some wonderful development that was coming forward, they could approach and go through the process. But we're taking away any hoops for anyone to jump through or we're taking away one of them, a major one making it very easy to do this.

I've heard some rather bizarre rationalizations where why it is okay to do this. I've heard councillors say, it's not that spectacular of a building. Well it's true it's not the Legislative Building but it is the collection of all these buildings together that create the effect of a large and significant heritage character in our downtown.

I wonder if everyone here today has taken the time to read the report and if so I hope you were paying close attention to it. The report of the Historic Buildings Committee says, that not only is it designed by Winnipeg's most prominent architect, it is the only remaining example of a modest commercial structure. The report states that the building is a historic landmark in downtown and acts as a bridge between the older Victorian structures further south on Main Street and the massive towers of

Portage and Main. To me that's not insignificant.

I've also heard councillors justify this decision by saying, that the owner doesn't want it designated. Well first of all, I don't think that's how we should be making decisions about heritage designation. We know someone who knows someone who doesn't like the idea. That's not very professional. And it's not appropriate and it's not what we should be basing this decision on. Our heritage assets belong to all of the citizens of Winnipeg, and if they are lost, that loss is to our whole city not just one property owner. As much respect as we all have for this particular upstanding Winnipeg business person we should make our decision based on the heritage value and the real issues at hand. Not how much respect we have for the person who is asking.

There was another important point that's being ignored here today. This is a viable property that if designated might be eligible for heritage tax credits. Making it more desirable for redevelopment. Isn't that what we're trying to do? The only disadvantage of the designation to the owner is that it can't be demolished without a more elaborate process taking place. I've seen documentation that the request for the demolition permit has been withdrawn. My question is, why not designate it and encourage reuse and redevelopment? Isn't that what we're trying to do in our downtown?

When pressed about concerns that a parking lot could be in the works, I've been told, there would have to be a public hearing and a conditional use before that could happen so don't worry. Well I find that cold comfort. With the eagerness of council or the apparent eagerness of council to facilitate things for development downtown it may not be so hard to convince council to allow a temporary parking lot. Even though the Planning Department opposes it, political will is often there right now to help out business community at any cost to sometimes ignoring planning and our planning goals. It would be a lot harder to do this with a heritage designation. This is preciously why designating this is the right thing to do.

We have the heritage designation process for a very good reason. To preserve heritage assets and to prevent the senseless loss of valuable structures that can never be replaced. Is everyone asleep? Please recognize the importance of this issue that is right in front of us.

I'd like to say, in the spirit of the Christmas season, that I'm usually quite impressed with the work of this council, but I'm really disappointed, I'm really frustrated today with a couple of decisions, this one as much as the last one almost. Why have people ignored this and why is nobody hearing the truth? I have not heard one good reason yet why we should disregard the recommendation of our experts to designate this building. Not one good reason. I urge you to vote against the PP& D recommendation. Thank you.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the Chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steek you're next.

Councillor Steek: Mr. Speaker, Councillor Gerbasi asked for one good reason. Let me give it to you. A new building, enhanced assessment. The reason the initial demolition project did not go forward was because an opportunity that looked like it was going to happen did not materialize. Not everyone wants to take over an old and rundown building.

How ironic after we've listened to this diatribe from Councillor Gerbasi that she couldn't jump up fast enough to support the demolition of Eaton's. She wants a compelling argument, the compelling argument is straightforward. I know Councillor Gerbasi's been disappointed not as much as many of us, she wants to know if we're awake. She's jolted us to attention that if she wants to keep something like this, there isn't another building any proximity to it of this kind of nature. Take a look of what's around it. You got Winnipeg Square. You go down

to Portage and Main we've got new skyscrapers. We've got the Exchange. It's ridiculous to save this old barn.

How many of you been in it? It doesn't got anything historically to recommend it. But you know what it does have? It is an incredible piece of property. You know what it sends out the message to the business and development community we want to move forward. We don't want to be trapped in 1912. I have a lot of problem with people who say, why should the owner have sway over to what happens to their building. Well here's why.

Because for decades those owners have pumped life into the place. They've kept it alive. They've paid the taxes, business taxes, property taxes and created employment. Maybe for some people it's important to their economic portfolio for the future. But Councillor Gerbasi decides that you know what, it's 1912, it's Grade III heritage which means it's about as attractive as your grandmother's '53 Chevrolet rotting in a junkyard. The fact remains is that we're going to save it. Give me a break.

You want to know if we're awake, yeah we'll be awake when you see the vote on this. Thank you.

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

Councillor Steeves: Although I plan on supporting the motion. I don't agree with my colleague Councillor Gerbasi.

To try to put this in context because I hate to see the acrimony amongst friends here. I'm just joking I love to see it.

I do tend to agree, just to put this sort of in a layman's context because when it comes to issues of heritage to a large extent I am a layman.

We have to balance the idea of the fact that there are very valuable and some older buildings in the City of Winnipeg. We have to somehow find a balance between exactly how valuable the older stock is versus what might eventually come to replace it. I think it's not, although we do hate to lose an old building, there's no question about that, it's not beyond the realm of possibilities, given the power that this council has, the power of the City of Winnipeg has by virtue of zoning and planning and plan approval and those types of things. It's not unreasonable to think that we might not be able to come back eventually if demolition does occur. We might be able to come back with a building in our downtown that's new and might be as attractive as this one. I could imagine that happening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor Vandal closing.

Councillor Vandal: About two weeks ago I picked up the phone and I called Mr. Wilson, and I had a conversation with him. He told me at one point there was the possibility of a new building at that site, but that deal has fallen through.

He told me he was ready to take his retirement, he had worked his whole life in the downtown of Winnipeg. His life savings were wrapped up in the building, and he's looking to sell the building and move onto the next stage of his life.

He told me he would prefer to not have a historical designation. So yes the owner of the building has told me that he prefers not to have a historical designation.

When you put it in that context, when you realize here's a Winnipegger that's devoted his entire life to the downtown of the City of Winnipeg, when you're assured through the zoning by-law that somebody cannot just come in, knock it down, create a surface parking lot, they would need a conditional use approval for that. And whatever decision is given we know it would be negative would be appeallable to the Appeals Committee, that's not going to happen. He told me he did not want to demolish the building, in fact they withdrew their demolition permit.

Placed in that context, I'm comfortable with the decision the Property and Development Committee made some

months ago, and the Executive Committee reaffirmed.

We have in the City of Winnipeg an national historic site designation, it's called the Exchange District. Within the Exchange District there are dozens of Chicago-style warehouse buildings which gives it it's aura of distinctness. Too many of those buildings within the national exchange district area are vacant. I would like to see our efforts going to fill up the vacant buildings within our national historic site designation. This building is not in the Exchange District. It is certainly not of the quality of an Eaton's building.

Mr. Speaker having put some context on this issue as I've just described I'm very comfortable with the recommendations moving forward. I admire the energy and the passion of Councillor Gerbasi for fighting for what she believes in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before I call the vote I would just like to remind you the City of L'vov, Ukraine City Hall was built in the year 1256, before America was discovered and it's still standing and still in operation.

Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Steek, Steeves, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Thomas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The clause is carried.

Motion No. 1, I'll rule it out of order.

The report of December 4, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED DECEMBER 4, 2003

Councillor Vandal: I will move Items 1 to 7 as consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Item 3. Anyone else. Item 6. 3 and 6 have been asked to be stood down. Question on the others, Items 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7 as consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 3.

**Item No. 3 – Lease of City-owned property at 410 Desalaberry Avenue to the Alhijra Islamic Foundation Inc. for use as a school
File FI-2.2 (33)**

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker this is a 10 year lease from the City of Winnipeg to the Islamic Foundation for use as a school. The report is self-explanatory, it's something that's an incredibly positive initiative for the City of Winnipeg. I would hope that it would be unanimously supported. I'll wait to see what the questions are from Councillor Steek and attempt to answer them.

Councillor Steek: Thank you. Through you to the Chair. Absolutely no questions whatsoever. I don't doubt for a moment that this clause will pass unanimously as it should.

Throughout the course of the debate on the new deal one of the references that we heard to, in some cases dismay and sometimes dislike. The like is the reference to being hip and cool. Very frankly that's what this is. This is one of the hippest and one of the coolest people in the City of Winnipeg doing something extraordinary.

Abdo Eltasse who is the owner of Peerless Garments has personally undertaken to open the first Muslim School of its kind in Manitoba. Mr. Eltasse has come forward with a request for this piece of property which has been supported both at PP& D and at EPC. He needs to be applauded for that initiative.

He is certainly among the best and the brightest. His commitment to this community is without parallel.

I wanted to pick up on something that Councillor De Smedt said earlier on. In many instances we are our severest critics in our city. But Councillor De Smedt talked about extraordinary neighbourhoods and extraordinary people. Mr. Eltasse is just that. He is with us today in the audience immediately to my right. We owe him an immense debt of gratitude for what he has done.

When you have a look at this report on page 4201, I would note that this is the first Islamic school of its type in the Province. The school is recognized by the Manitoba Board of Education is the member of the Federation of Independent Schools.

This is a wonderful initiative, 165 students attend the school realize a pre-eminent quality of education. Once again they're celebrating the diversity of this community. This is a wonderful clause to be passing as we move into the holiday season and I would like to thank the Chair of PP&D as well as those members of Executive Policy Committee that have been supportive of this. Thank you to Mr. Eltasse for his commitment to this city.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: This is in my ward and when Councillor Steek asked for it to be pulled off the consent agenda I got nervous. I'm glad to hear that he isn't opposing this.

I'd like to also congratulate Mr. Eltasse, and the Alhijra Islamic Foundation for coming into my area. It will be right near to where Mr. Eltasse lives. It's delightful to have him there.

This building is a small building and it sat vacant for a number of years, and it's delightful to see this very creative reuse. I have to tell Mr. Eltasse that I think that he's going to outgrow the space pretty quickly, and when he does I have a number of ideas of school locations that he might be interested in. So stay tuned because I think this is the beginning of something. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. I do believe I'm going to support this. It's an interesting project that's happened and I welcome the proponent. It's another indication of how we significantly assist our cultural communities in this city.

I have one question because it is a property that normally we would market out there in the general commercial arena, and hopefully to get some eventual revenue on it since I think we picked this up in tax sale if you recall Councillor Vandal.

I would assume that this property is eligible for municipal taxation. I know that they would not be because it would be into a school context not eligible for school taxation. I presume that part of the deal is that for a lease of one dollar and to allow them to develop this school that we would expect to get our municipal taxation. I'm not sure if you can answer that question.

There is a huge benefit being granted here. I'm not disputing that. It is a huge subsidy from a piece of property that we would typically market. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker I wasn't planning on speaking. I thought I would take this opportunity to echo the congratulations to Mr. Eltasse. He has done a great job of visiting councillors individually. He certainly took the time to come and see me and to tell me about the project. I appreciated that immensely.

More than that though, I did want to point out that the irony to a certain extent about how we all are very supportive of this project as we should be. And just this morning we were having discussions about the utilitarian city and how we might

not be able to afford to do these types of things.

I thought I'd take the opportunity to point out what a great project this is and how I'm glad we're not that utilitarian city that someone had mentioned this morning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, the strength of its city lies on its strength of diversity. This is a tremendous project for the City. I'm proud to move it.

Answering Councillor De Smedt's question. Yes, I believe they are subject to municipal taxation. I will follow up however and call the question.

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

Item No. 6.

Item No. 6 – Acquisition and Development of Land in North St. Boniface including Club Le Rendez-Vous Property
File FI-2 (35)

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker this one is fairly straightforward. I will stand down and wait to answer the questions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair of PP&D.

In reading the report it wasn't clear to me frankly why the City was buying this property. There are $235,000 in expenses related to it. Up and above that, there is of course the cost of demolition. The immediate query that came to mind was, why would we want to buy this if there's somebody from the private sector who's seriously interested in developing it, why would we not let them simply negotiate with the Rendez-Vous group and make an offer, purchase, demolish and they would have to come forward or they would make an offer that has conditions tied to it relative to a rezoning? But I fail to understand why we would want to dip into city coffers to acquire this piece of property.

I only have one other question. In reading the report and it isn't here, is to whether or not this was an initiative from the ward councillor to the private sector, or did the private sector simply take this as an initiative on their own behalf? I've seen the letter that's been attached. I just wonder if there was any communication here.

I'm not aware of a scenario where when there's a willing buyer and a willing seller and purchaser that we would become involved as the intermediary and have to incur significant costs. Quick brush here we're probably looking at $300,000, $400,000. I simply throw those queries out. I would ask not only the Chair of PP&D but obviously the ward councillor I'm sure can respond to them.

My key consideration is, was this an overture from the ward councillor to have something happen here? Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt you asked this to be stood down.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you. It is a bit of a comprehensive and long report, and it's difficult to get at all the elements. I do recall some of these issues when Councillor Vandal and I were working together on the PP&D Committee. I'm very supportive of redevelopment of the St. Boniface area particularly Old St. Boniface. There's some great opportunities here.

I'm just wondering for clarity if you could perhaps take a few steps where we had been and we did seem to have a private sector initiative here. I'm not certain why this private sector initiative may not be suitable and perhaps allow us to avoid some costs. Though I do see in the report that the proponent expects us to pick up the demolition costs, so maybe there aren't that many savings involved. Of course that might be for you to make those arguments.

I do see some opportunities here. It's not unusual from time to time that we do take

a sole source bid on particular initiatives, particularly if it just meets the context of development of a particular area. I'm not really speaking on behalf of Qualico, let's call them Brand 'X' has approached us and seems to want to do something that to be in context with the neighbourhood that we always thought about in that area, get rid of that car dump on one side adjacent to the river and do something over there.

I am very supportive of a project along this area. I want the Councillor to know that St. Boniface is near and dear to my heart. You have it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: First of all little bit of context. Le Rendez-Vous Club has been operated for the last 15 years has been shut down for about four months now. Several years ago the City of Winnipeg acquired an option to purchase the Rendez-Vous until the year 2006 which we could exercise at any time.

It's been known throughout the development community that the City does have an option to purchase. Qualico subsequently have sent the City an offer to purchase this property from the City with three conditions attached.

The first two we're going to be doing anyways. They involve other investment but we've already managed to get those in the budget somehow.

The third option was right of first refusal on other city-owned lands north of the Highline. So Qualico's offer to buy the Rendez-Vous from the City in fact had three conditions. One of the conditions the most important one was an option to other city-owned lands north of the Highline. An offer frankly which would be attractive to quite a few other developers.

The reason the recommendations are as they are because this is a pioneering effort. Meaning that through Building Communities there's going to have to be a little investment at the front in order to prepare the land for eventual sale. Which I propose be absorbed by Building Communities. And there is some bit of money left in Building Communities to clean up the site. At that point there's opportunities to sell the site along with other city-owned lands in the immediate vicinity thereby making a future development more attractive and have a full public offering because we're talking a significant amount of city-owned land here, a full public offering to the entire development community and not just sole sourcing to one person, to one company at will. The Rendez-Vous along with other city lands.

We're saying, let's go this route. We're going to get all of our dollars back from land operating that we've used to purchase it, we're going to get that when we sell the land back. And we're going to recoup tax dollars for I hope generations that want to live in an area close to the City.

We're close to cleaning up the west side of Tache Avenue. Hopefully with a little luck that will be done within the next year. Once we do that the whole east side of Tache area becomes quite attractive for seniors housing, for condominium housing, for immigrant housing. We need to however I believe be involved in the front end to prepare the lands and then do a thorough transparent proposal call to the entire development community to get those economies and scales by adding other city-owned lands and I believe you know the land I'm talking about, north of the railroad tracks. We're almost there.

This is an important piece of the entire secondary plan which is ongoing simultaneously. Something that in fact over the medium terms is going to make us money. It's not going to cost us money. This is going to make us money in property tax revenue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour of Item No. 6? Contrary? Carried.

Motions, none. 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 168/2003, 169/2003, 170/2003, 171/2003, 172/2003, 173/2003, 174/2003, 178/2003, 179/2003, 180/2003, 181/2003 and 182/2003.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 168/2003, 169/2003, 170/2003, 171/2003, 172/2003, 173/2003, 174/2003, 178/2003, 179/2003, 180/2003, 181/2003 and 182/2003.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that by-laws numbered 168/2003 to 174/2003, both inclusive, and 178/2003 to 182/2003, both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 168/2003 to 174/2003, both inclusive, and 178/2003 to 182/2003, both inclusive.

Councillor Vandal: I'll move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 168/2003 to 174/2003, both inclusive, and 178/2003 to 182/2003, both inclusive, be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question period. Councillor Steeves, Councillor Steek.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Steeves: I didn't pull No. 15-571 St. Anne's Road off the list because I sensed the energy level was getting low. No. 15 was a very contentious item. Folks around the table may recall this was the Louis Riel Mill site. While we often have to deal with bad news stories in the realm of development, I think this one should be picked out and highlighted as a real good news story in terms of collaboration and compromise between the interested parties. I'm wondering if the Chair of Property and Development would just enlighten the Committee with how that went as he was the other member of the Committee?

Councillor Vandal: Essentially we sent the motion to the Administration to negotiate with the proponents of the housing development, the Manitoba Métis Federation and Save our Seine, who are very active in St. Vital riverbank issues to basically negotiate a potential acquisition of a parcel of land where over the long term there could be some interpretive facility constructed in St. Vital subsequent nearby the Riel Mill site which is on the riverbanks of the Seine River.

I know Councillor Steeves is a huge supporter of this. He has lots of land dedication money that he wants to invest in this. The Administration are working on solving this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since Councillor Steeves is not in his chair. Councillor Steek you're next.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to the Chair of PP&D. First of all I'd like to thank the Chair for answering my query as to whether or not there was a definitive written policy regarding the fact that all offers for real estate must come forward to the Department.

The Chair was kind enough to supply me with a small book entitled "My Life in Hard Times In The Planning Department" by Joe Rogoski. But I would like to read just two lines which I think are critical. And the answer to whether or not there is a definitive policy as follows. "No there is no documented policy on this specific point". It goes onto say "that we try to get back to people and try to bring every offer forward", but he also states the following. This is disconcerting to me and I'm interested in hearing the thoughts from the Chair of PP&D. He states as follows. "Prior to the introduction of the RIS, we were able to provide a clear response, but now with the new RIS we provide this advice early on in our draft reports only, which are then submitted to the CAO's Office, CAO Secretariat, EPC Secretariat

and perhaps EPC", we cannot know what the recommendation will ultimately be."

I think that's profoundly wrong. I'd like to hear from the Chair of PP&D as to whether or not he supports the Administration giving us their best advice on every and any offer that comes through definitively. I think the question is very clear.

Councillor Vandal: Absolutely. All we ever want from the Administration is their best professional advice. I don't think there's one councillor in this room who would argue with that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your second question Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Having heard that and having read this document wherein this thing is filtered at least four or five times it may be marketedly different from what the Administration is recommending, will the Chair undertake to see that there is a policy realized wherein any and all offers solicited or unsolicited are brought forward, and the final offering from the Director is not tampered with on its way to the Committee?

Councillor Vandal: We have a new CAO, Annitta Stenning who's been here about a month. I believe her job as CAO is to manage the reports that come out of the City of Winnipeg. Real Estate Services write reports and they go up the line to the Director, to the CAO and eventually to the Standing Policy Committee. I certainly don't want to tamper with that process, and I'm not going to tell Annitta how to manage her reports.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Final supplementary question.

Councillor Steek: The Chair said absolutely, now he's saying he's going to leave it with the CAO who will filter everything. Okay. The final question then is simply this. Does the Chair support a policy in writing wherein each and every offer that comes forward to PP&D will see the light of day in an expeditious manner at the Committee?

Councillor Vandal: Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago I received an offer to buy St. Boniface City Hall through the Riel Community Committee. That's a ridiculous offer clearly. I think that's the sort of offer that the Administration should have the leeway to say no. We're not selling St. Boniface City Hall.

I think what we need to work on is a definitive policy in writing on how we handle this. If we want to sell land, we declare it surplus. Once it's declared surplus it's on the market, let's receive the offers.

Suffice it to say, I'm giving a long answer to a question that's complicated. We need a definitive policy. We are going to hammer out that policy at the Property and Development Committee starting in January. We have a new real estate director coming on. We're going to have a clear policy. The answer to your question is yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further questions. We will continue now with the next standing Committee is Protection and Community Services, dated December 8, 2003.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED DECEMBER 8, 2003

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to move Item Nos. 1 and 2 as consent items. I can't move Item No. 3, it will be stood down automatically because of the different decision from the Standing Committee and EPC. So I'm only moving Item Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Items 1 and 2, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 3.

Item No. 3 – Increase of Zoo Admission Fees
File PR-7.1.1

Councillor Gerbasi: Item No. 3 is the increase in zoo admission fees. Now

unfortunately we charge fees for some of our services at the City. We can't provide all our services for free. Therefore as politicians we have the responsibility of setting these rates and we have to stand up here and every once and a while they do increase. It's really no fun and nobody wants to stand up here and do this to the little children and families. Be the Grinch that stole Christmas. It's not part of my job I enjoy, but it is our responsibility to deal with these issues as they come forward.

Just to make a few points on it. At the Standing Committee Councillors Wyatt and Smith voted against the increase. Councillor Steeves was out of town on city business. That's why there was a different decision. When it went to EPC it was unanimously supported.

We heard about this last year when the three year plan for zoo fees came forward. It's the first increase in many many years. It's a very modest increase. Twenty-five cent increase. And it leaves our zoo rates as significantly underpriced is the wording from the Administration in the report. Underpriced compared to other cities. But not even comparing to other cities it's underpriced as an attraction in our city, so that you can go to a movie and all sorts of other things, and it's way cheaper to go to the Zoo then to do many other activities. When you look at it from a cold market perspective, our zoo is incredibly underpriced.

Another point I think is important and makes this a little bit easier is that we do have fee waiver mechanism that's in place for those in the community can't afford admission. Approximately in 2003, approximately 6,000 visitors have benefited from the fee waiver program. It's highly used.

I'd also like to mention that part of what's happening at the Zoo right now, is this year they're hoping to bring forward a couple of new attractions. White tiger exhibit, birds of prey exhibit I believe.

Last year even with the increase which was a minor increase again and the first one in many many years, the attendance has not dropped and is maintaining and doing well. They're hoping with these new exhibits that that will continue.

Finally we did approve in the capital budget we just approved some significant dollars for the overall Assiniboine Park. Just really in terms of giving the Zoo a new coat of paint and fixing up some of the problems there, and making it a little bit more attractive for our visitors.

There's a short term plan in place for the Zoo that we're dealing with in our budgets here in order to deal with the next immediate situation.

As you all know at the Zoo, we have bigger issues to deal with. Patty Sullivan the new COO of the Zoo is here of the Assiniboine Park Enterprises. There is going to be a public consultation process, and we're going to have to make some major decisions about the big issues that face our zoo in the future.

In the short term we still have to get up in the morning and there's been some positive steps taken I think to make our zoo more attractive.

Basically we asked our administration to find a way to make things work. I don't think this is overly onerous on the public, it's not a significant increase. It's still a very very attractive underpriced attraction compared to other attractions within the City not to mention even looking at other cities, when you look at it, it's very very much lower.

I hope that Council will be reasonable about this and not be a little too extreme about it. Nobody wants to stand up and raise a fee. You know it's really easy to stand up there and be the hero of the common person and say no to every fee increase, which I sometimes find in my standing committee. I think in fairness and respect for the job we all have to do here in being fiscally responsible, I would appreciate Council's support on this. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to move a motion to refer this back to the Standing Committee.

Since the Standing Committee meeting, it's come to my attention from our own administration that there's a plan there's a master plan that was never approved by Council of the Zoo tabled back in 2002. That's already knowledge of course. It's never been approved by Council. What I understand is in the next few months there's going be a full park framework coming forward along with the actual zoo master plan for the Committee to consider according to our own administration. I would recommend that this matter in light of the fact that it's a fairly minor increase of raising $68,000, $69,000 out of a $3.7 million budget at this point in time be referred back for consideration as part of the overall discussion on the park framework.

This was the main issue why I might add Mr. Speaker why the Standing Committee did not support this. There was a sense that we don't have an idea where the Zoo wants to go or where the Zoo is going at this point. There's no strategic plan. Therefore we felt that in light of the fact that we have not considered the master plan, it has not been even made, it's been given to Council at a seminar in 2002 but not actually tabled, and the fact that there's a park framework coming forward with the actual master plan in a couple of months or a few months according to our own Administration, I would encourage Council to refer it.

I'm moving referral.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You can speak. Two minutes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I recommend against, I'd like to speak against referral.

Councillor Wyatt is correct, that there is a significant process that we're just beginning in terms of the public consultation and decisions that we're going to have to make around the Zoo. It's easy to put off every decision and say, we'll make it later. This zoo increase is not going to pay for the Zoo master plan problems we're talking about or that issue. It's a very complex issue that is going to take a significant amount of time. It's not going to be done in a month or two. I don't see the justification to delay it. It's a tactic perhaps to just simply delay it.

We sometimes have to make tough decisions, I'm sorry, it's not all fun and games here. I think we just have to make a decision.

I would urge Council to do the mature but not fun thing and move forward with this. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The referral motion is in order. All in favour of the referral please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Lubosch, Steek, Wyatt.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Clement, Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 3, Nays 8.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Referral motion is lost. Councillors can I just remind you the time is getting on about ten after three, we've been debating these issues over and over again and really we're not getting nowhere. I say let's get onto the order of Council.

Councillor Wyatt: I thought it might be a great idea if we could come tomorrow morning and continue this.

Mr. Speaker, clearly we've gone through this before, it feels like déjà vu all over again, to quote a famous ball player. We were debating this back during the current

budget and following that the Zoo increase, there was a massive increase. The Chair said there was a minor increase, a massive increase. I've got the fee here. The adult rate increased 25%. The seniors rates increased 27%. This is the high season, 43% for youth, children, 60% and 46% per family. The average high season increase was 49.4%. The low season increase was 98.8%. It was a massive increase only a few months ago for 2003 that came in effect I understand September 1.

Mr. Speaker, we're now having another increase before us. I ask the question. When will this end? According to a report by the Zoo, and I don't know exactly where we're going with our zoo yet because we don't have any master plan yet before us and we don't have any park framework or plan which I said would only be a few months away. They're indicating here that according to Assiniboine Park's regular adult admission fee should be $6.78. And therefore is undervalued by 56%. Well clearly this is what this is all about Mr. Speaker.

Part of the report talks about the inelasticness of zoo fees, and that no matter how high we raise them give or take weather or something like that, we will still get attendance coming in. I find that hard to believe Mr. Speaker.

From the years 1993 down to 2003, zoo attendance has consecutively fallen and dropped year after year after year. In 1991 we had 517,898 people attending the Zoo. In 2001, that's now dropped 334,481. Mr. Speaker we've had a drop of 35.4% according to our own administration. By the way, in a similar period of time that we brought in fees for the Zoo. According to our own administration's report, over the last three years they're averaging a drop of 7.8%, so 8% every year.

We have a lot of work to do on the Zoo. The Zoo attraction, a typical zoo attraction should normally if done right attract an attendance the same amount as the City's population. Roughly 680,000 people should be attending the Zoo roughly every year. Does not mean that every citizen is attending but everybody, visitors and tourists alike and citizens attending the Zoo.

We are now as of 2001 down to basically half of that, 334,000. Yet we have a report before us today requesting another rate increase in zoo rates.

Mr. Speaker, based on the increases we've had so far in 2001 the Zoo was raising $512,000, in 2003 with the increase we did this year it jumped up to almost $700,000. With this proposed increase it will go to $767,000. In 2005, $873,000 and 2006 the same.

Let's be frank Mr. Speaker. We've had a massive increase in the last year in zoo admissions. The people who are the most effected by this are not necessarily the middle class but the working people out there, new Canadians who go the Assiniboine Park in the summertime, who don't have cottages, who don't have lakes to go to. They go out to the Park with their families, and you can go out there on a given week and see families, young families, most of them young families, new Canadians many of them, enjoying picnics, enjoying the Park and enjoying the picnic benches and the barbeques that we have out there and many of them attending the Zoo. These are the individuals who are going to be directly affected by this increase Mr. Speaker. An increase which is I said it before is unwarranted in light of the fact that we just had a massive increase. And specifically unnecessary in light of the fact that we're going to have a report coming before us from what I understand from our own administration only a few months away to discuss the master plan. This is a huge huge undertaking being brought forward Mr. Speaker.

Keep in mind what was proposed in the 2002 master plan was a $200 million project for the Zoo spread out over 25 years. The first phase being $49 million to be accomplished that would see attendance rise dramatically according to those who put together the master plan. I look forward to that, I look forward looking at that and taking that into consideration.

One of the things the master plan I understand will be considering in the park framework is the turn the relationship between what's tax supported and what's admission supported for the Zoo around. Right now we're roughly supporting the Zoo with $700,000 worth of admission money. The total budget is $3.7 million for the Assiniboine Park Zoo. That means $3 million coming from mill rate support.

The master plan wants to turn that around. Which tells me it's going to be talking about increased admission fees. I think that should be looked at in light of the entire global picture of the Zoo and what the Zoo should be doing and who it should be serving and who it should be marketing to.

To do this kind of nitpicking, this kind of little bits at a time of increases here and increases there tells me that we're not coming forward with a complete concrete plan and that there's no strategy. That's why the Standing Committee said, no, councillors give it time, give it time and consider this and give it time and let's hold off doing the increase, we're talking about $68,000, $69,000, it's not a lot to this council. I'll tell you what. It's a lot to the young families out there who are coming into this country new families, working families who have to go out and pay even a higher fee to get into the Zoo with their children and with their spouses.

I would argue Mr. Speaker, this is unnecessary in light of the fact that we've just had a massive increase this year. It's unneeded and I would strongly encourage council to not do this. We had an increase as I mentioned, 49.4% on high season rates back in April, almost 100% on low season rates. In that same period of time from 1993 when it was the last time we introduced zoo admission fees to 2003, the inflation rate in the City of Winnipeg was 18.3%. So to put that in perspective here.

I would argue Mr. Speaker it's not necessary. In 1993, when the Zoo fees were introduced there was quite a debate at that time I recall. Frankly Mr. Speaker one of the big things at that time was said, councillors don't worry we're going to have a free Tuesday. They'll be a free Tuesday for those who want to attend the Zoo who can't do that. Now we don't have a free Tuesday anymore, I think it was '96, '97 Council got rid of the free Tuesday. Now we've increased the fees. I'm told that if you want to apply you can maybe get in for free somehow through social assistance, but that's a means step Mr. Speaker. I know a lot of families out there are very proud and would not simply lower themselves or not want to do that because of their pride and that's something which definitely all of us can understand.

Mr. Speaker I would encourage this council not to support this today in light of the fact that I was hoping we could refer it so that we could have more of a discussion at the Standing Committee. Clearly that is not the will of this council. Clearly there are people who are out of touch with what a lot of working families are going through on a daily basis. I think we have to remind ourselves of that, and not lose touch with that. This is a big part of it right here Mr. Speaker.

I would suggest that we vote against this since we can't refer it. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I wasn't at the Standing Committee meeting as I couldn't make it, I was out of town. I should voice my support for the administrative report.

I want to start off by addressing Councillor Wyatt's comments as to administration having a different position. If that is in fact the case I have not been made aware of that in any way, shape or form. I hope that's not the case.

I want to remind again in terms of my support for this. We have to be completely cognizant of who is paying for this zoo. The taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg are paying for the Zoo as we all know and we subsidize it I guess to the tune of I'm not even sure to be perfectly honest with you. We have to remember that for every penny we give to the Zoo that is not through admission fees, that is

the subsidization of the Zoo and if we had a completely blank slate, and if we wanted to subsidize the citizens of our community, would we choose to do it through a zoo. Are there other services for the more disadvantaged folks in our community that we could more directly apply to them whereby they might be better served rather than having a subsidized zoo? If I was a person who was economically disadvantaged in this city would my first choice be a zoo? I'm not so sure that it would be. If it would be we maybe should go through some sort of process and say, to help out the disadvantaged people in the community we're going to first make the Zoo our priority because that's what we think the disadvantaged folks need the most. Make no mistake we're taking money from our budget to pay for this, and we're not doing other things for our citizens in lieu of. That's what we have to remember.

With respect to the financing and people going. I remember this from last time. I remember the report. There were spikes in attendance at the Zoo at various different years throughout the course of the last 20 years, and I remember that. And the reason that was, was because the Zoo squirreled away a little money no pun intended, and bought things. They bought pandas to come here. They bought elephants to come here. It was that that brought people back to the Zoo in decent numbers.

If the Zoo remains static, which invariably is what's going to happen if we don't raise the fees on a sort of a continual and fair basis which I think this is, if the Zoo remains static, what is going to happen, I'm not an expert in zoos but I can just imagine the same thing is going to happen has happened no doubt to everybody in this chamber, everybody sitting around this table. You go to the Zoo once and then maybe you go twice and it doesn't change and there's no new attractions and the use of the Zoo for the citizens of the community rapidly diminishes. The Zoo remains an attraction I suppose for tourists but it would be more of an attraction if we can get decent funding into the Zoo so that people can really look at it as some place to go. I'm a little worried about the idea that we should be subsidizing this as a service for our disadvantaged community. I doubt this is what our economically disadvantaged community would choose first if they were in fact given a choice. That's only my opinion.

Again, it never ceases to amaze me. My new years resolution might be to stand up every time I see this. We are continually talking about subsidizing through taxpayers money all these various different types of things, but yet whenever we talk about the new deal there are certain folks who stand up and seem to claim that we don't need any new revenue. Again, this has happened probably five times today alone. Five times today alone. We should consider that as we go through this debate and I'm hoping this type of reminder is going to be the type of thing that is going to bring people back into the pool so we can discuss revenue. I think we all know that we need a different set of rules around here. I think if we listen to what we're all saying here whether it's the Zoo or whether we want to do some great things with the Islamic Muslim School, whether it's the Conservatory at the Assiniboine Park. Sometimes we need a little extra dough. Sometimes we need a little extra funding Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have two issues here. Councillor Gerbasi you'll be speaking to the motion in concurrence with the Standing Committee that the fees not be increased and then we'll ask from someone from EPC to move because EPC's recommendation is that the fees be increased.

Councillor Gerbasi: So you're saying, we first vote on the Standing Committee recommendation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We'll be voting on that first. If it succeeds there's no need for the other one.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll just quickly close Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to point out, it's unfortunate that Councillor Wyatt doesn't believe the

Administration report but it said, 2003 attendance figures are near identical to 2002 to spite admission fee increases. I just wanted to clarify that one thing. It says near identical is what the Administration said on that one.

I don't know we should perhaps have a red herring exhibit at the Zoo because this is getting tiresome. I think basically everything's been said. I think there's one point that's a bit of a problem here using percentages to grandstand and make it sound like it's a massive increase because of you using a percentage. That is misuse of statistics. A $0.25 increase is not a massive increase. If you want to play games you can make it sound that way and you can sound good in a sound byte, but it's really quite irresponsible.

With that I close debate and I encourage Council to defeat the Standing Committee's recommendation which we're voting on first and then support EPC's recommendation. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Recorded vote has been called for. On the motion adoption of Item No. 3 from the Standing Committee, all in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Steek, Wyatt.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 2, Nays 10.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The clause is lost. Executive Policy Committee's recommendation Councillor Eadie will move it. Recorded vote. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillors Steek, Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 2.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's carried.

Motions, none. Consideration of By-laws.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move By-law No. 167/2003 be read a first time.

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

Councillor Wyatt wants to be recorded in opposition.

Clerk: By-law No. 167/2003.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that By-law No. 167/2003 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 167/2003.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'll move that the rules be suspended and that By-law No. 167/2003 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question period. Councillor De Smedt. Councillor Steek. Anymore?

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker, very quickly. The matter is the Allard School potential expropriation by the French School Division. I would just like to get from Councillor Gerbasi, and by her request since the Mayor was not really familiar with the subject this morning when we discussed it at EPC question period. Would Councillor Gerbasi undertake then to have the Mayor approach the Province and with the assistance of our Secretary of Intergovernmental Affairs to support the position that the City has, that we want to maintain the lease of the Allard School for the use by the Winnipeg Police Service?

And the second point, would she undertake to get our legal department to provide me and all members of Council with a legal interpretation of the process that the French School Division is using to assume that they can expropriate land, properties including buildings rather than just land? Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Through you to Councillor De Smedt. Thank you for the question. I would be very happy, will have a letter and will begin a strategy with the Province on this as well as, I'll speak with the CAO and have some kind of information from the Administration back for councillors to update them on this issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair of Protection. In June I tabled a motion requesting information regarding the status of the Police Commission Report. I was told that EPC needed 60 days, that was 120 days ago. Can the Chair of Protection in view that this is a jurisdictional issue, Police Services, can the Chair tell us what the status is of the report relative to Police Services, and the potential for a Winnipeg Police Commission? Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: It's still within the Administration and I believe there was some political discussion around it in which, I recall the Mayor in this chamber saying that he would like to sit down with councillors and hear their views on what do they see a commission doing. If they want one, what do they want it to look like because there's 30 different potential models of police commissions, so it's really not a simple thing that's yes or no you want one, you sort of have to say what you want. I believe the Mayor said he was waiting for some more direction from other councillors to come forward with those thoughts so that we could give some political direction as well.

The other aspect of it is, is that the Administration I believe was sent off to answer some other questions in more depth, and I don't believe we got an answer back on that. I'm certainly prepared to speak to the CAO and find out the status of it and report back to Councillor Steek and let you know. It really hasn't come up for discussion in quite a while anywhere, as we've been I guess focusing on a lot of other issues and no one else has raised it.

Basically the report is at the Administration and that's what I recall was the last place this issue was at.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Second question Councillor Steek.

Councillor Steek: As the Chair of PP &D indicated, it vaporized.

The next question is simply this. The Chair is well aware that in the '04 and '05 capital, there's $2.6 million in '04, $4 million in '05 relative to recladding of the PSB. Is the Mayor supportive, rather is the Chair of Protection supportive of seeing those capital funds allocated toward the building of the first new four divisional model station in the east, if logistics can be realized? You're right it is a capital budget issue, but I think it's something that falls clearly under the jurisdiction of this particular Chair.

Councillor Gerbasi: As I'm sure Councillor Steek is aware there was a motion that I brought forward at the Standing Committee which asked the Administration to do a further report looking at the real logistics of the recladding project and the impact it would have on moving the 911 staff, and it may make some sense to build one of the buildings earlier depending on what that report shows. It's going to be reporting back to the Standing Committee in April with that. Further information is basically needed from the Administration's point of view to make those kind of decisions.

It was felt that between the budgets of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and also the civic accommodations under Councillor Vandal's area, that there was enough money that there was some flexibility to move those things around depending on what happens, and we're really not talking about 2004 anyway. I'm hoping that the report in April will be enlightening and we could probably answer your question better at that time when we have further information. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your final supplementary question.

Councillor Steek: Mr. Speaker through you to the Chair. $535,000 that had previously been allocated to look after things such as structural drawings, engineering plans and so forth was put in abeyance into contingency account. Can the Chair of Protection because as the Chair of Protection she'd certainly be aware of that, speak to whether or not that trigger is going to be pulled in order to get this building moving along?

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I really can't speak to that kind of specifics. My understanding is that that's what that money was allocated for, and it will be used for the four division model when it's the appropriate time to be used. When April comes we'll have more information about that for you. If you would like further information specifically to what the status is on that money right now, I can certainly get that for you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, you're first supplementary question.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Chair. The public use facilities review or PUFF review, we're led to believe it will be coming forward in the spring sometime. I'd like to know when it will be coming forward, when do you expect it to be coming forward with its recommendations? I've been informed by the staff and talking to the staff regarding this over the last year, that the PUFF review is not going to be coming forward and making recommendations that this facility should be closed or that facility should close or this one should be closed, rather they're going to come forward and make recommendations of methodology to look at existing facilities on how we should be approaching our use of existing facilities, certain principles as well as methodology and principles when it comes to building of new facilities or newer facilities.

In light of that fact, and that there are a number of projects which have come forward that are now for whatever reason being held up or being referred to the PUFF review, and the fact that this PUFF review is taking some time, when do we expect PUFF to come forward with the work that's being done by the American consultant?

Councillor Gerbasi: My understanding is it's on track in terms of timelines, and that it was going to be in the spring. I don't know if that's April or May exactly. My understanding is there hasn't been a delay that nothing has gone off the rails. It is on track. As to what exactly is in the study, I'm glad Councillor Wyatt's already found out so much about it, he certainly knows more than I do about what's going to be in that study that's coming forward.

I'm not aware of what it's going to recommend. It's certainly on track, it's on time, and we'll deal with it when it comes forward in the spring.

I'm also not sure what's specific projects he's saying are in abeyance that we would have been doing before April or May. If there's a specific thing that's

being held up, I'm not sure what that is. The idea of the PUFF approach was to have a plan for our recreation facilities, and then we can make our investments based on a plan rather than just one off parochial kind of concerns and let's have a plan that benefits the entire city.

I'm looking forward to the report. It's right on schedule is the last thing I've heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, your second.

Councillor Wyatt: I guess it comes out of the answer to the question. I've talked to the staff and they've indicated to me that this review is coming forward to recommend principles and a methodology for reviewing all our facilities in the future. Not coming out and saying specifically. This is what we've been told one on one with our staff. Are you telling us something different, that there will be recommendations for closure of facilities because that's completely different from what I understand the terms of the contract were for the consultant?

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, I'm telling you that I haven't yet seen what the recommendations are going to be. It's silly to say I'm saying they're going to tell us to close certain facilities. I don't have any inside information that you don't have Councillor Wyatt, we've all seen the terms of reference. The report is going to be dealt with at our committee in the proper process in the spring. There's also going to be more public consultation before that time. I'm really not quite sure what you would like me to answer Councillor Wyatt. I hope that addresses it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your final supplemental.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that it's going to be coming forward in the spring which I imagine is March or April.

There's now it was mentioned at the Standing Committee and I want to clarify this. Is there now a new review regarding museum use facilities that is being conducted? This was referred to by yourself. Is this going ahead? It's now called this is called PUFF this would be called MUFF review. Is there a new global review going on here, another plan?

Councillor Gerbasi: What Councillor Wyatt is referring to is, there was an informal council session held regarding the Winnipeg Arts Advisory Council which only a few members of council were at. The Mayor raised some issues about museums, we have a very creative mayor who likes to come up with great ideas. He threw out some ideas about museums. Basically, museums are now under the purview of City Clerk's Department. The reason it came up at the Winnipeg Arts Advisory Council is that they have certain museums like the Manitoba Museum and the Aviation Museum they fund. The type of museums that I think Councillor Wyatt is referring to is the St. Boniface one, the Transcona, the local neighbourhood museums. City Clerk's has taken over that responsibility, I'm not really clear what the Standing Committee's role is as much as it used to be. It's a little bit different.

There may be some information coming forward from City Clerk's that they're working on to bring forward some ideas. But nothing has been set up. Nothing has been followed up in terms of setting up some kind of formal committee or process to relook at museums, it's an issue that's kind of out there. If somebody wants to take the lead on it politically and work with City Clerk's and come up with some solution to funding these neighbourhood museums and some of our issues with museums, that would be great because we could use somebody who's willing to put some work into dealing with some of those issues we face in funding our museums. I hope this represents some enthusiasm Councillor Wyatt for taking on some duties around here on this type of thing.

This point in time nothing has been set up, it's just ideas that were thrown out. There is no MUFF report that I'm aware of. We have had for many years as you all know when there's budget discussions

we're always struggling to fund our local museums. We do have some issues around that that need some policy work. It's a little awkward to know who should do that policy work. If anybody wants to jump on board and do that, that would be great. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillors, I would like to wish the Mayor well and Councillor Smith who are down with the flu, also happy Hanukkah to our Jewish Community in Winnipeg. Wish you well. I would say now this is the end and have a safe holiday councillors, make sure all of us are back in one piece refreshed and full of what you know for the next year. Councillor Eadie moves adjournment. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas, Vandal and Wyatt.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 3:39 P.M.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday December 17, 2003
CONTENTS

ROLL CALL.....75

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.....75

MINUTES.....76

DELEGATIONS.....76
Ms Cindy Sciberras.....76

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 3, 2003.....78

REPORT "A" OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 10, 2003.....78

Item No. 1 – Budgetary Implications – The New Deal – File FR-2.....78

Motion No. 3 87

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS.....103

By-law No. 141/2003.....103
By-laws numbered 166/2003, 175/2003 and 177/2003 103

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD 104

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED DECEMBER 9, 2003.....106

Item No. 1 – Recycling Activity Status Report – File WT-1.3 106

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD 109

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES
DATED DECEMBER 4, 2003.....109

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED DECEMBER 2, 2003.....109

Item No. 7 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 550 Kenaston Boulevard – File DASZ 23/2003..... 109

Item No. 12 – Extension of Time – Subdivision and Rezoning – southeast corner of Inkster and Brookside Boulevards – File DASZ 7/2001..... 116

Item No. 14 – Historical Building Listing – Cadomin Building, 280 Main Street – File G-3.1.1..... 117

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED DECEMBER 4, 2003..... 120

Item No. 3 – Lease of City-owned property at 410 Desalaberry Avenue to the Alhijra Islamic Foundation Inc. for use as a school – File FI-2.2(33) 120

Item No. 6 – Acquisition and Development of Land in North St. Boniface including Club Le Rendez-Vous Property – File FI-2 (35) 122

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 123

By-laws numbered 168/2003, 169/2003, 170/2003, 171/2003, 172/2003, 173/2003, 174/2003, 178/2003, 179/2003, 180/2003, 181/2003 and 182/2003 123

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD..... 124

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED DECEMBER 8, 2003..... 125

Item No. 3 – Increase of Zoo Admission Fees – File PR-7.1.1..... 125

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS 131

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday December 17, 2003
CONTENTS

By-law No. 167/2003.....131

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD.....131

ROLL CALL.....135