COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday June 23, 2004

The Council met at 9:39 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Deputy Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Deputy Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Angus.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pages for today are Brittany Perija of Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute. She is not here. Welcome of guests and announcements. I see that the mayor elect is not here, he is suppose to be here today at 9:30, but the mayor elect Mr. Sam Katz may be here later on. I'd like to announce that Donald Benham, the new Councillor elect for River Heights - Fort Garry is here. Welcome Councillor. And also Councillor elect Franco Magnifico is not here or he may be here, but if not, I'll recognize him later on, he is the new Councillor elect for the St. Boniface ward. I'd like to also Councillors, make announcement, a city clerk who has been with us for many years now, celebrating 30 years of continuous service as a number of years she's been doing the Hansard at the City Clerks Department who attends Council meeting in the glass booth above the gallery to record our Hansards, last day today is Gail Van Wyck. Here she is right here. Gail on behalf of all Members of Council and I'm sure Clerks and all the city employees, congratulations on your 30 years and may you have a very long successful retirement. Thank you very much. Also, Councillors there is an announcement, Deputy Mayor, Acting Mayor Eadie.

Deputy Mayor Eadie: I lost track of what I was going to say now. Mr. Speaker thank you. Mr. Speaker just two quick announcements. One is really a reminder that as a result of the bi-elections yesterday, the swearing in ceremony for the new Mayor and the two new Councillors take place at 4:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon in the Mayor's foyer upstairs. All Members of Council are certainly invited. You've received invitations, the remainder of the invitations are by invitation only to invited guests of the newly elected, but I hope that as many Members of Council as possible will be here tomorrow afternoon for the swearing in of the three newly elected. The second announcement I want to make Mr. Speaker is the follow up to the last Council meeting I announced that our colleague Councillor Gord Steeves was in the race for third vice president of FCM. I'm very happy to announce that after a very tight three way election that Councillor Steeves is now the third vice president of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and I'm sure all of us would like to congratulate him on his election.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further announcements. Were at a time now here to condolences motions. We have a few motions. Would the Clerk would you read the mover and the seconder for the first one and then followed by the second condolences and motion.

Motion
Moved by Councillor Wyatt
Seconded by Councillor Lazarenko

That Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Phil Rizzuto, which occurred on May 25, 2004. Mr. Rizzuto served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the current Park and Transcona wards from 1971 to 1983. This Council extends to his family it's deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would everyone please rise. The second motion Mr. Clerk.

Motion
Moved by Councillor Wyatt
Seconded by Councillor Lazarenko

Mr. Clerk: Moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Lazarenko, that Council place on record it's profound sorrow at the death of Teresa Ducharme, activist for the disabled community, which occurred on June 7, 2004. This Council extends to her family it's deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Everyone please rise. Thank you.

MINUTES

Councillor Wyatt moves the Minutes of the meeting held on May 19, 2004, be taken as read and confirmed. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

We have one delegation listed this morning. Mr. Doug Kalcsics, Senior Consultant with Royal LePage Stevenson Advisors and David Bell, Secretary-Treasurer, Winnipeg School Division, would you please come forth and give your presentation in support of Item No. 1, Property and Development, dated June 8, 2004.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Doug Kalcsics: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will be brief. David Bell and I are here to support the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, supported by EPC for the delisting of our school property Sacre-Coeur No. 2. We at the hearing before the Standing Policy Committee filed an order of documents and we won't go through them in any great detail, but I just wanted to list them.

We left my speaking notes with David Bell, a highlighted copy of the Heritage Research Report. Essentially, the summary of which was that it was a fairly low-key support for the listing. We also filed a number of photographs of the building essentially showing fundamentally the structural problems and the fire egress problems associated with the building that is on sight now. I will very quickly recap unless there are any questions of Council. But fundamentally the school has been obsolete as a single purpose building and it's very difficult to reuse. It has been obsolete, in fact since 1907 and the school division has to its credit tried to keep it as current as possible, but fundamentally schools were not designed like that since that period. There is significant life safety issues that are very costly to overcome. There are energy efficient problems for both heating and cooling the building just because of its initial construction. So it is a costly retro fit, it would be as much as a new building and it still would be an old building and not command the rents and the leases that a new building would command. It is in the wrong location on the sight for contemporary allotted commercial retail and we believe that Plan Winnipeg supports the redevelopment that we propose in terms of it's inner city revitalization policies and this represents a significant public sector investment in older neighbourhoods without subsidy.

So what we are saying is, please look at heritage priorities in the broader context of inner city renewal priorities. So that we believe that the City should demonstrate through this delisting that appropriate ground field redevelopment in older neighbourhoods can be competitive with green field sites and suburbs. Please demonstrate that the inner city redevelopment can work even without direct or indirect public subsidy and ACI is the development company prepared to make a 40-year investment decision at this inner city location. Please support us and encourage others to make similar investment decisions in Winnipeg's older neighbourhoods. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, any questions. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wondering what efforts were made by the school division to consider other options. I recognize in terms strictly of dollars and cents this probably is the most beneficial option for the school division. But considering it's the second

oldest school building still existing in Winnipeg, the Historical Buildings Committee did not recommend removing the designation. There's other factors aside from dollars here and I guess I'm just wondering what efforts were made to look at some other offers or other possibilities for the building, considering it's so close to the hospital, could there not have been some synergy there other than simply putting in a strip mall instead of a Historical building.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Kalcsics.

Mr. Doug Kalcsics: Maybe before I defer to Mr. Bell to speak to that point, I think it's important to understand and I don't want to take exception to the term strip mall, but we are really trying to build a signature building here and what we think is a very important corner of two major streets. We are actively trying to develop a two or three storey office building that has incorporated within some commercial development. We believe that there is synergy to this development to the adjacent medical present and essentially that's what we are building on, and we're aggressively pursuing leases to support this development. In fact, when it is built, it will be leases that will essentially shape the final form of the development. So be that as it may, I would defer then to David Bell to talk about the efforts of the school division has made to try and reuse this building.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Bell.

Mr. David Bell: Thank you very much. We did look at options in terms of utilizing the facility in the early 1990's. We looked at establishing a Sacre-Coeur French program there. It has been located just a block away and certainly we also looked at the Argyle Alternative High School when we had problems there in terms of the growth and enrolment. And in both cases because of the limited space and the amount of investment that would be required in terms of updating the existing facility, we were refused funding by the Public Schools Finance Board and looked at alternative spaces. Certainly I just want to add that the division has been a strong supporter of Heritage buildings. If you look at Wolseley School, if you look at Laura Secord School, we have made very significant investments in both of those schools. The oldest school in Winnipeg currently is under renovation, Isbister School, known as the Winnipeg Adult Education Centre. We are spending $3.7 million in terms of upgrading the existing facility, which I might add is a sister facility to Somerset, it is of the very same design. This certainly will provide the extension of that heritage building so that all of Winnipeg can have the opportunity to experience that older architecture. So certainly the division has been a strong supporter of heritage buildings where there is requirements in terms of our educational programs and the economics make sense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. No further questions. Thank you gentleman. We have two motions that are before us. Notice was given back on June 23 and their here before us. There are 2 reports of EPC, Acting Mayor Eadie.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 9, 2004**

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker thank you, I'm pleased to move that the Report of EPC for June 9 be received, and that Items 1 through 9 be adopted by consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour of the clause? Contrary? Carried.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JUNE 16, 2004**

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I move that the Report of EPC for June 16 be received, and that Items 1 through 10 be adopted by consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour of the clause? Contrary? Carried.

There are 2 EPC motions. I would like to ask Councillor Angus to take the chair.

(Councillor Angus in the Chair)

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko on the motion.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On the motion that is here before us today, this was moved by myself and seconded by Councillor Smith on June 23/2004 and this was asking that Council ask the provincial government to direct the Public Utilities Board to investigate and report on cause of the gas price increase it's effect on the Manitobans, the desirability of price regulation for the protection of consumers.

Now Mr. Speaker, the Province has that authority under the Public Utilities Board Act and a motion simulate was presented by myself on February 23, 2000. That in itself did not pass Council and I would like to see that Council passed this now as the seriousness what were faced with the high cost of gasoline and diesel fuel in the City of Winnipeg and also in the Province. It has gone to such a degree that people just can't, the courier services, the taxi's, the taxi industry also are asking for a increase in the fares because they can't meet the cost of the operation.

Also, you must understand that anytime that we have a gas increase for the City of Winnipeg for all the fleet vehicles that we have, one cent increase equates to a little over $200,000 a year that is born by the taxpayers. You must understand also that the Province, they get their share of revenue through taxation on the gasoline such as the Province. So the more they sell, the more for them. We just can't, when we try to have a balanced budget, we just can't do it and I'm sure the mayor elect, Mr. Katz, would be on the same page with this because this is something that should have been done a long time ago. When you want to buy a milk, anything, there is the Public Utilities Board that make a decision whether that increase will go ahead or not. And I can't say to the consumers of gasoline, which is controlled by the gas industries, the industries are so huge that they say they can't. Why would the price of gasoline go up to 98 cents or 89.9 cents a gallon, which in some cases was last week, and all of a sudden through out the whole City of Winnipeg. Every service station automatically, it's like you go through a computer and everyone gets that increase right across and then follows into the rural areas of the City.

And that in itself is coming to the point, Mr. Speaker, that I know that the squeeze is on the users, such as happening before with the taxi and courier services, all the trucking industry is coming to the point that they just cannot. And what I'm asking for Mr. Speaker is to see that Council asks for directions from the Provincial government. I'm sure that they should sign in with us and say look, we are going to do this or otherwise give us a bigger share of the tax that they take on gasoline.

So with all respect, Mr. Speaker, this is not to say that we are, we are just asking the provincial government to direct the Public Utilities Board. They are able to direct everything from beef to eggs to milk; the Public Utilities Board have their hands on it. But as soon as it comes into the giant corporations such as the gas industry all of a sudden their hands off and I'd like to know why. What gives them, gives them that ability to say that we can't, which they can under the Public Utilities Act, they can do this and I'm sure that others would follow Mr. Speaker and if the Province would do this, this would go through the whole province and other Provinces will follow suit.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. You are being given an opportunity to conclude. You want to close debate; Councillor Eadie would like to speak.

Councillor Lazarenko: So Mr. Speaker, back in February 23, 2000, I had a hard time even to get this motion to the floor of Council, because immediately some one moved that the motion be dealt with right there and that was barely passed by this Council to be debated on the 23rd of February of 2000, that's four years ago. And even though it was interesting that

the former Mayor had talked some much before about what we have to do, the City's share had backed off and said no this is not within our responsibility.
And all I'm asking now Mr. Speaker is that this be concurred with, send it on to the Province. The Province will make a decision and if we just ask them and they'll say no is no. Simple as that. They give us the Charter now that they tell us what to do. They're the big cheese and were not. So were just asking to get our share because it's coming to the point, the pinch is there Mr. Speaker and I'm just saying people can't. How many people are driving now, less than what they did before. And it's not to say because they should be using bicycles. In Europe when I was there last year, you've got more horses and buggy's on the road then you have vehicles because the price of gasoline is $2.25 of their money and their salaries about 90 cents an hour equivalent to our money. So there you go, this is why they can't, because they can't afford to drive but you've got these big government vehicles, and big trucks whizzing up and down, driving through and just going and sometimes for no reason at all because they don't have to pay for the gasoline like what we do with the City of Winnipeg, the fleets, the vehicles that we have such as the Province, the Provincial government has a lot of vehicles. We've been trying to say to stop your vehicles, don't let them idle, but you see the government vehicles idling all the time.

So Mr. Speaker, I would fully like to ask Council to endorse this motion and send it on to the province for them to debate and hopefully that the newly elect Mayor Sam Katz, will be able to take a lead in this and talk and negotiate with the provincial government on this matter.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just expressing my own personal opinion on this, Councillor Lazarenko is right. We had the identical motion in front of City Council for some discussion in April of 2000 actually and the motion was defeated on a vote of 10 to 3. I don't think anything has changed in the four years since this identical motion was debated. Gasoline prices go up, they go down, and even passing this motion Mr. Speaker, I suggest is not going to resolve any problems. Gasoline prices will still go up will still go down.

If indeed the Public Utilities Board does have the mandate to investigate this kind of thing, I suggest that it's a mandate they probably don't want to take on because it's way beyond their control and jurisdiction. Oil prices and that sort of thing are really not controlled in this country Mr. Speaker; I believe they are controlled through OPEC and threw international forces. Certainly if there was going to be a will on the part of any government to try and get a handle on this, it would be the Government of Canada who have national responsibilities and who also have responsibilities for foreign affairs. To the best of my knowledge, no Federal Government has ever taken this on because it's probably also beyond their control and it's beyond the control of government probably in any free society to really be all that tight on regulations for this sort of thing.

So I think Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government probably has about as much impact on this whole issue as we do. I notice gasoline prices have dropped since this motion was introduced. They probably will continue to rise and fall as the market place demands, but Mr. Speaker I think we ought not to be wasting a whole lot of time on this. It is not within our control, not within the Provincial Government's control. If the Provincial Government was really interested in taking this on, they could of done it long before now without any motion coming from this Council or any others. I would suggest that and I realize Councillor Lazarenko has all the best of intention, but I think that this motion should be rejected as it was four years ago and the other governments who probably have more direct input should take it on if they think it's an issue.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you, ready for Councillor Lazarenko to close debate.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Not much interest, I can see here in the chambers today. When Councillor Eadie had said or the acting mayor had said, not in this country, why not the foreign affairs. I would just like to remind you on the issue that we deal with at the City of Winnipeg to protect the City of Winnipeg interests, the taxpayer, we do have an interest. The Provincial government has an interest; it should have as well as the Federal government. The oil industries do not control the governments or so their not suppose to, but obviously they do because anytime there is no one who speaks out against it, oil industries and if they do, the prices drop like the acting mayor had said, that when this motion was introduced the price dropped maybe two or four cents. But then you will find the prices will sky rocket again. Back and forth, back and forth, and the cost is there.

I would like to know what revenue does the provincial government get when the prices, the cost is to this magnitude as what it is now, such as the Federal government. And I'm going to tell you why they will not do anything because its politics. At the Federal level and especially the federal level, there's big politics played between the elected people and the parties that control the country, that the gas companies, the industries have a big say because of their big donations and its coming to the point Mr. Speaker, its time that we would take the nail on the head and say look this is what we want, this is what we are requesting, we want someone to address the issue why is the price of gasoline going up to the magnitude it is right now. It's easy for some Members to giggle and laugh on this issue, but go to your constituents and say; I'm not in favour of seeing the gas price go down for you or for you even though I represent you. I'm not in favour, this doesn't mean anything to me because I believe in the oil industry when they gave out so much through the media, to say we can't because exploration and how much does the government giving the Feds, are giving to the oil company's for exploration costs. Why are some of those industries Mr. Speaker are not paying their share of income tax, I'd like to know what is the legislation that is provided to them, for them to be able to get away and the ordinary workers are harnessed so tightly, the income tax form is made out you have to get an auditor to unscramble it. All the questions they ask, not a simple and if not you are penalized and nothing, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility and this is something we are just asking. Let the Provincial Government deal with this. Thank you Mr. Speaker and I will be calling for a recorded vote.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much. Recorded vote has been requested.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Lazarenko

Nays

Deputy Mayor Eadie, Councillors Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Thomas, Wyatt, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker Councillor Angus.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 1, Nays 10.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: The clause is lost. Another notice of motion put out by Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Wyatt do you want to introduce your motion. This is seconded by Councillor De Smedt. It's the strong Mayor Model motion. Councillor Wyatt introduce the new motion please.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This motion Mr. Speaker, speaks to the need of reform and the need of changing how we do business here at city hall Mr. Deputy Speaker. One of the great things about this motion is that I think it as well as much of discussion of concern that has been raised over the last year or so in this council chamber did become part of the

civic election debate and the election issues that came forward. Many of the candidates included in their platforms stances on how they would govern relating to the Executive Policy Committee and as well relating to how the Executive Policy Committee derives with the rest of council and policy development.

This motion is asking for a review of the existing model of the EPC and to look at options that may be available as used in other cities with regards to how policy is developed and brought forward. It is my belief Mr. Speaker, that there are other ways of doing business and I am looking forward to the new mayor. I think it's fantastic, new change, breath of fresh air and indeed the new mayor who I think has an opportunity here, historic opportunity to set a new path and to decide on what, how policy development will occur at city hall and how policy development will be implemented. I think this opportunity is historic; it's a great thing, breath of fresh air and an opportunity for all Councillors.

So I welcome that. I hope that the new Mayor looks seriously at how the existing structure is right now and looks at ways to if not reform completely at least make changes to insure that all Councillors have input into policy development and policy discussions. Not just at the final stages, which has been the case with regards to matters coming forward to this chamber, but from the beginning to the end and in the middle. And I think that's exactly what Council is looking for. I know at times there will be a need for the EPC to get together especially with regards to the fact that they are charged by legislation to bring forward a budget. There is no doubt that it will be required. But nevertheless, that there could be a different way on how we involve all Councillors and the formulation and development of policy. I think clearly, this Council is and how we do business is an ongoing experiment. If you came into this Council ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, we would not be doing business the way we are doing business, or we have been doing business, it's changed. There has always been change and there's always been the so-called inner group and the group on the outside. There's always been this dynamic, but it's changed and I think it's changed to the extent Mr. Speaker, that rather than become more inclusive, it's become more exclusive. Rather than to try to reach to insure that all Councillors have input into the process, it's become a process, which can exclude people, and I think it's incumbent on those, Mr. Speaker who have power to ensure that they involve all those.

I recall a story going back to the days of TC Douglas and Saskatchewan. Tommy Douglas and Saskatchewan were basically, when he first became premier of Saskatchewan, instructed the clerk of legislative chamber to come forward to him and he said to the clerk of the legislature, I want you, whenever a member of the opposition comes forward and requests information, requests a copy of information, requests information, and he instructed his cabinet by the way to the same thing, to give full cooperation to that member of the opposition. This you got to remember Mr. Speaker, he had just come into power after a period of time when there was a lot of ranker, bitterness and divide. When information was not being shared, were literally the opposition was almost becoming, at that time a separate government, exclusive onto itself.

This Mr. Speaker is exactly what we need today. We need to have an approach and a methodology which brings inclusiveness and it's incumbent upon those, however the new Mayor chooses to pick his EPC and however he decides to have an EPC or if he wants to have an EPC altogether. Whatever the case might be, those individuals, including the new Mayor, it's incumbent upon them to reach down and to hear and to insure that as much as possible, all Members of Council have a role in policy development. That's what this motion is speaking to, and that's what this motion is about. So I would encourage the Council support it and I welcome, and I look forward to working with the new mayor. I think it's a fantastic opportunity that we have for the future of the City. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Mr. Speaker. This is not a breath of fresh air. I consider this motion to be a mighty cold wind and while it is evident to everyone on this Council that I did not support the particular person who has won the Mayor's chair. I think this is a very chilly welcome for the new Mayor to suggest that these changes come in. I think it's close to insulting.

For one thing, this is legislation, it's in provincial hands, EPC, chairs of Committee, that's legislation and so to suggest that the new Mayor could choose whether or not to have an EPC or choose to have various standing committees, there's legislation around that, but I could be personally insulted by some of the erroneous comments made by the previous speaker including holding up a personal hero of mine, Tommy Douglas and racking himself around that banner, but I won't go there. What I'd like to do is say that I'm very uncomfortable with this motion. I feel that it's insulting to the new Mayor. I think the Mayor should have the opportunity to set their own road and I cannot support this motion. It's most uncomfortable and both in its wording and conclusions. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. How the winds have changed and what breaths of fresh air do we have around here. May I just suggest a thought here and I'm going to make a motion to refer this back and I can speak to it, Mr. Speaker, if I may do that with instructions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt so you're moving a referral motion?

Councillor De Smedt: I will move a referral if I may. Thank you. I think in the spirit of compromise and what I think had been intended here, sometimes people get passionate about kind of how we are organized around City hall depending on who is at the helm. I am trying not to point fingers in any particular direction. I say this in particular to Councillor Thomas. Let this just say, that its probably timely at some point after the new Council reconvenes, that maybe something like this ought to be considered. I would change a few words in that motion within therefore be it resolved, when you get to subsection B, it's not the appellation of EPC or the appellation of the second chair, what we need to do is just consider the sustainment or the retention of it. In other words, I think a committee, high level committee should analyze how we want to construct our self in the spirit of consensus building and having a full circle of Council Members and the new mayor working together.

I think in that spirit if the mover of the motion could consider just changing two words as a friendly amendment, the two words of appellation, just say the retention of EPC, the retention of a secretariat. I think the words were probably a little bit too directive. Were going to abolish something rather than consider the merits of keeping it and then you allow the committee to make recommendation to Council. I know it might have that impression, Councillor Eadie that it's changing it too much. But I'm not so certain; I'm trying to get a compromise here. I respect what Councillor Thomas has said that we have to be, were not trying to be insulting to the new Mayor. I don't think the intention was to say let's throw the baby in the back room together here. But it may be timely to consider it and if you do note that it therefore be resolved I mean. We recognize that legislative changes have to be organized through provincial approval, so I rather not take a negative look at this, but maybe a more positive one. And so if we can refer this back to the EPC and will allow it to evolve. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. A motion is in order for referral. All in favour. Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor De Smedt, Pagtakhan, Smith, Thomas, Wyatt, Mr. Deputy Speaker

Nays

Acting Mayor Eadie, Councillors Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Steeves.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion is lost. You have Councillor De Smedt and Councillor Eadie and Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much. I can speak to the amendment, but I think there is no sense playing games around here, colleagues and I do think that sometimes we can move things ahead and I'm not sure why some of my more right wing associates and colleagues would not have acknowledged the referral, would have been useful to the EPC. I think it would make a awful lot of sense, because if we would pass this motion, I think it can be debated with some common sense around a committee of our associates, of our colleagues together here and the words can change because what I'm certainly trying to signal to everybody, this is not necessarily draconian.

I do happen to believe that a government like we have ought to have a cabinet system, but its how you work it and how you look at the matter and how you build consensus and whether you have a outer circle to your inner circle that can work in harmony as you move policies forward on behalf of all our citizens. So I think there's some sensibility to what the original intention was, it wasn't meant to be an attack campaign against the previous administration and the people that were sitting on EPC at that time and some of them are still on it today. Let me just say that we need to change from time to time about how we bring bridge building and consensus building together. So I think it would be very useful if you would allow this thing to proceed and see what a committee of Council might come up with. I think you might be surprised. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Acting Mayor Eadie.

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This particular motion, I don't think has a left wing or a right wing element to it. I don't approach it that way. I approach this motion and the debate on it in the matter of common sense. This has nothing to do with ideology as I see it, it may have a lot to do with the way some people feel about the structure of government here and that's fair ball and that's the subject for fair debate. A lot of the motion when you look at it, certainly frequently uses the terminology about power. The motion suggests that the balance of power has been shifted away from Council to the Mayor's office. I don't see any evidence of that Mr. Speaker because under the Charter, Winnipeg City Council is the supreme legislative and policy-making authority for the City. All of us collectively in this Chamber have the power to pass laws and to create and pass policy. No Mayor has that power unto him or herself at any time, any Mayor including the mayor that will be sworn in tomorrow, if they want a policy position taken or a legislation passed, they can't do it by snapping their fingers, they don't have that authority. They have to come to this chamber and convince at least 9 other members in this place to support their policy for the power is resting right here on the floor of this chamber as it always has. Nothing has taken that away. The influence and power of Council I suggest is not changed at all.

Again, it still reflects back to the power of Council to pass policy and to pass law, which become the official position of the City's government. And anyone who is Mayor has to carry out those policies, they are obligated to do that, whether they like them or not. I know from my experience here, that this Council has from time to time adopted policies that the mayor of the day has not been happy with. But he or she has had to carry them forward and represent them, as the policy

of all of us and that hasn't changed with any of the changes.

The roles and responsibilities of the Standing Committees with reference to empowering the Standing Committees as the main vehicle to formulate policy, well Mr. Speaker, that's what we have now. Indeed the changes that were made in the CUFF report in 1997, it gave far more broader emphasis to the standing policy committees to formulate policy, which would come to Council for debate and either adoption or rejection as the case may be. An indeed I certainly know it was the wish of the previous Mayor, that the standing policy committees spend more time on formulation of policy and less to no time on the minutiae of pity little things that should be handled by clerks. It hasn't always been that successful and we still haven't gotten out of that particular little process yet Mr. Speaker, but really the intention with the changes adopted in CUFF is to make the Standing Policy Committees work and deal with and formulate and recommend policy. Nothing has changed. It just takes the will of the committees to have the discipline to work on policy.

And Mr. Speaker, by in large that's happening. Although I've noticed just recently in the Committee of Protection and Community Services when it comes to the proposal of Fire Prevention By-law, that committee for a time has abrogated it's responsibility for policy direction and set the document out to a group of committees who have absolutely no decision making authority. The committee should have been seized with the responsibility and should have taken upon itself to develop a policy recommendation and send it forward to Council in due time for consideration. But that's an example of where committee has decided not to deal with it in that way and sent it out into the boondocks to a group who absolutely no decision making authority. But that's not a matter of structure Mr. Speaker, that was a matter of a political decision made by a committee. The structure and any changes are not going to change anything. The motion proposes that a committee of 5 Councillors be appointed Mr. Speaker, does anybody have any idea what kind of work you going to get involved with doing that. You have any idea of the costs of that Mr. Speaker.

This Council appointed in 1997 George Cuff and Associates to do the first major review of the City and both the Administrative and Political structure since Uni-city. That particular review was done by a team of professionals for nearly a year and it cost over $200,000 and they came out with a professional, well researched, well-done report. It wasn't universally accepted in this chamber and in the public, but it was broadly accepted. Do you think a committee of Council, without the resources of those professionals is going to be able to do the kind of work that this particular motion suggests should be done? I say it's not going to happen. It simply isn't going to happen. You need the professional expertise, you need the people with the time and the resources to do that kind of job and I suggest after seven years, that probably that kind of major overhaul isn't required. If there are some that don't like the end results of that CUFF report which is City policy, which was passed by an overwhelming majority of this Council in October of 1997, then you should propose that we hire another team of professional consultants and do it all over again. But, Mr. Speaker since 1997, we have made considerable stride forward in the restructuring of this City government. The reporting relationship or the creation of a CAO has not changed the reporting structure that much. Prior to CUFF we had a Board of Commissioners and everything was centralized through a board of commissioners. So we changed it from four people to one, with authority to manage the City. So that hasn't changed and nor should it change Mr. Speaker. Why would we fix something that isn't broken?

We are renown throughout this country for a lot of the policy decisions that we've made. Partly due to the decisions of this Council and certainly due to the administration, the professional administration carrying those policies forward to fruition. Why would you want to change that. It isn't broken Mr. Speaker and it doesn't need fixing. Now lets look

at the Charter. The ability of the Mayor to appoint. Well Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg Charter under Section 59 mandates a Mayor, that mandates that the Mayor must appoint a Deputy, must appoint an Acting Deputy and must appoint an Executive Policy Committee. This motion won't be able to change that. That is a mandate under the Charter. Section 61 of the Charter says that there shall be an EPC of Council, composed of the Mayor, composed of chairpersons of Standing Committees or composed of other Members of Council appointed by the Mayor. And it also says that the Mayor must determine the number of members of the EPC subject to a limit according to the Charter. Passing this motion isn't going to change that. It isn't going to do a thing Mr. Speaker. Furthermore, the Charter mandates that there must be a Chief Administrative Officer appointed by Council and the CAO under Section 97 of the Charter has a number of duties, six major duties. Among which, carrying out the power, duties, the functions assigned by Council, reporting to EPC on the operations of the City, ensuring that by-laws and policies passed by Council are implemented and on it goes. That's a mandate in the Charter. We can't change that. Nor should we change it. The CAO has a very clear legislative mandate under the Charter and he or she is obligated to carry out those duties. As well, it indicates that the Mayor may suspend the CAO for a period of not longer than three working days. That's in the Charter. If the Mayor of the day fells so inclined that the CAO should be suspended, the Mayor has the authority under the Charter under Section 98 to suspend the CAO for a maximum of 3 working days and in that period of time, the executive committee, Executive Policy Committee is required to either recommend to Council that the CAO be dismissed or to overturn the mayor's suspension and reinstate the CAO. All of those things are mandated in the Charter. I don't see anything in this motion that's going to change that. Mr. Speaker I suggest that this motion should not be supported, I am quite sure that all of us are human beings and none of us are entirely perfect, but I think that the changes that we have made here since we have adopted the CUFF report, which is now City Policy, have been positive.

I don't get very many complaints from the public about the general operations of the City government and the way it's going. People like the fact they've had taxes decreased or least frozen. Thanks in part to the discipline of the majority of members of this Council from time to time and the administration carrying those things out with a degree of professionalism that is unmatched anywhere else in the country. I think this motion would be a waist of time. I know very well that five members of Council and a few staff are not going to be able to carry out the kind of mandate this motion requires. It took a lot of money and professionals to do what came out of the CUFF report and I think it would be wise simply to defeat the motion. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too rise not to support this motion. I think what we are talking about is a governance structure obviously and a lot of times people talk about a government structure is going to change the way everything works and they laid the blame or dissatisfaction they feel of things on the governance structure. They're really looking in the wrong place. We really need to look at ourselves. It's Councillors and what we do. It's what we do on Standing Committees that shows the effectiveness of standing committee. And if you are going to suggest that we abolish this direction, you need to have something credible to replace it. And I really don't see anything credible in this motion to replace it. A Committee of Councillors or basically Secretariat Committee coming up with a whole new structure, perhaps eventually they would, but they really haven't defined the problem very clearly.

I think its another thing that, I think is an important point to make is that haven't a cabinet style of structure is part of looking at city government as a mature form of government. Other levels of government have a cabinet structure; I don't hear the

public demanding that we abolish the provincial cabinet. Yet we are trying to be more like other levels of government that based on what they do on policy, not just parochial popularity contests and parochial issues that each Councillor has. Were trying to do what we do based on policy or least that was the direction we took in the last six years under Glen Murray which I supported.

I don't want to move away from that; I don't want to move away from looking at things in terms of policy. I think policy committees should look at policy not necessarily these other kinds of parochial issues that Councillors sometimes try to bring there. I think that the mechanisms for open government are here. I think the whole issue of the accusation, which what it clearly is, it's clearly politics in terms of election which we just been in. To say that we haven't had an open government and now we will with a new person. I don't think it's founded as Councillor Eadie indicated, that there hasn't been an open forum of government. I think the problem is that Councillors have come forward, in many cases with motions that aren't well thought out. They haven't done their homework and then they expect everyone to change their way. Well that's not saying it's not open, its just maybe that idea wasn't all that good, that particular idea. And ideas that were thought out and were worked on can come forward in this process. I think I support a cabinet style government and I don't know if some of the newer Members of Council haven't served on EPC. I understand how much work is involved in being a chair of a Standing committee. It's not always fun and games. You take a lot of heat. You take a lot of responsibility and I loved the opportunity to do that and it's a great opportunity. And I think it would be quite fascinating to see some of those members of council if they get that opportunity which they may well under a new Mayor. If there're be so quick to abolish that system when they have the opportunity to experience it.

It is a wonderful opportunity to take on that kind of responsibility and to work on policy and work as a team and you do work with sixteen members of council cause ultimately the governance structure is that we meet here and we have many other mechanisms to include all Councillors on decisions, from Council seminars on important issues which we have and those things simply haven't been acknowledged in this political game of arguing that there's all this closed door system. We have one of the most open forms of government. Were a fishbowl and I think we can do more than include the community. I don't think its councillors that we don't include. It's the citizens and the community that don't have as much access to our meetings in the middle of the day and so on. Those are issues I would be more interested in seeing something done about than Councillors who claims they don't even bother to read the reports, they claim they don't have it. So they don't take the time to study it and do their homework. That's the problem is Councillors performance not standing up, not government structure.

I would like to open up Council to citizens more. That's more of a real problem, so I don't think this identifies the real problems and it doesn't identify a real solution and its just politics and sour grapes which hopefully now there will be some change and maybe some of those people will have the opportunity to be on EPC themselves and they can take the responsibility and they can take the heat that goes with that. They will understand because I think there is a lack of understanding about how this system works and I think we should be a mature level of government. We should be dealing with policy at policy committees and I'm looking forward to seeing some new people have a chance to do that so perhaps they will understand that a little better. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too called for the rejection of this particular motion at this time. Not to suggest that we shouldn't be looking at ways of improving communication. I take task with my friend from St. James area in terms of standing committee, not dealing with policy. He's referring to a standing

committee unfortunately for him that I have to sit on. When a major policy such as the fire by-laws and the changes and the cause and effect that it's going to have comes to a committee, I think that it behooves everybody to try and solicit input from other people who have an interest in the cause and effect of this. We can certainly make a decision, to make a decision in isolation without any viable input from the community; from people that are going to be negatively affected is rash in my mind.

So I don't see anything wrong with referring it to, but my friend calls it boondoggling committees with no authority to make any decisions. I suspect affectionately to the community committees that he so dearly loves and holds a high esteem to. But in our particular area we do have a group of citizens that voluntarily come out and make comments on the agenda and will make comments on things of this nature. I appreciate what you are suggesting about standing committees and dealing with policy. I think that is a very important issue.

Let me tell you, that this Council made a, and it wasn't everybody that was here off course, but the Council made a very conscious decision to vote for a strong mayor model. And a strong mayor model, and we went to legislature and we asked for that change to be made and they did make those changes and they have incorporated them into the Act. Now that strong model allowed us to in cooperation with the CUFF report that Councillor Eadie had mentioned to eliminate for the last 6 years the squabble that was perpetually taking place between Councillors and the administration through the old Board of Commissioners model. Councillors, you've Councillor Wyatt were here when one of your predecessor was in that chair. You will remember that they would continually blame the Board of Commissioners for bringing down stupid policies. They were just doing their jobs in terms of trying to bring forward policies that they thought were going to be good. But inevitably, we tried to save in the budget; they'd say well close wading pools, shut down libraries. All of this side would go ballistic or the big black hole on the other side. We were able to eliminate that with a strong mayor model because now those decisions, as they rightfully should, rest with this particular chamber. This chamber then makes the decisions on that information. If I have any fears about leaving this particular hallow hall its that the administration is once again going to take back the agenda and there not going to have the Councillors be as much in charge of their portfolios and their files as they should be. And if we are unhappy with chairs and we want to provide an opposition role, then we should be able to do that. If we as a Council decide we want more information on specific files, we should mandate and we should determine that there are seminars on a regularly scheduled basis not called at the whim of the chair of EPC, but regularly scheduled and we should have some opportunity to input what items are going to be on those agendas. Then we have an obligation to secure from the administration the background information and attend those meetings and have general discussions, not to attend those meetings just to get information so we can run out to the media and explain to them how this is going this way or that is going that way, but to generally get information to valuably put in input. Those forms will become public obviously and flow up through the standing committee and through the community committee if necessary on to EPC onto the floor of Council.

But somebody has to be in charge of driving the ship and the model we got now has put the Mayor and his cabinet in charge of trying to drive that ship as opposed to the Board of Commissioners, which were driving it before. And I have to tell you this is a much much better system. I don't always get what I want, but I always have a fairly good feeling that I understand what is going on and know where I can input my concerns and or get the information I need. We have a very responsive administration, not just to the chairs of standing committees but to all Members of Council. All Members of Council have access to asking what ever questions they feel are important to them on any specific issue and they get

responses generally back out of the courtesy of most of the administration, at least they used to in my department informed the chair of the committee that somebody has made this inquiry and I think that's only reasonable.

As a chair of committee if the Free Press is asking a question on potholes or one Councillor is asking some questions on potholes, I as the chair of that committee understand what the issue is so that particular member comes to me and says, what is the administration doing here, I have at least an understanding of it, that's only a courtesy. It's not secret back room deals or anything of that nature.

The chairman also gets an opportunity to set the agenda and if there are sensitive items for individual Councillors that are coming on the agenda, I think it behooves the chairperson to let that Councillor know that there's going to be an item that they might have some concern on. They don't always pick everything up. They don't always notice everything and so a good chair will do that. But there's no mandate of secrecy, there's nothing corrupt in the magic kingdom if you like. We have a Mayor; we have a strong mayor model. The Mayor is going to try and make his stamp and drive the direction. He selects particular chairs to help him achieve that objective and it moves through the process. I don't see anything wrong with the process at this particular time, although I do suggest there are areas as I just identified that could be improved. This motion is not particularly effective at this particular time. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor Wyatt to close the debate.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I welcome the discussion; I think it's been very useful. The previous speaker, I found his comments very informative and I now I've talked to him about it before. I do recall the days when the administration did have over arching powers and when a Councillor or Council would come to the administration and ask for the savings in this department or that department, the response was well will close a fire hall in your ward Councillor.

That was the freeze and chill that pervaded. There is not doubt that there's been improvements made and I agree with that one hundred percent of the fact that we've moved and with the CUFF report we have made changes, we eliminated the Board of Commissioners, this Council eliminated the Board of the Commissioners bringing authority and power to this body ensuring that at the end of the day Council had to be accountable. But that's the key word here, Council had to be accountable. Right now we have a system, which still needs to be changed.

There's still an imbalance of power and I guess what were questioning here today and we've heard it a number of times is a creation of the strong mayor model. And clearly that's what it did and I think George Cuff was concerned about that, he said a strong mayor model he was considered about that and he wanted to ensure that would have a counter balance of Council plus the standing committees that develop policy, but what in effect has occurred is that in reality the implementation of the strong mayor model Mr. Speaker hasn't allowed for the powers to basically be usurped out of the committees to a large extent with the chairs of the committee being appointed directly by the mayor and now with the power of the EPC Secretariat having the authority to go through all reports before they reach the committee floors.

And what that has done Mr. Speaker is it prevents committees from doing a lot of the policy work and development because of the concern that is then out of the reach, out of the power, out of the authority of the EPC secretariat and this was a decision made by this Council shortly after the 1998 election. I believe it was in January 1999 when Council voted that the EPC Secretariat would have full control of the reports and through the report information system that exists today. I would argue Mr. Speaker, that we would be better off eliminating that and insuring that committees truly have policy and development and I agree with a lot of

the comments that Councillors all have to be accountable and responsible, but its difficult and I know I've moved motion after motion after motion on various subjects that my committee, the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services and the response was EPC Secretariat make work on that or give us time were working on that. Well this is what the body of the committee, the Standing Committee on Protection and Community Services exists, should exist for the development of policy in that area, in those areas that their responsible for.

And instead, we have a situation where for example, I request that we work and develop together on a single issue. We refer the matter while suggested, this was shortly after the election that the matter be referred off to the EPC Secretariat and the CAO and then we don't see it again. We ask where is this, where is it, mean while we could as a group be working together on these issues and these challenges. The reality is we know the strong mayor model exists and that the reporting powers go through the Mayor's office and the power of his appointment, the power of chairmanship, the power of being able to control policy development that way and lets not fool ourselves, our senior administrators, very good, very efficient, were very lucky as a City to have them also know that as well and they know that this is where the power resides. And this is where things happen and where they don't happen. And it they want to get something done that's how you do it. Now, you could argue that you could jockey here or jockey there and maybe do a little bit here. I believe policy development should be out in the open for all to see, for discussion to take place, rather than behind close doors which is the case today Council. Behind close doors where it happens and by the time a report comes forward, that report is finalized, this Council is here only to rubber stamp. You want to make changes, you want to refer it back, the referral motions are defeated, as we've just seen today. Doesn't happen.

I welcome the motion referral for my Councillor, my honorable friend from St. Charles. I think it was a great idea. We could have kept this alive. I'm not totally tied to the wording of this motion, I think the idea of getting some discussion happening and where we could go with this is a useful thing. Do we have to hire a hundred thousand or five hundred thousand consultant, I don't think so. I think there are some changes that could be made to ensure that Councillors have it. Yes, there is also the issue of structure; yes there is also the issue of individual responsibility Mr. Speaker. Individual Councillors all have to do that and ensure that they play an equal part in the process and their actively engaged, but its difficult to do that when you constantly beating down because your not given the information because your refused it because of the system we have today. Mr. Speaker, I encourage Councillors to support this. I encourage the referral motion. We're an ongoing experiment, its not over yet. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Ready for the question. All in favour. Contrary? No for the clause. Before by-laws I would like to remind Councillors there are only twelve of us out of sixteen, four Councillors are not here and we still have the number, number nine to pass motions. Deputy Mayor Eadie would you move the by-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Deputy Mayor Eadie: I'll move that by-laws numbered 101/2004, 102/2004, and 103/2004, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 101/2004, 102/2004 and 103/2004.

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that by-laws numbered 101/2004, 102/2004, and 103/2004, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 101/2004, 102/2004 and 103/2004.

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that the rule be suspended, and that by-laws numbered 101/2004, 102/2004 and 103/2004, 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. None.

Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development, Report of June 8, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPEMENT DATED JUNE 8, 2004

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'm pleased to move that the Report of Property and Development for June 8 be received, and that Items 1 through 40 be adopted by consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: And the amendment, Item 15.

All the rest. All in favour of the clause? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 15 – Subdivision and Rezoning – Northwest corner of Day Street and Larche Avenue West File DASZ 10/2004

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Councillor Wyatt has drafted a motion here. He has spoken with Director of Property and Development, Harry Finnigan as well as the developer and I don't have a problem with the motion as written.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt. Housekeeping. All in favour of the clause? Contrary? Carried. There is one motion I believe. Motion by Councillor Wyatt and Pagtakhan. That motion was carried. Contrary? Carried?

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that by-laws numbered 93/2004, 94/2004, 95/2004, 96/2004, 97/2004, 98/2004, 99/2004, 104/2004, 105/2004, 106/2004, 107/2004, 108/2004 and 109/2004, be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 93/2004, 94/2004, 95/2004, 96/2004, 97/2004, 98/2004, 99/2004, 104/2004, 105/2004, 106/2004, 107/2004, 108/2004 and 109/2004.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that by-laws numbered 93/2004, 94/2004, 95/2004, 96/2004, 97/2004, 98/2004, 99/2004, 104/2004, 105/2004, 106/2004, 107/2004, 108/2004 and 109/2004 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 93/2004, 94/2004, 95/2004, 96/2004, 97/2004, 98/2004, 99/2004, 104/2004, 105/2004, 106/2004, 107/2004, 108/2004 and 109/2004.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that the rule be suspended, and that by-laws numbered 93/2004, 94/2004, 95/2004, 96/2004, 97/2004, 98/2004, 99/2004, 104/2004, 105/2004, 106/2004, 107/2004, 108/2004 and 109/2004, 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. None.

Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Report of June 2, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JUNE 2, 2004

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, Thank you, I'm pleased to move that the Report of June 2 be received and Item 1 be adopted by consent with grateful thanks to the administration for an excellent job on this two year project.

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

Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Report of June 3, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JUNE 3, 2004

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'll move that the Report of June 3 be received and Item 1 be adopted by consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Motions, no motions Mr. Clerk.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 100/2004 and 111/2004 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2004 and 111/2004.

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'll move that By-law No. 100/2004 and 111/2004, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2004 and 111/2004.

Deputy Mayor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-law No. 100/2004 and 111/2004, 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.

Questions, none.

Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, dated June 7, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JUNE 7, 2004

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I'm pleased to move that the Report of Protection and Community Services for June 7 be received, and that Item 1 and 2 be adopted by consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillors DeSmedt and Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Gerbasi: Number 1, the committee concurred with the recommendation but I believe Peter DeSmedt would like to comment on this.

Item No. 1 – Community Incentive Grant - Canadian Association of Veterans in United Nations Peacekeeping LGen RR Crabbe Chapter File PR-2.6(34)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Councillor Gerbasi. I do appreciate you mentioning the comment that this is being recommended and I think it's important that I just wanted to highlight to all of our colleagues on here really this might look like a benign kind of CIGP but its really an important item to peace keeping veterans in this city. They are going to putting a memorial up on Memorial Boulevard. It will be close to the Cenotaph and its to be

a long lasting permanent tribute to our United Nations peacekeepers that represent Canada both men and women and members of the RCMP and others who serve over seas are very important duties on our behalf.

Let me just say that I'm extremely grateful to those of you that have found an opportunity and a way to support it. It wasn't obviously mandatory but I think everybody was aware of this program and Councillors Eadie and Clement and myself and Assiniboine Community Committee have provided per capita grants to the tune of $4,000.00. I believe Riel Committee, Councillors Angus, former Councillor Vandal and Councillor Steeves provided $650.00 through per capita and what you are seeing is through the will of other Councillors who obviously didn't have the elasticity in their per capita grant program made a recommendation to use CIGP money and so Councillors O'Shaughnessy, Wyatt and Councillor Lazarenko are providing $4,000.00. So we're contributing some $8,650.00 towards a $34,000.00 project. The province is contributing about $3,400.00 and I think this is a fine representative commitment by the City.

You should note this had come to the previous Mayor about a year and a half ago and he for some reason did not have the opportunity to support this. I am not saying this pejoratively, this is not a post kind of election comment, but for some reason the peacekeepers became kind of concerned that the project could not be supported. So through your support I am very grateful to acknowledge that and I should mention to you that really this whole thing is being backstopped by the Jewish Veterans Association. They are backstopping the peacekeepers; these are people who have served both in World War II and Korea and in peacekeeping operations.

We have some very distinguished people in that community that have committed to this. People like Graham Dickson who lives up in the north end who did service in Korea and Mr. Arnold Freeman, for those of you who don't know, that gentleman was in the Israel Defence Forces in 1948 before he came to Canada. And so I think the backstopping of this is a great tribute to our Veterans who have been involved in peacekeeping operations. So I would just like to highlight that to you and I thank you for your support and I'm sure Veterans do as well. This Memorial will be erected and a ceremony will be held this August. As you know the Province has dedicated August the 9th officially. It was done two years ago by Provincial MLA's who got approval as official peacekeeping, peacekeepers day in Manitoba. It's celebrated on the Sunday previous to the 9th, this case Sunday the 8th of August. There will be a ceremony down at the Memorial Boulevard where this particular carom will be erected. Thank you again.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Call the question.

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

Item 2 for Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Gerbasi would you do the same thing, hear what Councillor Wyatt has to say.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to actually just introduce it first.

Item No. 2 – Community Incentive Grant – Transcona Anti-Graffiti Campaign
File PR-2.6 (33)

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's always difficult when a Community Incentive Grant comes forward and isn't supported because we have a sense that program is with the Councillors discretion and they know their ward best. It's a difficult decision to stand up and not support a particular Councillor's initiative.

But the fact of the matter is both the Standing Policy Committee three to one and EPC I'm thinking unanimously, voted against this particular grant and I'd like to give a little bit of background as to why. We do sometimes as we just did with the last Item we discussed approved

something that doesn't quite fit with criteria if evidence can be shown that there's a good argument for that. In this case the difficulty is that were talking about a particular graffiti program, one area of the City that's been basically operating money that will be required yearly, this second year of this and the problem is were in the middle of developing or improving hopefully our current graffiti city wide graffiti strategy and there's expected to be a report coming forward quite soon on that.

All Councillors were interviewed over the last month or two by the department to look at what do we want to do. We realize we have a graffiti problem city wide, it's not just in Transcona, it's not just in North Kildonan, in fact in Councillor Smith's Ward and Pagtakhan and my wards are particularly bad, although it's recognized as a city wide problem. The concern that some of us had and Councillor Smith supported me on this and supported the rest of the committee on this, was that it's going to diminish our city wide program if different areas of the City that happen to have extra funds.

I don't quite know how these areas have extra funds. In Fort Rouge, our facilities are in such shape, that I need to spend that money on community clubs and park improvements. Maybe those Councillors expect to get that money from somewhere else. But that's what that's money for and the rest of us need that money, or many of us, particularly in the inner city need that money for that. We don't have money to spare to run programs that should be part of the base budget of the City like a graffiti program. And frankly, I don't give, if the public works truck is driving through Transcona and he's getting special resources, I'd like to ask some questions about that. Because frankly all of us have the exact same problems. All of us are entitled to a citywide program and all of us have huge concerns about graffiti and I don't see why one area of the City should have capital funds, which aren't even operating funds.

So it's the wrong fiscally, its an irresponsibly way of funding a program. We should be looking at this comprehensively not parochial. We should be looking at the whole city and doing something about the graffiti problem and I appreciate that Councillors are frustrated in their own areas and their trying to do a creative initiative and I don't want to criticize that. We're all in the same boat; we have to work with our business associations. In Osborne village they help a lot with graffiti, but they can't do it alone. And we all face the same problem; we don't want our citywide program diminished because one area of the city happens to have some extra money they can throw away on it. It just simply not fair, its inappropriate and its not the best use of capital dollars.

So that was the rational why nobody in any of the other areas, with the exception of the Councillor of the area supported this particular grant. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Mr. Speaker, after seeing Item 1 through 5, maybe I should have changed the name to Transcona Veterans Anti-Graffiti campaign. It might have just slide through and it would have passed. I found the speech very interesting by my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, this is a problem that I have been championing and talking about since getting elected back in 2002. In fact, shortly after that in February 2003, at the Standing Policy Committee of Protection and Community Services, I moved a motion for the purpose of bringing together a comprehensive program, comprehensive strategy with dealing with graffiti throughout the City. Identifying the fact that our funding for graffiti had gone down from over $900,000.00 in 1999. We had the Pan American games and we wanted to clean up the city and make the city look good down to a level of $390,000.00, it hasn't changed much since then. We have a problem with graffiti across the City. There's no doubt about it, in every ward in every community and every sector of the City.

And so I moved this motion at the Standing Policy Committee of Protection

and Community Services largely because of the fact that in my mind graffiti is related to safety and the perception of safety and whether we feel safe in our City. That motion then went off the idea, again it was recommended send it to the CAO, send it to the EPC and see what they can come up with. I followed up with again in the spring of 2003, what's happened with the report, what's happened with the work being done, nothing. Fall of 2003, nothing. Winter of 2003, nothing. Finally in February of 2004, I sat down with the previous Mayor and I say what's going on with graffiti. What's going on with the request for this? This is another good example of where we get tied up with whose developing policy, where and when.

So after waiting and waiting and waiting, Mr. Speaker, and seeing that nothing was happening I felt that as the Ward Councillor for Transcona, the community identified in the last civic election, graffiti was a problem. And I felt that it was incumbent on myself to act. So I wasn't going to wait until we finally get a report, who knows when and it didn't seem to be a priority to the powers of be then, to get a report coming forward to deal with this issue. I welcome the report finally that's come forward by the way, that's possibly going to be coming forward to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works.

I participated in the interviews Mr. Speaker, with the administration and I hope sincerely that the recommendations, that there are real recommendations that come forward out of that. That they are implemented and that the work that the report will do in the committee will put this out of business. I would love to see what I'm doing here be put out of business. That there would not longer be a need, that we could resolve the issues without having duties, these things in our wards. That would be something that I would welcome. But in the interim, I am working to try to solve the problem in my community as best as I see possible. I guess that's what I'm asking this Council here today. Is as the ward Councillor I feel this is an important project.

We all have projects. I could hold up a list here Mr. Speaker of different programs and projects that this Council has waived criteria on in the last number of years and read them out one by one but I'm not going to do that. I've identified this as a priority. Last year, this Council did approve for the program $10,000.00. We scaled it down to $7,500.00. $7,500.00 is what we are debating about here today Mr. Speaker. Let's keep this in perspective. I mean this Council has passed items like this, million dollars plus without thinking. We're talking about $7,500.00 of a program, which I feel is important in the community. We've scaled it down. We've scaled it down to and we've also gone to other groups. The Transcona Biz participated last year with gifts and kind. This year they're actually putting cash up. We've talked to them and they're coming forward with $2,500.00 in cash plus gift and kind. Last year we were lucky enough to have Vickar Community Chevrolet Olds donate a van for the purpose of graffiti removal in the city and it was extremely generous of Larry Vickar, an outstanding business leader in our community to do that. He recognized it as a problem, he came forward donated a van towards it. We had to offset some of the insurance costs to that, that this year we tried to reduce our savings there.

We said look if there is a way we can find savings, we approached the City of Winnipeg through the budget of Graffiti Control, the $390,000.00. They were able to provide a van. And I understand other Councillors have now inquired about that. Councillor Pagtakhan I understand has inquired about that and asked about a van as well. I think that's great if there's a van available to help remove graffiti in other parts of the communities. Great. I don't begrudge that to anybody. What I've been doing is doing this labour with the community. We have a volunteer individual who's spear heading this. He's a deputy chief for a fire department in the City of Winnipeg. He goes around with his grandson removing the graffiti on the weekends and other times. We have a young part time student hired to do this. We've cut down on our staffing because I knew this would become an issue because of the criteria change.

And so I thought how can we make this happen because what I'm trying to say Mr. Speaker. How can we make this happen? And it has an affect; it has a positive impact when people see that the graffiti is being removed and being taken off of public buildings. Right now we have a program in the City that can barely keep up with removing graffiti off of our own structures and our own buildings never mind anything else that's out there. And they can barely keep up, they can't keep up. This is the reality. They can't keep up with the amount of graffiti. We identified as a problem in 1999 because of the Pan American games because we saw it as an issue. Now we Mr. Speaker stopped funding it. I think it should be made a priority. I'm doing what I can in my ward. I know that the new mayor, it's good to say the winds have changed that are now blowing across the city.

The new mayor, Mr. Speaker he has identified crime and safety and graffiti as an issue. And I look forward to working with him on that. He came through with a decisive victory, forty three percent the first time he runs, that's very well. I got sixty two percent the first time I ran Mr. Speaker, so he has to work hard building. Fifty seven per cent did not vote for him. So he has to work hard to bring people together Mr. Speaker. Bring people together and bring us together to build the bond so that if he decides to run again, that support will grow. We are in some ways a divided city, if you look at that support, were a divided city. Let us become more united, lets come together and lets use the Transcona Anti-Graffiti campaign as an option to come together as a Council and use it as an example and symbol of what we can do for the future.

Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity to do that. I never begrudge, I've stood here and supported Councillors when they come forward on issues in their communities Mr. Speaker. I can start naming them and they know who they are and I voted for them when they came with issues outside the criteria. I supported them in my standing committee. I've supported them here. When a Councillor sees that as a criterion, I've always, every time, every time supported Councillors on issues in their community. When they see that there is a party that didn't meet criteria, every time I supported them. And I'm asking for that same support today. Everything that I fund with my Community Incentive Grant Mr. Speaker, I funded, $7,500.00, all of it goes to parks and playgrounds and different things with regards to meeting the criteria of recreation in the community. We put $50,000.00 to the Rotary Centennial Park in Transcona. $30,000.00 to Joseph Teres play structure. We have money going into walkways for wheel chair ramps. We have money going into planting trees and enhancing community areas in the community. We're trying to do things in the community to help people help themselves and that's what the CIG is all about with matching funding. And I've done that all along.

This Mr. Speaker is just one more example of, unfortunately does not meet the criteria. Unfortunately we don't have a lot of resources out there when it comes to the programming needs. We've talked about that before. We know that's a need. We know programming is a need and we don't have those resources. I realize that this is for capital. I don't like having to take it from here, but I went to the EPC previously two months ago, and asked on land dedication because I knew the criteria had changed with regards to CIG. EPC said forget it, its not going to happen in land dedication, we rejected it. So now I come forward Mr. Speaker on the CIG looking for support from this Council to make this happen. It's a priority in my ward. I see it as a concern and I would appreciate Councillors to recognize that. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I am supportive of this CIGP and I would ask our colleagues around the table here to show a little elasticity. I think in the application of the policy we've done it for many respects.

And I do know earlier this year we went through some crisis discussion around

here, how we can control this and so we end up with a kind of bizarre policy that should be two thirds of the vote of Council to pass a adjustment to policy to get approval for CIGP out of criteria. I find that bizarre; you we don't even need two-thirds vote of Council to pass a budget. Simple majority is good enough for the annual budget. And I've spoken to that before so I really won't belabour it, but I think we've taken a sledgehammer to swat a fly here in trying to bring some common sense.

Most of us have supported CIGP's to individual Councillors when it tended to make sense. There is the odd one I think that created part of this policy change, the two thirds vote and which means we have to sit around here and discuss it and find out why we should be elastic or not elastic. I think in this particular case, the Councillor of the ward has come up with a support group in his community that is providing a valuable service. It's a small amount of money and while it is capital money we do know the magic of how the administration is building up our reserves and it isn't costing us a whole bunch more because it is capital money. Please look at it that way. It's not costing you four or five or six percent a year, extrapolated over twenty years. I do think well, we can discuss that Councillor Clement; it is not an expensive issue.

In this particular case, I think it makes a heck of lot of sense, it provides a tremendous service to that community. I wish I had a Biz in my area, but its not really needed in St. Charles. We don't trump that up. I'm maybe a little more fortunate not having as much graffiti as certain other wards and having travelled with the administration here two weeks ago when they were taking us around to show us the graffiti issues in the city, I mean I became pretty sensitized to what the concerns are in most wards. So I think this is innovative, I think we should be a little bit more considerate of the Councillors urgent plea to help support this program and hopefully I think I did hear him say that we are reviewing the policy. That we may be able to put more money that can be done through administrative processes and this may not be required. But they have made adjustments from last year to this year. I think that's very respectful of that community and their trying to help themselves. So really lets try and help them help themselves. I do think certainly, a pro debate on this is certainly worth it and I would urge you to be a little bit more considerate in this particular case. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm going to support Councillor Wyatt for his request for $7,500.00 for an anti-graffiti program as well. Some of you probably know that North Kildonan is having similar program, the North Kildonan Clean and Green Team Project. It's in its fourth successful year this year and it was funded by a local non-profit organization, which rallied around the Bunns Creek and riparian forests and walking trails that the creek holds about eight years ago. It's true that all of our wards have got similar problems and in some cases unique problems and challenges to deal with, but we certainly have the liberty and the opportunity to try and address these challenges in creative ways and creative means.

And in Councillor Wyatt's case, he has an organization that has formed in order to address the need to reduce and hopefully eliminate some of the graffiti which I agree is epidemic in our city in many areas and epidemic to pretty much everyone's ward. In North Kildonan, the case has been that we have used capital money's, land dedication reserve, community incentive, we've also appealed to other levels of government, successful using the urban green team program to hire two to four students. We've also used the federal government 's money; career start program and we've received a number of private donations over the years from corporal businesses. North Kildonan doesn't have the benefit of a BIZ organization because of the geography and development of Henderson Highway. It doesn't really lend itself to that kind of organization and that structure of an organization.

But in the mean while, we haven't ignored the fact that we have a very significant problem with respect to graffiti and we've dealt with it by using capital funds. The taxpayer when they remit their taxes is not nearly as concerned about whether the money is capital money or operating money, they want to see value for their tax dollars and when they drive home from work or take their kids to school and they see less graffiti when they go to the sand box in the playground and they don't have to worry about glass jars cutting their kids feet and hands, when the mailboxes that occasionally get turned over mysteriously in the night by winds that have not been predicated by our weather services are set right again, when bus shelters are tided up, when litter is cleaned up, the noxious weeds are pulled from boulevards and park areas, where pesticides are not appropriate for use. When these things are done, Mr. Speaker, the community is happy and the community is pleased and they see value for their tax dollars.

It's not possible at this point in time in our city to deliver the level of service on a micro level, on a community level, and every community at the same rate and at the same constituency. Since 1995 we've reduced our staffing complement from 12,000 to about 8,000 and a lot of those staff that used to do this kind of work, seasonal work are no longer in our employ.

So we have to look to non-profit community organizations and other groups that are enthusiastic about doing some of the community development work that is needed in our city, that is appreciated in our city and we have to try and support these groups, whether they are senior centres or BIZ's or community groups that are trying to do good. And I certainly don't begrudge Councillor Wyatt, in the absence of a meaningful program to address these types of challenges and these types of opportunities, I don't begrudge him one bit using what is really a very modest amount of capital allocated dollars in order to improve the capital in this community. Sometimes it's more important to fix what we have and to put what we've already created into repair then to just add more capital, which is obviously even at this time not being maintained at a satisfactory and sustainable fashion.

I can tell you that in North Kildonan, the North Kildonan Clean and Green Team has had budgets that have ranged from between $50,000.00 to in excess of $70,000.00 per year. They've hired anywhere from six students to more than a dozen students. They have done work not only in North Kildonan but in East Kildonan and Elmwood, and indeed Councillor Thomas has also contributed capital dollars to facilitate work to be done in some of the most hard prest areas in East Kildonan and Elmwood and it's all been very successful. I'm hoping that when the administration comes back to Public Works with their anti-graffiti strategy, that they will also consider looking at, trying to facilitate funding for community action plans, similar to what Councillor Wyatt has initiated. Similar to what has been developed in North Kildonan so that we can have a balance of resources for both the development of capital and makings of that capital Mr. Speaker.

I really don't see $7,500.00 as a huge deviation from the policy. I see it as a creative way of providing a group of volunteers and interested persons in Transcona the opportunity to make their community a little brighter and more enlightened and more orderly and I'm hoping that we will all be, not just charitable but innovative today and support Councillor Wyatt in his bid to try and do some good work in Transcona and with that I'll close Mr. Speaker and call the question to you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi. Closing debate.

Councillor Gerbasi: Call the question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour. Recorded vote has been called for. All in favour of rejecting.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Acting Deputy Mayor Eadie, Councillor Angus, Clement, Gerbasi, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Thomas.

Nays

Councillors DeSmedt, Lubosch, Smith, Wyatt, Mr. Deputy Speaker Lazarenko.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 5.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Carried.

Motions, none. By-laws, none. Questions. Councillor Angus.

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

Councillor Angus: Can you tell us if were going to be mosquito fogging or not or do you know anything about that, an issue you can bring us up to date on. I notice they had the first dead bird arise and people are complaining pretty regularly about the number of mosquitoes. So if you could just comment on that, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you for the question through you Deputy Speaker. First of all in terms of the West Nile, the decision of whether to fog based on the West Nile threat will come from the Provincial Health, just to clarify that process, that's not a decision the City would make, that would be in response to a Provincial Health order and we haven't got anything like that yet.

But obviously the situation been monitored, I understand they found one first bird, egg and there considering the threat is still quite low at the moment. In terms of the nuisance mosquitoes and the fogging issue, there have been memos sent around fairly regularly from the department but I can send, ask them to send another one today to all Members of Council. Basically, because of the cool nights, the mosquito's count is low at night and also the fogging might be ineffective at night because they won't be reaching those mosquitoes, as their fogging tonight. The weather conditions are not conducive to fogging and the numbers aren't high enough, so it wouldn't be effective if they were doing it immediately anyway, but that is being looked at on a day to day basis and I can have a memo sent around from the department to all Members of Council with an update about how things are going today. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions, if not, Clerks would you take note that there was no consideration of by-laws on this.

Standing Policy Committee on Public Works dated, June 8, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED JUNE 8, 2004

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce and move the Public Works Committee meeting dated June 8, 2004, Items 1 to 6, as consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Angus is not in support of item 2. The rest, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Item No. 2 – Residential Solid Waste Collection Contract Extension
File WT-1**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't really have a lot to say by way of introduction. This wasn't too controversial coming, it wasn't at all controversial coming through committee or through EPC and perhaps I'll just stand down and wait for the comment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The report is avoided in relation to the review contracting out all of the garbage services. The make or buy report that is currently in the works and being looked at as to whether we should be contracting out. There was indication there's a savings of about three million dollars. That's the first thing I noticed that wasn't in the report and it would be hoped that they could have that report back and decided on fairly quickly.

The report does indicate that they've got to sort of look at starting to tender by this summer in order to make the deadline of 2005 for the beginning of the pickup of services. But the report in my mind is also void in the relationship between the amount of money we're paying this one section for one year of collection of garbage verses the five or six year contract that we have with these people and I am not questioning the administration recommendation nor the committee's decision to put this off for a year, but those are questions that I think have some relevance in here. It seems to me were paying an inordinate amount, higher amount for a one year pickup and I don't, can't compare that to sort of the five or six year cost of picking up garbage.

I don't know if you have that information Mr. Chairman, and unfortunately I would have given you a heads up I was going to ask this question but I just sort of through the last few pages scrolled going through the agenda material and I wondered if you could just tell us A; if you know the total cost of picking up garbage over a five or six year contract, if you don't you can certainly put that information and forward it out to me and secondly where we are at and what cause and affect this particular extension may have on the make or buy concept that's going to be following up to Council very shortly I expect. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you for the question. I don't know that I can do, by way of answering, I don't know that I can do it necessarily justice but I'll certainly endeavor to get what every information I can't fill in today. Solid waste collection at this stage of the game is certainly complicated. We're in the froze as everybody here knows of, I guessed were going to be forced through the course of the 2005 budget deliberations to consider the idea of a user pay model. The sense is that maybe that won't be a very popular thing, but won't be part of the mix. But the fact is I guess some information will be coming back on that.

With respect to the privatization issue that's going to be discussed. That to remains outstanding, given circumstances; I don't have a great sense that there will be any resolution to that issue in the very very near future. I guess the informal discussions I have with Barry McBride is that the reasons that we've gone with recommending that the contract be extended for one year are for the following reasons. These appear in the body of the report. The first of course is there maybe potential conflict of the user pay program and then the reasons are given there, people can read them for themselves and it also talks about enhanced competition and just reading the body of the report, it states as outlined in the table above solemnly asserts division manages five production contracts all of which are multi year works. Best practices indicate that in order to ensure competitive bidding, contracts should be in six years duration and have staggered start and end dates.

The six-year duration provides potential contractors a better opportunity to recover the cost of capital assets such as trucks. Staggered starts allow for a shorter period of time and it continues. It states again currently two of the five contracts end on the same date. If Council approves this recommendation then all five contracts will then have the staggered start and end dates. So there's a method I guess to structuring things this way and I guess that's the reason. With respect to the other information, I will endeavor to garner that information as soon as possible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. On Item 2, all in favour? Contrary? Carried. No motions.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law No. 110/2004 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 110/2004.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law No. 110/2004 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 110/2004.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-law No. 110/2004, 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, none.

Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues, dated June 8, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED JUNE 8, 2004

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I'm please to introduce the Item from the Fiscal Issues Committee dated June 8 that had to come here and I'll move it as a consent item.

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

No motions. Consideration of by-laws none. Question period. None.

Councillor Eadie moves adjournment. Councillors before we leave, I would like to thank the administration, especially Annitta Stenning that's been here all the way through. Thank you for sitting at Council and Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think its behoves us to acknowledge and recognize the tremendous job that the Clerk's department did on the election. They had short notice to put together a huge campaign, did a remarkable job in getting the most people in 30 years into the polls and through the polls successfully and they should be officially commended by this Council for doing an excellent job.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi

Councillor Gerbasi: Would it also be appropriate to acknowledge two of our colleagues who are not here with us today, Councillor Vandal and Councillor Steek. I for one think it's important to acknowledge their contribution over the years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. They took their choice. All in favour of adjournment.

ROLL CALL

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

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 11:28 A.M.