COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday September 29, 2004

The Council met at 9:37 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Clement.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Benham, Clement, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Thomas, Wyatt, Lazarenko.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have no pages with us this morning. No special guests to be welcomed, we do have a motion of condolence, I would ask the clerk to read the motion please.

Motion
Moved by Councillor O'Shaughnessy
Seconded by Councillor Angus

That Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of former Councillor Richard Wankling, which occurred on September 4, 2004. Mr. Wankling served the citizens of Winnipeg as Councillor for the Wildewood ward from 1971 to 1976. This Council extends to his children, Karen Mueller, Rick Wankling, Leslie Nagel, Christine Haider and their family its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker: Councillors and those in the gallery please rise for a moment of silence.

MINUTES

Councillor Gerbasi moves the Minutes of the meeting held on July 21, 2004, be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: We have a number of delegations this morning, Mr. Mayor I believe you wanted to

Mayor Katz: Yes, I have been informed by the City Clerk's office that we have several delegations for and against a specific motion and what I would like to do is move a motion to suspend the rules to allow a maximum of ten delegations for an additional, I'm sorry, additional ten delegations to speak on the subject for a maximum of five minutes with no questions.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor I would find it only fair to say that we have an additional twenty-seven at the moment requests to speak. We already have the two for and against which our rule. You have moved that we allow an additional ten, which would be the first ten I imagine to register in addition to those that we have. Motion that the rules be suspended to hear an additional ten speakers on the item regarding bus rapid transit to suspend the rules, all those in favour. Recorded vote has been called for by Councillor De Smedt. All those in favour of suspending the rules to hear the additional ten delegations on a limited basis please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Benham, Clement, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Thomas, Wyatt and Lazarenko.

Nays

Councillor De Smedt, Mr. Speaker, Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is carried. I'll read off the ten names of the additional speakers who each will be given five minutes and there will be no questions allowed of these people and if they please

come behind the podium so that they may be ready when it is their turn to speak. Sarah Amyot, sorry for the pronunciation, Winnipeg Student's Association, Larry Pelzer, Acting President, Winnipeg Labour Council, Shane Nestuck, Heather Mack, Lee Haber, Christopher Leo, University of Winnipeg, Cathy Van De Kerckhove, UMSU Vice President, Bill James, President, Southdale Community Centre, Gary Gervais, President, Heartland International English School and Tim Anthony.

We'll move on with regular delegations at this point. Cindy Sciberras, Executive Director of Heritage Winnipeg in support of Item 1 of Property and Development, September 7, 2004. The other list of delegations if they could be ready are Nick Ternette, Jim Jaworski, Kaj Hasselriis and Ken Klassen, if you could also be ready when your turn comes. Welcome Cindy, you have ten minutes

DELEGATIONS

Ms. Cindy Sciberras: Good morning everyone. I'm here to speak briefly as executive director of Heritage Winnipeg, we followed the issue on the delisting or the taking the King building off the conservation list and I'm really just here to reiterate what we had mentioned or what I had mentioned at the Property and Development Committee and I also sat in on the EPC, so on September 7, 2004 Property and Development had concurred with the Historical Buildings Committee and on September 22, 2004 the EPC concurred with the Property and Development Committee that the King building not be taken off the historical buildings conservation list and I'm just here to state that was a very good decision and I hope that the Councillors here this morning will look at the importance of the precedence that this is going to set for future building owners in the district.

As a national historic site, this particular building, why it's so important is it's not only a corner building on the corner of Bannatyne and McDermot, but it's also, or King and McDermot, but it's also across from the Old Market Square. The district was given national designation in 1997 and I'm not here to sort of overwhelm you with the historical background of the building, but we have an obligation as a City of Winnipeg for good stewardship and this particular building should not be taken off the conservation list with regret of demolition.

The building owners it should be noted, that they came forward as soon as the City of Winnipeg put the vacant building and derelict building by-law in place. In 1992, the building sustained damage from fire and there was no monies put back into the building and it should be noted that the building has been neglected for about twelve years and in light of this vacant building/derelict building by-law, the building owner has requested this be taken off the building conservation list, does not want to sell the property, we've approached the building owner, he does not want to sell the property.

We feel he hasn't looked for a feasibility of the building, proper redevelopment proposal, so I'm here today, Heritage Winnipeg would hope you make the right decision, that this building is part of a national treasure. It's also a growing trend with cultural and heritage tourism. The exchange district we feel has been catalytic in downtown revitalisation and we don't want the council to sort of set precedents with this particular building, with building owners who neglect their buildings. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Next we have Mr. Nick Ternette in support of Item 5 of the report of Executive Policy Committee dated September 22, 2004 regarding rapid transit.

Mr. Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Sam Katz and members of city council. I'm here to support the main thrust of the following motion, that it is prudent to hire for expanding significant public funds on the bus rapid transit, to conduct a full and independent study as to the relative costs and benefits of the full range, I would like to repeat the word full range of rapid transit models including light rail bus rapid transit and improvements to current on

street transit and be fully accountable in terms of capital and operating costs which costs could have a significant impact on the tax payers in future years.

To be honest, I've been sincerely concerned about the nature of this debate the last month on rapid transit because you either for it or your against it. There's a real dilemma for some of us and I wanted as a preamble to indicate that there is a attachment attached to my presentation by Jeff Lowe, urban transit expert also who can't make it here today but who felt it was important that his comments be attached to mine and I would appreciate you reading it. When those of us who opposed the BRT bus rapid system, but on the other hand support a real rapid transit system, an LRT light railway transit system. I wonder what drives BRT supporters to ignore the LRT option. Why are we so caught up in supporting Flyer Industry who are significantly subsidized by tax payers money instead of looking at alternative technology that is real, which is manufactured by Siemens in Germany or although Siemens being a German company does have a North American light railway vehicle manufacturing plant in Sacramento, California and Bombardier located in Montreal which designs and builds light railway systems and vehicles in various cities around the world.

Why are we so concerned about rapid transit systems being implemented my friend. Well they are very important questions to be asked. Well as former Mayor Glen Murray said, rapid transit deals in the broader sense of the word, most effectively with the issue of urban sprawl, which is why the biggest issues that, are faced here in Winnipeg. In fact, a real rapid transit system promotes the development of downtown and as in Calgary and I lived in Calgary between 1980 and 1985 when the LRT was built there from the beginning right to the end, encourages redevelopment at every rapid transit station through the building of coffee shops, coop housing, food stores, etc. which increases significant tax revenues for the city of Calgary.

And last but not least, as Aiden End suggests in the recent Winnipeg Free Press column, imagine rapid transit and no cars. A complete transformation of our Winnipeg car culture. And Winnipeg is so reliant on car cultures; we have a two-car culture in this system at the present time. Calgary which is a right wing city, an oil city is far less reliant on cars, far more reliant on electricity of which we have the cheapest form for and at the same time now BRT is wind powered, the most non-polluting way of operating, driving 225,000 people each day back and forth from work. In fact in Calgary, you will find that the number of cars during rush hours are half as many as there are in Winnipeg during rush hours.

So you might ask, where are the cars? Well, they're parked in car parks, which are attached to the rapid transit stations in suburbia. There by encouraging suburbanites to leave the cars and take the rapid system downtown and back for work and for pleasure and for shopping.

So tell me, how is a BRT going to make any difference in regards to sprawl, economic development and Winnipeg's car culture. All it will do at best, it will cut down the travel time between the downtown and the University of Manitoba by approximately ten minutes. As Transit Board 2000 has indicated and this is a lobby group located in Ottawa. It will not increase the frequency of busses running or the number of passengers per trip as compared to a light railway system. As Tom Brodbeck of the Winnipeg Sun says, all of the BRT feasibility studies are full of holes. It doesn't give us any evidence that a BLT system will increase rider ship. In order to make rapid transit a success, you must create a critical mass that is built a significant length of a transit line thereby creating a substantial increase in the ridership that will lead to cost benefits. I am sick and tired of being told, Nick you believe in rapid transit and a LRT will be ideal but it's too expensive. So why can't you support a BRT as the best that Winnipeg can do right now. My response, why waste 50 million dollars on something that will do nothing to include the public transportation systems in Winnipeg.

In fact in 1986, Mayor Norrie was in Siemens in Germany studying options for a LRT at that time and Siemens offered him a deal that never was accepted by the Province or the Federal government here, never came in. In terms of building an LRT here in Winnipeg at a cost equal to what were now talking about a bus rapid transit system. So there can be negotiations, because there's competition between those who are in the bus system and those who build LRT's.

According to Winnipeg Transit's own reports, this is something we go back, we've been discussing this years and years, public transportation rider ship has decreased every year since 1986. Based on the fact that we've increased the transit fares every year since that time, based on yearly increases. And there has been a 21 percent cut, this is their own report, 20 percent cut in bus service since that time. And were talking about rapid transit, while we have a crisis in the regular bus system at the present time.

In the mean time, this is what fascinates me, Ottawa under the same program that Winnipeg has gotten its 50 million dollars so called, has lined up 600 million dollars in tri-partite funds which it intends to use to electrify and expand the existing not BRT, but the light railway transit line and Toronto is getting over 1 billion dollars to tri-partite, but still a significant amount coming from the Federal and Provincial governments to be spent on modernizing and improving all modes of its current system which of course is the subway and various other options that they have. And then there's Winnipeg, which gets a measly 50 million dollars for BRT. Come off it.

I am fully supportive of Council endorsing the establishment of a rapid transit task force consisting of members of Council, here however I am a little concerned and worried that the motion does not indicate that there should be citizens on this transit task force. In order to, in order for a task force to be credible, it has to have representatives from various elements of the community. That includes the business community, I would suggest the BIZ groups, it would include people who are into bus rapid transit, the committee has been formed here for bus rapid transit. Those of us who favour LRT should be on this committee and there should be people who are opposed to any form of rapid transit system that should be on it. You need to have a cross section of citizens on this committee with the Councillors in order to provide legitimate credibility for it, as you are doing this 200,000 dollar study, coming up next June of next year. Otherwise you won't have any credibility, the thing will be viewed as just a throw away and really the whole idea therefore is then, that were not serious about looking at rapid transit in the real sense and looking at what options Winnipeg does really favour and simply say that this is an excuse because we really don't want rapid transit. I don't think that's fair and I think that it's important somebody move a motion to amend that, to clearly indicate citizen representation.

Also when it talks about public consultation, I would strongly urge that this not be nominal as we've had so often in this time, since 1971 that we have open public forums, maybe something like what the Mayor did during the New Deal discussion, where we had six major forums, we had over 400 - 500 people attending all the forums throughout the City of Winnipeg, all regions of Winnipeg, suburbia as well as inner city where they can get a real full impact from the citizens on what their views are about the kind of problems first of all we have in public transportation systems, what kind of rapid transit system we want and how do we go about implementing and then comeback with a full detail report in June which we will be able to implement and then go and negotiate, not for 50 million dollars, a measly 50 million dollars, but let's go with what Toronto does.

Once we've decided on an option, and I would hope that it's an LRT option, why can't we go and ask for a billion dollars. I don't understand the Federal government is prepared to give lots of money for transportation to Toronto and Ottawa, why can't Winnipeg get it. I don't buy the fact that we can't get lots of money to build a proper rapid transit system that

will really fundamentally alter the car culture in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you very very much.

Mr. Speaker: Questions, Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank you Mr. Ternette for your presentation. Mr. Ternette, how much more will a light rail transit system cost compared to a bus rapid transit system.

Mr. Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, a very good question. To be honest, I'm not an expert on this field. The range of debate is gone, the costs may be double the amount of a bus rapid transit system, but then I have been told by other sources this is not true, that it depends on who you negotiate with, whether Bombardier will offer a better deal then Siemens will, the point is that in 1986 we discovered that, and I can get you the information, it was actually published in the newspapers, that Bill Norrie did go to Siemens and they said that if you are serious about building a LRT at that time, that was in 1986, we will give you a deal that deal will be that the costs of a LRT will be the same as if you were building a BRT, because they were in competition with Flyer and others in terms of buses, we're talking about trains and busses, there two fundamental different alternatives. And they said, we will give you a deal that we can build it for the same cost as a bus rapid transit.

So, I'm saying, the possibilities depending on the kind of negotiations you do with the companies who produced the railway system, you might be able to get as good a deal for an LRT as for a BRT.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Supplemental Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you. Through you to Mr. Ternette, just to put on the record that all the estimates I've seen are that an LRT.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Benham, only questions and no preamble on supplemental questions please.

Councillor Benham: Fair enough then.

Mr. Speaker: No, we are not playing that game today either, specific questions to Mr. Ternette only, you have two more supplementals.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Ternette, how would a future light rail transit be built if the City doesn't move today to secure the high speed corridors and the bridges and the underpasses and overpasses that are necessary for such a system.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Ternette.

Mr. Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, I would obviously would appreciate, I understand CN has offered the lands that we should move on that immediately. I don't hear any objections that the Council dealing with that issue, however I would suggest to you Mr. Benham that you are, there was a railway option line preserved on the bridge where certain condo's are going to be built in your neighbourhood and you voted against that, rapid transit railway line, so I wouldn't be so quick.

Mr. Speaker: Please, but well done. Final supplemental Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry but the delegation has just put wrong information on the record, am I allowed to correct that.

Mr. Speaker: That's the nature of political debate. Do you have a final question.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Benham. Councillor Gerbasi, you also had a question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Ternette. Are you aware of how much money Toronto and Ottawa are having to put up to match the Federal money that they've been given, normally these things are done on a third to third basis, do you think Winnipeg has a billion dollars to match the Federal billion dollars if they decide to give us a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Mr. Ternette.

Mr. Nick Ternette: Mr. Speaker, yes you are correct, most of these are matching funds, amounts to one-third provincial, one third federal and one third municipal. Again, I would suppose that the issue here is that you need to get support behind this. Let's assume the task force makes a strong recommendation that is significantly supported by majority of citizens of Winnipeg that you want an LRT. Then I would suspect the business community would get into it. In Calgary, for example the business community supported it full heartily. I am absolutely astounded that there is no support here by the business community or very mild support even for a BRT. Why, I don't understand.

During 1982, Calgary was in a bus situation because the oil prices had dropped drastically and it was in bad shape and whatever else. There was buildings that stopped construction. I lived there at that time and the LRT construction did significantly redevelopment all over the downtown. It revitalized and brought people back into downtown. It brought business back, it increased the tax base for the City of Calgary and the business community fully supported it. If the business community would get behind us, the Asper family or the Richardsons for example, they could raise the money to do an LRT. I believe so.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Thank you Mr. Ternette very much. On the same side of the same issue, Mr. Jim Jaworksi. You have a five-minute spot. Jim.

Mr. Jim Jaworski: For a light rail transit activist like myself, a question must be asked forth with. Is it time to dance in the streets of Winnipeg yet. I say not quite yet. A few things must happen before we can. Firstly, the main problem with getting light rail transit of the ground here has always come down to that agreement signed by former M.P. Lloyd Axworthy, signed December 8, 1983. The so-called deal precluded any other mode except diesel busses for use in the southwest transit corridor. I've concluded that a person could talk to the politicians until blue in the face on the benefits of rail transit, but until the Liberals do something about their bus way or no way attitude, nothing will help to resolve this issue. In order to fix this problem then, the Liberal Party of Canada and possibly the provincial branch must revise its policies to include rail-based transit for Winnipeg.

The idea was that New Flyer being based in Manitoba could benefit; sorry could build fancier diesel buses or electric trolley buses because they would be eligible for federal funds from their Western Diversification fund. The problem with buses built is that there aren't very comfortable for it's passengers, mainly when accelerating and decelerating, cannot easily position itself reliably close to the curb, well that's only 12 - 20 years and costs three times as much in labour costs to haul one hundred and fifty passengers. The two largest rail transit manufacturers, namely Bombardier and Siemens can build an LRT vehicle that lasts for forty years and costs 1.5 million dollars. A diesel bus for the southwest transit corridor, which recently was estimated to cost 1.25 million dollars.

The important thing to understand is that if Winnipeg goes with light rail for its rapid transit system, New Flyer will not be in a disadvantage. They will remain the leading bus manufacturer in North America. Nothing is going to change that soon. And they can still manufacture regular diesel busses for use on feeder bus routes to rapid transit stations and for other cities urban transit fleets. New Flyer won't go out of business when Winnipeg chooses light rail transit.

Rail transit can attract more riders than BRT ever will. Other rail transit systems have proven that more than 50 percent of new riders in the short term are auto capable but choose to leave their autos at home. In the longer term, rail based transit can double the system wide total passengers. Imagine Winnipeg Transit reporting 90 million passengers in ten

years from now rather than the 38 million they do now.

And in our winter climate, only a rail-based vehicle can pass through blizzard conditions. A rubber tire bus will get stuck in a blizzard relegating it to no better operating conditions than the private auto. And staying on that topic of winter, diesel busses need heated indoor storage or else their engines won't start. In comparison, a rail vehicle can stay outdoors because its propulsion is based on electricity. Thereby making it cheaper to store.

Secondly, Mayor Sam Katz's rapid transit task force must be very careful to whom it tenders it's consulting work. The consulting company who wrote the cost benefits analysis released this year on the southwest corridor was elected by Winnipeg Transit administration. That is pro bus way consulting company McCormick Ranken of Ottawa, Ontario who also had something to do with the Ottawa transit way. Winnipeg Transit must not be allowed to be directly involved in this part of the process else its inherent lack of objectivity was its bus way recommended again.

The same company had also been given the consulting job for the downtown connector service and whose still unreleased recommendation were weak in reviewing street car, tram and chartered at busses as options. Mayor Sam Katz, please, please, please be careful out there when choosing consultants regarding rapid transit. You're on the right track here. Consultants get paid too much to begin with and it would be too bad if they came out with weak recommendations or the process, sorry or the persons writing the report has some strange connections to McCormick Ranken or their like. Currently the Calgary Sea Train recently upgraded to its system to use wind power to generate electricity to run it's light rail vehicles. I hope that Winnipeg's light rail line can be operated using renewable wind energy to.

In 2002, the Victoria Transport Institute did a study saying that an eighteen-kilometre light rail transit line would cost 350 million to install and 12 million per year to operate. Would attract 15,000 daily trips and grow to 30,000 trips within 10 years. That's the power of light rail transit to enhance urban areas travel options. Our southwest corridor is smaller than that; it's about 12 kilometres so we may be even able to do it cheap, even for a lower price than 350 million.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Speaker, are we going to have everybody speaking beyond their time today. That could create a precedent.

Mr. Speaker: Fine.

Mr. Jim Jaworski: Okay, one more quick thing. Thank you so much City Councillor for holding to the idea that BRT won't work and keeping the flame alive for light rail transit in Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. We have two listed delegations in opposition to the same clause, Kaj Hasselriis.

Mr. Kaj Hasselriis: My name is Kaj Hasselriis.

Mr. Speaker: You have ten minutes by the way Mr. Hasselriis.

Mr. Kaj Hasselriis: Thank you very much. Before I get started I just want to thank the Mayor and the rest of Council for opening up the speaker's list and ensuring that there are more than just the four of us who are allowed to speak this morning. As you can see there is a lot of us here who have come to listen to hopefully a good public debate about this issue this morning in City Council chambers.

I want to let you know about how much public support I feel there is out there for bus rapid transit. And I feel like I am well qualified to talk you about the public support for bus rapid transit because I helped organize a group in Winnipeg over the past two weeks called Winnipeggers for Bus Rapid Transit that you may have heard about.
About two and a half weeks ago, I opened up my Free Press, the front-page headline said 'Rapid Transit doomed?'.

And I thought I want this plan and I am afraid maybe that were going to loose it and I want to know if there are other Winnipeggers who feel the same way as me and who want to fight for this.

So I sent out an email to anybody's who's email I had and asked them to forward it along, asked people to come to my house the next Monday night, three days later and if any one was interested, we would talk about how to strategize in order to save the bus rapid transit project.

I didn't know what to expect, I didn't know frankly if anybody would come to my place that night. I was worried maybe people wouldn't want to come to a stranger's house on a Monday night and it was raining out. But I was very pleasantly, in fact incredibly surprised to see that there were forty people who came to my place that night. Most of whom are strangers, most of whom I never met before who heard about the meeting by word of mouth and who felt very genuine and very passionate about wanting to save this project that we care about very much. Everybody had all sorts of different reasons.

We decided that night that we would form a group called Winnipeggers for Bus Rapid Transit and that we would try to do everything we could to show over the course of the next two weeks how much public support this project has and I think that it is absolutely amazing how much work, volunteer work so many people have done. I think you've noticed some of it. We've already printed up a pamphlet, some volunteered to write and design a pamphlet, we have a pamphlet. Someone volunteered to write a poster campaign and then another person volunteered to design it and we've been putting it up around town over the last few days.

Someone from my house that night was from a street theatre company and they wanted to do a street theatre demonstration. So they performed a street theatre demonstration last week. These are all citizens who have felt so strongly about this issue that they've come forward and wanted to do everything they can. Not only to phone their City Councillor and the Mayor and email, but also to express themselves in so many other ways and to ensure that as much as the public is involved in this project as possible.

We gave free bus tickets to all of you, members of Council and I know that some of you have road the bus in the past week and a half to do your own personal studies about the transit system in Winnipeg and I hoped the rest of you have also done that. We also endeavoured to get endorsements from as many influential people and organizations as we could and we have been successful in getting a number of key endorsements from organizations like the University of Manitoba Students Union, The University of Winnipeg Students Association, the Downtown Winnipeg Business Improvement Zone, the Winnipeg Labour Council and also from Dr. David Suzuki.

One of the people, I remember that night at the meeting at my house on the agenda that I wrote up, I thought that it would be nice if we had a website, but I don't know anything about websites, but someone in the room knew how to put up a website. We had a website up and running and as a result of the website that had an email on it, emails have been coming in to me at the rate of every hour or so in the past two weeks and so many people have been adding their names to the email list and wanting to know how they can help save this project. The public response has been absolutely incredible and from all areas of the city and from all different age groups. There's actually a gentleman right up there, named Gordon Linny who came out to a petition drive on Saturday afternoon, 75 years old and we feel so great that we have support from so many different areas of the city and from so many different age groups.

One of the things on the website that you can do, you can download a petition and at that meeting that night I was very worried about a petition. I felt like I don't want to have start passing our petition and I was worried that I didn't know if anybody would sign it. I didn't want to announce we were going to have a petition and then have no one sign it. But

we put it on the website and some one at the meeting assured me petitions will come in and he even told me that we should put an address on the bottom of that petition, so I put my home address. I said why should I put my home address. He said, people will lick a stamp, put it on an envelope and put a petition inside and mail it to you.

I really have to tell you what happened in the last 48 hours, it just so remarkable to me. Petitions have been flying into my house from all corners of the city, backdoor, front door, they've been coming in the mail. People have been putting stamps on them; they've been coming five at a time, fifteen at a time, a hundred at a time. It's like in the Harry Potter movie, at the beginning when all those letters come flying in from Hogwart. That's what its been like and from people I have never met before been knocking on my door and people who's names I've never heard of are on the return address.

There was a young man, a student at St. Paul's High School who lives on the same street actually as you Mr. Mayor in Tuxedo and collected a 160 signatures and his Dad drove up to my house the other night and dropped it off and there was another envelope I got from a woman and it had names like Esther and Mildred and Margaret and Wilhelmina on it, I thought obviously there's no way this came from St. Paul's High School or any other high school. This is a good age demographic we've got and it really thrilled me. As a result, in just the past two weeks alone, just through people collecting five here, ten there, hundred here, whatever they can get, whatever they posted around, their schools or their business, we have collected 3,763 signatures.

3,763 Winnipeggers in the past two weeks alone just from downloading petitions on the Internet, passing them around to their friends and colleagues have said they want bus rapid transit now. I really feel like this campaign has really caught fire. People really care very deeply about this. I've never been so heartened in my life and I have to say that I am a bit of cynic by nature and I've always heard of grassroots campaigns before, but I've never actually believed that they existed. Now over the past two weeks I've discovered that grassroots does really exist. People will come together; they will meet other people with like-minded views. Strangers will work with each other. People will do something for nothing to fight for a project they care very deeply about and in this case it's the project for bus rapid transit, for a faster, better, greener transit system in Winnipeg like the kind this city deserves, like the kind that so many other cities in Canada and around the world enjoy.

And I hope that you recognize all the public support that this plan has from across the city, from all fifteen wards and vote today to start what I think would be a great progressive project for the future of Winnipeg. Thank you for listening to me.

Mr. Speaker: The City Council Procedure By-law does not allow demonstrations from the gallery. Polite applause I think we can be okay with that, showing support is fine, but if you would keep it brief so we can stay on with our business. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you for your presentation today. As a young person and a Winnipegger, how important is this to your feeling about our city and the way our city is going, what does this mean for young people like you who are deciding whether to stay here or move to some other city in Canada or whatever. What does it mean to you, whether this project happens or not, does it really matter to somebody like you or other young people.

Mr. Kaj Hasselriis: This project very much matters to me. This project is very symbolic to me of the kind of project that a city needs in order to be progressive and future thinking and future looking. I want to let you know actually that I rarely take the bus actually. I own a car and I drive it most days around Winnipeg and that's my main mode of transportation.

When I go to other cities however, I do take public transit and I like taking public transit and I believe very strongly that a good public transit system is very necessary for a city. I believe very

strongly that when public transit works best, it works when it can compete with the vehicle, with the car. When public transit can go as fast as the car and be as efficient, then I think people will make the choice to leave their car at home once and while and take public transit more often when they find that it can be a convenient mode of transportation, like it is in so many other cities. This city does not have that kind of public transit. We have a public transit that is outdated and inefficient and inconvenient and doesn't get us to where we need to go when we need to go there.

This is the kind of city I want to live in and this is why I want to stay in Winnipeg, but this is why I want to fight for this kind of project and so many of us too, feel exactly the same way and I want to say that in terms of, you know people talk a lot about young people and what's going to keep us in Winnipeg and I hear a lot about downtown revitalization, especially from City Councillors. That's been the big buzzword of the last 3 or 4 years. A lot of exciting projects have been happening downtown, like the Canwest Global Park and the MTS Centre that's opening in November and the Human Right's Museum that's a couple years away and people will be brought downtown by Manitoba Hydro, etc. But we don't have a good fast green way of getting people downtown. So were trying to make downtown more attractive to Winnipeggers but were not giving them an easy way to get downtown.

People don't want to drive downtown. They worry about parking, they worry their car going to get broken into, but if they have a good fast transit option, they would come downtown, they would spend their money downtown and they would help grow the economy, that's why I feel that this project is so good for the economy. Yet you know, people talk about young people want to go where the taxes are lower and I want to talk about taxes because I am a tax payer. I pay taxes here, all three levels of government and I want my taxes to be spent wisely.

And I think with bus rapid transit is a good way to reduce property taxes. Right now Winnipeg Transit is too reliant on property taxes. Let's relies on revenues because not enough people are riding transit. If we give people a better transit system, I believe more people will ride the bus then revenues will go up and then bus riders will be the ones paying for transit and not property owners so much.

And also when it comes to taxes, I just want to point out that the Federal government has been talking a lot about giving the cities a share of the gas tax which I think is terrific but one of the ways were going to get our biggest share of the gas tax is according to how many Winnipeggers we have riding transit and if we have more people riding transit, we get a bigger share of the gas tax. And someone who owns a car and pumps gas into my car, I want as much of that tax as I can possibly get and also I want to point out, as a cyclist and many people here are cyclists and I know many of you are cyclists, not just to get around to where you need to go but also recreationally, this rapid transit lines will have bicycle paths on each side and I think that would be a great thing to encourage physical fitness and people getting out there and being in public.

And I guess the last thing I want to say about young people is that; right now young people are the ones riding public transit. Right now, 50 percent of teenagers and people in the 20's ride transit regularly. I want to keep those young people on the bus. I just turned 30; I don't ride the bus anymore. My friends don't ride the bus anymore. We've got to the point where we can afford a car now, so thank God we don't have to ride the bus anymore. But if the transit system is better, than all those young people who are growing up on the bus right now will be encouraged to stay on the bus and encourage the growth of the faster better greener public transit system in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much.

Mr. Kaj Hasselriis: Thank you very much for listening to me this morning.

Mr. Speaker: The final listed delegation in the five minutes slot in opposition to the same clause, Ken Klassen.

Mr. Ken Klassen: I guess what we all want here, we all want the same thing. We want a better Winnipegger. What I am going to try to do this morning for you is offer what I think is pertinent information that you may not have received already. I am going to try to offer constructive suggestions. I think what we have here is a very divisive debate in the City of Winnipeg and I think it is completely unnecessary. I'd also like to just agree with some of the thanks that were mentioned by Nick and Jim. I think they are well intentioned but I think they made some errors supported by facts.

The first thing that I would like to talk about is the issue of energy, what's not in the motion here today. I think it's rather ironic when we talk about bus rapid transit on the day after oil prices have set a new record high. New record high. My background is energy and energy management. One of the things that I'd like to do and I'd like to suggest to you, I was reading the Winnipeg Post in Calgary, giving you Council, special (in audible) why energy is important, why transportation energy is the most important. We spend more on energy in Winnipeg than we do on health care on a per capita basis. And bus rapid transit helps reduce that.

My first concern here is the public consultation process. Plan Winnipeg requires the City of Winnipeg policy 2A-01 to commit the system gains of political decision-making process of the facilitating access to information in a responsive, comprehensive and transparent fashion. After we solicit (in audible) policy permeation applicable decision making through meaningful public consultation.

So lets review what happened. First thing is, the benefit cost analysis of the proposed BRT phase one report was not released in a timely fashion. The report dated September 3 that was only released two weeks later on September 22. I'm still waiting for requests from somebody in administration or the Mayor's office to ask the Civic Environmental Committee to review the report, provide its own independent opinion separate from that of the EPC secretariat and separate from that of Winnipeg Transit. That's our role is to provide the Mayor and EPC with impartial expert advice. Instead, our attempts to get copies of the report were slow, we couldn't get electronic copy, were told we have to take time of work, come down, pick it up in person, if you want it by courier you have to pay for it, anything to stop it. Seemed really petty.

Only one of five Community Committees has held a meeting, that's City Centre where the public can express their opinion on this issue. There are no public representations at the last EPC meeting. I don't think that this can be considered actively soliciting public opinion as part of Plan Winnipeg. This consultation process is deeply flawed, completely contrary to all guides of public involvement.

If you look at the U.S. for example, the U.S. Federal government has public involvement techniques for transportation decision-making. So there are well-reasoned guides on how you should go through a process involving the public. Seems to me, based on the media report, the public presentations here are useless. The minds of the Councillors have all been made up on this issue.

Now, something I want to talk to is the Winnipeg Free Press reporters wanting appropriate research pole. The pole on rapid transit, its only a small part of the large (in audible) pole and I think its somewhat limited. Careful how you interpret it. The City of Winnipeg has previously spent 3 years and almost a million dollars asking what are the priorities for Winnipeg, this from the mid '90's. Most extensive consultation that the City seems to be on transportation. The most important thing that people felt, 3 to 1 ratio, rapid transit travels on more roads. When you look at other community priorities, from workshops and so on, transit improvements funding, please increase fire (in audible), expanding road system, funding same or last, priority not immediate.

The Civic Environment Committee lets fast-forward to 2002; Civic Environment Committee asked Winnipeggers what were your most important environmental priorities for the City of Winnipeg. Number one, expand transit, expand transit. And if you want evidence that Winnipeggers do respond to alternative methods of getting around the city, look at the commuter challenge for the last two years. Winnipeg has won the commuter challenge; we've beat Vancouver, green cities like Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton and Ottawa.

I think one of the most disturbing things that bothers me is the media disinformation that's existed. Mayor Katz when you appeared before the Civic Environment Committee, I took heart, that I was glad to see he wasn't sharing all the information. But I guess what disturbs me is that the city administration isn't following his guidance. The city was not proactive in counter acting a constant stream of misleading media reports that could sway public opinion. September 10 is the week after

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Klassen take one minute to sum up your most important points remaining.

Mr. Ken Klassen: What I'll do is, I'll skip ahead to BRT verses LRT. If you look at BRT/LRT don't listen to Nick, don't listen to Jim, don't listen to me, what you do is look at people like the Transportation Research Board in the United States. They've studied 26 bus rapid transit systems throughout the world. What is their conclusion.

They do work; they track and rise, and do trans-American developments, more cost effective and provide greater operating flexibility than rail transit. Look at the general accounting office in the United States. They've looked at consumer reports from both Congress and the Senate. What did they same about bus rapid transit rather than LRT. Bus rapid transit shows promise; bus rapid transit offers communities a flexible best transit option. BRT in terms of increasing rider ship, if you look at the experiences again, the Winnipeg Sun says no evidence it will increase the rider ship.

Charlotte, North Carolina, 55 per cent increase. Cleveland, 13 per cent, Honolulu 300 per cent, Los Angeles 26 percent and so on. The list goes on and on and on. When you take independent analysis, BRT seems to work and work well.

One last thing that maybe I'll wrap up with is, example of what LRT is. If you look at the twin cities, they have the high waffle line, just opened 12 miles long, 912 million dollars, 76 million dollars per mile. The TRB says, LRT systems and all these systems they looked at around the world, that cost 2 and a half times more, they're no faster, they don't attract anymore riders, and they don't have any better land development benefits. So, I was once an LRT advocate, I'm a BRT advocate.

I've travelled around the world the last four years, dozen of cities of experience; dozens of rapid and I think BRT is the way to go.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Questions, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Klassen. I know you have a lot of expertise at looking at different research on various transportation planning issues. So I want to ask you, there's been a lot of discussion in the media and in the last few weeks about the cost benefit analysis and the whole process that was done around this particular project and I'd like to hear your thoughts in terms of rather that, about that cost benefit analysis and whether its supports BRT and moving ahead with this project and the credibility of that report.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor.

Mr. Ken Klassen: My profession is, I'm an engineering technologist. I have more than 20 years doing cost benefit analysis. I've been on both sides doing them, interpreting them for consultants.
The MKI report that I saw was very well done. I checked the whole bunch of

assumptions, there's the odd one that I might disagree with, but I found it to be inherently very very conservative. I compared it to the Kenaston underpass cost benefit analysis. They were light years apart. Kenaston one was almost incomprehensible. The cost benefit of Kenaston, I got a letter last night from traffic engineers City of Winnipeg, the cost benefit for that now that the Inter-model terminal has moved as fallen below one million dollars in travel time savings.

The BRT, 12.1 million, twelve times the savings, 12 times. I don't think in the history of Winnipeg I have ever seen such a disparity between cost benefit analysis and I'm really puzzled why the road project goes ahead and the transit project has to wait.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, that's it. We have an additional ten delegations who will speak. Just to reiterate, that each one has a maximum five minutes. There will be no extensions and no questions are permitted. The next delegation is Sarah Amyot, President, University of Winnipeg Student's Association.

Ms. Sarah Amyot: My name is Sarah Amyot. So I'm here on behalf of the University of Winnipeg Student's Association, which means I'm here representing over 9000 students. But I'm also here to echo the concerns of what I would say to be about 50,000 plus post secondary students in Winnipeg. Those are students who attend institutions in Winnipeg.

Students, seniors and other low income groups are by far, by far make up the majority of transit users in Winnipeg. In fact, over 50 per cent of students at the University of Winnipeg get to the University of Winnipeg by public transit, by some mode of public transit every day. For these reasons we clearly have a vested interest in seeing improvements in the public transportation system and for these reasons we support the bus rapid transit plan.

Since being elected, many of the concerns that students have come to me with are in regards to transportation issues and transit issues. And over whelming students would like to see transit options that are reliable, efficient, affordable and environmentally friendly. We believe that bus rapid transit accomplishes all of those things.

As University of Winnipeg expands, our footprint downtown and as enrolment continues to grow, parking concerns and vehicular congestion downtown continue to be a problem. These problems are on the increase. We believe that bus rapid transit helps to address some of these issues.

To echo what Kaj had said, we believe that youth want a city that is vibrant and green and we believe that bus rapid transit supports those ideals. Part of the current bus rapid transit plan includes expansion and the room for cycle pathways and things like that, along, parallel to the route and those are all things that students support.

And also we believe that bus rapid transit serves to complement the initiatives that this city as it simply redevelops the downtown Winnipeg. Things like the new arena, the Human Right's Museum, things that have already been mentioned. If you want people to use them, the need to be able to get there and bus rapid transit is one of those ways that people can get there.

And I guess I just like to end by saying a couple things. In this debate, there's a lot of things that we don't know. We don't know if we'll get the federal and provincial money. We don't know how to use it, how it will be used. We don't know if we can hang on to the CN land. And we don't know when we'll have the will and commitment to proceed with rapid transit plan again.

And lastly, we don't know how the city will be able to continue to grow and expand in a responsible way if we don't invest in a public transportation system that is viable and efficient. But what we do know are a couple things, and we do know that the primary users of public transportation are youth, students and other low-income

groups and we do know that overwhelmingly those groups support the bus rapid transit plan. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Our next speaker Larry Pelzer, Acting President, Winnipeg Labour Council.

Mr. Larry Pelzer: Good morning. The Winnipeg Labour Council supports publicly owned and operated bus rapid transit development in Winnipeg. For a city to be healthy environment requires citizens to have transportation options that will enable them to quickly and safely move from one part of the city to the next. For every city needs a strong transit plan that encourages walking, biking and public transportation making sure that public transportation is convenient, fast, effective and essential component of the program. Extensive studies have established that transit is a priority right now.

It has taken 30 years to get the BRT plan off the ground, completely guaranteed provincial and federal funding. It is now the time that council really considers BRT today. Providing an option for commuters will reduce the number of vehicles on the road, less congestion, pollution and parking problems. Most transit users are young people and an effective BRT will contribute to a city where young people will want to stay, work and raise their families.

The Winnipeg Labour Council endorses and fully supports the introduction of a BRT in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Shane Nestuck.

Mr. Shane Nestuck: Mr. Chairman, I understand that I have five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: You do have five minutes.

Mr. Shane Nestuck: Could I get an indication from you on perhaps, Councillor Gerbasi when I have a minute left.

Mr. Speaker: I will give you a note when you have a minute left.

Mr. Shane Nestuck: Thank you very much. In seems we have a total consensus that everybody wants a better transit system in Winnipeg. I'm here because I'm a strong proponent of a better transit system. However, we have had a lot of information spread out about bus ways. I'm going give you the negative information about bus ways so you know what you're dealing with.

Mr. Benham told me that Ottawa has a bus system that, bus way system that works. What he forgot to mention is that capital region is interlaced with high-speed freeways that are separated as to grade and freeways that are separated by wide parklands, so that high speed is attainable and then a diamond lane is an excellent concept of using the existing infrastructure that is in Ottawa for BRT.

However, we don't have any such system in Winnipeg and the concept of a diamond lane down the side of Main Street and Pembina during either a rainstorm or any of our winter weather is absolutely absurd. It will not be high speed. To have a high-speed rapid system you need separation, separation either by grade or by isolation.

So, technology of roads, the bus ways are going to run on the same type of construction that we do our roads here and if anybody on City Council is under the impression that we have the money to maintain the roads we have, I wonder where you think were going to get the extra money to maintain the new construction of bus ways. I'll leave that.

Power, we have a power and energy expert here whose supports the bus ways which are supposedly run on hydrogen or hydrogen electric. Any energy efficiency expert know sir, that when you convert electricity to hydrogen, there is a cost and when you reconvert it back to electricity there is another cost that is exhortably wasteful.

Now, I have going to jump, I haven't got to my minute yet, so I am going to keep going. Location, putting a bus way along beside main line railways is absurd. There are already huge mounts of dangerous

chemicals transiting our city everyday. They pose a public health hazard that is not acknowledged by any politician that I've heard. And you all now what happens when there's a rail derailment of one of these vehicles. It's a tragedy and it's a tragedy waiting to happen. To put a bus way in proximately of that already large hazard and to bring people closer to that hazard, the railways is not a judicious move.

However, there is a solution and I'm just going to draw up a solution on you right now. Mayor Murray told me that the cost of rail relocation in town is 380 million dollars. Well I'm going to say a billion dollars. Just so were safe to the costs. Well if we were to relocate the main lines in Winnipeg. Not only would we free up a lot of land for development and economic development etc., etc. etc. but we would obtain billions, that's with an 'S', and a capital 'S' of roadways. We would obtain a network that right today almost goes to the airport. It's three blocks from the airport, the railway system. And it interlaces our city inside, outside; upside down except for Mr. Benham has allowed it to disappear.

One minute, so I would like to mention that previous speakers have all been in accord with me and I commend the Mayor for bringing this issue forward and the suggestion of a rapid transit taskforce. I think it's supported by everybody. It has to be immediate. It has to be transparent. And I'd like to thank Mr. Kaj Hasselriis who the young man spoke to all the people that agree that the bus system sucks. It's very easy to get people to sign up and get an email and agree that our bus system sucks, because it does. It absolutely does and what we all, people who want BRT, they want better busses. Well yes, but the busses are local and short distance and they're not high speed but they're a whole lot faster than walking.

So if you can grab a bus at the corner of your street and go four or five blocks, six blocks to the LRT and bang off, that's what they really want. Thank you very much sir.

Mr. Speaker: Our next speaker, Heather Mack. She's not here. Okay, she's left. Lee Haber.

Mr. Lee Haber: Hi, my name is Lee Haber. I'm a high school student and I think it's a great privilege just to be speaking in front of the leaders of the city. I would ask you to just hear me out, give me your undivided attention everybody and treat me with the same respect that an individual deserves.

I am speaking against Katz's motion, against rapid transit. I am against this motion because his goal is to postpone indefinitely rapid transit without any credible alternative funding for another rapid transit plan. The money is already there in place to start rapid transit and Winnipeg has been pursuing a rapid transit for the last thirty years. Surely the time is now.

Winnipeg has the statue and the size for rapid transit. Winnipeg is a city of 600,000 and there's cities a third the size of Winnipeg who are pursuing rapid transit systems and constructing them. I'll give an example, I've done some research and I've found that a city, Eugene, Oregon with a population of 200,000, that's much smaller than Winnipeg is going to build a rapid transit system this year.

I have met with Mayor Katz's previously to discuss this issue and I thank him greatly for giving me the time to speak with him and also with some of my friends. He was very polite but I did feel very tense when speaking to him and I did not feel like I was being taken fully seriously. So I'd like to be taken seriously now.

The whole debate, they've been trying to make is as if it was rapid transit verses community centres. Both are important for thriving communities and a vital city. The money is already there for rapid transit. The federal and provincial governments have allocated that money for rapid transit.

And the thing is, it's been shown that the 43 million that's suppose to go to community centres will do little to fix it, in

fact the cost is going to be much higher to have any effect on fixing community centres. Also, I mean in my community, Tuxedo, you go to the community centre there, it's pretty much empty the whole time. Now you'd wonder why is that. Many of these new areas of the city, there just isn't any community. So you got to wonder how much will this money do to even helping a community in which people don't even use community centres and where it's relevance is doubted. I mean there are community centres like Crescentwood which are very active but I'm unfortunately I'd say Crescentwood Community Centre is an exception.

I'll move on to my next point. If you don't see the first plan of rapid transit as much, view it as a start for a much greater plan. Rapid transit is a symbol for a better Winnipeg. It is part of a vision for a more dynamic, a more liveable city with unmatched culture and beauty. Look at all these people who have taken their time from their lives because they care passionately about their city and have a vision for a better one.

They want rapid transit. We should look at rapid transit as a candle, lighting the way for a better city. Please Council, don't extinguish this flame. Listen to those who care about Winnipeg. If you don't, who knows, many of these townspeople may say, hey, I'm going to move to other cities that do care about my energy, like Calgary or Edmonton. So, this is really about the future of Winnipeg, it isn't, it's a start to the future of Winnipeg and I think that's the most important thing.

I'll just end by saying; the stars are aligned for rapid transit. We have the money; we have the corridors, this plan finally there after thirty years. The time is now. Save rapid transit and save my Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Professor Christopher Leo from the University of Winnipeg. Professor Leo.

Mr. Christopher Leo: My name is Chris Leo, I'm from the University of Winnipeg and I'm been making a public nuisance of myself on the issue of public transit for, well I'm going to be celebrating my tenth anniversary of that next year.

When I first starting doing that, I got sceptical responses, disbelieving responses, people saying, dismissing the notion that sprawl was a problem that it had anything to do with the decay of the inner city. In the last election in fact I think every candidate paid at least lip service, every candidate I heard at least, paid at least lip service to the notion that sprawl was a problem, even his Worship I noticed was saying that he was going to do something about sprawl.

I'm encouraged those of us who have been taking about this issue have had some success. I think now much more widely understood that sprawl is a problem. What's less, well understood I think or at least not clearly enough understood is that the transportation system profoundly shapes what we do about sprawl. A transportation system shapes development far more than I we generally appreciate. If you have a transportation system like Winnipeg does, that's premised entirely on, or almost entirely on automobile transportation, then what you going to get is what we've gotten which is hundreds of millions of dollars spent paving the bald prairie in anticipation of future low density developments which are the only kinds of significant proposes you're going to get from developers as long as there's not an alternate transportation system available.

Put a transportation system in place that allows for a more urban lifestyle, that allows for higher density of developments, some mixing of commercial development with residential development to make it more friendly to alternative forms of transportation including transit, put that in place and the development proposals will follow because developers will say we now have the accessibility that makes it possible for us to do that. If you don't build a rapid transit system, the kinds of development proposals your going to continue to get are the kinds that we have been getting and the roads and other infrastructure will have to be built to accommodate them.

Meanwhile, we can't remotely afford to maintain the infrastructure in the inner city and you don't need me to explain to you that there's a massive pot hole problem, that regularly sink holes open up in the street, construction equipment size sink holes occasionally open up in the street and things sink through them because of the deterioration of the sewer system underneath. We can't remotely afford to maintain what we've got, and yet were going to have to continue to build more of that unless we create the conditions for, start creating the conditions for a denser form of development.

Now, we are not going to get a complete transformation of car culture. Mr friend, Nick Ternette to the contrary, that's not going to happen. There will continue to be the conventional kinds of suburban subdivisions that we've talked about before. But if we create the alternative, the market is there. Any developer will tell you that there is an unmet demand in Winnipeg for a more urban lifestyle. If we create the conditions that are created by rapid transit we are creating the conditions for that kind of development and we start to allow for choice.

Whenever we engage in this debate people are always talking about choice. Well we don't have a lot of choice. The only generally speaking, the only high quality development that's available is low density single family homes on larger lots. If we build a rapid transit system, were going to be able to start putting our money where our mouth is when we talk about choice. We will be able to provide alternatives in development. Without the rapid transit system it's not going to happen and Winnipeg will go the way of so many American cities who have built that kind of a transit system and has ended up with a downtown that's a collection of empty lots. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Next, Cathy Van De Kerckhove, Vice President, University of Manitoba Student's Union. Cathy.

Ms. Cathy Van De Kerckhove: Good morning everybody. My name is Cathy Van De Kerckhove, I'm the vice president of the University of Manitoba Student's Union, which represents over 27,000 students. We're here to express our support for the creation of a rapid transit system for the City of Winnipeg.

One of the main concerns we regularly here from students is that regarding transit and also parking on campus. Many students are disappointed with the current state of transit in the city with the top complaint being that long travel times and the lack of accessible bus routes.

Our Fort Garry campus regularly serves thousands of students and staff on a daily basis. In fact, we are the third largest city in this province. Because of this, parking on campus is severely limited and traffic congestion is a major problem. There is also limited apartments for rent near the University so many students must live further away from campus and commute everyday.

As many other urban centres have some type of rapid transit, we believe that the proposed rapid transit system will greatly add to our city. With the new development in the downtown area we will need a way to get students to and from these venues without creating further traffic tie-ups. Another benefit that we see to a rapid transit system is obviously the impact on the environment. The more people that use the transit will take more cars of the roads and lessen the environmental impact and thus also reducing the degradation of infrastructure such as roadways.

We fully support the rapid transit initiative and we regularly, greatly encouraged by not only rapid transit, but also by the talk of creating separate cycling paths, which are severely lacking in the city.

Enrolments in the post-secondary institutions have been steadily increasing and studies show that this trend will continue. With students heavily relying on transit, we are very discouraged that students that are just starting at the U of M may never see an improvement to transit within their university careers. Providing a quick, reliable transit system

would not only benefit students but all Winnipeggers alike. I encourage those on city council to support this initiative and create a rapid transit system for Winnipeg. And I also would like to ask, where the City Councillors that previously supported it, where they are.

Mr. Speaker: Keep it down, your using up her time.

Ms. Cathy Van De Kerckhove: We need civic leadership, leadership with vision and a positive outlook on this city. Leadership that will think beyond their short term political agendas and will think of the future, think of young people who want a growing, vibrant, functional city and think of the children who will be growing up in a world that is so dependent on oil and the car culture and along with that comes the negative affects to the world and to the local environment.

Believe me, there are many people who voted for Mayor Katz for this leadership and vision, but are now truly disappointed. I myself can't understand how this can even be happening. I don't understand the justification and how the Mayor's priorities are set. I urge the Councillors, the Council here to think of the future, to build a healthy city for your children that will keep young people here and encourage others to move to this city.

Keeping youth in the city is not about offering concerts and entertainment; it's about a strong transit system that allows us to move throughout the city quickly and easily. The BRT system can be the greatest project to ever be undertaken by the City of Winnipeg.

I know Duff Roblin, he was a Premier, but where the City of Winnipeg be without Duff Roblin's vision and Duff's ditch.

To quote from one of my favourite movies, Mayor Katz and City Council, if you build it they will come.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Bill James, President South Dale Community Centre.

Mr. Bill James: Good morning. As you mentioned, my name is Bill James, I'm the president of South Dale Community Centre. I have lived in the City of Winnipeg for thirty years and I'm pleased to be here this morning.

Speaking against the transit corridor, I have some brief points here. I'll be under the five minutes.

A priority for our city and province is been stating as trying to keep our children from moving away. A rapid transit system while may be a unique thing will not accomplish this goal. Tax payers have stood by while the city spent millions on bridges that were necessary to be replaced, a walkway with a spiral and what's turned out to be a conversation piece on what to do with the structure in the middle of the walk bridge. We spent lots of money trying to move Winnipeg into the 21st century when our facilities for the recreational enjoyment of our residents are falling apart and are struggling to move into the 20th century.

We need to do things in this city to promote ourselves from within. Trying to impress the rest of the country with me to things is not what Winnipeg needs to concentrate on. Cities like Toronto, Montreal, Calgary need efficient ways to move people around it as they are much bigger and more spread out then our workforce that uses the public transit in Winnipeg.

We spend more time and money in this city worrying about what others think of us than what we think of ourselves. In our area of Southdale, we've seen tremendous growth almost doubling in size in the last fifteen years, but I've seen no corresponding investment in our recreational facilities, which should be happening considering the significant amount of increased taxes that are being collected.

One of the things that almost anyone that has lived in Winnipeg clearly states is it is a great place to raise a family. Raising a family and keeping that family in Winnipeg will not be a trip accomplished with a transit corridor. We need to spend

money on things that will be used and enjoyed by the residents of Winnipeg, not just those who are living close to a proposed corridor.

The largest knock on Winnipeg is a large tax load that residents pay. I think residents would be allot happier saying, yes we have high taxes but our neighbourhood recreational centres are top notch as opposed to saying, yes we have high taxes but we have a really neat rapid transit corridor. The residents of the city need a balance and something in our neighbourhoods to show that our large tax burden has a purpose. There is only so much money to go around, but we as residents would like to see some of the money come back in the form, better form of support for our community centres. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. James. Next speaker Gary Gervasi, President, Heartland International English School.

Mr. Gary Gervasi: Mr. Speaker, Mayor Katz, Councillors, ladies and gentleman. Thank you for the opportunity today to speak to you on this issue. My name is Gary Gervasi, I'm the owner and president of Heartland International English School. Heartland is a language school that brings foreigners to Winnipeg to study English for terms of one month to a year. For the past five years, we brought more than 1,200 people, age 16 - 65 from 37 different countries to Winnipeg to study English.

After work on Monday, I was waiting for the bus at Main and Pioneer and I ran into a few of our students. One student was from Seoul, the other was from Osaka. I asked them how there enjoying their time in Winnipeg and they said they're really enjoying themselves. I asked how they liked their host family and they said their host family was great. Well, one of them liked the cooking better than the other, but they were allowed to cook there for themselves so it was okay. I asked them where their host family was located and they said, Lindal drive. I said wow, that's a beautiful neighbourhood and they said yes it is. I said how long does it take you to get home from here. They said ten minutes. I said wow that's great, that's very convenient for you. They said yes, but the last bus runs at 6:45 and there is no busses on the weekend.

So here we have two individuals who will be in Winnipeg for approximately six months. They've saved up money for at least three or four years and will spend about 20,000 dollars. They have chosen Winnipeg as a destination. They have chosen Winnipeg as a destination for the experience of their life. They've chosen Winnipeg over Vancouver, Toronto, Sidney, Melbourne, London, New York, Los Angeles or Auckland. They will go back to their country and become leaders of their generation. Wouldn't it be great if these ambassadors for our city went home and raved how great Winnipeg was?

It's not that there aren't great attractions for visitors to enjoy here. Imagine if every visitor is seeing attractions such as the Fort Whyte Centre or Lower Fort Garry. These are world-class tourist attractions that many tourists never see. Even the water slide park or wall climbing at Vertical Adventures are practically impossible to get to without a car. The fact is you can't get to a lot of places in Winnipeg if you don't have a car. It's unfortunate that were missing this great opportunity not just with international students, but with all visitors. To send people back to their home countries with glowing reports of our city. What a shame it is that someone spends six months in our great city and goes home and says Winnipeg is boring.

And what a shame it is, that some of the Councillors in this room do not have the ability to understand the importance of having decent public transportation.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Our final speaker this morning, Tim Anthony. Mr. Anthony.

Mr. Tim Anthony: Good morning everybody. Councillor's thank you very much for this opportunity to speak and thank you Mr. Mayor for that motion that allows us to present these cases.

Firstly, I just want to make an observation about the economics of the bus rapid transit system, which I am in favour of. The bus rapid transit system is being rejected by one of the studies that compared bus rapid transit to the Kenaston Underpass and bus rapid transit is going to provide a 210 per cent return on its investment verses the 110 per cent that the Kenaston project was projected.

So, if Kenaston was good enough, BRT is good enough to get this kind of funding because were going to get something back for it. Leaving aside actual numbers, just the first leg of this bus rapid transit system thing which was just a part of downtown to I think Pembina and Jubillee area, that alone wouldn't be worthwhile, because if you think that's connecting downtown to the south of the city, right now your stuck with a Main street bridge, Donald, Osborne, Maryland if you want to get to the south of the city. If you've been on those streets in rush hour, you don't want to have to do that again. It takes so much time to travel that short distance.

Another point really about this whole thing is why has this whole thing been framed as a choice between community centres and bus rapid transit.

We need both, if I had to choose one it would be bus rapid transit that's for sure. But I'm going to admit that we need both. I'm going to admit that we ought to be able to afford both and I'm going to admit that were in the top ten of Canadian cities, are we broke.

It doesn't make sense. We've heard from students you know people from the students associations and all them and they have made their case, but in terms of economics, I want to say something about students and travelling. Students in St. James and I would imagine in the north end and the other outlying parts of the city including probably Transcona can spend as much as two hours getting from their home to the University of Manitoba. That's four hours a day, because you have to go home at the end of the day. If you consider that students sleep maybe eight hours a day, they have sixteen left of waking hours. We are asking students to spend 25 percent of their waking hours on a bus.

Twenty five percent of the students waking hours is a part time job. It's economics. It's benefit beyond calculation. I mean you give a student a job, you're doing all kinds of things, your freeing up the government from having to loan them money at no interest and all that kind of stuff. He wasn't going to pay the money back anyways because, you know.

Now, we've also heard the idea of this funding being switched from the bus rapid transit to community centres, there have been questions raised about how that's going to work. The funding that was committed by the federal and provincial governments was committed for bus rapid transit, at least at the time. The mayor reported to have assurances in writing that there's not going to be a problem with him switching the funding to other purposes. But I've also seen reports in writing in the press that officials from those funds are not so sure that can be done. So, there is some question about whether this is really going to work.

Also, the idea that using a federal program that would be returning federal gas taxes to cities for transit infrastructure and projects of that nature, at the most that looks like it's going to be about 25 million dollars, that would be the most we could get and that's assuming that all that gets approved. There would be some procedures to go through there and they have not been gone through yet and we don't know how they would go.

One has to wonder, what has happened since this Council voted; they voted 15 for and one abstention in favour of bus rapid transit less than two years ago. One has to wonder, what facts do they know that may be changing their minds, they've already changed some of their minds. We don't know and we should know. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Next on our agenda are the reports of the Executive Policy Committee, the report of September 8, 2004 Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 8, 2004**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the Report of EPC for September 8, 2004 and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 through 3.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour, sorry, Councillor Angus asked that Item 2 be stepped down. Consent Agenda Items 1 and 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Move to Item 2.

**Item No. 2 – Preparation of Separate Tax Bills for Municipal and Provincial portions of Realty Tax
File FL-2**

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor do you wish to introduce the clause. No. Councillor Angus do you wish to speak.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I know were all here to hear the rapid transit debate and I consider this a bit of a warm up, preparation sort of before the real fight begins.

I want to talk about this particular motion, not that I'm going to get in front of it, and not that I'm going to suggest that it be defeated or referred back. But the facts are, that during every June we send out the property tax bill and every June the total amount at the bottom is the property taxes and every June, everybody that gets their property taxes phones their local city Councillor and says, boys what's going on with my taxes. And they don't tend to look at the fact that 50 per cent of that tax is for their school board and they should be talking to their school board at least as equally as they do to members of city council.

Now the report itself says that there would be all sorts of problems with separating a, the provincial government by the way makes us send out the bill, makes us collect the money and makes us distribute it to the school boards. It's efficient and I appreciate that and I respect their right to ask us to do that. The genesis of the motion that was put by my colleagues on the floor was to examine an alternative method and that is separate school bills.

One thing the report lacks Mr. Chairman, that it occurred to me is that we should be moving with the technology we have, computers and all of the things that are available to us, to some sort of a quarterly billing system. A quarterly billing system would allow us to put the surcharges for water, the surcharges for any other services that we have on individual customers bills on the quarterly basis. Perhaps help them lessen the shock, but Mr. Speaker, what would happen is that there would be a big spike at the end of June when the school board, a portion would be in there. And it would clearly draw attention to the fact that the school board portion is much larger.

Now when you consider the fact that we've got water bills that are going out on a quarterly basis, this particular process could probably be introduced and save half a million dollars as opposed to looking at costing an additional half a million dollars to put in a separate billing system.

Mr. Speaker I don't anticipate that anything immediately is going to happen with this. I hoping that the Charter will be changed and allow us to make our own decisions on how we bill and how we don't bill and who collects and who doesn't collect.

But in this particular instance, I would like to sort of serve notice to the Chief Administrative Officer that there are methods that can be employed that we should be thinking outside the box, we should be looking at better, more efficient opportunities to not only inform the public more readily of what is going on with their bills, but more importantly to be able to look at giving them accurate information on a timely basis. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My gosh there might be one

item today that I'll agree with Councillor Angus on. I really think the issue has to get refocused. This is about sending a signal to the province that we are tired of having this issue come before us every spring. It's the education tax. It isn't municipal tax that's the problem in this city. We have held the line on property taxes over the years. We're very cost efficient in the delivery of services. The people know that, we've explained it. Every department has clearly outlined their delivery of services. We in fact though have been cutting back services to hold the line on taxes.

So, as Councillor Angus indicates, he would like to serve notice that the Chief Administrative Officer, I think we, as Council should be articulating this issue when we can, publicly, that this is a provincial responsibility. Education tax should come off the property tax bill. It is now time that the province modernize how they fund their education system. Because we and the citizens of Winnipeg both business and residential home owners, commercial owners are paying the bill unfairly. There needs to be another system.

And so if we are going to serve notice, we really should serve notice by having a small delta cost that we acknowledge to produce two tax bills and as Councillor Angus says, there's a better way of doing it to keep the cost down, let's find it. But lets not just keep shuffling this to the side.

The time to have political action and discussion is now. Not next June after all the bills go out and everyone postures and says yup, call your MLA. We need to start now. Education tax has to come off the property tax bill. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers, Mr. Mayor do you wish to sum up.

Mayor Katz: Yes, there is absolutely little doubt that both Councillors Angus and De Smedt are absolutely correct. There is a phenomenal amount of confusion in the public when they see these bills and there is no doubt that it should be separated and I can ensure everyone that that will be our job to lobby the provincial government to make those changes. I think everybody in this chamber would agree with that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Question on the EPC recommendation to file the motion.

All in favour of the clause? Contrary? Carried.

Report of September 15, 2004 Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 15, 2004**

Mayor Katz: I'd like to introduce the Report of EPC for September 15, 2004 and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes I would like to stand down the Item 1.

Mr. Speaker: Item 1?

Consent Item 2, all in favour. Contrary? Carried.

You'll deal with Item 1, madam clerk.

**Item No. 1 – Plan Winnipeg
Amendment: Kenaston/McGillivray
Area of Regional
and Mixed Use Concentration
EP-1.1(PW)**

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor do you wish to introduce the clause.

Mayor Katz: Yes there is a, the administration has been meeting with several developers in that area. I believe there are approximately three. The goal was to have a controlled plan for development to make sure that the area; one is properly developed with access and egress as well as being developed in a very safe manor. There is some very exciting, potential projects going on there that would add on tremendously to our tax base.

I can tell you right now that negotiations are in process with the administration and these developers and if you have any specific question and I would be happy to try to accommodate you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, I've raised this because the expansion of the area regional commercial and mix use concentration by 63 acres is not supported with enough information in this report.

For example, it says in the report, existing and future residents will have convenient access to the goods and services required on a daily basis, thereby reducing the need for additional automobile use, they would otherwise need to travel to similar commercial facilities in other quant rants of the city.

Tell me, we've all been out in that area, we've seen all of the development, tell me what cannot be bought there. I just don't understand what would be the need for excess to goods and services required daily. What goods can you not buy there that you would need daily.

I could list you all the friends that are there, it's a fairly large area of commercial basis.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith I've stopped you clock, not to use your time, but were not here to debate the merits, the recommendations that we hold a hearing to discuss it, there is merit or not. If you're arguing against it, you'd be arguing that we should not hold a hearing.

Councillor Smith: No, I want to hold a hearing.

Mr. Speaker: Well's that's what the recommendation is to hold a hearing.

Councillor Smith: Okay, then I'll support it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith.

Mayor Katz: Just for clarification, our plan is to hold a hearing and just so you know, this development is phased in over a number of years, it's not happening all at once, just so you know that.

Mr. Speaker: It's not happening if the hearing says no. Question on the clause.

All in favour of the clause? Contrary? Carried.

Report of September 22, 2004 Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 22, 2004

Mayor Katz: I'd like to introduce the Report of EPC for September 22, 2004 and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 through 4.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker, I'd like Item 4 sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Sit down, clause 4.

All in favour of clauses 1 to 3 by approval, by consent? All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 4, madam clerk.

Item No. 4 – Plan Winnipeg
Amendment: Fort Rouge Yards
File EP-1.1(PW)

Mr. Speaker: Did you wish to introduce it Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Just one, I will to tell you this has to do with in fill housing, it's a first reading looking for public hearing, I would definitely move it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm supportive of in fill housing and I'm supportive of the public hearing and I would like to address that.

We have a number of items on the public agenda, some that Council has already said, we should be paying attention to for

housing, both in suburban areas and in the inner city and it's important that we have these types of hearings to get factual information on the table so that we are allowed to make decisions.

In this particular case, one of the key elements of this particular hearing, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to compromise the hearing in any way, this is the rapid transit system, it says so right in the report. And I guess I'm concerned that if a vision to put seniors housing in the Fort Rouge yards and student housing so they can have quick access up and down that corridor to the University of Manitoba and downtown, is compromised by us defeating the rapid transit, how does it affect the potential and future development of this, or will that be determined in the secondary plan, I guess is my question.

What sort of impact does this have to substance and decisions we make and when will that information be considered.

Mr. Speaker: At the hearing that your about to approve. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 5, madam clerk.

Item No. 5 – Rapid Transit
File TT-5.1

Mr. Speaker: We have an amendment moved by the Mayor. Here we will consider it once.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Eadie

BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation 1, be amended by replacing the words "Canada Strategic Infrastructure Program" with the words "Federal Infrastructure Programs".

Mr. Speaker: Anyone wish to, just by show of hands would anyone contradict that amendment or allow it to stand as acceptable. Is it agreeable to all, that amendment and change the term Canada to Federal.

Councillor Gerbasi: Can we have a copy of that motion before we.

Mr. Speaker: We are getting a copy. Do you have a problem with it. Then we'll vote on it separately.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to hear it again.

Mr. Speaker: We'll vote on it separately then. Thank you very much. I'm looking here under the clauses, I don't have further amendments. We'll move ahead. I have one and three only before me. Items 2 moved by Councillor Lazarenko, number 4 by Councillor Angus. First of all Mr. Mayor would you introduce the clause, then we'll have the amendments introduced by their movers and then a speakers list.

Mayor Katz: On September 22, 2004, the Executive Policy Committee submitted the following to Council. I believe you've all had the opportunity to look at the recommendation and the motion.

First of all I want to thank those delegations who appeared here today, for their thoughtful presentations. I commend them for their passion and for their dedication to our city. I wish to take this opportunity to expand on the vision that I shared with the Crescentwood Community Centre this month and let me begin by sharing in some greater detail the underlying concerns I have about the current BRT proposal.

There are several practical problems, I've already identified, including insufficient funding and a lack of public support in the context of the many pressing priorities we on Council must deal with. But my biggest concern is the way in which this proposal reflects on the attitude and confidence of our city. Councillor Steeves at Executive Policy Committee last week articulated a concern that I share, that Winnipeggers have not been captivated by the BRT proposal that is now on the books.

He argued that it would be irresponsible to embark on a capital project of this cost and magnitude without a concerted commitment by all Members of Council

and by the citizens of our city. I also know there is lots of confusion, many Winnipeggers did not know until very recently that rapid transit proposal had been quietly moving forward involved buses. Countless people have told me they thought it was a rail system and were disappointed to hear it wasn't.

With this amount of confusion and the lack of public support for the current proposal, we cannot move it conscience, move ahead. The resolution before you points out that with only 34 million dollars in funding offered by other levels of government, we have raised only 9 per cent of the funds we need for even the most basic bus rapid transit system. This lack of financial commitment reflects a lack of enthusiasm and support from our partners in the federal and provincial governments.

I said before, that I worry about building a house when we have only enough financing for the basement. I said in my election campaign that I believe our best years are yet to come. I believe in the city and I believe in energy and commitment of its people. As our population grows in the years ahead, public transit will be an increasingly important part of our community infrastructure. And it should come by offering a better option than the one we have now.

As long as I am Mayor, this change will not be forced through intrusive, social engineering but through free choices made from a viable range of transportation options. I believe passionately that we must adhere to three guiding principles in our public transit planning.

We must reflect the rights of our citizens to make their own choices, informed as fully as possible about the costs and consequences of those choices. We must take a leadership role in protecting our environment so that our legacy to our children and grand children is a safe and healthy planet.

And before we embark on a path that will lead to a massive expenditure of public funds, we must have not only the consent but we must have the full commitment of our citizens and the other levels of government with all the information and options on the table.

On a personal level, I believe that any major initiative to change the way Winnipeggers travel is bound to fail unless we offer a radically different and better alternative then is being offered now. My personal commitment is to move ahead in pursuit of a credible transit system for Winnipeg that will truly capture the public imagination and obtain their true support and backing.

I happen to think that Winnipeggers and our partners at other levels of government will rise to the challenge. That is why with your consent, I have proposed to meet this immediate and pressing priority with the money now available to us. That is why with your consent, I will name a rapid transit task force. I thank you for your passion, I thank you for your commitment and I would ask that you support the resolution before you today. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor did you take a minute to tell us the significance of your proposed amendment. Should be third, changing the words Canada Strategic Infrastructure Program to Federal Infrastructure Programs.

Mayor Katz: Yes, I believe it was in. The purpose of that change is that this gives us the opportunity to make sure that the monies are available and programming that exists as opposed to the specific item that was mentioned in the initial resolution. No, we do thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Will now introduce the motion number 2. Councillor Lazarenko.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Lazarenko
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the item be amended by adding the following as Recommendation No. 6:

6. That the Executive Policy Committee forward the Task Force

Report and its own recommendations to Council for final approval;

And renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will reserve my right to speak to Item number 5 later on in the debate. This motion that is before you now, Mr. Speaker and Councillors is the simple correction to be made, because Executive Policy Committee does not have the final authority on any recommendation or a report that will come to them. This in itself has to be finally approved by all members of council and this motion is a simple one and it just recommendation to council for final approval when that report has been brought forth by the Executive Policy Committee Mr. Mayor and so that council will have the full benefit of the report and then to make a final decision.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lazarenko. We have a motion number 4, will now be introduced by Councillor Angus, it is a motion to refer with instructions, therefore, rather than restrict the debate to the specific points in here as it would be debatable anyway, could we treat it as a, with council and Councillor Angus in agreement, could we treat it as an amendment so that it would be part of the overall debate and then we'll vote on it first when the others are over. Is this acceptable to all?

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Angus
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi

WHEREAS it is being proposed to delay the BRT project which Council approved in its Capital Budgeting;

AND WHEREAS a significant amount of consultation, planning and preparation has been expended on the BRT project to date;

AND WHEREAS Councillors may have not been fully supportive of the BRT system project, but did have an understanding of the proposal;

AND WHEREAS a significant amount of negotiation has transpired with the Federal and Provincial Governments, and tentative agreements have been reached regarding joint funding;

AND WHEREAS it is currently being proposed to transfer funding from a 2000 Federal/Provincial Infrastructure Program to community recreation and leisure facility projects in response to the concerns raised through the Public Use Facilities Study;

AND WHEREAS the current proposal does not identify the specific projects to be funded, nor is there a planned strategy;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 5 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee be referred back to Executive Policy Committee before support for the current BRT project is withdrawn, with instructions to:

1. Provide Council a written communication identifying which Federal/Provincial Program will support the community facilities and what the criteria for support will be.
2. Identify the specific utilization of all monies which are being proposed to be re-profiled.
3. Convene a Council seminar explaining the implementation of the new proposal.

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker, it's acceptable to me with the following revises. I get three minutes to introduce my motion and reserve my right to speak to the clause.

Mr. Speaker: Absolutely, thank you. And you have more than three minutes to introduce your amendment.

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker, I imagine that this motion will have about as much success passing as saving the bus rapid transit system. But I would like to lay on the table some logical thought in terms of alternatives that we can consider.

Why rush, this perhaps is the theme of this. We can always make our decision, we can ask transit to stop any expenditures of any money on the bus rapid transit system pending Council's final resolve to this particular issue. I don't have a problem with that.

But I am concerned with a number of things that are uncertain and I'm concerned about giving up what we've got, a bird in the hand, that is an agreement under a specific program for specific funding that all three parties have agreed to for something that I'm hoping that they will agree to. I think they will agree to. And I anticipate will be subject to another program coming down the road.

And in order to clarify that, I'm suggesting that we lay this particular clause over, refer it back to Executive Policy Committee with instructions. That allows me to sort of talk about the concerns that I have, the alternatives that are available and ask EPC to take a sober second look at the possibilities of bus rapid transit.

I go no further than the amendment that has been introduced today, that we change the name within the first amendment to the Federal Infrastructure Program where as it was identified as the Canada Infrastructure Program.

Does that mean, Mr. Speaker, that we are going from a different program because I was under the impression that the Canada Infrastructure Program agreement was a 2000 agreement that had certain parameters that allowed for the inclusion of things like transportation improvements and bus rapid transit. That's the one that Kenaston was included in. That's a good thing. I'm supportive of that. I'm not quite as supportive with the sewer cleanup, because I think that we could have done that anyway without having to have the problem say were going to contribute to it, but I welcome their money. So, that's good.

But the facts are, that I'm not absolutely clear what the difference between the Federal Infrastructure Program is and the what the Canada Infrastructure Program is and if there's a parameter change, if in fact there is a new program coming down the pike that were going to be taking advantage of, are we in fact going to be loosing the money that is on the original infrastructure program or is it just going to be sort of transferred over.

If there is a new program, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Mayor, then perhaps Council could be aware of what that particular program would be. What the parameters are and how's its going to be effective.

So, Mr. Chairman, what I'm asking for in my last few minutes and I don't need the full 10 minutes to introduce this particular motion, although some have suggested I can take it.

I'd like EPC to provide Council with a written communication identifying which federal/provincial program will support the community facilities and what the criteria for support will be. That's number one and that's pretty self-explanatory. It's a bit nebulous although I have faith, and I have a lot of confidence in the Mayor's ability to communicate with his senior partners and if they say yes, okay, that's fine and will go ahead with it apparently and I respect they got that information.

The facts are when the rubber tends to hit the road; politicians tend to back peddle if it doesn't suit their particular criteria, present company absolutely included Mr. Speaker. Just look at what were doing with bus rapid transit, the back peddling on a regular basis. It seems to me Mr. Speaker, that in order to be absolutely sure of what were doing and where were going and what Council is buying into, that we ask our senior partners to attend EPC through the administration to identify those programs that are available and then the question is baited, is that a new program or is it a transfer of money from the 2000 program.

The second thing, Mr. Chairman, is I'd like to identify the specific utilization of all monies, which are being proposed to be re-profited. Now, what that means Mr. Speaker is that were going to be getting money back, ostensibly 17 million from the province, 17 million from the fed's and 16.5 million from city council. Now of that

16.5 million, 6 million is in the capital budget that can be applied to this program in transit for a new communication system on all of the buses which was going to be part of it, which we had hoped that the fed's would be able to pay half of the costs.

So that figures going to stay. So of the remaining money that the city is going to be putting in to, of the 10 million dollars, we have the 17, 17, 34 and the 10, how are we anticipating redirecting that. What is the process going to be. Who is going to understand what the criteria is for a community club that on one hand we have a 500 thousand report that says we should close a whole bunch of community clubs and the other hand we have a wishful lottery type ticket that says were going to save all the community clubs. How on earth are we going to make those decisions. I think that those are important considerations before and when we start looking at the funding formula.

Now I noticed Mr. Speaker, they've asked the EPC Secretariat to undertake some sort of a negotiation with the federal levels of government. I am absolutely surprised the administration is not included in that particular mandate. I don't why they wouldn't be included. That we wouldn't have the people from the community centres department and with the administration going out and negotiating and talking about the realities of what's going on. If it's going to be the Secretariat, I would hope that at the very least, they would include the administration. But I think the Council clause should probably look at saying that. However, I transfer Mr. Chairman off the main route of my motion.

So I want to identify the specific utilization of all monies. Like when we get that money, how are we going to parcel it out, over what time frame and where is it going to fit into the budget. How are we actually going to fund it and pay for it. If which we did with the first phase of rapid transit, Mr. Speaker, we can't speak about now or I can wait until I get my 7 minutes.

I'd also like to see in the interim, and we don't have to do this, as long as we can get the information from the fed's and the province, particularly seeing how they seem to be so agreeing in writing as to what were going to do. I think our finance people can do a calculation of the money were going to get and where it's going to be invested and where it fits into our budget process which is coming up right away Mr. Speaker and then convene a Council seminar to explain the implementation of the new proposal.

Now we're already in partial ways doing that while we look at the PUFS report and so I don't have any difficulty with that, but somehow we've got to understand what money is available, what the criteria for expending it is, how it's going to be parcelled out and how we're going to be able to afford to fund our portion of that money. This is not just a delaying tactic Mr. Speaker, through sober second thought, we looked at the bus rapid transit system and we decide that we want to keep it because we can do both programs, once we've looked at the opportunities that are available, that's an option I would hope that Council would give serious consideration to.

But in the meantime, when I look at the cash flow, when I look at the budget requirements, I look at what is in the capital budget for 5 years and I look at how the City of Winnipeg is going to be funding their share of the 45 - 50 million dollars on bus rapid transit. I see that it's a manageable plan with a considerable amount of money already in the capital budget to fund the first phase.

So, before we flush that particular project and the money that we've got in our hand down the tubes, I would like to find out a little more Mr. Speaker and I think it behoves all Councillors to not buy a pig and a pope, but to get more accurate factual information to help make the decision on where were going to go. We can still make that decision. 30 days from now or 45 days from now or a special Council meeting, we can still make that decision. We simply do not have to make it now because we do not have enough information on what the alternative is going to be Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Angus. We have before us the clause, clause 5, two amendments to that clause; motions number 5 and number 2 and a motion to refer with instructions, motion number 4 just introduced. Debate will be on the clause and the amendments and the debatable motion to refer with instructions. I have a speaker's list and any additions, just put your hands up, but I have Councillors Benham, Thomas, and Magnifico. Councillor Benham the floor is yours.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to vote today against the Mayor's motion and to vote for bus rapid transit for Winnipeg. I ran on the issue of bus rapid transit, I received a mandate from the people of River Heights - Fort Garry to vote for it and today I'm keeping my pledge to the people I represent.

This is a historic day, today we, as Councillors will all cast the deciding vote in this debate. Either the people of Winnipeg will get bus rapid transit or they won't, it's that simple. Let's imagine for a moment that this city council stays the course. Let's imagine that every member of council who has supported and voted for bus rapid transit in the past, votes for it again today. What would we be saying yes to.

Bus rapid transit, simply a separate road for buses. The buses can go 80 kilometres an hour, they pick up people in the suburbs, they deliver them downtown, they take people from downtown out to the suburbs. They deliver people to their destinations much faster than now. Bus rapid transit corridors would serve every area of this city and every ward. It would increase the number of people leaving their cars at home and using public transit as an option, taking every fully loaded bus, taking more than 250 cars off the road, reducing green house gas emissions, reducing wear and tear on our roads, reducing repair costs, reducing road congestion for those still driving.

Fire trucks, police cruisers and ambulances all could use the bus way increasing the chances of saving lives when every second counts. Bike ways and walking paths along the bus rapid transit corridors, local contractors building and engineering them, New Flyer Industries with a show case for it's world class buses produced in Winnipeg.

Bus rapid transit will allow people to get downtown to the Red River College, MTS Centre, Manitoba Hydro headquarters much faster. That's the positive vision. Winnipeggers know what's at stake in this debate; let's not insult their intelligence. Don't pretend this is about community clubs. We all love community clubs. I don't accept for the moment the false dichotomy, the false choice that has been laid before us, of kids playing softball verses bus rapid transit.

We all know, there is a separate process by which we as a Council will deal quite properly with the entire recreation, leisure and library needs of our constituents. This city can and must do both.

This isn't about community clubs and please don't pretend you're a friend or a supporter of rapid transit when your not. Please don't pretend that another study piled upon another study on every other study that has ever been done including direction to the future chaired by Councillor De Smedt and a task force that included Councillors Eadie and Lubosch as well as Gerbasi which recommended bus rapid transit and was unanimously supported by this council.

Don't pretend the vote today will only delay rapid transit. The people of Winnipeg are way too smart for that. They know that if city council passes the Mayor's motion today, it will stop bus rapid transit in Winnipeg. The money that the federal and provincial governments have set aside and budgeted for bus rapid transit, 34 million dollars will be returned to them. I thought we were trying to get money from the province and the federal government for the city of Winnipeg.

But, no Councillors who support this motion will be sending that money back with a little note saying, keep your stinking money, we don't want a modern

public transit system in Winnipeg. That money, the money that's already got Winnipeg written on it is lost forever. The province and the federal government will reabsorb it into their systems. I know what the Mayor is saying, he's saying he's got a handshake deal with a federal cabinet minister to redeploy that money and get exactly the same amount of money for community clubs and of all things, transit.

Mr. Speaker, the Mayor has told the Winnipeg Free Press that he has assurances in writing from the federal minister. I want to stop for a moment Mr. Speaker to thank the Mayor for asking his staff to provide me with background on the federal decision but they were unable to give me those assurances in writing. If the Mayor has something to table, I would urge him to do so.

Nor, were they able to sight for me, which federal program would provide money to community clubs, but the Mayor has agreed that they don't qualify under the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Program. I have something to table with Councillors, Mr. Speaker, if that's the correct procedure, I'd like to distribute to all Councillors at this moment and this is from the federal minister. He left me a voice mail yesterday, my staff transcribed it, his office has given permission for me to quote from it.

And it says, that the federal minister will honour the request of this council as we would expect and as we would want him to. But he says very clearly here Mr. Speaker, that it needs to come back to us and we'll start the process all over again on what will do with that money. We could put it back into other city projects, however they would have to be other city projects that meet the test for this program.

Mr. Speaker, only two possible outcomes. One, we'll get back, we'll give back the 17 million dollars in federal government, apply to a different program and be turned down because we don't meet the criteria of the new fund. We wouldn't have any federal money for bus rapid transit and we wouldn't have any federal money for other priorities, community clubs or anything else.

The second possibility Mr. Speaker is that we will qualify, we'll get the 17 million dollars in federal money under the new program and then I'd wonder and every other Winnipegger would wonder, hey, if we qualify for that program, maybe we could have done both. Maybe we could have had money under the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Program for bus rapid transit and money from another federal program for other priorities including community clubs. Why wouldn't we do both. This Council has a responsibility to do both.

Now, I'm just going to talk for a minute about the 7 million dollars the Mayor is proposing we spend on transit. 200,000 of it wasted on the Mayor's study, he's going to give us the bells and whistles on the buses, but not the bus rapid transit system to run what their designed for.

The Mayor has taken Winnipeg transit, the poor old horse that's given us so much good service over these years, so faithful, he's taking Winnipeg Transit out behind the barn and shot it. And then, he's given her a new set of shoes.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal briefly with light rail transit. Some of the so-called friends of rapid transit say it's not like rail transit. No it's not, that costs five times as much, get over it. And let's talk about securing high-speed corridors for the future,

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Councillor Benham: Mr. Speaker, fact, CN owns a key piece of land at a crucial junction that the city needs to build any future rapid transit corridor. Fact, CN has clearly warned the city privately and now publicly that if the city doesn't acquire the land soon, CN will sell it to other buyers, in fact if we don't proceed with bus rapid transit today and we don't acquire the land soon, all of Winnipeg east of the Red River, Transcona, St. Boniface, St. Vital, Elmwood-East Kildonan and North Kildonan would be cut off from any future corridor.

The Mayor may say we should acquire the land anyway and if he said that he'd be right and he'd have my support. We should acquire the land and build the bus rapid transit corridor on that land as phase two, as we promised the people east of the Red River so that the people who live there can benefit from bus rapid transit.

And I turn to my colleagues, Councillor Lazarenko representing the people of Mynarski and Councillor Pagtakhan representing the people of Point Douglas and I ask myself, who are the people of Mynarski and who are the people of Point Douglas. And we all know that every ward has a mixture, but I know that every census measurement shows that many are lower income.

Many of them rely on public transit as their only means of transportation. Wouldn't they want a system that connects their neighbourhoods to places where they can work and shop and take classes and get there faster. They're needs are always put last. Are we going to do that again today.

Mr. Speaker what is the point of any of us being in politics if we can't achieve some lasting good for the people we represent.

My great grandfather served as a City Councillor here and was part of the decision to plant elms. A hundred years later, his grandchildren and great grandchildren and great great grandchildren are still enjoying the benefits of that decision.

Today demands that kind of leadership and vision and determination and courage from all of us. We have to think about Griffin Pagtakhan and Abby Steeves and Ava Katz and Mason Benham. Our children and grand children and all the people we represent and all the people who will come after us to make Winnipeg their home.

We owe it to them to vote yes for bus rapid transit. Yes for the future of Winnipeg. Yes because it's the right thing to do and no, no, no to the Mayor's motion.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I rise against the motion to divert hard fought rapid transit dollars to other initiatives for so many reasons. I hope I can get them all in within the 10 minutes allotted to me.

First, rapid transit is a priority. Not once but twice in the past five years, council has met as a whole to determine it's priorities and rapid transit was discussed and prioritized on both occasions as a significant tool for facilitating both downtown renewal and as a way to meliorate the problem of our rapidly deteriorating street system.

Our downtown is congested, the streets are gridlocked, particularly during rush hour. At times, it has taken me a half an hour to go from City Hall to the Centennial Library in my car during rush hour. People are beginning to avoid downtown. If we want to encourage people to return to the downtown, they must have an efficient, effective economic alternative to the gridlock, single occupancy vehicle.

Our mass transit must move large numbers of people to key destinations quickly and reduce the wait time for people wanting to catch the bus. Rapid transit does this; rapid transit encourages people to leave their cars at home by providing prompt pickup and speedy delivery. No more circling around the block three times looking for that parking spot. No more idling at intersections waiting for the light to change. You move quickly, at twice the rate you would be allowed to travel in your car, along dedicated routes, unimpeded by other traffic only stopping briefly to allow others on or off the system. Maybe you decide to hop off at a latte at one of the kiosks we put along the route. Back on in five minutes, still arriving at half the time in would have taken you in your car with half the hassle.

I have a friend who lives in Toronto. She never uses her car to get around inside the city, why would she. It's quicker, it's easier, she can relax and enjoy the trip.

She doesn't have the hassle of trying to find a parking spot. She loves rapid transit in Toronto and she never took the bus when she lived in Winnipeg and she hardly ever went downtown when she was here.

Rapid transit is an important component of downtown renewal. Businesses wouldn't mind paying full taxes in the downtown if they got their fare share of the commercial dollar in this community. The second and closely related point is, our rapidly deteriorating street system. Our streets are in bad shape. We have spent more money each and every year for the past six years fixing our broken down street but were are not getting at the root of the problem.

Our streets are deteriorating fasting than we can repair them. Why, we have too many people in single occupancy vehicles who could be accommodated on our transit system. We need to invite their participation for each full bus with no one standing. This means 40 vehicles are off the road. The less vehicles on the road, the less quickly our streets, infrastructure will deteriorating. If the streets maintain their good condition for a longer period of time, then we can more regionally capture renewal of the streets at a point where we are simply repairing, rather than having to completely rehabilitate or totally reconstruct a street. If we reach a street when it is still in fair condition, it costs us approximately 50,000 dollars for one block of street renewed, where as having to rehabilitate that same block of street costs around 250,000 dollars and a complete reconstruction of that same block costs over a half million dollars to renew.

Thus if we can reduce the wear and tear on our streets and lengthen the time frame in which we do street repair, at the 50,000 dollars per block level, then to redo twenty blocks of street would cost us 1 million dollars, rather than the 5 to 10 million dollars that we are now spending on twenty blocks of street. The 9 million dollars, which we save, could do more streets or could be transferred to other priorities such as renewing libraries, community centres or parks and open spaces.

But good economics is not the only reason for a rapid transit system now. It is also good urban planning. Good urban planning anticipates demand and gets ahead of it and meets the needs that are looming on the horizon. At the cost of gasoline prices, people can no longer afford to spend a growing portion of their work dollar commuting. We need to provide an efficient, effective way to commute.

That is rapid transit. People are becoming increasing concerned, not only in the time spent in slow moving single occupancy vehicles, but also on the money being lost in fumes as they idle their way, idle away their time in congested intersections. They want rapid transit and we need to be prepared. We cannot fiddle away this precious time and divert us self's from this goal.

However, it's not nearly good forward planning, people need rapid transit now. It is not an accident that the route between the downtown and the University of Manitoba was prioritized as a first leg in a series of future corridor. It is not only the area of highest use, but the area of highest demand. Students travelling both ways can ill afford to waste the little money they have idling in traffic. They need an efficient, cheap mode of transportation. Rapid transit will allow them to spend less time on the road and more time at the campus, studying, researching and preparing.

My niece now spends over two hours a day travelling between the University of Manitoba and East Kildonan by bus. This must change for the sake of our daughters and our sons. Our daughters and our sons are our future and there is this aboriginal expression, which says we do not inherit the earth from our ancestors, we borrow it from our children.

Rapid transit is not only an economic imperative. It is an environmental necessity. We cannot continue to encourage the use of single occupancy fields, vehicles. Fossil fuel consumption by these vehicles is a serious problem for most major urban centres. We should not wait until smog alerts and asthma

warnings are commonplace in Winnipeg. We have an opportunity to be forward thinking. We pride ourselves on our good clean air in this city. Let us not continue to put this precious resource in jeopardy through negligent and backsliding.

As a Sociologist, I wish I could have more time to delve into urban planning issues such as compact urban forums, sustainable communities, combating urban sprawl or effective community planning. Each of these urban planning tools is an effective efficient; transit system is paramount to its implementation and success.

The rapid transit studies are there. The cost effective analysis is clear and convincing and has been replicated many times in many jurisdictions including our own. The time to act is now. Stand up for rapid transit stand up for progress.

Finally, I will speak briefly to the misguided idea that these dollars be transferred to community clubs. Yes, community clubs are under funded. We all know this. Like our streets, community clubs are in need of repair. However, we have had some success with both the provincial and federal government in obtaining money for community clubs. Dollars have been put aside through the NWCRP Program, Neighbourhoods Alive, the old NIP Program and many other initiatives to upgrade and expand our community centres. Was it enough, no. Could we have used more, yes, but the precedent has been set for funding these centres.

We can negotiate more money through existing initiatives, but we have never before been able to negotiate money for a rapid transit system in over 30 years of trying. Why, why, why would we give up an opportunity to move forward on one of our long term goals and one of our top priorities and loose the momentum which we have gained and finally achieving the support from other levels of government which we have sot for so many years.

Yes, these governments will come to the table with us for community centres; they've done it before. We don't need to use this money for that. This rapid transit initiative represents a unique opportunity for us. If we blow it, it may never come again. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Angus moves we call it 12:00 and rise to 1:30. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We're done. We will reconvene with Councillor Magnifico speaking at 1:30.

Council recessed at 12:00 noon.

After recess

Council reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Clerk is there a quorum present.

Clerk: Yes, Mr. Speaker there's a quorum present.

Mr. Speaker: Council shall now reconvene and I believe before we continue with the speakers that we have a honoured guest with us this afternoon, Mr. Charlie Mayor, I believe the former member of parliament for Portage - Lisgar and former Minister for Western Economic Diversification. Welcome Mr. Mayor. Councillor Magnifico you now have the floor. I have no other speakers by the way, is there anybody else. No.

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First of all I support the Mayor's rapid transit recommendation. I'll tell you why I support it. I'm a little confused about this whole process.

Unfortunately, I was not at city hall when this BRT was introduced. As a matter of fact, I believe I'm the only Councillor in this room that wasn't here at that time and so I wasn't involved in the process from the beginning.

And it makes me wonder though, why if it was such a solid idea and it was such a great thing for the city of Winnipeg, why this vote isn't something like 14 to 2 today, without anybody having to convince anybody of anything.

I know why as I say I'm not voting for it because one side tells me the numbers are and statistics are possibly skewed and the other side says no they're not. One side says don't worry about the future funding and the other side is worried. One side says the first lane costs 50 million; the other side says no it costs 75 million.

I don't know whom to believe. I really don't and I represent taxpayers of this city. It's a lot of money were going to convince of this program and it would be irresponsible to proceed without proper clarification of this project and with unity on Council.

A unity that if this BRT idea was so great and so unbelievably unprecedented should already exist on this council and I don't know why it doesn't.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other speakers. Going once, going twice, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: I was going to wait, but, strangely the other side isn't speaking that much. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was going to go ahead with my prepared speech but something has come to my attention since that time which is a letter letting us know that the Director of Transit has resigned. Rick Borland who was with us for 37.5 years. This is a tragic loss and I think it's a sad, sad day for the city.

I do want to quote to you from a letter, which I will share with the rest of Council that I anonymously received from some transit workers, that in his letter he states thanking the workers, etc. but that the citizens of Winnipeg and the staff of Winnipeg Transit deserve better. They deserve to have a great city with a healthy and vibrant downtown. One that will occur when Council decides that improved transit and the rapid transit system is a priority. That's our former director of Transit, Rick Borland.

I'd like to thank all of those who came out today to city hall to witness and speak to this important decision. The City of Winnipeg has debated the question of whether to build a bus rapid transit system for over 30 years. While we have been pondering our decision, other major Canadian cities have moved ahead and built there's. Today, most of the cities that Winnipeg competes with for citizens have made major investments in rapid transit while we sat on the fence.

A modern BRT system has multiple benefits for Winnipeg including the revitalization of our downtown, economic development and improved quality of life. The bus rapid transit system proposed for Winnipeg will result in infill housing; create jobs for our local firms, construction, engineering, architecture firms. It will help make our city competitive to keep young people here and entice those from other cities who choose to make their lives here.

As such, it must certainly be considered a vital part of our civic infrastructure. It includes separate bike paths along with the bus ways. Something much desired and demanded by our citizens. The cost benefit analysis that we've all seen shows an understated ridership increase of 25 percent in the area of the first phase. BRT can be built in phases and each phase realizes the benefits. Benefits in increased ridership, economic development, relieve traffic congestion and on and on. The two hundred other North American cities that have rapid transit, they have built it in affordable phases, just as we were planning to do. This is how these things are done. If we wait until we can build every phase, all at once, it will never happen.

If not now, when. For 30 years Council has not made transit a priority and were finally taking that step forward and now it seems we will take three steps back.

Mayor Sam Katz's frame, this is a choice between funding our community centres and funding rapid transit. This is a political spin that is misleading. The real choices between investing more money in road extensions and widening that support car based infrastructure only or investing in forward thinking and sustainable alternatives such as bus rapid transit.

This false framing of the issues is disruptive and damaging. It's divisive among our citizens, to pit the needs of

one group against another. We don't have a clear plan yet for a recreation facilities. We haven't agreed about how to or how not to proceed with PUFS and yet we are already cancelling an ongoing capital project to put money forward before we have even decided the priorities for that money.

We should be looking at all our capital budget decisions, logically and thoughtfully. Not just reacting to a political election promise made by one of us even if it is the mayor. It is interesting that even with the cleaver political effort to make people choose between community clubs and transit, to put us in that terrible position. Today's Free Press pole said that 50 percent of the public still support BRT. This isn't a fringe group of a couple of Councillors and some University students. This is 50 percent of our population supporting our transportation plan in Plan Winnipeg.

Every place that rapid transit has been brought in, the public ends up embracing it and expecting it as part of their city services, as the value of it becomes real to them. The support for this will grow and be overwhelming if we can ever get this council to move and get started with it.

The president of Pro Research said in today's paper in noting a near 50/50 split in public opinion, Councillors who are really looking at which way the wind is blowing aren't going to find it. We need to show some leadership, not just try to please every voter or think about our short-term popularity. The idea of trying to stop BRT because of the cost will result in throwing our citizen's money away. We've already spent 1.3 million in our capital budget on engineering studies because we believed this project would proceed.

We are throwing away another 200,000 to study something that has already been studied to death. If it is studied objectively, we will get the same result that we've gotten over and over. BRT is the best choice for Winnipeg. There is no guarantee of federal and provincial reallocation. The new program for community clubs we've heard talked about, the phantom program, which probably will happen; we would have applied for anyway. We had two pots of money.

The first pot was already in our hands after years and years of effort and now we may loose it for transportation infrastructure forever. Three levels of government set aside money for this project. If we do not go ahead now, will set us back a long time and we may never get all three levels of government on board to fund it again when we've been so fickle. How will we be credible if we go back again and say now we are committed to rapid transit this week, why are we throwing out everything we learned and starting from zero, from ground zero. The service study resulted in a council decision to base our transportation and infrastructure decisions on sound cost benefit analysis. This was a huge step forward as we agreed to make choices based on long-term benefit to our citizens, not just the political whim of the day.

Does electing a new Mayor mean that we throw out all existing council policy and start over and turn back the clock, do we start from zero knowledge and tackle every problem as if we know nothing.

The 200,000 dollars were throwing away to study this issue is just a classic delay tactic that will accomplish nothing. The issue has been studied to death and we have our answers, the thing is they aren't the ones that some members of council want to hear. So, lets spend another couple hundred grand and see if we get a different answer.

I'm going to skip a couple things cause I'm going to run out of time.

We've done repeated cost benefit analysis showing a benefit ratio of over 2 to 1 for this project and those analyses were done in accordance with the federal requirements. This ratio is significantly higher than other projects that had less stringent analysis and scrutiny and yet the factual information is being dismissed and ignored. The objective information is being misrepresented and undermined by misinformed memos sent out by spin-

doctors. Our respected and experienced transit administration is being treated as if they are worthless and we've now seen the results of that today. And I'm deeply saddened by that and it's a huge loss to our whole city.

Suddenly the political winds and whims are what are steering the city rather than the evidence, the facts and the research. How will this council deal with future issues such as Waverley West, will we ignore the cost benefits analysis there to and build something even if we will pay huge price later or will we wait and see if we like what the research tells us. If it fits with the political whim of that particular day, maybe we'll do that.

Plan Winnipeg includes BRT as part of our long-term transportation plan. It continues to make sense for Winnipeg after decades of talks and studies and I was going to talk about the difference between BRT and LRT but I don't think I'm going to have enough time.

The world is changing and we need to wake up. The price of fuel reached record highs this week. Do we really think that the world is not going to change. Does this Council think that green house gasses don't exist. Are we not yet there, aware that some resources are not renewable. Does this Council feel no inclination to plan ahead so that our citizens have transportation options that respond to that changing world.

We are the leaders and we need to have some vision about our future. One of the students earlier referred to something I was going to say to that when Duff Roblin proposed the floodway, he didn't get awarded the first prize in a popularity contest. He did however save our city from disaster. Does this council really believe we can put our heads in the sand and pretend that there is no action required from us related to the environment. Well 200 other North American cities forge ahead with transit infrastructure; we in Winnipeg are looking to set back the clock to 1950's.

Councillors that have spoken out and tried to inform the public about the issue have been called such names as Chicken Little. Well I think a more accurate description is that; we are the canaries in the coalmine.

For anyone who doesn't know, they used to send canaries down into the mine, they were sensitive to the poison gasses and would drop dead in time to warn the miners to get a move on. Well this council needs to get a move on.

Some Councillors who have supported this project are now saying they cannot support it unless the Mayor supports it. Each of us has a choice about the decisions in this council which last time I looked had 16 members. Each of us is part of this government and will have to live with the decisions we make. What kind of city are we choosing to have. One that is forward thinking, that is sustainable, that will continue to grow or a city that moves backwards and lives in the past but ignores the changing world and the direction the world is going.

Mayor Katz said in a recent news release that he welcomes the growth of our population. Why not 18,000, why not 25,000, we have to think bigger. With that growth comes a desperate need for transportation choices that are sustainable. Traffic congestion and parking problems are only going to get worse.

I have spoken out very strongly on this issue even as the support has collapsed around me. Why, because I go home each night to a house full of teenagers who are watching. They're watching this council decide about their future and the future of their city. I cannot imagine how I can explain to my grand children, that back in 2004, I decided not to build rapid transit and decided to ignore the need to build a modern city. This decision today is bigger than this council and each of us.

After all of this,

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Thank you Councillor. You've summed up. Your time is long gone.

Councillor Gerbasi: After all this debate, I haven't heard one good reason why

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Sit down please. Councillor Steeves.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Please if this continues, I will have the gallery cleared immediately. You're not leaving me much choice. No further demonstrations or the gallery will have to be cleared. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is a difficult issue; my thanks extended to everyone, all my colleagues on council, everyone gathered in the chamber today.

Obviously an issue that is very very difficult, I want to thank everybody for their articulate and for taking the time to care enough about the city that they live in to come forward with their viewpoints regardless of what they are. It is very very important.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the history on the BRT project or the rapid transit project, whatever term you want to use. I think it's important to recall the history of this project. Specifically, with the former Mayor, the leadership of Councillor Angus, both of who were instrumental, along with Rick Borland who's going to be duly missed at the City of Winnipeg.

The project evolved of course from the former mayor's vision of what was in fact originally a light rail proposal. I think that was everyone's idea. We started off with that idea, that this project would in fact be light rail. That was what brought people on board to the idea of rapid transit in the city of Winnipeg. That was what excited people.

From they're for reasons of for mentioned, most specifically price, it was brought forward that perhaps light rail wasn't feasible in the city of Winnipeg. We had to do something a little bit different. We then looked at things specifically like the bracketed bus modules where buses would move down a bracketed way through a dedicated roadway with retro fitted busses. They could go at higher speeds in close proximately to one another and that was the bus rail that was contemplated. That was soon, that idea was soon left because we, it was determined that too was too expensive, most significantly because of the grade separations going across roadways and the light.

From there, we moved to the idea that a bus way could exist on a flat track potentially through optically guided guidance systems, that would follow the track and again could move quicker along the long track at higher rates of speed. That was then abandoned for a lot of reasons including price, cost, etc. also the fact that those busses weren't manufactured here in Manitoba with New Flyer or other industries.

From there, we moved to the flat track as currently being proposed with the idea of more progressive hydrogen or other, I guess bio diesel or other new technology busses that would move along a kind of more traditional track. In the current proposal that has been ratcheted back, essentially to a flat track using existing bus stop, that's where we've evolved to. All of which has been for good reasons, I suppose, primarily concerned with price.

That's the history. Through the course of negotiations for probably about a six month period preceding the announcement you saw this past March I believe, the Mayor in conjunction with the Premier and the lead Minister of Manitoba entered into a series of private discussions that involved only those three to my knowledge. I don't believe it involved any other elected official; at least it didn't involve me. At that time, those three individuals emerged to have a press conference at the Forks wherein this project was announced as part and parcel of three projects that were going ahead under the federal infrastructure program.

That was announced and to my knowledge has never been voted on at Council, it's never come back to this chamber. So what we have essentially is we have an announcement, we have an announcement that existed at the Forks

and has never come back to this chamber. To my knowledge, with the specific reference to the infrastructure promise the first time it's appeared in this chamber.

When people refer to the 15 to 1 vote, I believe what they're referring to is the allocation to the capital funding which existed, which existed in the five year capital plan which was not part of the federal infrastructure money. That's an important point to make just so people are aware, because I think there is some misinformation out there and I think the history has been a bit changed I suppose.

The process, people are concerned about the process has been difficult and fairly so. There was no collaboration by Councillors before the announcement was made at the Forks. It went ahead without Councillors getting together and sort of saying, this is specifically what we want to do on the bus rapid transit, although we had agreed in principal I guess to the idea of bus rapid transit and that was something of a problem.

In fairness, that's probably true. However, having said all of that, I remain a supporter of bus rapid transit and we could go ahead with that plan despite all of those challenges. Subsequent to that, subsequent to the press announcement, the Mayor of course left, a new election was called, throughout the course of the election; the bus rapid transit issue was brought to the floor. I think to some degree it was to a greater or lesser extent, I think, support was questionable, I think to say the least. I don't say that with any great pleasure.

However, we did emerge out of the election with I guess some plan, with the idea that bus rapid transit would remain in place. However having said that, we are where we are and we have to deal with that and I don't exactly know how to, I don't exactly know what the proper course is here but I think there has been that misconception as to where, how we've gotten to where we are and that we have to clean, we have to clean this up, we have to make a decision to move forward.

The fact is, the current mayor stated he is not comfortable with the current proposal under bus rapid transit, fair enough. He said that quite categorically, he's been pressured to come forward with a position and he's come forward with that position.

In that context, although I guess philosophically I'm a supporter of rapid transit, I do feel some obligation as the chair of public works to talk about the specific problems that are presented as a result of the current situation that council finds itself in.

As it stands right now, there is no written agreement between the three levels of government on bus rapid transit. That's still has yet to be signed by the city of Winnipeg to my knowledge. Ostensibly, and if I'm correct, for this project to proceed, it would require the signature of the Mayor of the city of Winnipeg. None of the three infrastructure projects to my knowledge have agreements that have been signed and put in place. This is the information I've received from the provincial government. Now again I suppose as not part and parcel of the negotiations between the former mayor, the lead minister and the premier, I can't say, but I believe that is the case.

So haven't said that I guess, operatively, I'm not exactly certain if this even need be discussed on the floor of council. It's probably good that it's being discussed and probably should have been discussed prior because this is an issue that was important enough to be discussed, it's just never had that chance. All we've really done, I suppose as a council, is voted 15 to 1 in favour of a larger capital budget that contributed a very, very small amount of money to bus rapid transit.

There's never been I guess a consensus on this council, this project should proceed and should go forward. Having said all of that, there's I guess, been some different information. One of the Councillors has stated that if this project is not supported, then we will loose the money that the other levels of government have brought forward.

One of the Councillors then produced an email from the minister stating that includes a part from Minister Alcock quote, I have indicated that I am willing to see the money redirected, yes I have absolutely and Doer is of the same thing, I guess that means the same mind. If there's a difference of opinion, I suppose we can take it as a fact, that the lead minister and the premier are both of the mind, they are willing to see the money redirected.

And again, that still remains in dispute, but I think we can look at that as proof that were not going to loose the money if this project doesn't go ahead.

To move this project forward in Public Works, it's at best questionable; I think to move it forward in this context without robust support of Mayor and Council. I don't what is purported to be accomplished today, but if someone going to suggest that were going to force the current mayor to sign the agreement that doesn't yet exist and if the mayor doesn't want to because of philosophical departure from this project, what then happens. Is another Councillor going to come forward and sign that agreement on behalf of the city of Winnipeg. And if that's the case, how is that going to affect the provincial government or the federal government. Are they going to sign or if the premier won't sign who's going to sign on behalf of the province. If the lead minister wouldn't sign, who'll sign on behalf of the federal government.

I guess what I'm saying if you're looking, if somebody has to run this project through, a 75 potential million dollar project over the course of the 3, or 4 or 5 years that its going to take, I don't see how the pieces are in place for that project to go ahead. We've never asked transit administration to give us their opinion on where they think this project could proceed in this context. But I'm certain if we did, transit and public works would be the first administration, would be the first to tell you that we would never attempt to go ahead on a project of this magnitude if council and mayoral support did not exist.

And that Mr. Speaker is the fundamental problem that we have here. Regards of how you feel about it philosophically, without that support the project remains very, very perilous and in my opinion questionable.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In speaking to the clause that is before us, I first want to thank you Mr. Mayor Katz for doing what you did.

This has been on the minds for some of us for a number of years now. And it's so odd for people to come along and say, you did this, you failed, you failed here, you failed there. Every Councillor has been in here for many years, those that just have come and seen, will know for a fact there is a criteria that we must follow, there are priorities that you must have to abide to because it is the tax dollars that are paying, I don't care with federal, provincial or municipal. Somebody has to pay this bill.

Now, when I hear some of the comments made about downtown is going to die, we have to revitalize downtown. What is happen since the 70's with the downtown Portage Avenue. We killed it, because we allow all the huge developments going into all parts of the city of Winnipeg, all the huge malls that are put into place, people go to shop where they can park for free and no one will give them a ticket.

This is today's mode, of shopping, not downtown. We have an opportunity with the Eaton's building, True North Project was passed by council, one voted against, that was myself, not that I want to brag about it, but it's true. I was the only one to vote against it. Process was flawed, it was challenged. The Executive Policy Committee at that time marched it onto the floor of council with the former mayor, vote on this.

It's a good project. True North would have hockey back in Winnipeg, where, demolished Eaton's site. We had challenges, it took them a year and a half before it was finally resolved. Resolved through the courts. It made Council look mighty foolish, it gave a bad name, a bad

reputation to the business community. We were not open for business because we did not know what we were doing.

This is a repeat, Mr. Speaker, I'm not opposed to rapid transit, hell, I've been here for 30 years and I've always been saying we should have, but it's the funding, who's going to pay for it. It's easy to pit Councillor against Councillor, area against area, ward against ward. North End is getting zippo out of the proposal that's there, and I've talked to transit. Nothing, Main Street is not included.

Questions are being asked of me, what do you tend to do about that, well I'm going to speak against it. Because I think this business plan, a lot of work has to happen and I thank the mayor for doing this. A task force will be able to provide all the information. A task force will be able to talk to the other levels of government. The other levels of government let me tell you, they have a concern as well as we do.

The minister responsible, Mr. Alcock has an area that this will adversely affect him. Councillor Angus, the area affects him. Councillor Benham, Councillor Gerbasi, it affects them because this is the area that it represents. I don't blame them, raising the issue, but when you take a look at the funding formula, 17 million dollars from the province and the provincial government, I mean federal government and the province. Two levels of government, 34 million dollars. What happens after the 34 million dollars today provided to us with our share, what happens, were looking at a long-range plan for the next 30 years of over 400 million dollars. What share will they be giving us then.

No table talks, nothing. We don't have a business plan to say to the fact that this is what should be discussed, no its shoot it down the tube real fast because we want it. One segment of the city of Winnipeg, Pembina Highway, we want it. What about the other area, you have to include all the plans in there Mr. Speaker so that when you have to make a decision, make a good common sense decision, that we as a members of council have to make.

Not just spin off the tongue and say this is what we want. I'll just give you something Mr. Speaker that I have raised this back in 1995 on the night you had with the Winnipeg Jets, with the province of Manitoba, north south to pay the losses. For every one hundred dollars that an employee, now the province will take in a payroll tax, will take the GST, the PST, all the taxes that come with them, they get it all back. Ten fold, for as long as the project stays alive, they will be getting their money, their share. We get nothing. We put our 100 per cent in there.

For every one hundred dollars, a wage that kind of makes, I'll give you an example, people that are paying 50 percent of their salaries to income tax. That's 50 dollars that that particular person will keep. The other 50 dollars will go to the 2 levels of government. The federal government will take 30 dollars, the province takes 20 dollars and you know what we get, a lousy 44 cents.

This is the honest, this is the fact. That's all we get, 44 cents and we sit here, bicker amongst ourselves, charging those, the other two levels of government, we want our share, two thirds of the population of the province is right here in Winnipeg. They represent, get elected the same way as we do, and I love once again, Mayor Katz I commend you on this. You're going in the right direction. Not to hastily what we did before. Bring it to the floor of council, vote on this because of you don't your bad.

The provincial government's revenue, that they get, we get 18 percent. Two thirds of the population, 18 per cent. They come along, they say, look, 17 million dollars from the fed's, 17 million dollars from the province, if you don't do it we'll walk. Then walk. Keep your 17 million because this thing is going to cost us a lot more, were looking at 400 million dollar cost to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker that's so unfortunate, it's so unfair. Winnipeggers are left in the dark because the other two levels of government will say, this is what we want, these steers some Councillors in the right direction and the Councillors debate this,

bicker against one other, trying to out do one another, talk to the delegation. I don't think the delegation is, they're here. They want to know the story; they want to know what's happening. But, here's what were faced with, how would anybody say that no public consultation. What kind of public consultation was there dealing with rapid transit. For the tune of 17 million that each level is giving. What was there to say that one fix is going to have long term, were talking about 30 years.

Where's the business plan to talk about transit use, rapid transit, light rail transit hasn't been discussed. Mr. Borland has retired, dedicated, served 21 years that I've been on the committee, he's served, very well and I wish a lot of good health and luck and all that.

But, the CUFF report has told us, each one of us met with him, we have a failure with our recreation facilities. Our pools have a pole in the north Point Douglas has been shut. Kids want to go across Main Street, west of Main Street, get the hell out of here you belong to Point Douglas. And what are we doing, well rapid transit, we have to have, we must have rapid transit. I don't care if its two kilometres or two miles down Pembina Highway got to be. North end is going to take a bus, North Main is not good, because they tell us, North Main doesn't have a problem with transit.

They get downtown, fairly at a good pace, but to come downtown, take rapid transit, chase down, Pembina Highway to the University, the first leg of this. So, what happens the next leg. How about Inkster Boulevard, what about Main Street, what about Cathedral, talk about the roads are in bad shape, they're falling apart. We have to do something. Some members have been saying we have to do something because the roads are a disgrace.

Well, the Councillor that talks like that should be doing something. Let's concentrate on the infrastructure, we've got 1.8 billion dollars to look for and we can't find it because the other two levels of government are telling us no. It's your cost. Who's damaging the roads, the big transport trucks are travelling down McPhillips, down Main Street, McPhillips is being resurfaced again, over and over again. What cost is coming to us. Transit is doing a certain amount of damage also, to the curbs because of the weight. In some residential areas, and I've got complaints, I've got complaints that people and I was there when the bus went through because the street is having to be repaved. The cracks in the walls have appeared.

These are the questions that I'm asking some of the Councillors member. I don't know what problems, I know what River Heights has, one hell of a big problem with it's potholes. Streets are in very bad shape. The former Councillor, the Councillor before were trying to do what they could but their limited amount of money to spend to correct that infrastructure problem that exists there.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting a lay over. I think that we have to take this and do what is right. Set up a task force and Mr. Mayor I will suggest what the delegation has said here, get citizen members on there, somebody from the business community on the task force, it will work. They're present and my motion which I Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced that it has to come back to council and I've got, the mayor has accepted that, that motion. And then we can make a proper decision. Not to grandstand, to hear some applause in the chambers over and over again. That is so unfair. This is not what you call democracy at work. You listen and not go over and over again the same repeats, over and say this must be. I don't care what has to happen, this has to be done. That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support the motion being put forward by the mayor and coming out of EPC. I think this is a wonderful debate that were having today Mr. Speaker. It's the first time that we've really had a debate at least since I've been here on this issue. It's very timely,

oil is now hitting 50 dollars a barrel and with regards to the state of the world and parts of the world in crisis, it's definitely needed.

We need to have a vision Mr. Speaker with regards to what our rapid transit system is going to look like and what were going to do for the city. It has to be part of the vision for a better Winnipeg. The question is how do we take those ideals when creating a rapid transit system, to create a rapid transit system based on environmental principles, based on the idea of getting it out to the public and having as much democracy and democratic ability to access a system of rapid transit around the city and the most cost effectively. How do we take those ideals Mr. Speaker and translate them into a practical rapid transit system for the city.

And I think that is what we are debating here today and I'm hoping that for the first time, we will have that discussion through the task force that's been proposed by the mayor. I want to thank him for that. I think it's an excellent idea to propose a task force to take to the public to get expert opinion involved and to look at what will work in Winnipeg and make a made in Manitoba or a made in Winnipeg solution with regards to our transit needs.

First of all I just want to say Mr. Speaker, with regards to the news release that came out yesterday, this does not add anything to the debate with regards to the headlines saying vote tomorrow, the cut off needs Winnipeg. When I read this headline Mr. Speaker, the first thing I did before reading the actual news release, I thought maybe all the bridges had been wired with detonation devices and we're going to blow them up the next day after the council vote.

The reality is, east Winnipeg has felt sometimes cut off, but I can ensure you it's not transit related, it's quite often related to the fact that we see these huge infrastructure projects going on in one end of the city and issues such as the Chief Pegus trail is being ignored and north east Winnipeg or that we see the fact that squad cars are in downtown Winnipeg instead of in the suburbs where we need them on a Friday or Saturday night.

Those are the sorts of things that I hear from my constituents about what their upset about and what they feel cut off from the rest of the city. Well, transit is not one of them. The idea of saying that this is somehow going, were jeopardizing our future, that the railway, the CN will do what they wish, well in Transcona Mr. Speaker, will have a lot of experience dealing with CN. Matter of fact, right now CN taking one of our young people to court, no criminal record whatsoever for walking through a midway that he's walked through since he was a young boy. And we've got now the public attorneys fighting this for us on behalf of the community.

So we now what the CN can be like, we know they play hardball and I'm happy to read in here that we will continue to discussions with the railway. The railway has a real estate department, they will do what they need to do and the city will do what it needs to do. And that's how we've always dealt with the railway in the past Mr. Speaker.

To raise this as some sort of scare tactic is just that. It's a scare tactic and it doesn't contribute anything useful to this debate. The debate at hand should be about a vision and if there wasn't a vision sold in the first place about this rapid transit system Mr. Speaker, today we would not be having this huge argument today. The streets would be full of people saying don't take rapid transit away. Don't cancel rapid transit. The vision was never sold.

Instead, it came from the top down as so many things happen in the past year, in the past whereby we were told that this is going to be the system. All of a sudden, we get a power point presentation, no report, no report, a power point presentation telling us this is how it's going to work, this is where it's going to work.

Just to give you an example, Mr. Speaker to my surprise in the ward that I represent, all of a sudden I found out that

there's going to be diamond lanes running on Regent Avenue where they don't exist today, taking two lanes out of commission. Now, I'm not saying that's good or bad but the fact of the matter was, the community was not consulted. But this is how it's going to be. For the first time, we have a mayor who's prepared to listen, who is listening, and who wants to consult not only with Councillors but with the community at large to build a system that will last not only for tomorrow but for generations to come.

And why is that important Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you why. Because this city has a history of throwing the baby out with the bath wand. And I'll give you an example; I'll give you an example. Forty, fifty years ago we had trolley cars running in the city. And then at the time, council said let's get rid of the trolley cars. We don't need trolley cars anymore, were going to diesel. A whole new model adopted, we threw them out and we got diesel busses. And many of us today, when we look back, wish we had the trolley cars back. And there was many advantages to it.

There's not one model necessarily Mr. Speaker that can work here. And I think that's the important thing to say, this is a debate, this should be a debate not about this guys against rapid transit and this guys for a, rather it should be a debate about, we want rapid transit. We need rapid transit, Kyoto and all the environmental; for the environmental future of this planet demands that we have rapid transit.

Nevertheless, there is questions, what sort of model do we build that's sustainable and works into the future.

In January 2003, shortly after getting elected, I made a point of sitting down with Dr. Barry Prentice, the Director of the University of Manitoba transportation institute. Dr. Prentice as you know was chair of Transplant 2010 in the mid 90's and made some very good recommendations on what we could do on our transit system. He had some very good ideas. Now, he was not sold on this idea of having a total bus corridor system across the city. As a matter of fact, he felt that there was better ways to get transit to the people. And I think there is.

The first thing we have to do Mr. Speaker and let's be realistic about this is to create demand. We have to ensure that the market can respond and that the people want to take transit. What does that mean that means that we have to be able to compete against the automobile.

I'm surprised to hear that we are creating bus ways so that we can end the congestion on our roads so that more people can take cars. The idea is Mr. Speaker is to make transit more competitive, not less competitive with cars. Make it so that transit is the model to go, using both carrots and stick approach to make that happen.

I think the task force Mr. Speaker has to start to address these questions and I'll just name some of them. Creating a demand, how can we do that. How can we involve the private sector. The private sector has a role to play here Mr. Speaker, if the turn of the century, the private sector was the one who delivered public transportation. It wasn't only until the 1940's and 50's when we decided to nationalize buses.

At that time ridership was very high, there was less people using cars system, we become a more affluent society, there's more cars on the road, ridership is consistently been dropping Mr. Speaker.

Other cities around North America have engaged the private sector, especially when it comes to borrowing for large projects, using the private sector to go out and run these facilities and borrow so we can keep the costs down. These are things that we can explore through a task force. We have to ensure that what were building is economical. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we don't all of a sudden see transit fares having to be raised to maintain and operate a system that is only serving one segment out of the city. That is a concern, and that has not been explored because there's been no business plan that I've seen.

We have to look at ways to use our existing infrastructure Mr. Speaker, our existing roads. We have, find me a city in North America, Europe or North America as far as that goes, where we have four lanes of traffic in each direction coming into the middle of the city. I mean this city is privileged and the fact of the matter is I don't think our town planners planned that, they did it because of the ox and carts and the mud and everything on the road, so they made Portage Avenue massive.

But today, we have this massive road. In the city of Los Angeles, they've not only explored, they're implementing a system where they use BRT where basically I'll just read a part of what their doing. They're tying in their single priority system linked to the city of Los Angeles traffic management centre that uses state of the art technology to adjust traffic signal timing to provide priority for transit vehicles.

They've literally created centralized stations along existing routes. What's the benefit of that, people live there all ready. You have housing already, people are right there creating feeder routes into the main system using our existing regional streets.

Mr. Speaker we have an infrastructure problem in this city, we all know that. We cannot even maintain these existing regional streets that we have and yet were talking about literally building new regional streets. New regional, that's what they are, two new lanes of new regional streets. Let's use our existing regional streets better. We have the technology. Global positioning system is there and the technology exists to adopt that.

The city, believe it or not, in Latin America, current team of Brazil has lead the way with regards to this. When American city after American city going down in delegation to see how they use they existing street system. I'm not suggesting this council goes to Brazil, but nevertheless, there's different ways we can do business.

How can we reduce the subsidy on transit that were paying, 47 million dollars a year. Will this increase our subsidy, rapid transit or will it reduce it. That hasn't been answered. Can we use the existing rail tracks. I come from Transcona; we have rail lines running into all parts of the city. You go to other cities, they lease private transit users or the public will lease off the rail lines. The use of rail, can we do that. Has that been explored, no I don't think it has.

Can we build a rapid transit system, Mr. Speaker that is sustainable at the end of the day. There are a lot of concepts, and there are a lot of ideas. I think this task force has a big job ahead of it's self. But I welcome it; I think this is crucial to the future of our city. For the first time, were going to have a process here to engage the city in a discussion with an end goal, with a deadline of June 2005 to come back with recommendations on what we can do to get some concepts out.

Now if we get the concepts on the table, then I think it is necessary to go back to the public and say this is how it's going to be implemented and this is the impact on communities and get feedback that way to ensure this broad based support for rapid transit.

The support is there, I believe that, there's no doubt about it, but the question is, what's the system were going to build, let's build a system that works in Winnipeg maximizing the resources we have and building a system that all citizens can enjoy. Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Try reading Plan Winnipeg. It's all in there.

Mr. Speaker: Excuse me. Before we move on to the next speaker, with all respect Councillor Wyatt I would like to find out, well we all respect Dr. Prentice, he did not head Transit Plan 2010, that was Robbie Gorvorick, you see. Next speaker we have is Councillor Lubosch followed by Councillor Smith.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. There's been some very passionate, eloquent debate here today and I guess depending on who's side your on, it all sounds pretty credible but a

lot of it I'm afraid has been advanced in the absence of some pretty important facts.

And the fact is I was a BRT and rapid transit supporter right from the get go and that was at a time when the reality, reality of where we are today looks somewhat different and maybe a little more encouraging. We were, we thought collectively at the beginning of a new deal for cities, we thought there would be significantly more money coming our way from the federal and provincial governments and there was a lot of reason to be optimistic that if we invested in 75 million or 100 million in new infrastructure that there would be money to pay for it, a more proportional share of the money that we pay to the federal and provincial governments in the first place.

But, I find myself in a position now to where its time to take a look at the reality of where we've arrived. And in this reality check, I have as a back drop a billion dollar infrastructure deficit that our experts tell us is not going away, that our experts tell us and the experts that we hire tell us is an increasing risk to our city and that ultimately is what propels business and people from wanting to move here and that we're not making a lot of headway on this billion dollar infrastructure deficit.

I find it ironic that the same Executive Policy Committee Council members who are advancing so passionately the bus rapid transit system and the investment the 50 or 75 million or who knows how many millions of dollars are the same members who for the past decade weren't prepared to invest even a 1% tax increase in our city. 1% a year, that's below inflation and even that was off the table, in fact we delivered budgets of zero and minus one and minus two per cent for the nine and half years that I've been here Mr. Speaker.

And the fact is, that this has created some very serious problems for our city, very serious problems that a bus rapid transit system in of itself is not going to solve. Not in a hundred years Mr. Speaker.

I find it very frustrating that while I'm listening to this debate and I'm hearing arguments like if we don't do this, as same as Portland has done it or Ottawa has done it or as Vancouver has done it, or Toronto has done it, that were going to become a back water, that were going to be unrecognized and that were not going to be keeping up with the Jones's, that suddenly all the other great things in Winnipeg like our diversified communities, our interesting people, our arts, our culture, the things that make Winnipeg great, that suddenly all those things aren't going to count. That the only thing that really counts today is that we have to step up to the plate and dump another 75 million dollars into a plan that is ultimately a good plan for our city, I'm not disputing that, but it comes to the expense of all sorts of other things that we should have been doing for the past 10 years that we haven't done. Because, certain people who advanced their objectives more effectively that other people around here, were basically drunk on tax cuts and that's all the priority, and that was all they wanted to do.

Let's see if we can put an extra 50 bucks into Mr. Jones's pocket, forget about whether he takes the bus, in fact, the same EPC members who are bringing you the BRT today or the BLT or whatever you want to call it, the fact is that same group also raised transit fares a dime here, a nickel there over a hundred per cent more than inflation, knowing that the demand for transit is completely inelastic and what that means in economic terms is that those people who take the bus don't really have a choice, even if they didn't want to take the bus because the only other choice is they walk. The can't even take a bicycle effectively Mr. Speaker because we've invested less than a hundred grand a year and that's a good year into bike paths in the city which is deployable.

You've got a bike path that goes from there to there, whooped de do Mr. Speaker. Less than hundred grand a year on bike paths. I could go on and I will.

Let's talk about what we've done for transit. Our city has grown, we've got

Linden Ridge, Linden Woods, we've got some new development in North Kildonan, we've got Southdale, we've got areas out to the west and what has transit done, well the city has grown, transit has shrunk. How much sense does that make. We haven't even invested into the system we've got and the fact is even the fact that we haven't invested in a system that we've got still creates cause for alarm when every year our transit folks come back and tell us that these buses are empty and those buses are empty and I'm sorry but we don't have any money for a transit shelter here because we had to replace a bus over there. We've gutted the system we've got and putting a new, a new bus rapid transit system in one part of the city and even expanding a bus rapid transit system in the whole parts of the city is not going to repair what we've got, it's not going to bring the people back to transit that we may have lost. And at this point, the people that are taking transit for the most part don't have a choice.

And the fact that we've consistently raised fares even in spite of what our experts told us at that time, in spite of what the same people who come down here today have told us that it's basically shifting the tax burden onto the backs of the poor. This council did it anyway Mr. Speaker and they did it without any indiscretion.

You talk about environmental issues, well I'm sorry but a diesel bus is still a diesel bus and even if you believe that if you pack it full of people your going to take 250 vehicles off the road, I'd like to see you pack, I'd like to see you pack buses on any route, first of all Mr. Speaker in order to take vehicles off the road.

The same Councillors who are talking about these environmental issues and preaching to the converted about green house gasses and air quality are the same people who are driving the biggest SUV's in their class to work everyday by themselves. How much sense does that make. How can we possibly take this seriously Mr. Speaker.

Let's lead by example. You talk about environmental issues, we have combined sewer systems that every time we get a high rainfall, dumps raw sewage into the Red River which goes off to Lake Winnipeg which is ultimately killing one of the tenth largest fresh water lakes in the world while we sit by and worry about BRT's. There's lots of environmental issues that we could be coming involved in Mr. Speaker, it just happens that this one is the cause cerebra of the day.

I've talked about bike paths, you want alternatives to the automobile, well start looking at your sidewalks, some of which are 40, 50, 60 years old and won't be replaced for another 40 or 60 years and start getting serious about cycling routes.

Let's talk about sustainable development. Right now were hundreds of millions of dollars in the glue every year in deferred maintenance, which ultimately costs us more and more and more because we can't keep up at this rate.

We've got playgrounds; you talk about doing something for young people. Thirty thousand dollars a year in capital for your playground renewal, fifteen wards in the city of Winnipeg and thirty thousand dollars a year for a decent play structure that costs on average between 80,000 and 120,000 dollars to replace.

But if you do the math on that Mr. Speaker, I hope some of these kids live for 120 years because that's how long those kids who aren't going to be able to ride on the BRT are going to have to wait to play on a jungle gym with their friends. A 120 years in some cases. That's deployable Mr. Speaker.

Our facility use study has shown us that there's hundreds of millions of dollars in maintenance that has been deferred on our recreational facilities. Not just community centres, our swimming pools, our bike paths, our playgrounds, our playing fields. Mr. Speaker, the fact is this is going to be the toughest budget year that we've faced here in more than a decade.

The numbers are starting to roll in and were going to have some tough decisions to make. And while we make those tough

decisions, I don't want to have to worry about where were going to pull the next 10 or 20 or 30 million dollars a year in order to service our new bus rapid transit system.

As important as I believe it is, but the fact is, we've haven't done a very good job of taking care of the infrastructure we've got right now and were handing that off to our future in a terrible state of disrepair.

And until we get our act together around here and until we get our heads around investing even 1 percent a year into our budgets, maybe 1.5 percent so we can keep step with inflation, until we get that problem solved Mr. Speaker, I'm not committed to buying any new toys no matter how backwards it makes us look. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Well first of all I want to say this; I'll not be voting for reallocating funds that were ear marked for rapid transit and to Councillor Lubosch I tell you, these are not toys. They perform a function, however I believe the mayor. He's not killing rapid transit with his motion, however, I'm not supporting the motion as I want this council to debate to show strong support for rapid transit even though at this time its obviously not going to pass.

Most Winnipeggers who support the BRT and this proposal for the south western corridor do not realize that what we are debating today for our transit system will only save 10 minutes of travel time from the University of Winnipeg to the University of Manitoba, 10 minutes. And that is because at this time we will would be using diamond lanes for a great part of the route. Would it not be better to have the bus way, which would be part of it, a separate road for the buses to use going all the way to the University of Manitoba. This would have a dramatic saving of time. That would be rapid transit.

Saving significant travel time for transit riders through the completion of the south western corridor would persuade our citizens that the other corridors need to be completed, cause they could see the value of the system.

On Tuesday, December the 17th, 2002, Canada's environmental minister formerly notified the UN of the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol limiting green house emissions. We must start reducing the carbon dioxide and other gasses pumped out by factories, cars that trap heat in the atmosphere warming the planet.

I don't know if any of you have seen the recent issue of National Geographic showing how serious global warming is. And I'd like to point out to Councillor Pagtakhan, my friend, that his area has a great number of new immigrants and low-income families similar to my ward and they cannot afford a car. They rely on public transit to go to work, to make a living, to provide a home and food for their families.

And how is the city of Winnipeg improved Winnipeg Transit over the years. Well, the direction to the future, a guide to better transit for Winnipeg states on page 43, quote, to reduce the level of general revenue fund support required for transit, service levels were reduced permanently in 1994.

With the price of oil reaching 50 dollars per barrel and possibly climbing, travelling by car will just be too expensive for more and more of our residents. And I'd also like to point out to the Councillor from Transcona, I very rarely go to Transcona because it's such, it takes so long and it's just so, it's like going to a another country. It's easier for me to go to England then to go to Transcona. Would it not be better for the city to have all of its parts easily accessible. I mean you should be able to go to Fort Garry or St. James, great distances in a few minutes.

It would make a far better city. And those of you who worship your cars, and refuse to take transit should welcome rapid transit, as it will mean less congestion and fewer headaches.

In conclusion, I say lets not approve this clause from Executive Policy Committee, let's start rapid transit now.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. Any one further. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Yes, it's always a tango here and speak for a person who proposed an amendment would like to wrap up.

This is a very important subject. I would also echo the mayor's comments to thank those dedicated citizens who came out here with a lot of passion. The young men and women and those of us of middle age that are here in the audience as well. That look at rapid transit or transit as a great community investment. I support the transit system. I support revising, reinvesting in our transit life, so that we cannot only make our city proud with all the other hype that goes with it. But make it very practical for generations to come.

But it's all about timing. There always seems to be a button, so I would like to just indicate my position. I was proud in 1999 working along with Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Eadie, Councillor Lubosch and we brought forth as Councillor Benham has shown, a report called Direction to the Future. That title was crafted carefully. It wasn't that we need to do this now, it's direction for the future and it says, the report makes a number of recommendations to create the conditions supportive of increased transit use as part of the ongoing physical and economic development of Winnipeg.

And it really came about from a motion as a result of a debate on increasing transit fares as we usually do every November or December. A nickel here, a nickel there. And it was established by council that we have a working group, that the transit department be directed to explore and report to the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works which I chaired at the time.

By May of 1999, strategies to increase ridership, stabilize transit fares. The aim of achieving reduced fares without increasing the mill rate support during the forth-coming years should be given priority. That last word, you better listen carefully, without increasing the mill rates support.

Every transit system in the western world that we're aware of probably throughout the world is heavily subsidized by government. They don't make money. Now there's really nothing essentially wrong with that, part of our public good contribution when we all through money in the pot together to support society.

Part of the problem that Winnipeg is had is from the 1980's, starting with the Paulley government, and carried on by the Filmon government and carried on by successive governments, is that there is no increased support from the provincial government for transportation, for transit. Regrettably so.

I guess they always fall back on the process that you're on the point that we have shared revenues, taxation revenues so therefore it's in that pot. It's regrettable, but as Councillor Lazarenko so well points out, we don't get a lot of generated income from increased spending as our economy grows. They do. The fed's do. And that's why it's so important what linkage we have to keep coming back to and Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Lazarenko and others have talked about it, is that we do need a new deal.

Cities in this country are not able to be sustainable financially, fiscally whatever framework you want to call it.

So my position is, I have been a very strong supporter. This report was crafted very carefully, Mr. Borland was the Director of Transit and I too regret to hear of his retirement today, as a dedicated servant who's given a lot of service to the city of Winnipeg, crafted very carefully with public consultation, I heard someone say there was no public consultation, that isn't true. There was stakeholder's consultation. Very well crafted. It wasn't perfect perhaps we maybe could have done more.

But at the end of it all, we found a report that we could put a, hang our hats on the hook with so to speak, that it made sense that in the future we need to do things.

What the executive summary says, you really should read it again. The first thing we got to do is make ongoing improvements to service that we have today. Now I represent proudly a suburb. I can't tell you how often in many issues that we talk about around city council and with my constituents in my suburb and other suburbs that really you know the suburbs did not get a good deal in uni-city in 1970.

The city of Winnipeg got, well you see you got our tax base, you loved it, you also got some cash that was in the bank. But over the years, services have eroded. Public Service, Public Works, Transit, maintenance of our boulevards, Police Service, can't get a police constable out there or a car out there on a weekend, maybe three hours if a client calls in that there's a potential break in. And I'm not saying that pejoratively about the police department, hopefully their watching and they don't take this negatively, but the fact of the matter is and all the other suburban Councillors are in the same boat. We don't have enough Police Service in our suburbs.

So we've continuously cut back, cause we don't raise taxes and I can of support that, there is tax on we on the city, but as you heard me this morning, it has nothing to do with the residential property tax base, it has every thing to do with the education tax base. We couldn't grow some of our taxation, which I think residents would responsibly pay for services they get. There are many clients of this city who have, who pay taxes that don't even cover the 79 dollars a year, annual cost to pickup waste.

So the fact of the matter is, there is tax on we not so much because we have been wasteful in the city of Winnipeg, we cut a lot of staff off over the last several years. There's been a dynamic process to make sure were cost effective, but we have not been keeping up with all our other facilities.

I come back to transit, how many of you will go down, back home tonight, look at your transit stops. I am tired of seeing the transit stops that are ill maintained not because the transit department doesn't want to do it, they'd love to, there isn't enough money. They're shabby, the boulevards around them are ill maintained and it's not just one or two, it goes on and on. And that goes to the attitude people have about their transportation system. You get tired of going to a transit stop where there's waste around. Some of them without arguing very persuasively to get a waste bin put around a stop, it's hard to get.

Or a bench, so when the weather's nice you can sit outside. Or the stops, you know they're congregated to get them heated. That's why we have a lot of improvements to make to the existing system. To make them attractive, to have park and ride facilities so people can use it and then to keep looking at all the other recommendations that are in here that make sense. Working towards, how do we end up with something that moves people as we have this confluence of influence hitting us now and the environment, oil pricing and I guess we need a bylaw to get rid of SUV's on the road, but you know as soon as I say that, my friends would you say, look the reality is we drive cars. But the reality also is, that's its going to be very expense to do so and you may have to hybrid yourself. We will see, in 10 years everybody can now maintain in a hybrid field.

The report also talks about the funding sources and how you do this. You go to the very last one; it says making a commitment to high-speed transit. It's one of the last things we've talked about in here, because they new there's a innovative approach to what this report was trying to say. Not do it next year or three years from now, but do it when you can address all the other issues and get some commitments or funding. We know we need tri level funding, but we also and we put this in deliberately, capital program transit infrastructure reserve, capital program funding obviously, transit infrastructure reserve if you can get some

extra monies from your fares and public private partnerships.

These exist throughout the world and we need to have these explored. People can make an investment and make it work.

Let me just say that, you now, some of us echoed a concern at the time this came to council for capital funding. I said on the record that I would support part one of phase one which is to get me through confusion corner. But we never had the plan, regrettably through a lot of hype and the chair of the time Public Works, my previous Mayor, here it is guys, here's this plan. Where's the detail, show me your land assembly, where are the grade separations that you need, what are the issues related to a partnership with maybe housing. We need to know that detail before you tell me that I have to spend about 50 million dollars to get through to Jubillee. I might say I'd like to get through to confusion corner. Jubillee is next and we may not need 50 million dollars for that.

You now, today you can get down if you had some commitments to diamond lanes and a grade separation at confusion corner. This city council did not take action back in the late 80's or early 90's to acquire property that is vacant on confusion corner so that we could have a grade separation there to get traffic from the Midtown bridge straight through Pembina and all the way to John Angus's place in St. Norbert.

So let me just say that I am going to support the Mayor's position because I think it makes sense, to pause, he's not throwing it away or I think as somebody said, I think were blowing it in the wind.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt your time is up.

Councillor De Smedt: I'll just conclude very quickly, I think it's a very important subject and I appreciate my colleagues being patient. But were not just going to blow it in the wind, the tri partite funding, it can come back. It is important for us to sit down and look at priorities, look at the newer deals that may come. This city can no longer borrow money; at some point in time it will be useful to borrow, because I do believe in inner generational transfer of expenses of major projects. So we have a lot of work to do, give the Mayor some slack, the media and all the good people that have come out in support of the current transit way, we don't have to do it today, it isn't urgent. Let us reconsider and see how we make investments of public money in a wise way in the future.

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

Councillor Angus: Mr. Chairman before you start my clock, may I just, I've had some communication with the Mayor. I have what I hope is a friendly amendment that everybody will agree to. I brought to his attention that it's foolhardy to tie yourself to a fix percentage in the motion. In clause 4 they've said there is no less than 67 per cent of the total project costs. I asked him and he has agreed that if he changes that to a substantial amount, that there's a substantial amount of money before we proceed, that gives us just a little bit of latitude and I think that he will sort of not concurrent to that friendly amendment and if you can ask if everybody agree to that, it's just removing the 67 percent and putting in a substantial amount of funding in place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Angus, perhaps, Mr. Mayor you have said you agree on that.

Mayor Katz: Yes, we have said 67 per cent and we obviously want to have substantial amounts of money whether it's 60 per cent or 75 per cent that's not really the issue that it has to be a significant amount of money, absolutely correct.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, Councillors you've heard that request

Councillor Angus: I'll ask the clerk to write a motion and I will speak to it at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Write it out and continue Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: All right, thank you Councillors and thank you Mr. Speaker.

Let me start with a quote from Proverbs in King James Bible, it says that, Proverbs says that where there is no vision, people die and while I'm not a particularly overly religious person, as I get closer to my maker I become more cognizant of things of that nature Mr. Speaker.

It seems like only yesterday, but it was in fact nearly 30 years ago in 1977 when I ran my very first campaign and one of my platform items was a high-speed rapid transit system from downtown to the University of Manitoba. I based that Mr. Speaker on a report that came out of the University of Manitoba that said there was an ideal corridor to build some sort of a first stage to try this. This was in 1977 people. They said, we have people going to the University of Manitoba, which is a state, a city-state within my ward of 20 to 30,000 people that come from all over the city. They are going out to the University in the morning and they are coming home in the afternoon. And the people from out in that end of town are going downtown in the morning and coming home in the afternoon.

It was an ideal particular space to try it. I have long tried to champion the vision that we have, four seasons. We have a dollar that we can afford. We have four manufacturing companies, two manufacturing companies that manufacture buses and we have an ideal set of property available for the first phase of a rapid transit system whereby we can try and look, and work and develop something that this city may be able to utilize.

I don't have any illusions Mr. Speaker. I believe in this particular motion, that they're going to put a stop to the rapid transit and I'm disappointed by that of course. I respect the Mayor and I respect his ability to be able to come forward with his vision. I would have liked a few more details and that's why I put the motion on the table to refer it back so we can get more specific information on what is going to replace rapid transit before we give up the money in rapid transit.

It sort of frustrates me I guess, a little bit in that I personally and while my colleague from St. James who has sort of suggested tongue and cheek that I did a slight of hand and did some wiz bang stuff, I really tried to have several seminars where by we showed Councillors the total area of what the project was. We had the transit department in to talk about the various bits of information. We weren't just buying a pig and a pope.

We have looked at various things like the cost of a light rapid transit system. A light rapid transit system would be very very nice. People, I would love to have the same type of thing that they have in other centres, but were looking at 30 to 40 million dollars for light rapid transit. These figures weren't snapped out of the air, they weren't just sort of pulled out the department did research. They worked at what was involved and they looked at the various costs and they said that a conventional bus rapid would be 5 to 15 million dollars. It's more affordable and more organized for our particular climate and for our opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, is it the Walt Disney World and as Al Golden used to say, Steve Juba wanted a monorail. Those things aren't going to happen. Let's get a grip, as everybody has said, transit is falling apart and we've talking about trying to do something that's going to get more people to ride on it. Well you know perhaps keeping the fares level is one thing, perhaps improving the bus system, giving fancier busses, giving them the opportunity for high speed, clean, articulated busses which by the way I understand, FCM has just indicated that they are prepared to recommend supporting 50 per cent of the cost of those buses being purchased and they would be manufactured in Winnipeg and the money would stay in Winnipeg where we have employees Mr. Speaker.

And never mind the fact that gasoline is up to 50, our oil is up to 50 dollars a

gallon and no indications that its going to come down. Never mind the Kyoto accord and the environmental concerns. Let's just look simply at where in fact were going to go and how were going to invest the money.

And the fact that everybody has suggesting that we have been all over the map on this. Let me tell you, we have to put a lot more faith in funding, falling into place for Kenaston, which we haven't really got in the capital budget, then we have for the transit system. It certainly is true, Mr. Chairman of Finance, and I'll give you an opportunity to stand up and speak to it.

I'm not closing now, this is my 7th minute, you still have an opportunity. Mr. Speaker, no I'm not closing debate in any stretch of the imagination. I've got my seven minutes; Councillor Lazarenko and I established that at the beginning.

So, Mr. Speaker let me just go through the numbers, as quickly as I can and as much as it's sort of galling, it's 50.5 million dollars. 5 million dollars was to study how we were going to get into the second phase, the east lane and have some sort of continuous of that particular vision.

Ten million dollars was for intelligent transportation system improvements throughout the whole of the transportation network. Of the whole of transit, so as to improve that sort of thing. That money was put in there to give all of transit a boast and I'm glad that there leaving some money in there, hopefully we'll get it. At least 40 million to be spent over 3.7 for phase one, that's 10.8 million dollars per kilometre.

Check that against 35 million dollars per kilometre for light rail transportation. And never mind the fact that at every gosh, darn corner you have down Pembina Highway or down Transcona, when it crosses a road like Kent or crosses McGillivary you got to have gates that go down and stop the traffic. These things have to have transition type things that are going to make it costly for these light rapid transit systems to really work. Unless you elevate them and that elevates the cost.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the big picture with some of these things. We have an agreement of 17 million dollars from the fed's, 17 million dollars from the province and 16.5 million dollars from the city of Winnipeg. We did work on it with professionals from transit. We got consulting information from outside on the system. We asked for and did surveys of people, surveys that came back very very positively. We laid out in presentation after presentation after presentation, PowerPoint presentations to a number of people that showed them the information that we were going to do showed them the total direction and showed them what the story point was going to be.

And if we don't every get started, we will never ever get done. And to suggest that 67 per cent of the total project is going to be required to be in place, that means Mr. Speaker by voting for this motion in the way it is right now this will never ever happen, because the total project is well over 780, 800 million dollars, to do the whole city. So you've got to do it piecemeal, my God if they had this type of rule in place at the federal/provincial regulations for the floodway, they never would have got the floodway started because they only gave 160 million dollars for a total project of 700 million dollars.

Now, its like 20 per cent, 17, 18 per cent of the total cost. So sometimes Mr. Speaker you have to go incrementally. But just in order to sort of bring this back into place, it was not randomly pulled out of a hat. It was not just sort of suddenly thought up. It has been studied and studied and studied and studied and looked at. And the bottom line is, unless we have partners, that is senior partners from the province or from the federal government to assist us with this, this council is never going to make the decision to go ahead and do it. And I don't care what task force you put together or what studies they come back with. We're not going to be able to do this individual thing by our self.

Thank you Mr. Speaker, so, we look at an incremental portion. We looked at and we've already acquired the land for along

Stradbrook. We've already acquired the land for a station and the stations by the way were shown to be located at confusion corner where we have land set aside and we looked at a station down between Osborne and Corydon and Pembina and Jubillee, two stops all the way downtown. Yes, it's not a big thing, it's not the end of the world, it's not Disney World and it's not particularly spectacular. But if we cooperate with FCM and got that funding for those buses and we had 20 articulated buses, we would be helping our manufacturing industry within the city of Winnipeg that is struggling to try and keep those jobs here and keep that plant here and could bring people in from all over the world and say you can see these buses on that test track in the east yards off of Pembina Highway.

We were looking at building housing, seniors housing and students housing to try and work in conjunction with that and we may still do that. But how those people are going to get wherever they want to go, I don't know.

Mr. Speaker we looked at all sorts of things and all sorts of opportunities and I'm surprised to hear Councillor Steeves talk the way he is, I'm sure he replaced me. I sat on a rapid transit steering committee, which had the upper level management and sort of was governance on that. There's one for Kenaston and there's one for the rapid transit project. That is too keep some political input so that we can be comfortable with the direction we're taking and that's a responsibility use that the Chair has to participate in that and do it.

Councillors, this is a huge step backwards. I don't have any doubt that it's going to pass because we've got a Christmas present that isn't even been opened, we don't understand, we don't know where it's going and were giving up something that we've already got, when we shouldn't be doing that. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. I wish these things weren't be happening, it's so hard to concentrate. Councillor Clement, I've got one speaker. Do you want to speak to. I will put you on the list.

Councillor Clement: I can't Harry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You can't, okay. Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I've heard a number of very good arguments for rapid transit today. I've only heard a couple of arguments and they weren't very good for bus rapid transit. But I am glad and Councillor Steeves when he pointed out, or he beat me to the punch that this item on it's own was never debated, was never even voted on by this council. It was always a matter of package of things we're sending to the province or the fed's for their grants. We sent seven things, they accepted three. I guess this was one of them at the time.

It was never voted on it's own and we've come out of an era of very secret, very clever, very exclusive and a very exclusionary government and hopefully that era has ended. Hopefully we can have some openness back in this chamber so that not just those, the chosen few get to know what's going on, but everybody does. Hopefully we will have meaningful seminars in great numbers again to deal with the issues on a much more open basis.

I heard terms green and environmentally friendly and there talking about 50 dollars a barrel diesel fumes. There's nothing friendly about diesel. At least make the buses electric.

I heard gridlock; I don't know many Winnipeggers can even spell gridlock. We don't have gridlock; we don't what it is in this city. We do have a short term problem because of the construction of the MTS Centre has taken away a piece of Portage Avenue and it's slowed down traffic considerably. All the lanes will be back any day now; the official opening is in November.

We don't air condition our buses, and we're trying to get more people on the busses. I've argued for years and years

and years, air condition the buses. And I keep hearing it costs more money. It's not environmentally friendly. Smelling sweat isn't so great either on a hot summer day.

I've heard we can loose the money, we can bypass the money, but I haven't heard anything specific. I have heard specifically from the Mayor that he has assurances, the money is not lost if we approve this clause today.

I'd like to start off, hopefully end off, but at least start off believing him. We could loose the land. I had lunch yesterday with the head of Property, Mr. Finnigan who says he can live with it, that's all accessible, but it does make his negotiations a little bit harder, dealing with CN. And the CN really doesn't give two hoots what we do with the land, there're trying to get the best deal for themselves they can get and unload the land their not going to need.

Councillor Benham, well if your suggestion that if we don't support this, you don't support rapid transit is getting close to bullying. I support rapid transit. I support it for the whole city but I don't support bus rapid transit in this mode at this moment. And if you want to live as a politician, you better qualify a lot of things; cause never is an awfully long time in this business. Some of us doesn't even last a week.

I support, one more thing first, Toronto a billion dollars for rapid transit, Ottawa 200 million, if you think Ottawa, the tax payers, the property tax payers of Ottawa are putting up 200 million of that 600 million, your pretty naïve, they're putting up nothing. Ever heard of the National Capital Commissions, supported by you and me and everybody across this country, that's where the municipal share is coming out of, more federal dollars. Do you think Toronto is putting up 333 million directly. I doubt it. Do you know how many MP's come out of Toronto. About as many as all of Western Canada, that's where that's money coming from.

It's going to be difficult for Winnipeg to compete on those levels. But I'm not willing to give up and I think this bus rapid transit plan has one thing going for it and that's immediacy, that's now. But over now, I'm not willing to accept half a loaf. I would rather see the Mayor set up the committee, study it for all parts of the city, come back with a timetable with cost estimate that would be publicly debated and then see us make a decision. To be implemented for the long-range betterment of our city and our citizens. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. No further speakers to the issue. We'll just go into the motions that are here before us.

(Councillor O'Shaughnessy in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: We have an additional amendment put before us, an addition, an amendment to recommendation number 4 of clause 5 moved by the Mayor and seconded by Councillor Angus.

Motion No. 6
Moved by Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Angus

BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation 4 be amended by replacing the existing recommendation with the following:

4. That the establishment of a Rapid Transit Task Force ("Task Force") be endorsed, consisting of members of Council to be appointed by the Mayor, to report to the Executive Policy Committee by no later than June 2005 on various rapid transit options for Winnipeg ("the study"), with analysis of relative costs and benefits, to consult with the public and to develop and recommend a long-term funding plan to support the full implementation of a rapid transit system which plan should include strategies for obtaining combined financial contributions from other governments and/or private partners comprising a substantial percentage of the total system cost over a period of years.

Mr. Speaker: Is this wording changed, acceptable to Members of Council to replace, being the clause, no Councillor De Smedt it will have to be voted on separately then. No, not until it's

introduced. But I guess this will, first of all I can't accept it at the moment we'll have to vote on some others first. We cannot have more than one motion to refer and two amendments on the floor at the same time.

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker, with a suggestion perhaps if we could deal with the referral motion, I would close and we can deal with that, if it passes, back to King James of course, then all of this will sort of go with it. If it doesn't pass, then I can talk to the substantial amount of money.

Mr. Speaker: There are more problems than that but that is the direction we will have to go anyway on this. Councillor Angus closing debate on the motion to refer with instructions.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity and I appreciate the tolerance and the patience of my colleagues.

One of the things that has been suggested is that could be reviewed if this was referred, is to exactly what stake Flyer has in this, what types of buses they're talking about. I am of the understanding, Mr. Speaker and was as the chairman and was representing, that they're using hybrid types of buses that would be economically sound and pollution free if you like as much as they possibly could.

However, I am hoping Mr. Speaker that we adopt a sober second thought. I see no need to rush to judgement. If I have my dates correctly, it was almost two weeks ago when the Mayor sort of stood up and at that point, when I talked to some of my colleagues via email, they haven't talked to very many Councillors in relation to what he was intending to do. He just said that this was the direction he thought we should take. Subsequent to that, they did talk as I understand sort of to individual Councillors, and that's a good thing.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's been less than two weeks on a plan that has been more than three years in the making, two or three years in the making, in the preparation. I look at the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund that is funding the Kenaston underpass and it was designed to use the criteria set, to fund the BRT and I look at the substantial change that they have made and they were changing it to the Federal Infrastructure Program and Mr. Speaker, I have every bit of faith in my colleagues as much as you can in politics, that senior levels of government living up to their word. They too want to get elected. Some of them probably before some of us will have to get re-elected, but the facts are Mr. Speaker, that if we set this down even for 30 days and let EPC talk a little bit more, get something in writing from the fed's and the province as to what they're going to do, provide council with written communication, identify which federal/provincial programs will support the community facilities and what are the criteria for sport will be. Identify the specific utilization of all monies, which are being proposed to be re profited, like what is the source, how much are we talking about and convene a council seminar explaining the implementation of the new proposal.

I heard Councillor Lazarenko, talk in terms Mr. Speaker, of having a pool that is already been closed and the people can't go swimming there, I hope he isn't under the misguided indication that were suddenly going to be reopening that pool because even the PUFS study says close it down, shut it down.

So, I think that there's still an awful lot of concern as to where this money is going, what sort of community projects are available and how that is going to work. And I'm a little fearful that were giving up a bird in the hand which is the rapid transit and albeit it it's only stage one. No question about that. It is stage one. But remember it would be a test track and if we can just review that application and see the impact on the employees of Flyer and Motor Coach. Look at the impact on the east yard development of housing. Look at that confusion corner issue and still have your task force to look at the broader issues of the complete city.

We can have our cake and eat it to Mr. Speaker and I am convinced that the federal infrastructure program that is

coming is going to allow us to use community centre money and I think that we're trading off community, money from rapid transit from the Canada Manitoba Infrastructure Program that we've already had a handshake and a public announcement to agree on and were going to be not able to double dip when it comes to the community centres.

So, I think Mr. Speaker that were making a bad deal and I would like to have an opportunity to refer this back to Executive Policy Committee with these instructions, to have the seminar and allow some factual information to come on the table so that we can have a good and intelligent discussion. We can still proceed Mr. Speaker, setting up the task force. We can still proceed once we have those facts to deep six that transit portion if you want.

But to rush to judgement in this fashion to me is not a particularly good idea. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Angus. We'll now have the vote on the motion to refer with instructions and it will be recorded. All in favour of referring the clause back to EPC as per motion number four please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Angus, Benham, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Smith, Thomas.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Wyatt, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

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

Mr. Speaker: The motion to refer is defeated. We'll now close debate on the 2 amendments that are before us; I cannot accept a third amendment until these have been dealt with. At which point I shall ask what you will is on that. First, of all on the amendment, motion number 2, Councillor Lazarenko did you wish to close debate.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Lazarenko
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the item be amended by adding the following as Recommendation No. 6:

6. That the Executive Policy Committee forward the Task Force Report and its own recommendations to Council for final approval;

And renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker I think that we have trashed this as much as we could today and I'm not going to dwell to long, I guess I could take my five minutes on it, but I think that Council should approve this, because it's just a manner of housekeeping, because if you don't let the report that comes in from the Executive Policy Committee find it's way back to council, the task force report then, you are loosing the privileges that each member of council has to make that final decision. So, it's just a manner of housekeeping, you know that this be referred back to council for final approval.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor, not so fast, we also have a motion 5 moved by his Worship, seconded by Councillor Eadie. Did you wish to close debate on that. Explain it, no, okay we'll vote on these two and then I will ask your direction on the recently put forward amendment as to whether you wish to have it considered because of the timing in which it came in just as we were closing debate. On motion number 2 by Councillor Lazarenko.

Mr. Speaker: All in those in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Thomas wishes to be recorded in opposition. The motion is carried. Motion number 5 moved by Mayor Katz, seconded by Councillor Eadie.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Mayor Katz
Seconded by Councillor Eadie

BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation I be amended by replacing the words "Canada Strategic Infrastructure Program" with the words "Federal Infrastructure Programs".

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed, same as recorded. Carried. We now have motion number 6 before us which was an amendment changing somewhat, the wording of recommendation 4 of clause 5. Would you allow it to be introduced?

Councillor De Smedt: Yes, I'd like to speak to it very briefly.

Mr. Speaker: Well we have it, do you wish to accept it, I think it was in in time, unless any one objects, but it does trigger a full round of debate. It has to trigger a full round of debate under our rules. But if you wish to introduce it, Councillor or Mayor Katz did you wish to introduce or defer to Councillor Angus.

Mayor Katz: I'll refer it to Councillor Angus.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Mayor, thank you Mr. Speaker. Let me just bring to your attention, to the fact that if you start putting in these types of fixed ceilings or fixed floors, you run into some significant difficulties in passing up good opportunities as they come along. I will suggest to you, that if you really want to take the total cost of the PUFS report, according to the consultants and the net present value, your talking about 1.2 billion dollars. Under this particular formula you would have to have 700 million dollars in place before we could do anything with PUFS.

So be very very careful about precedent setting and what you are doing. All were saying is we want to make sure that there are monies, a substantial amount of money for the project within place. We got to be cautious Mr. Speaker. I think if you tie your hands, if you give specifics.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, this amendment is now before us and anyone wishes to speak, but I will be of course enforcing the rules that it be strictly to this change in wording before us. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and the only reason I intended on speaking, I'm not sure why we would change from something that is pretty reasonable for our expectation in funding major projects which is, it's always been posed on us from higher up, that's it's a third, a third, a third and that's all were saying no less than a third, a third, a third.

Substantial percentage doesn't tell me anything. I am very much afraid because I've heard Councillor Angus and other speaker around here, if we get, the term pig and a pope in the way, we'll have a whole bunch of money. They say well look it, it's a 400 million project, we'll give you 50 percent, were suppose to accept it and be grateful.

You know, were working on a new deal in Canada for Municipalities on sharing of revenue. It's about getting a share of GST, let's be clear about this. It's about getting gas tax revenues and perhaps some others.

This country is going down the tubes if all we do is keep sending money to Ottawa and stand back and expect them to dispense it, their largest and their mechanisms. So I thought the 67 percent figure is not an ominous one. It makes darn sense. This wishy washy substantial percentage is one of those great kind of political statements saying let's not upset the apple cart and let's keep going. 67 percent is not an unusual model that already exists today. Let's not get off of that one because we say no less than, as Councillor Lazarenko and many others have pointed around here.

You know when we look at the taxation models; the benefit that we get from everything is around 15 percent. Fed's around 45-50 percent and the province

gets the rest, on the growth of their economy and spending. So, Municipalities are really in a tough bind and that's part of our problem. That's why we keep saying, this whole issue today is about priorities and pausing and lets looking at where were going.

I don't want to hamper us with this wishy washy reeling out substantial. There's nothing wrong with 67 percent, no less than. Hold the line. Sorry Mayor Katz and John but I mean I thank you for your parent wisdom, but I think it's a strategic error. Okay.

So hang the line and make it tough because were not getting yet any indications how this new deal is going. There are very clever people in Ottawa and I know all about Ottawa and BRT's and how they collect revenue for the National Capital Commission. Ottawa grew by 17,000 civil servants a year and a half ago. 17,000 civil servants, that's the growth in government that we all pay for.

So, obviously I am more fiscal conservative, you know that. But, look at the same time, let us gall darn well hold the line on what we expect, to get sharing of revenues and I'm optimistic, no matter what government is in Ottawa that we will find a mechanism to share back to municipalities their rightful amount because were going down the tubes folks until we find a better way other than market value on a property tax base, funding of this community for years ahead.

So, I'm sorry I'd would like to ask for a little more consideration and perhaps you will kindly consider withdrawing it John and Mayor Katz.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor De Smedt. Councillor Steeves, followed by Councillor Lazarenko and Councillor Thomas. You opened it up over nothing.

Councillor Steeves: I don't, I'll be brief, I just want to make one point. The 67 percent as referenced in the original report, that's an obvious reference, Mr. Speaker to the capital costs. I mean we're all used to around this table talking to one third, one third, one third. That's why the 67 percent is in there. Although it's not representative, if you look at the remainder of the sentence, it doesn't actually indicate capital costs.

The concern I have with this motion and I don't think it should be, I think we could make a small change here, but if it reads to comprise substantial percentage of the total system costs over a period of years, that almost sounds like operating costs, which I don't think we would ever purport to get from another level of government. They only pay for capital costs.

So, if it could read substantial percent of the total system capital cost over a period of years, I think that would probably elate my concern. And I think actually Councillor Angus's and Mayor Katz's amendment is wise in that, especially when you consider the idea that we're making application to FCM under the federal green fund, which I understand, is borrowed money, not granted money. So we have to pay that money back. So in that context I think we probably wouldn't get the 67 percent anyway.

So I don't know if the amendment might be accepted. If were going to leave substantial percentage in there, I'd be comfortable with that, but it might say capital costs, just so nobody is under the impression that were asking for operating capital which we would never get.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker, the delegation was here this morning and said about the rapid transit task force also had said, members of the public and I'm sure that the Mayor well in his power would be able to appoint members of the public so he wishes and I wish that he would do that.

But, dealing with this change of the substantial percentage, what does it mean. What if the fed's would say 25 percent, take it or leave it. And anytime that we've been dealing with them and the province, it's always been one third. And one third is 66.7 percent. So lets leave it at 67 percent as was submitted in

the first place and let's not fool around with numbers.

I mean it doesn't make any sense to say the substantial amount or percentage. What is it 25 or 15, and I like to guarantee you, we have the substantial percentage, they will not come to us and give us 67 percent, I guarantee because they're say your not asking for that. This is pension able trust, 25 percent should do you good and we're opening up a can of worms and we'll be sorry for it and we've always been dealing with one third and a one third is 66.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lazarenko. Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank You. When I was first on council in 1989, we had a meeting at the Convention Centre when at that time the committee was known as Works and Operation presented their report when they decided to go with the BLT system and over the past 15 years, I could bring a report that would be about this high and the number of times that we studied this and the number of consultations and the number of community services

Mr. Speaker: How does this, this is way off topic Councillor.

Councillor Thomas: What I want to say is that whether it's 67 percent or whether were diddling with the numbers, I know I only know half the story, cause this has been going on for 30 years, not one more report, the time for action is now. It's not a matter to me of whether it's 67 percent or 64 percent or 25 percent, that's most irrelevant, as far as I'm concerned this is a minor change and just putting lipstick on, the problem is with the clause itself, we can't be supporting another rapid transit task force when what we really have to do is get on with implementing rapid transit. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Thomas. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. If I'm understanding this right, Mr. Speaker, I think Councillor Angus is concerned that if we put a specific number in there, it saying we have to have 60 percent of the total system

Mr. Speaker: or more,

Councillor Gerbasi: costs, so basically to support that motion as it's written today, were completely killing rapid transit forever, because no city builds their transit system but in phases and so if that's how I'm understanding it, what Councillor Angus is trying to give us some wiggle room so we don't have to have two thirds of the whole thing. Am I misunderstanding it. That's right.

So, the purpose of the motion is to say, it says substantial percentage, which gives us some wiggle room. But, it still saying and if we pass this clause today, it still saying that if we don't have big percentage of the whole system already funded were never going to build it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Angus did you wish to close debate.

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker, sometimes you wish you never introduced a motion because it's more complication then its worth. But, Councillor Gerbasi is right, I was trying to give us some wiggle room to take opportunity, but Mr. Speaker the reality is we can always come back to council and say let's forget what we did in the 67 percent.

And so, unless you insist that this stay on the floor here, I would be more than willing to with the consent of the Mayor to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: It's in the hands of council. I think a vote would be just as easy. There's no more speakers. All in favour of amendment, motion number 6. But he can't. We have to have the same vote to give him permission to withdraw it. No this is to support the motion. Quickly, madam clerk go.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Angus, Benham, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Smith, and Steeves.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Pagtakhan, Thomas, Wyatt, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 9.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is lost. On the clause as amended by the earlier amendment. Recorded vote. I forgot I apologize. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I accept your apologizes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I must confess that this has been very different from my first council meeting. And I will tell you that the reason I ran for office was to implement positive change. It was to fight a battle that had to be fought. It was to make sure that every council member had the opportunity to have access to all the information, have access to the Mayor on a regular basis and always try to make informed decisions.

That was my purpose in running. I've heard many comments here today. I heard people talk about the federal money. Here's what I can tell you about the federal money because I prefer to speak in fact not fiction.

The president of the federal treasury board has delivered personal assurances that he will respect the city's lead on these priorities. He has also assured me that the money will not come at the expense of other federal money. The idea that Winnipeg is somehow loosing money on this resolution is just not true.

The fact is, that a handshake was all it took to announce the federal BRT funding in the first place. There still is all these months later no agreement in place for the BRT funding. In fact, some Councillors have told you, have suggested that there is some kind of signed deal. Not true.

I heard people say that if we don't do it now, it will never happen. Why I think everybody here knows because I've said it more times than I can remember, that I support rapid transit. I believe every member of the floor of Council including almost everybody in the gallery supports rapid transit.

I hate to go back and give another example where they said it would never happen. And you know how many times people came back to build a new arena and it was turned down. Well guess what, today we do have a new arena. So no one's going to tell me, it will never happen.

And when people talk about mandates, I heard one Councillor speak of mandates. Well I will tell you with all respect, Councillor Benham you mentioned the mandate from your voters, I will tell you that I too have a mandate from the voters. And I also have a very very very strong mandate from the voters in River Heights.

And my mandate is to make difficult decisions and make sure that every Councillor has the opportunity to make a right decision because these are not easy decisions we make but that's why we're here.

The mandate is to work with Council to set priorities and make those tough decisions. That's what this vote is all about, priorities and decisions.

Some of us want to have everything. I wish that was possible. But if we could just get everything we want, then we would not need government at all, would we. And you what, everybody said we could fund community centres later. Well funding community centres later, interesting idea. I note that we already are facing projected deficits in 2005 and 2006.

We have no new money deal yet and a capital budget under tremendous strain. So how exactly are we going to find some

funds later on for the real needs that we've identified for community centres. That's exactly the kind of thinking that leads to financial problems. Being responsible is about making tough decisions and identifying priorities. This resolution supports the right priority for Winnipeg and that's the mandate that I have for Winnipeggers.

I have met with residents, I have met with transit customers, I have met with bus drivers. They want the foundation fixed before we buy a new car and community centres lie at the heart of our social, of our cities social foundation.

And in conclusion, I found it rather interesting when Nick Turnette was making his presentation and Councillor Gerbasi asked a very good question referring to Toronto and one billion dollars and does the city have that money, where are they going to get that money for Winnipeg. Well what I say to you is emphatically, that phase one of the BRT is 75 million dollars, and why do I say that, because that's what was requested of the two senior levels of government and it was turned down. And it doesn't make a difference if it's 50 or 75, but the total package is 400-425 million and probably will be higher and I guess I wonder do we have that money and the answer is no.

Thank you very much and I hope that you will support me.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Recorded vote on the clause as amended. All in favour of the clause 5, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Clement, De Smedt, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Steeves, Wyatt, Lazarenko, Mr. Speaker Councillor O'Shaughnessy.

Nays

Councillors Angus, Benham, Gerbasi, Smith and Thomas.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 5.

The clause is carried. Now move onto the Executive Policy Committee, the report of this morning, September 29, 2004. One item, report on Heritage Conservation Tax Credit. Madam clerk would you introduce the clause.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 29, 2004

Item No. 1 – Heritage Conservation Tax Credit - former Scott Fruit Company Warehouse, 319 Elgin Avenue
File G-3.1.5

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I would like to move to suspend the rules so that this clause can be heard and talked about.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour of the rules suspension to deal with this clause. All in Favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 1, any explanation needed on the Heritage Tax grants. I think it's unanimous, is it not. All in Favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motions. You have a motion number 3 moved by Councillor Angus, which is automatic referral.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS maintaining adequate reserves provides the City with the ability to respond to unexpected events and extraordinary situations such as natural disasters, maintain stable taxes and ensure sufficient funds are available for major capital projects;

AND WHEREAS City Council has authorized the establishment of Capital, Special Purpose and Stabilization reserve accounts;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has established guidelines and rules regarding the expenditure of funds in reserve accounts;

AND WHEREAS maintaining adequate levels of funding in reserve accounts forms an integral part in maintaining the City's credit rating and allows the City to undertake long-term future planning;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Charter puts restriction on the use of reserve funds as follows:

289(4) Money raised for a reserve fund established under subsection (1) shall not be expended or pledged for any purpose other than that for which the fund was established, except where
a) the chief financial officer certifies that the amount in the fund is greater than the amount required for the purpose for which the fund was established;
b) the amount in the fund is no longer required for the purpose for which the fund was established; or
c) the purpose for which the fund was established is terminated;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that any expenditure out of a reserve fund for a purpose other than which it was established or is allowed by the City of Winnipeg Charter, require a two third's majority vote of Council.

Mr. Speaker: And moving onto by-laws for first reading only, your Worship.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: I'd like to move that by-law numbered 130/2004, 135/2004 and 145/2004 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Consideration of by-laws, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that by-law numbered 134/2004 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 134/2004.

Mayor Katz: I'd like to move that by-law numbered 134/2004 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 134/2004.

Mayor Katz: I'd like to move that the rule be suspended, and that by-law numbered 134/2004 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: We'll move onto question period. Councillor Lazarenko could you take the chair for a short while please. Questions. Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Just a very quick question to Mr. Mayor, as we sort of passed the 67 percent requirement for the total project of rapid transit before it can proceed. Is the same principle going to apply to the community centres package. Is it your intention to sort of, or is it too early to tell.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: We all know what the tri-party agreement is, basically one third, one third, one third and that's what the two thirds, i.e. 67 percent came from and I believe that will continue to be the same situation and we will get that same support and hopefully we'll get more.

Councilor Angus: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any further questions of the mayor. Say none. Mr. Mayor you did a good job, only one question. The report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, Report of September 14, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2004

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce and move the Public Works Committee meeting dated September 14, 2004, Items 1 to 4 as consent and number 5 as laid over Mr. Speaker.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law numbered 129/2004, 131/2004 and 147/2004 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 129/2004, 131/2004 and 147/2004.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law numbered 129/2004, 131/2004 and 147/2004 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 129/2004, 131/2004 and 147/2004.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-law numbered 129/2004, 131/2004 and 147/2004 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, Councillor Angus.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Angus: Mr. Speaker, just very quickly, Gord would you be kind enough to provide us with an update, Council with an update on the costs of the Kenaston Underpass. I know that it was 39 million dollars when I was back in the chair and a lot of water has gone under the bridge and I see they've done the public open houses and if you would be kind to give us a summary of how much it's costing and perhaps, I would appreciate it.

Councillor Steeves: I will undertake to do that, certainly no problem. I have to say right off the cuff that 39 sounds low, based on what I've heard recently, but I will get back to you with the exact number.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions. If not, Standing Committee on Fiscal Issues, no report. Motions if any, none. Consideration of by-laws, none. Question Period, no questions. Next is the Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development, report of September 7, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPEMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 7, 2004

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the Report of Property and Development for September 7, 2004 be received, and move Items 1 through 30 be adopted by consent.

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

Property and Development motions, Mr. Clerk is there any motions, 1 motion.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan
Seconded by Councillor Angus

WHEREAS on July 21, 2004, Council adopted Item 6 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated July, 9, 2004, with respect to the rezoning of property located at the northwest corner of Bayridge Avenue and Ulster Street from an "RM-2" Multiple-Family District to a "C2" Commercial District to allow for *commercial development;*

AND WHEREAS Clause 1. A. iii. reads as follows:

1. A. iii. That the subject land shall be used for the storage of lumber only;

AND WHEREAS the proposed use, the storage of lumber, by itself, (Wood Yard) is not a permitted use in a "C2" Commercial District;

AND WHEREAS it is the intention of the applicant that the subject lands be utilized for the storage of lumber in conjunction with an adjacent lumber and hardware products sales and storage operation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council reconsider its decision of July 21, 2004, decision as follows:

1. That Clause 1. A. iii. be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

1. A. iii. That the subject land shall be used for the storage of lumber, only, in conjunction with an adjacent Building Materials, Hardware, Home Improvement Supplies or Equipment: Sales use.

2. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Councillor Angus: One motion, Mr. Speaker and I would beg the indulgence of council to suspend the rules. The administration has advised Councillor Pagtakhan and myself of a bit of an error on an item in my ward, a re-zoning and this is simply going to correct it for the by-law. It just, they brought it to our attention, so I respectfully request suspension of the rules, that Councillor Pagtakhan introduced it, but it's in my area and so that's why I'm speaking on it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor your in favour.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, I moved the motion.

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

On the motion, All in Favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Pagtakhan By-laws.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that by-laws numbered 124/2004, 125/2004, 126/2004, 127/2004, 128/2004, 133/2004, 136/2004 and 137/2004, 138/2004, 139/2004, 140/2004, 141/2004, 142/2004, 143/2004, 144/2004, 146/2004 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 124/2004, 125/2004, 126/2004, 127/2004, 128/2004, 133/2004, 136/2004, 137/2004, 138/2004, 139/2004, 140/2004, 141/2004, 142/2004, 143/2004, 144/2004 and 146/2004.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll like to move that by-laws numbered 124/2004 to 128/2004, both inclusive, 133/2004, 136/2004 to 144/2004, both inclusive, and 146/2004 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 124/2004 to 128/2004, both inclusive, 133/2004, 136/2004 to 144/2004, both inclusive, and 146/2004.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll like to move that the rule be suspended, and that by-laws numbered 124/2004 to 128/2004, both inclusive, 133/2004, 136/2004 to 144/2004, both inclusive, and 146/2004 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.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that by-laws numbered 148/2004 and 149/2004 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 148/2004 and 149/2004.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll move that by-laws numbered 148/2004 and 149/2004 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 148/2004 and 149/2004.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll like to move that the rule be suspended, and that by-laws numbered 148/2004 and 149/2004 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, no report. No motions. Consideration of by-laws. Your Worship, Mayor Katz.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Katz: First of all, let me apologize to all council members for the short notice. This was brought to my attention yesterday and there was a meeting this afternoon actually at twelve o'clock. This is in reference for all those just to make sure, closing the lights to accommodate the new hydro building and unfortunately they, a decision is required by September 30, 2004 so that's why it's here.

So, I'd like to move that By-law numbered 132/2004 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 132/2004.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I'll move that By-law numbered 132/2004 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 132/2004.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-law numbered 132/2004 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. No question period.

Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services dated September 13, 2004.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2004

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd like to move the report of Standing Policy on Protection and Community Services dated September 13, 2004. There's item 1. I

see Councillor Lubosch is standing it down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Lubosch, okay, thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: I can introduce it briefly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay, you introduce it, yes.

Item 1 - Community Incentive Grant - John Black Memorial United Church File PR-2.6(33)

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. This is a community incentive grant that doesn't meet criteria; it is the reason the Standing Committee did not support it. The reason, it basically is fixing a roof on a church. I don't know, we have a lot of churches in Winnipeg and I guess the committee felt we need our recreation funds to go into recreation or maybe reasons why the ward Councillor felt that there was community things going on there of value, but the committee choose not to support the grant. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll beg council's indulgence; I know it's been a long day. The John Black United Church in North Kildonan is a church, but it operates as more of a community centre than a church the other six days of the week. In fact, the roof is required to keep the rain and snow out of the building and out of the hall and the rooms that are used from senior's groups, the Good Neighbour Senior Centre used to consider it their home. They are now in Elmwood and I wish Councillor Thomas was here because she supported this grant at community committee when it was there back in July.

There is a lot of other activities that go on in the church. they open their doors to the boy scouts, the girl guides, the beavers, there's other kids organizations that meet there. There's senior organizations like the Garden Club that meet there. It hosts a local art show each and every year where local artists both professional and amateur artists come to display their work. It's a three-day event and its very well attended.

The amount they're asking for Mr. Speaker is $6,448.00 which would be contributed as part of an overall project cost of $25,000.00 They've raised $8,000.00 of their own money. There is various fund raising initiatives and although the application that we have before us shows that the province hasn't, hadn't committed at that time, I can tell you that the province has already put its community, places, and signage in front of the church and they are in fact supporting this project.

There's precedent for supporting John Black United Church in the past. Former Councillor for North Kildonan, Terry Duguid had provided them with money to replace some of the windows, to allow better lighting into the church basement where a lot of these activities take place.

I found it interesting and in fact enlightening to know that Executive Policy Committee on September 22 supported a request by the Manitoba Hindu Society for a land dedication reserve funding in the amount of $25,000.00 and in fact today, not only did we approve that Mr. Speaker, but we approved an Executive Policy Committee amendment which was put forward on September 22 that the criteria of the council policy for land dedication reserve funding be waived for any expenditures which do not qualify.

Now in this case, community incentive grant comes to us we know that the money is for a roof. I don't have any idea what the $25,000.00 dollars is going to be used for by the Manitoba Hindu Society but I have faith in the West Kildonan Community Committee, which ultimately looked at this issue carefully at their meeting and determined that the need for the money had merit and that the city should contribute to it. And this is on top of the $15,000.00 community incentive grant that the West Kildonan Community Committee had already provided to the Manitoba Hindu Society.

So, I guess what I'm begging those Councillors who are still here today and Mr. Mayor to do, is to give the residents in North Kildonan and the members of the John Black United Church the same consideration that the residents in West Kildonan received when they asked for funding that may not have not met all the criteria for which the funding was set out.

And I hope you will give favourable consideration to this request for funding for $6,448.00. I know that it's not a grant that's directly related to sport activity or directly related to recreation but it does keep the rain and snow and the elements off of the people who are participating in the recreation activities in the church and I dare say that if they're a bunch of youngsters in the church, that chances are they might be playing floor hockey or something which is sport related when the inclement weather outside is not favourable for that activity. So, I hope you'll see fit to support this. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Speakers Councillor O'Shaughnessy followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't believe in parochialism in very many areas but I do believe that in certain obvious limitations that Councillors should have the right to know, to exercise their knowledge of their ward and I think that's what Councillor Lubosch has done.

He knows that this church has scouts; he knows that this church has a senior's group, that those are recreational activities. He knows that the province has come through and now total project funding has occurred, which means that if you look at the criteria, they all have been met now because the money is all there and our people may not consider it sport or recreation, it is capital, it's a roof.

By the way, my name was on there to speak before you mentioned West Kildonan (in audible). And I think you now your ward. This isn't for something obscene or in any other way wacko and I would trust your knowledge in your area. You now what, the voters in North Kildonan will be your judges and in this case I think they'll judge that you've done well. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I supported this request for funding when Councillor Lubosch brought this forward at the community committee of East Kildonan-Transcona. I sit on the committee of Protection and Community Services and I supported it there even though the committee choose not to support it.

I think Council, in the past we've always had a rancorous debates on these sorts of issues but I, the reality is Mr. Speaker this is a church which has opened its doors to the community. Allows the community to use its facilities, allows for seniors to use the facilities, allows for children, scouting groups, girl guides to use the facilities. So I think by showing some support here for this church, I don't think were stepping out of line with regards to our existing policy. I think were being somewhat sensible and clearly the Councillor for the area has identified a need and feels that this makes sense.

And I concur with my colleague's words, Councillor O'Shaughnessy that he knows his community better than anybody else and sees this as a need. As we should note, I recall that if I'm not mistaken, this does, if it does go to recorded vote I don't know if it's necessary but a two thirds vote on community incentive grants, so I would just ask Councillors to keep that in mind and keep in mind the amount of money.

I think it is a worthy project, I support my colleague and I thank him for bringing it forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm just picking up the point from Councillor Wyatt, yes it is a two thirds vote and off course just in case everybody's trying to count before hand. I

mean I'm on line in supporting Councillor Lubosch in this. He does have an understanding, it is recreational participation. I'm sure he's being very selective when he identifies where committee's incentive grants should be, so I would be supporting him and I hope we can get the required two thirds vote for him. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No further speakers. Councillor Gerbasi closing debate.

Councillor Gerbasi: Councillor Lubosch has made a pretty compelling argument and I think it's recreation and it's a small amount of money and I don't have a problem supporting that. Our capital priorities in my opinion are so totally out of whack after the decision we just made, what's $6,000, so I'll support Councillor Lubosch as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lubosch would you want to move that as a positive motion.

Councillor Lubosch: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All in favour of the EPC recommendation. The positive motion Councillor Lubosch moves that the grant be approved. Thank you.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie recorded in opposition.

Motions, if any, none. By-laws none.

Question period. None.

Councillor Eadie moves adjournment.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Roll call madam clerk.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Councillor Lazarenko, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Eadie, Angus, Benham, De Smedt, Gerbasi, Lubosch, Magnifico, Pagtakhan, Smith, Steeves, Thomas, Wyatt and O'Shaughnessy.

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 3:51 p.m.