COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday January 26, 2005

The Council met at 9:32 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 Magnifico.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Due to exams and other pressures we don't have any pages with us this morning.

MINUTES

Councillor Angus moves the Minutes of the meeting held on December 13, 2004 and December 15, 2004 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Move onto the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 12, 2005, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 12, 2005

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the Report of EPC for January 12, 2005 and move adoption of consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

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

Report of January 19, 2005 sir.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 19, 2005

Mayor Katz: I'd like to introduce the Report of EPC for January 19, 2005 and move adoption of consent Agenda Item 1 to 18. I would like to draw Council's attention to the amendment to motion number 7.

Mr. Speaker: Be it known that motion No. 7, committee appointments will be taken as consent. I'm sorry, can I have an order here, Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Four.

Mr. Speaker: One, Three, members of EPC are, I don't know are members of EPC permitted to stand down their own items. Are they subject to internal disciplinary action. Consent agenda Items 2, 5 through 18 I believe, Mr. Clerk, 7 being as amended.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clauses 1, 3 and 4 have been stood down. Clause 1, Mr. Mayor did you wish to introduce the clause.

Item 1 - Plan Winnipeg Amendment: Waverley West
File EP-1.1 (PW 2/2003)

Mayor Katz: As we all know here, it wasn't that long ago where we had two days of hearings which started early in the morning and went late in the day on the Plan Winnipeg Amendment. The purpose was to determine whether or not there was a need for more housing lots in the City of Winnipeg so people could have choices of where they have desires of living. We had people come forward on both sides, very passionately make their case. In the end there was very little doubt in my mind or in the minds of EPC that a case had been made that we do require more lots in the city of Winnipeg and I will let the others speak to that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt I believe you'd asked to be stood down along with Councillor

Gerbasi and Benham, Angus, no, okay, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Today, this meeting will be crucial Mr. Speaker with regards to the approval, or not approval of Waverley West as if approved here by in large it goes on to the province and the Minister as we know and most likely the Minister will order a Municipal Board hearing, but lets be honest the Municipal Board is largely politically appointed and this seems to be of high importance to the province, the Premier only has to crack his whip and the seals on the Municipal Board will get in line and pass this as they, will be told to do.

We live in a province today Mr. Speaker where by in large we have one person running the province, we're provincial Ministers seem to be scared to speak out on substantial issues never mind back benchers. We don't live in a democracy anymore, in Manitoba we live in doeracracy, well doeracracy, Gary Doer sneezes and we run with the tissue to wipe his nose. Waverley West is a turning point for our city while most of North American cities, suburban development or sprawl has become the norm. Even now in the United States the term ex-urban has been created to develop beyond the norm of suburban developments.

From this a clear pattern Mr. Speaker has developed. American city after American city has encouraged more and more sprawl to watch their downtowns and central business districts die. This pattern has been followed by millions of dollars of urban renewal for downtown urban renewal.

With Uncle Sam, sometimes stepping in to pay the bill to make up for that. We have a situation then where quite often after the fact, monies are placed in surrounding neighbourhoods, surrounding communities to try to renew them as the sprawl tends to also derogate and create ghettos, inner city neighbourhoods surrounding downtowns.

The time has come Mr. Speaker for the Doer government and the partners here in Waverley West to lay the cards on the table with regards to the real costs of this business venture being sprung upon the citizens of Winnipeg. What will be the true costs with the acceleration and decline of our older neighbourhoods by encouraging more outlay migration.

We are loosing the battle in Winnipeg with regards to this and it's the existing neighbourhoods that are taking the hit. Every month ever since being on the Property and Development Committee its hard not to notice that in the in-camera meetings, we take over anywhere from five to ten to twenty new properties in the inner city on tax arrears. These are dilapidated homes, empty lots, properties which home owners are prepared, the property owners are prepared just to walk away from. This is happening in Point Douglas, this is happening in the West End, this is happening in the North End.

Yet, Gary Doer and his big business partners propose to build his own vision and version of Fantasyland, the so called model community. Real communities are dying and rotting in the mean time. An example of this hit home recently last year where a charitable organization, a well known one Habitat for Humanity decided to build some homes in so called suburban communities like Transcona, St. Vital, St. Boniface, homes as we know are for working poor, folks who cannot afford to get a mortgage from a regular bank or who can not seem to accumulate enough equity to be able to put down the down payment.

When I asked Habitat why are they building now in the suburbs and not in the inner cities, the response was quite simple, we can't retain value when we build homes in the inner city. The homeowners are folks who we're trying to help move in, they have a 20 year mortgage, they pay that off their mortgage, so much a month even being discounted and at the end of the day the value of the house that they were paying towards is not there, its declined.

So, they make a conscious decision, we want to help working people, we want to help the working poor and the only place

we can do that is to get out of building solely in the inner city.

This I think hits home Mr. Speaker that we are loosing the battle. Good public policy with the provincial government leading the charge would create zones for renewable by aggressively funding and creating incentives for in fill development in old neighbourhood housing renewal. Instead not only does the province offer crumbs off the table in the form of cosmetic programs that act more like window dressing instead of substantial action.

Mr. Doer now wishes to exasperate the situation by making matters worse. Waverly West amounts to a government sellout or fails to address the problems head on rather than join; it joins instead and becomes part of the problem. Jump in the bed with the big business and big business developers in a rush to build Fantasyland and it's a shock, Gary Doer who's suppose to lead a social democratic party in government is acting more and more like a Conservative, in deed if Gary Filmon sold off MTS to pay off growing debts, now Premier Doer is proposing to sell off provincial crown lands via Waverley West to pay off his growing budget deficit.

Don't be fooled, the costs of new urban sprawl such as Waverly West are real. We will pay for the new regional, who will pay for the new regional streets, the regional extensions, the widening, new underpasses, overpasses. As I said previously to Councillor Angus the other day, there's no doubt in my mind that we're going to have to not only take Kenaston as a four lane, we're going to have to turn it into six lane, you putting 30,000 people in a community the size of Brandon. We're going to have to twin roads, build underpasses, build overpasses, the demand will be great.

It the province's existing record investing in Winnipeg's infrastructure is any sign of things to come as pointed out quite correctly by the Mayor in his State of the Union address, don't expect much help from them. If the folks out in south west Winnipeg thought their traffic problems were bad, they've seen nothing yet. Who will account for the wasteful use of our existing resources such as schools that are half empty in existing older neighbourhoods that are dying for renewal. Yet a new suburban community schools are bursting at the seams not being able to keep up with the growth or poor planning that has gone with it.

So, let's lay the cards on the table. Waverley West is not needed. Reality check number one, we already have more than enough land in Winnipeg set aside as neighbourhood policy areas to meet our future needs. Developers, propaganda machine backed up with the province has been very impressive with the information rolling out and the developers are right, they're right, in south west Winnipeg which has grown fast is now almost out of lots but when they make this argument its almost as if the rest of the city has dropped off the map and doesn't exist. This industry propaganda supported directly by the province.

The reality is the law of the land is available Mr. Speaker for development in the west and in the north west and in the north east and in the south east. There is more than enough land available in the rest of the city for Winnipeg to develop for years to come. Only one section of the city has run out of raw land for development and that is the south west. By further developing the south west at the expense of the rest of the city, we will only insure one thing, more and more demand for greater and greater services and infrastructure for the south west.

Build and divide it and now you must feed it, one area of the city benefiting while the rest pay the tab. Reality check number two, if the province had any political common sense they would develop a policy that would accomplish two goals.

First Mr. Speaker they would work to restrict urban sprawl in outlaying areas including the capital region and secondly they would work with the city to aggressively renew existing neighbourhoods and encourage infill housing opportunities. This would be sustainable and it would indirectly delay

the need for development of new communities.

And finally Mr. Speaker, reality check number three. Gary Doer has no intention of recognizing reality check number one and reality check number two. To do that would require political leadership. It would mean saying yes to some people and no to others and he has not become the most popular Premier in the country by saying no to people including who he prefers to follow and let the chips fall where they may no matter what the future costs and consequences.

Our city and province deserves better. I started this speech out Mr. Speaker by saying that Waverley West represents a turning point and I do believe that. We have done much in the last decade to try and renew our downtown and more work needs to be done and now we must double triple or even quadruple our efforts to renew our existing neighbourhoods. Three years ago I started to spot the odd boarded up house in my community, Transcona. What has happened in the inner city can also happen in Transcona and in St. Vital and in East Kildonan and in St. Boniface and in Fort Rouge and even St. James and heaven forbid River Heights. Some say that the signs of decline have already been spotted in parts of Elmwood and West Kildonan.

We have a choice Mr. Speaker, we can build a city on a hill, a shining city on a hill, it's difficult, it's not easy, it involves patience and tolerance, it includes ideas that the quality and goratarisum. Its called building a city where the secretary or the person who collects rubbish, or the person who's a simple labourer, labourers in the same neighbourhood as the doctor, the lawyer or the entrepreneur business person and the doctor, lawyer and business person lives in their neighbourhood.

For just as we know that the ghettos that are created because of somebody's lack of wealth are disappointing and depressing, so are the ghettos created when we build simply ghettos made out for the rich. We have a choice Mr. Speaker, we can grow like American communities with all the huge and beautiful suburbs and ex urban areas only to be contrasted with old neighbourhoods and massive decline or we can look to other areas of the world like Western Europe and follow their lead as they have been forced to slowly recognize what we have failed to recognize so far and that's the worlds resources are finite, no infinite and a better use of those resources begins at home. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll be voting against this clause.

Mr. Speaker: Really, thank you Councillor, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. The decision of EPC last week and the decision of Council today will be based on a number of assumptions and I'm greatly concerned that these assumptions have not been questioned thoroughly enough. I'm also concerned that this Council is not showing the leadership and vision required to do what's right for Winnipeg.

An assumption is being made about the impact of this new suburb on the ongoing financial sustainability of the city. Cost benefit studies did include operating costs for new transit services for example into the new suburb. However, will Council have the political will when the time comes to actually add those new transit services into our actual budgets. Past history has shown that as the city has expanded, transit services shrunk. Is the political will there to support the transit system in the future. I have my doubts based on history and based on the recent decision to cancel rapid transit.

And what of all the other services that this huge area of the city will require. When the budget pressures come, will Council just decide to stretch services for recreation, street maintenance, snow plowing further and further or will it add all the money required into the budgets. These are the kind of assumptions we're making.

On top of the problem of the lack of political will to deal with the increased operating costs of the city, we have no capital region plan. We've heard in the

State of the City speech last week that the Mayor is eager to sell services to the capital region. I'm not sure why he believes other municipalities who are always crying poverty and want to keep their taxes low, why they would agree to give us a healthy profit for these services and now we're seeing a water park popping up a week later, I'm sure it's not helping the problem this kind of approach.

But one thing is clear, with this approach we're going to be stretching our thin services more and more through Waverley West and now even further beyond into the capital region stealing from the poorer inner city to give to the suburbs and even to non Winnipeggers now. This is crazy.

Another assumption is that the density of the new suburb will be higher than other ones that have been built in recent years. We know that higher density is a better land use and a better use of existing services. The cost benefit analysis is based on the assumption of a higher density development. But if the development community finds its not quite as easy to market that as quickly, will Council have the spine to insist on a higher density development. What if the market shifts or demographic projections change. I expect we will hear sorry folks, Waverley West will have to be less dense, effectively like all the other car oriented low density, driving from big box to big box developments that we've had in the past.

Will Council bend to this pressure and say the market has spoken based on what I heard at the discussion at EPC I expect so. Another assumption is that rapid transit will be built. It's obvious from the maps shown in the Planning Department's presentation that it is foolish to build this new suburb without building rapid transit at the same time.

We know Waverley West will bring massive pressures in the area of traffic congestion even with all the new infrastructure that's been calculated to be needed and put in. Pembina Highway will be a nightmare for example no matter what we do, but is the assumption that the rapid transit will happen realistic, is the political will really there, well forgive me if I doubt this Council's commitment to that.

Another assumption is that this development will not hurt the downtown and the inner city. We can say all the plenitudes we want, but it is a lot easier for developers to plunk down low density lots on empty land than try to build existing neighbourhoods. What commitment is there from this Council to housing in the inner city. We need more of a commitment than one new tax credit program idea. These are complex problems; we need to work with other levels of government to build affordable housing.

Right now each house built under the housing programs requires a $20,000 subsidy and even that is not enough to make that a low income house, housing. We need to build on the efforts of fragile recovering neighbourhoods such as West Broadway and Spence Neighbourhood and Point Douglas and that's only the tip of the iceberg otherwise we will slide back into a donut hole of a rotting inner city. Not only does that destroy people's lives, it costs suburban tax payers money and in the end all of us the quality of life and the quality of our city. Will money for housing be in our upcoming operating budget. The silence is deafening.

The Planning Department report speaks of a better way of doing things, the Director of Planning says that he recommends a collaborative approach. When I listen to the discussion at the EPC hearing on Waverley West, I heard Councillor Steeves at least talking about environmental and sustainable development and a collaborative planning approach. I also heard him admonish that his vision was quote too generous.

It appears that the majority view of EPC is to have a more basic vision, responding to the market forces primarily following the lead of the development industry in building what ever is easiest and will be snapped up the quickest if available. Reacting to proposals in an adversarial process rather than coming up with innovative ideas in a collaborative process with the community, developers

and Planning Department. Does this Council believe in a planned city or do they believe it is out of our hands, let the market take the lead or are we going to take the lead, the way that beautiful world class cities like Vancouver and Portland do.

The message I've heard from EPC is clear. The approach to development will be status quo, the same approach of passively reacting rather than being proactive.

Furthermore the entire process of amending Plan Winnipeg is seriously flawed for a number of reasons. We are forced to decide to build this suburb and work out the details later. The words trust me come to mind. I'm not sure the public is able to do that.

Why can't we hold off approving the amendment until the secondary plan is done. It seems like such a done deal anyway that it's going to be approved with the province being the provinces project, so why not do something creative here.

Another flaw in the process is that the province holds all the cards; it's the regulator as well as the developer. This makes absolutely no sense. Why did EPC not use the opportunity here to apply some leverage to the province. For example, they could have insisted on investment of the profits of this project be put into the inner city and downtown revitalization, they could have demanded controls on development in the capital region. Instead we are about to rubber stamp this project and give away all our bargaining power. I expect that EPC, I asked EPC at the Waverley West hearing to please put some teeth in this approval if they must approve it. Use this as a lever with the province to get some assurances about money being put into the inner city and downtown. They could have demanded that there will not be a continued subsidy of the capital region at Winnipeg's expense or even freeze development in the capital region until we've done our secondary plan.

But no, Council is poised to give up its power and now the citizens of Winnipeg are at the mercy of future decisions made by this Council. A wing and a prayer and a verbal promise and we've seen where that's gotten us in the past.

I strongly suggest that citizens participate fully in the next election because our future depends on who's sitting around this table.

In closing, I would like to say the way good things happen in Winnipeg is when there is the political will to make it happen to be creative, to roll the rock up the hill, to dare to lead in a new direction; I do not see any of that happening here today. The assumptions that justify this development are not supported in reality. The current toxic cocktail of lack of political vision and leadership of this Council will lead to endless sprawling car oriented suburbs and an environmentally and financially unsustainable city.

Madness is defined as going in the same direction over and over and expecting different results, so, I will not be supporting this amendment. A message must be sent of the status quo is not good enough. It is time for the change and actual leadership and courage that Winnipeg needs. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I certainly associate myself with some of the comments made by the two previous speakers, Councillor Wyatt is quite right to point out that God forbid River Heights to use his words that in fact all neighbourhoods are, all older neighbourhoods in Winnipeg are endangered by newer developments and that's one of the points I wanted to go on and make and of course I support Councillor Gerbasi's comments regarding the absolute necessity of bus rapid transit for this development to proceed and I will be expanding on those thoughts as well.

I did begin this process Waverley West is of course a very important issue to me Mr. Speaker given the geography of this city, given that it is immediately south of the people I serve in River Heights,

Crescentwood and Lindenwoods and I was prepared to be convinced and I will say Mr. Speaker that I will associate myself as well with the remarks of the Mayor earlier that a case has been made that if we need new houses and if we want to build them inside city limits so that we get to those taxes which of course is a very important point to me, then in fact Waverley West probably is our best bet, It certainly probably the only area with the kind of volume that we can foresee for the housing in the future with both our population increase and with the increasing rate of house formation, household formation.

But, it is clear to me that if we have 30,000 people coming to the corner of Kenaston and McGillivray every day on their way to somewhere else and every single one of them is driving a car they will face a decision at that corner and many of them will choose instead of going up Kenaston to use Lindenwood Drive East or Lindenwood Drive West to avoid the lights on Kenaston and Waverley, I'm talking about a very serious traffic issue for a very important part of my ward, how do I know this Mr. Speaker, how could I predict this because of course this is exactly what happened in River Heights and Crescentwood two valuable older neighbourhoods in this city with a very strong property tax base and they started to have lead through traffic as we started to build south of Wilkes in the 70's and 80's, Mr. Speaker I don't want to see us repeat those mistakes and therefore if we are to proceed with Waverley West, if the case is to be made then we simply must proceed with bus rapid transit, we simply must use our noggins and provide an alternative means for those 30,000 people to get out of Waverley West and into the rest of the city.

Today Mr. Speaker we are faced with an interesting situation as regards the future of bus rapid transit, what I am making a condition for my support of Waverley West. The Councillors were told and the Mayor informed the public and this Council that the money that was designated for bus rapid transit could be transferred to community clubs, kind of like transferring money from checking to savings at a Credit Union or a bank.

But Mr. Speaker the federal government is not a credit union or a bank as the federal Minister has reminded us, the federal government has rules and the federal Minister is responsible for ensuring that those rules are maintained.

The president of the Treasury Board has said two things clearly and consistently from the beginning of this process and to act surprised seems to me to be a bit disingenuous. It includes statements he made in a voice mail that I tabled on September 29 and for those who don't recall, I'll table it again in which he said two things, first, I will fight for you, I will fight for Manitoba and I will fight to get what this City Council wants but you have to meet the criteria of this federal program in order to get the money.

Mr. Speaker do community centres meet criteria for federal funding. What does the federal Minister say, the Minister says no, federal funding of community centres does not meet criteria of the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund and the province says if it doesn't then the province can't agree. What does the Mayor say; we're talking about bus rapid transit as a condition for Waverley West. Maybe it does, maybe it doesn't. Mr. Speaker ten Councillors in this chamber, yes Mr. Speaker, oh Mr. Speaker, I would hope you would stop the clock Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker is the clock going to stop. Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that Mr. Speaker. Thank you so much Mr. Speaker for that stand in favour of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, Councillors have voted to support the Mayor on the basis of a promise that 43 million dollars would be delivered to community clubs in their wards. Does anyone here believe that that is going to happen and if as every Councillor understands that money was going to come from the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund. Is it important what fund that money comes from. Yes, it is Mr. Speaker because all of us around this table understand that in order to qualify

for federal money you have to play by the rules.

When Councillors have to go out and I again associate myself with Councillor Gerbasi's comments that the year 2006 is coming. Councillors will have to go out and talk to the voters as they do on a continuing basis and I think they're going to be asked a couple of important questions, I think people are going to ask, what happened to the money that you promised me for community centres and why didn't you build bus rapid transit when you had the money.

If we had simply proceeded, construction would have begun, I want to correct an error I put on Council record Mr. Speaker, I said that construction would have begun in spring of 2005, in fact I checked the record, construction would have already begun if Council had not voted as it did on September 29.

I believe that the voters of Winnipeg will be asking all of us these questions, where's the money for the community centres and why didn't you build bus rapid transit when you had the money, Mr. Speaker when construction begins on bus rapid transit, Waverley West will have my full support, until that time I will vote against the motion. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Benham. Soon to be Mayor, Councillor Thomas.

Councillor Thomas: Thank you Mr. Speaker, just for the weekend I'm told. Okay, as you all know I do not routinely support developments. I have been very hard on developers and development and rigorous in my questioning, firm in my demands for good appropriate environmentally sustainable use of land.

I feel that all Council has access to this report here and in explaining my reasons why I am supporting this development I will start by going through this report which I'm sure you were all given at some point so if you have it on hand please follow along, if not I will not go into great details about it, but the first thing I wanted to say is that we do have a list of criteria that we gave the administration in developing it, demonstrated need for additional land to satisfy projected demand where there is a full range of infrastructure can be divided in a environmentally sound economical and timely manor.

Well, demonstrated me, I will just call your attention to page eight, the city of Winnipeg's population projections. We are at a level that we had thought in Plan Winnipeg when we approved it that we would be at 2013. we are at a level that when the Conference Board of Canada looked at it in April, 2002 they thought we would be at this level in 2009. Some people said well they're being a little bit over excited in the limited growth that has happened within the city but Statistics Canada has revised their projection and we have reached that level now. Our population is growing.

If I call your attention to page thirteen, housing demands. We all have strong housing demands in our area, but this, the south west quadrant has the highest need of housing demand. 37 percent of people who want to buy a home want to buy it in this area and if you go to page seventeen on this you will find that in the south west quadrant we have less than six months supply of land that is zoned residential and serviced on which people can develop. If you look at the recent develops that happened in the area, Lindenwoods completely full, Lindenridge, Whiteridge, Waverley Heights, Richmond West completely full. No land there, those are the ones that are immediately adjacent to the north and to the east of this development.

So it's not something that's out in the middle of nowhere, its contiguous, contiguous by on two sides. Now, ironically the area that I represent has the most service land available, two years, two years of service land available and I've been told that that's not in my area because I last summer approved two developments, one in Eaglemere and one in Valley Gardens and now my ward is completely full. There is no place to do

development in my ward unless you do a lot split. I'm full, full up.

People who want to come to Eaglemere, people who want to come to Valley Gardens, people who want to come to the rest of beautiful East Kildonan and Elmwood, God's country, the perfect place to live can't unless they're buying an old house and want to fix it up, they can't because there's no place for them in my area and I know they'd like to come because every house that is on the market and I studied what's on the market in my area, snapped up within a week.

I've had a couple of people who decided that they were moving into a seniors complex in my area, their house was gone before the day when they put it on the market. People want to live in the city anywhere they can but as I called your attention to the area in the south west quadrant, there is a demand for people wanting to live in the south west and you know that. The average length of residence in my area is 22 years and the people who are new in the area want to live near their Aunt's, their parents, their grandparents so they're buying houses in my community and the people who want to live in the south east quadrant want to live near their Aunts, their grandmothers, their mothers as well and they want to build close to them.

And now, given all that, we have something that is very magnificent in this province, we've had for several years in a row more people coming in than leaving and we've had amazing growth, unanticipated growth, unanticipated by Plan Winnipeg, unanticipated by the Conference Board of Canada, Statistics Canada surprised us all when they told us that we were at a level that we thought we would be at in 2013, that's eight, nine years from now.

We've got to do something about that. So is there a need for this development, there certainly is. A need to protect the inner city, yes there is, I represent an inner city ward and I think that is important, a need to strengthen and encourage development of marginal lands in the community. We have a few places where there are marginal lands that have become available or might become available very very soon but if you notice within, on page, where is the marginal lands thing, anyways, you'll find it if you look, marginal lands in the city on page sixteen, two developments together of 1605, 65, that is less than the amount of new housing development that occurred last year, last year, so if we develop those marginal lands and we certainly need to develop some policies around developing them and encourage developers to do that and do that in environmentally responsible way, that's good for one year.

Will this rate of growth continue. I don't know. We seem to be the hot place to be, but not just for one year, for the last five and the rate of growth is not remaining constant, the rate of growth is actually increasing with each year. So we don't know where we're going to be next year. We're the place to be in Canada. We're the place to be.

It's a problem we haven't had before but we've got to start thinking about this new position that we've found our self in.

Yes, I agree we have to do something about development but not just this one, all development we have to look at it. I've become aware of the fact that some of the other places around the country charge huge development charges per lot, some in excess of $30,000 per lot to do things like develop their streets and sidewalks, and police stations, fire departments, new buses, perhaps their rapid transit systems, we charge $36, we should look at that, we should look at that in context, in context of what it costs everybody else. I think we need to examine that.

I believe that Council is prepared to move forward on providing additional rigor to all developments and secondary plans but what we have here and what we need to acknowledge is that we are out of land in this sector and we are close to out of land in every sector of the city and my sector, the area that I live in, but not my ward, my sector has the most land to offer but it's not too much. Thank you very much. Don't normally need an extension but I

guess today I do, you guys have got me all excited.

Should this development be diverse, yes. Should, okay, thanks I'll calm down, should it be sustainable, yes. Should it be compact urban forum, definitely. I know given Council's expressed concerns that they have mentioned today and what we've heard from the citizens at large, that we need to review the secondary plan and the developmental plans that are presented very carefully and that we will all take a keen interest in ensuring that its done properly and we may need to give the Property and Development Committee additional directions on how they do developments everywhere.

But we shouldn't hold up putting new land into the neighbourhood area while we get our act together and do this because fellow Councillors we're out of land. It's how we do it that's important and I'm very confident by the concerns expressed here today that we will talk about this in depth on how we do do it.

When we look at the inner city I am confident that all Councillors will contemplate with sincerity and rigor what we can do to encourage people to develop compact urban forum in some areas where it has been deteriorated, but we have a program right now that is actually turning that around. Do we need to strengthen it, do we need to add more areas to it. Right now we're focused on four areas, the north Point Douglas area, the Spence Broadway area; I can't remember all the areas but its there. Do we need to look at adding more areas, do we need to look at adding more incentive, do we need to look at talking with the developers on what they need to encourage them to develop the kind of compact urban forum that we've all said we're sincere about having.

These are questions for all development and when we come to looking at the secondary plan and the development plan for this area, I hope we will all remember what we said here today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Angus: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. As the ward Councillor that's affected by this particular proposal I was not at the public hearing and choose not to speak at it, I was in fact out of town but I do want to say that there are, I recognize and I appreciative of the input of my colleagues, the need for the rapid transit and moving people out of the Waverley West is I think an important thing in the future, I will point out of course that it'll be 15 years to 20 years before you'll have the 30,000 people and in that time hopefully we can build some sort of a people mover. I think the Mayor and the Czar of transportation over there is on that track to try and construct something, so that's good.

The suggestion that we're deteriorating or taking away from the downtown, I must have missed that part, but what I did hear was that the people from representing the provincial government from MHRC said that all the profits from all of the land sales that they're going to be making are going to be dedicated to the downtown, to inner housing and it may come as a surprise to some of my colleagues but improvement in neighbourhoods whether they're downtown or anywhere else costs money and governments at all levels are stretching the elastic band as thin as they can to make sure that they reinvest what money they do have in appropriate areas.

So I have to take them on their word that they're going to after the previous NDP government back in Red, Ed Schreyer's time, I said red Ed Schreyer, I didn't mean to say red Ed, I just meant to say Ed, back in Ed Schreyer's day when they land banked all of this property for future development, you know they've sat on it now for almost 30 years and they're going to be unloading it, so I've taken them at their word that they're going to be developing it.

But the problem is as you have mentioned the downtown area needs fixing and we have to address some concerns of that and the help that the provincial government from the profits they're going to make and the new role that former Councillor Vandal has in trying

to address that issue, I'm comfortable will bring some positive results.

If we do not allow this development and do not allow for the sale of this land then those profits will not flow and then we will still have a problem of funding, financing and trying to make those things happen. So I'm not sure of its cart or horse or which comes first or any of that stuff but it sounds to me like a reasonably good plan because if we don't allow this particular type of development, then the people that are going to want to live in those suburbs are going to go to LaSalle or they're going to go the R.M. of MacDonald and they're doing that now by the thousands.

We see on a regular basis, we had a proposal to try and work out a cooperative arrangement for water services in the East St. Paul where we know that Marwest is going to build a development. We choose not to try and cooperate until the provincial government does something and that's fine, we've bit our nose off to spit our face on that issue a number of times and they're going to build them whether we want them or not and then we're not going to get any of that taxes.

So I think that its very important that we recognize that if we don't look at providing an opportunity for the people to be able to choose where they want to live, they will choose something that is not in our best interests, its called market demand and market demand is clearly showing in places like Pritchard Farms, in places like East St. Paul, in places like Stonewall and all of the areas in south of Winnipeg, R.M. of MacDonald and all of those places where accordingly they're going to building some sort of a water park pool, isn't that great.

You know the facts are that if we don't allow this and if we don't progressively think about how we can manage these developments we are going to loose them. And it may come as a surprise to some people, but not everybody wants to live downtown. Not everybody wants to live in the downtown area. Mike Pagtakhan clearly does because he lives down there, but he's about the only one here that I look around that I can think of that has chosen to live down there.

Harvey lives in the inner city I guess don't you Harvey, yes, you represent that ward and that's always a good thing. But not everyone wants to live down there so here's another interesting statistic, now I again wasn't at the hearing, I didn't hear so I've pulled this out of the reports that were there. Do you know that by the city accounts and the developer accounts that there is a profit in excess of costs of $1,358.00 per lot built that flows back to the city of Winnipeg.

Now let me repeat that, they build a house, they tax that particular house, the cost of servicing that house by both the developers agreement and the city's agreement is that the costs are going to be much less than the profit that we make on the taxes, so that means that $1300.00 plus for each unit that is built there flows back into the city. Now what does it do with it when it flows back to the city, it goes to help the Firefighters, it goes to fix inner city housing, it goes to fix streets because all of the costs for cleaning snow, picking up garbage and providing those types of services that are required for that are accounted for in the taxes that have been reduced.

So let's not again, once again bite off our nose to spite our face, let's look at the opportunities that we have to try and manage the development in such a way that it becomes more profitable. So, the province is providing the profits to the city, the per house profits will flow back to the city for us to do what we want and the only thing that remains is the process, again I would suggest to you that its going to take well it would be, to get up to the maximum capacity in year nineteen, year nineteen and that's 7500 homes, okay and according to my friend Bill Clement, there's six cars per home, trips, ten, ten, it doesn't happen in my family that way, I don't drive my car out and back and forth in my neighbourhood ten times but I believe that the Minister of Finance knows what he's talking about, so its going to be an awful lot of traffic.

So yeh, were going to have some problems. Its going to be dependent on us to make sure that the secondary plan that we develop this in such a way that traffic flows are mitigated to existing neighbourhoods as best we can, we're going to have to try and direct, ensure that the development pays for roads like the extension of Kenaston as best we can.

We're going to have to ensure that the province puts in the cloverleaf at the perimeter highway and that Waverley is shut down because it's working at capacity now. We're going to have to ensure in the secondary plan that there are and we have, I sat on a development committee which has changed the rules and has allowed the developers now to instead of having to put lakes everywhere for land drainage, they can put streams that will allow the water to flow and meander throw a neighbourhood, we've got to ensure that we reserve property on a hundred feet on each side of that for walkways and for bicycle paths and that that runs all the way from the St. Norbert Arts and Cultural Centre right up to the Fort Whyte Centre and people have got to see that image, they've got to know where Kenaston is going to go. We've got to make sure that we put aside a hundred acres for recreational facilities that are close to major arteries.

These are the principles that have to be adopted in a secondary plan and then we have to determine on a case by case development application basis as the market demands predict, what type of housing will go into each four or five hundred acres that they develop on a annual basis, if they can develop that many. If the immigration boom continues then fine we will develop as many as we can, if it doesn't then they will cut back, that's the way supply and demand works. The developers do not build homes on spec, they do not go out in a neighbourhood and say let's put up all of these houses and hopes that next year the city of Winnipeg will have an influx of immigrants and people wanting to move up and buy these houses.

Most of the houses that are out there are pre sold. The developers, the builders, the people that know how they're doing it and if we do not address the needs of this particular industry then we will loose them and once we've lost them it's a heck of hard problem to get them back. They move Mr. Speaker, they'll move to Calgary where they can get business, so they'll move to Edmonton where they can get business or they'll move beyond the Perimeter Highway to get the business.

So do not be afraid of expansion, development and applying the principles of market demand to the needs of a community. The community has to expand, how you're going to deal with the secondary plan, how you're going to deal with the continued development of this is going to be the crux of this particular matter and if I had known now or back when I first got elected in 1977 in Fort Richmond and Richmond West and all of those things, I'd had done a whole bunch of things entirely different. And if this passes, I've got a couple of motions that I think are going to try and set some tones that I think are important to be said. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

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

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker. This issue, its funny the perception depends where you're standing on this one because about six months ago, five months ago, I was at a opening of the showcase of homes in an area in Transcona that I forget the name of the development, we'll call it Waverley East just for a name and, Canterbury Park and its beautiful and the Councillor of that area was like a proud father, this is unbelievable. It's funny how urban sprawl can be distorted when it's your own ward, when that money and those houses could have been gone to the inner city.

But, I think that the point is Transcona or St. Boniface or Waverley or Charleswood, every area of the city needs available land for housing for the future. You have to have it for the reasons that have been mentioned before, people leaving town and the desire of people to live where they grew up. Their neighbourhoods, their areas. They need that and they want that

and as a city we are obligated to supply that.

Downtown has to grow. The inner city has to grow through economic spin offs. We need private money coming into this city to build our downtowns, not cannibalization of own government money over and over again. Our Mayor has indicated that his wish is to see private money coming into this city. That will revitalize our downtown. The business people that want to live downtown, the professional, that's your Waterfront Drives, that's the areas that we're looking at developing and its happening now slowly.

The inner city lots as in St. Boniface we have ours to take care of and Point Douglas and different areas. Unfortunately we're not equal, some people have a lot of money, some people have not so much money, but even people that make their 25 or 30 thousand dollars a year have a right to have their own neighbourhood. These neighborhoods exist, they're not as affluent as some of the other neighborhoods but they're still neighborhoods. We would take that away from them I don't think so. Every era and every time that history has ever had has had two different levels and there always will be. We have to take care of those areas just as we have to take care of the urban sprawl.

But you can't substitute one for the other. They're totally different and they always will be. I voted in support of this motion because I think it's good for the city.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Magnifico. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes Mr. Speaker, a few comments on the record on this important debate. Out of my other colleagues on executive committee I sat here in this chamber for two days of the formal public hearing process and I kept quiet and just listened to what the various presenters were saying and I made some notes and I want to make a couple of comments about a couple of the things that I heard during the hearings and one glaring example of one thing I did not hear at those public hearings.

On the first day of the hearings which was basically spent listening to those who are in support of the Plan Winnipeg amendment we certainly heard a number of the property owners in this particular Waverley West area come forward and outline some of them with considerable eloquence the reasons why this amendment should be passed and followed up subsequent to that with the necessary secondary planning that would have to take place if this designation should occur.

But there's one major property owner in this area from whom we did not hear Mr. Speaker and that was the provincial government. Not a single Minister of the crown could summon the intestinal fortitude to come to this hearing and outline as a major property owner in this area their vision for Waverley West and that was a significant absence of what I felt could have been very important information for this hearing.

Why they couldn't summon the interest I don't know, the excuse of a conflict of interest was banded about in press releases and they couldn't very well appear here and then sit around the cabinet table and make a pronouncement on the by-law when it gets there.

However at the end of the first day of public hearings Mr. Speaker, Premier Doer had no hesitation in speaking to CJOB about Plan Winnipeg amendment and Waverley West. As a matter of fact he used the word choices a lot, not that odd group but their choices.

Mr. Speaker he used the word choice a lot, he outlined that we as a government we believe that a sustainable number of choices outside of Winnipeg is good but we also have to have choices in Winnipeg. He went on to say that Winnipeg should have growth in the downtown area and in the areas of Winnipeg that allow the revenues to grow consistent with the population increases now in affect in Manitoba.

So maybe now we have a hint Mr. Speaker of where, what the provincial government's position is on this amendment, but all of a sudden it appears that the excuse of a conflict of interest is now flown out the window. It leads one to wonder when this by-law gets to the cabinet table will the entire cabinet now declare a conflict of interest because the Premier has already put his cards on the table and let somebody else make the decision on this by-law or are they actually going to ignore that particular excuse and behind the closed doors of the cabinet room actually make a decision on this and let us know what that is.

I want to speak about a process complaint that was raised by one of the presenters, a former MLA Cerelli who sent an email earlier in January and demanded to know how much time she was going to be allowed, the question process and then indicated that this is a manipulation of the public and it limits public participation.

We indicated at the start of the hearings that we wanted folks to try and keep their commentary within sort of a ten minute time frame, so that everybody would have a chance. When that former MLA came here, she, we allowed her twenty one minutes to rant about process and all of that and I want to say Mr. Speaker that as one member who is frequently had to appear at the legislature on behalf of the city government to speak to MLA's about bills that are of importance to the city of Winnipeg, I want to tell you my experience that frequently happened when this former MLA was there and had some say in the process.

You're lucky to get barely twenty four hours notice when you're invited to appear before legislative committee and when you get there this MLA and others would graciously allow you five minutes to say something after some debate, they debated amongst themselves whether it should be five, should be ten, always five and then you wait in line while everybody who lives outside of Winnipeg gets to speak first, God forbid they might have to stay in a hotel and then maybe three or four hours later you get your turn.

That's legislative process. Mr. Speaker we gave our by-law first reading in March of last year, everything was public then and they hold intent of the by-law. In early November we announced that public hearings were going to be held in early January, in early December the advertising took place and all of the documents, our planning documents and all of that became available to the public.

So many months notice of the intent and at least thirty days notice of the details so that people could take some time to prepare. So, there Mr. Speaker, I'll gladly put up my process against the legislature process any day and I know that we in the city of Winnipeg are not going to be found wanting.

The Council of Women Mr. Speaker, always here to say that we're never adhering to Plan Winnipeg, that amendments shouldn't be allowed to Plan Winnipeg, that all of them which are of course unfounded but people should be encouraged according to the Council of Women to live downtown. We should be encouraging downtown development and we shouldn't be allowing these other choices.

Interesting to note that of the three or four presenters from the Council of Women who I was able to find record of not a single one of them has chosen to live downtown. They all live in suburban areas, just like I do and that's fine. They all have the right to do that and they have the choice to do that but none of them have followed the courage of their convictions to live downtown.

So it's okay for them not to allow other people choices, but they can live in their suburban areas and that's just fine Mr. Speaker. People can't choose whether or not they want to live in Waverley West, they all have to be living downtown according to the Council of Women.

So, downtown only is good unless you're a member of the Council of Women and then suburban living is just fine. Thank you very much. So much for that.

Mr. Speaker the Plan Winnipeg legislation that we've been operating under does speak a lot about downtown first and indeed many policies that we've adopted over the years do take us in that direction. However the legislation does not have a single statement in it that says downtown only. We are a large and a diverse city and folks have the right in this city as long as we're still living in a free and democratic society to make their own choices as to where they wish to live.

Some people indicated to us that this Waverley West area seemed to be some where off in the country somewhere beyond Sanford I don't know because they kept saying we ought to be encouraging development in the city, I guess they never looked at a map because Waverley West is in the city in its entirety. It's almost surrounded by already developed residential developments. So it's contiguous to the city. One of the reasons why our planners recommended that we adopt this amendment, because it does make sense in terms of sustainable growth.

We're not leap frogging something. We're not creating urban sprawl, that famous phrase. This isn't urban sprawl. It's well planned; it would be well planned contiguous development in our city.

Mr. Speaker, the Plan Winnipeg by-law is a city by-law, it's city legislation and like any other piece of legislation it's not carved in stone, its not like the stone walls that are, around which this chamber is been built Mr. Speaker. Plan Winnipeg like any other piece of legislation can be a living and breathing document and from time to time when conditions warrant it, we change our legislation and some of those folks suggested well once we adopt the Plan Winnipeg by-law then we should never ever change it until we go through the review process every five or six years.

But those who advocate that obviously haven't read the legislation because there's a very clear statement in here Mr. Speaker which guides us all. Its says that City Council's role in policy development is ongoing and for Plan Winnipeg to be most effective it must continually guide this work recognizing that as the city's needs change so to must it meaning the by-law change. So Mr. Speaker that's what's we're doing here today, following these public hearings.

There have been many changes that have developed since this legislation was passed in December of 2001. Some of the things changes that have occurred as Councillor Thomas has said were not anticipated when we passed this by-law in 2001 but one of them is this whole situation with regard to Waverley West. It wasn't anticipated that growth would take place, that three years ago that growth would take place then as quickly as it has and so we're here today Mr. Speaker as legislators recognizing that the key statement in this Plan Winnipeg legislation that says as policy makers we have to be prepared and change in order to make Plan Winnipeg work effectively and that's why we're here.

This by-law recognizes that many things have changed in that quadrant of the city since the by-law came into effect in 2001 and that's why its been recommended that this amendment be adopted because we have to recognize that we have to recognize that change and then take steps to accommodate that change, that's why I'm voting for this amendment Mr. Speaker because it reflects a responsible policy decision, it respects what Plan Winnipeg specifically guides us as legislators to do on a daily, on a weekly, on a monthly, on a yearly basis, respond to change and do the things that are right and proper to make change happen. So I'm voting for this amendment and I thank you for allowing me to rant.

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

Councillor Steeves: There you go, thank you Mr. Speaker. I too as a member of Executive Policy Committee had a chance to sit through the many presentations, most of them very very good presentations within the course of two days and I'm not to proud to say I learned an awful lot, many many things I wasn't aware of prior to going into those hearings.

I also want to acknowledge the contribution of the previous speakers; I also want to acknowledge specifically the import and the gravity of this decision. This is not a decision I think that this Council should be making lightly and I think over the course of the two days at the public hearings what the debate seemed to crystallize down to was the idea that people who were opposed to this development are concerned Mr. Speaker that by spreading out growth in the city of Winnipeg we're going to loose the density within the city such that we won't be able to recognize a lot of the economies that we need to establish a strong city and as importantly the city will become a less exciting place to live, a less vibrant downtown, potentially less safe, etc. Those are the types of concerns.

The development community raised the concern that if these lots aren't put on stream we run the risk of not being able to keep up with projected demand for housing. Incredibly both sides of this debate seem to rely on the same theme as underpinning for why their particular position should be adhered to by Council and that was either if we don't allow this development to proceed we run the severe risk of loosing young people in our city. They'll leave for other places or conversely if we do allow this development to proceed our city will become less exciting and we'll loose young people to other cities.

What it told me is that both sides in this debate felt very very strongly about their position. Both sides of this debate felt that their position was the one to be followed and regrettably as everyone is aware we can't follow both positions but I hope what everyone learned as I learned is that there are legitimate and different view points on this and that we should be careful as we move forward in this process.

It's important to note I think and it hasn't been said yet today that historically in the city of Winnipeg it was us that asked for this. I wasn't part of that history but my understanding as reported by folks in this chamber and as reported by former Mayors that at some point the city of Winnipeg approached the province with respect to this land and asked that this land be brought on stream for development purposes in the city of Winnipeg.

That foresight was existed many many many years ago, potentially even decades ago when the city fathers and mothers thought that this land would be required by the city. That decision and that position was no doubt made by virtue of the fact that we don't have a capital region strategy. There is a capital region strategy I suppose but not an enforceable one.

Its interesting when we, the city of Portland has been brought up many many times over the course of this debate and it was brought up by many many delegations over the course of the two days that we sat here. I've been to the city of Portland, I don't know if anyone else in this chamber has been to the city of Portland, but one thing you'll know about the city of Portland which is a great city, one thing you'll know about it is that it has a regional planning authority that stewards not only the city of Portland but the 25 surrounding municipalities.

We don't have that and we can't pretend we have that. It doesn't exist. We have to make and I'm not complaining, I'm just recognizing that reality. We have to make our decisions in that reality without getting into the metaphors of who has what cards, that is a fact of life.

The city of Winnipeg administration was asked to bring back certain facts and they did so. They've told us and I'll quote from their own study that this development should be seen in a thirty year time frame. In that 25-30 year time frame we anticipate we'll need 35,000 new lots. We have available for development approximately 2300 new lots in terms of infill in the city of Winnipeg.

The green fill lots surrounding the city of Winnipeg are just over 20,000 for people's edification just so they're aware, the huge demand in the city of Winnipeg and the city of Regina and the city of Calgary and other cities right across Canada is not necessarily because

there's huge population growth. It's because the density in terms of people per household is declining. We've all heard told many many times around this chamber that if we move from 2.4 people per household in the city down to 2.3, the new need for net housing in the city of Winnipeg is about 10,000 units. That's at a zero population growth. That is what's driving this demand and the demand is real. It's not a made up demand, it's a real demand and it exists and we have to deal with it.

The way I see this by bringing Waverley West on stream Mr. Speaker is that Waverley West is green field development on the periphery of the city of Winnipeg not unlike at all the other 20,000 or so odd lots that exist around the periphery of the city of Winnipeg. Councillor Eadie is quite correct when he states or I don't know if he said this but he implied and he's quite correct, that Waverley West is actually much closer to Portage and Main than a lot of the proposed green field development around the city of Winnipeg, i.e. what I'm saying is if we were to build a Waverley West tomorrow which we're not going to do, but if we were to do that from a fiscal standpoint, from a environmental standpoint and from maybe other standpoints it might make more sense than if we developed way out west in Councillor Clement's ward or way up in the north east of Winnipeg which is a great area Mr. Speaker but Waverley West is actually more approximate than many of the green field developments that exist around the city of Winnipeg and that no one is debating are suitable and ready for development.

So the way I see this and I don't know if anyone else sees it this way, but the way I see it is we add this on to the stock and that if we make the choice that Waverley West is indeed one of the next places to be developed, then that may actually make more sense than some of the other green field development, green field sites that exist around the city of Winnipeg. I don't know if anyone else agrees with that standpoint but I think it's fairly easy to look at the map and notice that that's factually correct.

The concerns that I have with this development and I do have concerns Mr. Speaker are that our financial projections which were done by our administration which show an acceptable rate of return over a eighty year time period, those are based on certain conditions and certain expectations and Councillor Gerbasi did mention the densities and I want to re-mention those densities because I think they're very very important.

When ND LEA were making their presentation, I specifically asked and I remember the slide number, it was sixty six in their slide presentation, they talked about the densities and they compared the projected Waverley West development with the existing Whyteridge and Lindenwoods and as you know Mr. Speaker Whyteridge and Lindenwoods are right now at around three units per acre but not my facts, the developers facts. The projected use in Waverley West is estimated between five and six. In my estimation what that will result in if we stick to that and if we stick to that projection based on our financial models we should at the end of the day have a new and exciting and progressive development in this area such as Councillor Angus eluted to.

It doesn't have to be business as usual. People are evolving; cities are evolving all the time. Development is evolving all the time. There are plenty of examples Mr. Speaker right across Canada of different types of development that are existing in suburban environments that are very very progressive and very very sustainable.

Our financial models over the eighty year period are drawn with that in mind. I share some of Councillor Gerbasi's concerns when she states that it would be easy for this Council to get away from what we know is the right thing to do in terms of the projected finance and the projected densities. That is why we have asked as Executive Policy, we've asked our Property and Development Department to come back to us Mr. Speaker with an idea on how we're going to work on a comprehensive secondary plan development in Waverley West.

That makes Waverley West different in my estimation because that doesn't exist for Eaglemere or it doesn't exist for the new Bonneville for Island Lakes or for Royalwoods but it is going to exist for Waverley West. And it's for that reason that I still hold a sense of optimism. I mean I've accepted like a lot of people around this table that the demand exists. I have a difficult time imagining how someone could really advance a plausible argument that the demand doesn't exist. What I do hope for Mr. Speaker is that as a Council we'll stay on this file. We'll stay in this file and we'll make sure that ultimately this is a development that is a little bit different, it's not going to save the world, I acknowledge that, but it is a development that is going to be different than what we've done in the past, more progressive, more sustainable and better for our city. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Firstly I'd like to say this morning I heard on the open line show that the premier of Manitoba had stated that any profits that the province will make will be redirected to the problems of the inner city.

Now I've heard this just before I came into Council this morning and just also Mr. Speaker to put this in a directive manner this is not the first time this is come before Council, this proposal. The first application was made on September the 17th of 2003. Council decision on March 24th on the report from the Director of Planning, the only one who voted against it and I have to say at that time Councillor Magnifico or Councillor Benham and the Mayor were not here. Councillor Wyatt was the only one that recorded in opposition to his opposition to this. He was consistent, now all of a sudden I hear there's more, where was the concerns back when this was dealt with starting from 2003.

Mr. Speaker we've been dealing with the issues of bedroom communities, we've been dealing the issues of suburban sprawls going back to the 70's when we were responsible for the additional zoning. We had applications coming in from outside of the city of Winnipeg jurisdictions of building new sub divisions which we did at that time. Now we're faced with a problem of bedroom communities because you have an urban sprawl, now you're proceeding to provide housing which falls within the jurisdictions of the city of Winnipeg, those that we have dealt with are out of our jurisdictions, the tax base was gone.

This proposal Mr. Speaker addresses the issue of the need because if we don't proceed to go this direction we are going to loose more, more losses that will be built outside of the city of Winnipeg, the bedroom communities are going to be making a bigger profit.

When we proceeded to make those changes a number of years ago and I'd say close to 30 years back, north Portage redevelopment, what happened, they, most of those major retailers were moving into the suburban areas, the malls that we had approved through Council, said you're allowed to build this huge subdivision and also put in your big chain stores, you big box development, no objections from Council, so what happens we lost Eaton's, we lost pretty well the Bay, Holt Renfew, People's Credit Jewelers, all of those stores moved into the suburban malls where they have ample parking and people congregate, people go there even people from the inner city.

I as one don't shop downtown because the shopping, the parking is just ridiculous, you over park a bit and before you know it you get the eager beavers are there with their pencils to make sure that you get a citation to provide more revenue to the city. Now I've been raising this so many times. This proposal Mr. Speaker address the issue a total of 3,075 acres, the net development is 2,500 acres of 1,740 will be for residential development and it is going to allow 6 units per acre which will give us 10,044 new dwelling units. This is going to continue on till the year of 18 to 25 years from now.

It addresses the issue of the transit services. The proposal that is here and the report is here, the secondary planning process that'll take place, it addresses the transit services, there's a report from transit, police, fire, emergency service, community centre, recreational facilities, schools and etc. etc.

But, when this was dealt with at that time and I have to just, to go back to where I started. Why did majority of the members of Council not vote in opposition because then when Mayor Murray was the Mayor introduced this through the Executive Policy Committee all voted, I was one who voted for it, I don't object about having vacant land, I represented the Riverbend, Rivergrove area where acres and acres of land that were stalemate, there was nothing happening. We had frogs crawling all over the place until we decided to do something; we had to dedicate three, four acres because there was the concern of the frog plains of the area that they were historical. We had to do something.

But we did develop that area and that area continues, it still continues to develop, you cannot have land that is sitting idle because what is going to happen with it. These acres that are in this location rejecting this, what'll happen. The provincial government will have a say in this to, look you can't blame the province too much because how many of us actually gone and met with the provincial cabinet Ministers.

We have the Intergovernmental Affairs Councillors, did we ever get a report to Council of their discussions, having meetings. I'm prepared to go with Councillor Smith to meet with the Premier head on and I want to know what will be coming to the inner city I represent, 41,000 people I want to know right directly from the Premier, what is your business plan and if this is one of them, I'll congratulate him.

When applications are made, I know years back in the 70's we had a tendency of any time a developer would propose a development we had a choice of saying defeat it, kill it. But the hub of your tax base, majority of your taxes that we collect and the city of Winnipeg comes from residential dwellings. It is not and the more you have a bigger tax base the more you can do. How much of the money that has been transferred from the tax base that we have now that we have approved other developments within the last twenty, thirty years, how much of that money is redirected now to put services into the inner city.

Cause the inner city, their services are, were complete a long time ago, they're falling apart, the need of infrastructure is so great in the city of Winnipeg I stated this a number of years ago, ten, twelve years ago that we need about a billion dollars in infrastructure work. We have sink holes where the buses, where the trucks, where the cars disappear and who knows what else is happening with the under current of our water system that the lines may be broken and we don't know because its being washed away that more sink holes are going to be happening.

The question at that time Mr. Speaker was very simple, Council was not concerned. Inner city would cry out, the majority would say look this is not a problem, I'm concentrating more on others. We went with a new deal with the Jets, how much money was that going to cost us, something like a 112 million dollars, our share to try to save the Jets. The Jets were going a year before that, Council proceeded because that was a priority, then Mayor Norrie had said this is Jetamania, who ever is going to be voting against it you will be history, you will not be here again.

And then the losses, 59 million dollars we paid for our share of the losses with the province and the city, was that a priority, no. True North, 14.5 million dollars in total, did I hear anybody complain to say listen we have to do something for the inner city. Let's be realistic Mr. Speaker, we have to be realistic and like I say once again, Councillor Wyatt I listened to him because he was, had been constant that he's been in opposition to this proposal.

But some of those that voted in favour of March of 2004 are changing and I'd like to know why because they showed us no

concern before. So, with all of this, give this a chance, it doesn't mean to say that Council's making this final decision. This is going on now for the hearings and giving them an opportunity to address the issues and needs, given opportunity for people to come as delegations , they will come and say look we want to see about the schools, transportation, sewer and water, all the services that is going to be addressed. But to use the issue continually on and on, transit, transit is being addressed. I'm not concerned about rapid transit now, we dealt with it some time ago, I'm concerned with one thing to see what the committee is going to do to come up with some kind of a plan.

So, Mr. Speaker I think we should just get on with the business what we're elected to do and get this underway.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you know we've heard a lot about Waverley West, I sat through those two days, I've read every article in the paper, the reports, but you know then it really hit me, was Rodney MacDonald he is a member of the environment committee and he said this and it was reported in the Free Press, you don't visit a great city to see the suburbs. Let that sink in. You don't visit a great city to see the suburbs.

And so why the rush to approve this amendment. There has been no meaningful public consultation on Waverley West. The public hearing was scheduled during daytime hours making it impossible for the majority of Winnipeggers to attend and when I asked why Waverley West cost benefit study in the hands of the City Planning, Property and Development in July, they had it in July 2004 and was not made available to the public until December the 14th 2004.

That's information that people should have and should be able to go ahead and discuss the whole question, they were denied this. There has not been meaningful consultation with Waverley West.

Why does this matter, well because the amount of land covered by the amendment is so huge, it would mean the development of 13,000 single family homes with nearly all of these future homeowners coming from existing neighbourhoods, this is an important decision this Council must make and should do after extensive consultation with Winnipeg citizens.

Last Council meeting I sited the Statistics Canada about the density of major Canadian cities and I'll site them again, Montreal has 847 people per square kilometer, Toronto has 793 people per square kilometer, Vancouver has 690 people per square kilometer, while Winnipeg has a density of 162 people per square kilometer.

This means Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver can provide civic services at lower costs. If we approve this amendment today we are approving increased taxes for the future. Should we not innovate plans to encourage housing investment in our existing neighbourhoods, should we not seek to maintain and improve our existing neighbourhoods and I agree with the comments made by Councillor Clement, which appeared in the February 19th issue of the Winnipeg Free Press.

Councillor Clement stated that the city is moving too quickly on the controversial Waverley West suburb while land in older neighbourhoods lies vacant. What I cannot understand is the political party I belong to as it is campaigning for Waverley West. Sure they say the profits the provincial government makes on Waverley West will be invested in the inner city. If they are so sure they're planning figures, why not pass legislation ensuring that this occurs. And I thought it was interesting at the presentation by Planning, Property and Development Department showed a slide on how transit will serve Waverley West.

You know, I got it right here, we learn from one slide that when Waverley West is quote within 35 minutes commute of downtown with rapid transit. That's a nice fact to know but how long will it take with

our bus system. Should we not learn from the past, maybe Planning Property and Development Department should review the decline of the downtown. Why did it occur?

Remember Rodney MacDonald's words, you don't visit a great city to see the suburbs. Lets do our part to getting our city a chance at greatness, let us defeat this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Smith. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker Waverley West is a 20-30 year plan, its not going to be built over night, its going to be built over the long run and its part of a greater scheme of development for the city of Winnipeg and in fact we have to consider this from a point of balance because its not just about Waverley West or the downtown or the inner city, its not about or, its about as and its equation of doing things in a holistic way and a balanced approach and that's exactly where I'm coming from.

I live in the inner city Mr. Speaker, in the Centennial neighbourhood one of the poorest areas, in fact the poorest neighbourhood in all of the city of Winnipeg and I'm committed to that neighbourhood and in fact it often gets a bad reputation and I can tell you having lived in St. Vital for 24 years and having moved to the inner city, it isn't that bad at all, in fact its on of the greatest neighbourhoods I've actually lived in the city. People are really great, they've got big hearts, they may be socially economically challenged but they're wonderful people and there's a lot of good things that are happening, in fact it is a neighbourhood that needs stabilization but it is becoming stabilized and the people are being mobilized and I think this city government as well as the provincial government and the federal government is also committed to the inner cities and neighbourhoods like the Centennial neighbourhood.

Waverley West the province has said, Terry Wotton appeared before us from Manitoba Housing and Renewal Cooperation and stood here at our public hearing and confirmed and affirmed that he's going to be providing, the provincial government going to be providing support to the inner city and to our downtowns. So that's a really important point because that's exactly where I'm coming from, I represent the inner city and by supporting the Waverley West amendment I'm not turning my back on the downtown or the inner city, quite the contrary I'm supporting that and I would like to hear from the Mayor his support with regards to inner city development as well as to the downtown.

So areas like William White, North Point Douglas, Spence Neighbourhood, West Broadway and now I met with residents from Centennial neighbourhood and they have actually now have a plan Mr. Mayor for that neighbourhood and things are turning around finally in that neighbourhood and I think its really important that this development proceed because it is a 20-30 year plan, we're going to be proceeding with secondary plans and areas like the inner city and Centennial are actually going through secondary planning process themselves and I think that's extremely important because we have to proceed from a sensitive holistic development approach and I think we're doing that and I rise in support of the Plan Winnipeg amendment for Waverley West.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Pagtakhan. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker thought I'd do something novel and speak to the issue. The issue Mr. Speaker frankly is one of land designation today. Currently we have attractive land that is designated under Plan Winnipeg's agricultural and we're talking about changing it to neighbourhood, that's actually what were doing here today.

We're not building a 10,000 lot suburb today. What we're doing is putting in motion the opportunity for those applications to come forward so that they can be screened in an appropriate way and so that we can deal with all of the

melure that is being discussed here today.

The fact of the matter is that there has been a case made about the shortage of lots. I recall going to some meetings about Plan Winnipeg in the year 2000 and earlier, I didn't specifically work on it, I don't know what information that the Councillors had at that time, that left some of the lands not designated for neighbourhood Mr. Speaker but I'm sure that they dealt with it based on the best information that they had at that time.

Which is why as Councillor Eadie suggested today as he read parts of the document that the document in fact is a document that has to be flexible and provide some opportunities for this Council to be supreme in those decisions and correct things if there's a correction that's required and it would seem that based on the information that we have that the case for a shortage of building lots in our city has been made and that this should go forward and I intend to support it as a result of that.

It's the next phase of this when many of the issues will be raised, Councillor Smith just talked about something I said a year ago and in fact it might have been 2 years ago that I was making the comments, the fact of the matter is that there was no way that I was going to be able to even remotely support dealing with Waverley West in any way, shape or form unless Kenaston Underpass was going to be built because there was just no way that the traffic would be able to be sustained in that area in any way shape or form during the early moments of the Waverley West subdivision.

Since that time, that Councillor Smith as spoken out, the province of Manitoba has had a change of heart and actually put some money into the Kenaston Underpass as have the federal government and of course we're going ahead with that project this spring.

The controls that we will have over this will come through the various phases and the way that we treat the secondary plan. Whiteridge I believe had seventeen phases, Lindenwoods I think had nineteen. Lindenwoods wasn't created as a 2,500 lot subdivision or 3,000 lot subdivision in one fell swoop in one rezoning. There was countless rezonings, it was done like that for a reason because the lands were being assembled as they were coming forward. All of the lands in Waverley West aren't assembled either, there's options on many of them and there's other people who live there that are going to have either join in or there's going to have to be creative drawing of the lots so that at some point in time that they can because they can't be land locked and those kinds of things.

The issues that I'm hearing about though Mr. Speaker, A are transportation, we've already got transportation issues in the surrounding area and the other key issue is schools which is something we don't have any control over, none.

The other thing that's interesting here is that at least some of the relief from that transportation will probably involve a road out into MacDonald which is in the capital region. While not only do we have no ability to try and deal with that, we don't even have a capital region strategy. We've been pleading not just us, every municipality on the periphery of this city has been pleading with both of the last two governments for the last 10 years for a plan. We haven't seen one.

In fact yesterday we had this huge water park issue raised out in MacDonald right on the edge of the city, right at the end of a street that 90 percent of, in fact all of the residents on the street live in the city of Winnipeg on and they're going to see a whole bunch of traffic not a word from the provincial government about whether this meets any kind of criteria under Plan Winnipeg and by the way the water that they're going to require is right there for them, there's a two inch line that the R.M. of MacDonald has run out to Sanford and your know who paid for it, the province of Manitoba. Do you know where 68 percent of the province lives, in Winnipeg.

But what happens when we develop Waverley West, does the province pay for that, no the developer does, well interestingly they are one of the

developers but it just goes into whoever buys the lots and pays them back and that's how this works.

So in Winnipeg you penalized and all of the services have to be paid for by the developer but in rurban Manitoba, I'll call it, which is where urban sprawl actually is, is getting sewer and water services, all of them are getting it and they're getting it paid for by the province of Manitoba and the only thing that the residents pay for is the actual hook up, they don't pay for the installation of the whole capital project and this is gone on in every municipality on our periphery.

I don't know what Mr. Doer is going to do about that or what they're going to say, I keep hearing rumors that they're about to make a magical announcement about the capital region, I guess we'll just wait and see how magical it is when it arrives.

Councillor Angus made some comments about taxes, you know it's interesting, he said that in Waverley West that we would be in a situation for each home built at about $1,300.00 net better off. You multiply that by a hundred lots, that's a $130,000, you multiply it by a thousand lots, that's over a million dollars, a million three and this is ten thousand lots, that's 13 million dollars were better off each year once the whole thing is built.

And what does that do, how does that help everybody. Well if that's what the net gain is on a lot in Waverley West when it gets built then one has to assume that the feasibility study that was done in Lindenwoods a few years ago where it suggested that the net revenue to the city of Winnipeg after expenses was about three million dollars a year, was pretty accurate. I would submit similar in Lakeridge as well and every nickel of that money is going to subsidize any number of issues that we pay for when we do our budgets.

And I might point out to people that since 1995 we've had one tax increase, in 1997 it was 1.9289. Every other year we were zero except in 2001 and 2002 we were minus two, so for a hundred dollars Mr. Speaker, for a hundred dollars of municipal taxes payable in 1995 Mr. Speaker, its actually today that same hundred dollars is $95.93, that's what we've done for the last nine years and over and above that inflation for that hundred dollars is another $21.89 and this Council has chewed that number ever since.

Now, how did it do it, was it magical, did we make some changes, yes we did, did we make them as fast as some people would like to see, maybe not but we made a lot of changes but we also had growth and with growth and every time they build a house in my constituency in Whiteridge or my former constituency in Lindenwoods an extra 13 or 1,400 hundred dollars was going into the coffers to help us do that kind of stuff, that's where we got some of the money, it wasn't magical. We get more money because we have more growth and the more people that live here we have more disposable dollars. You can't force people to live in certain places; they're going to live where they want to live.

And as far as the downtown goes, I heard Gary Doer on the radio this morning and he said that every nickel of the money that they would make in Waverley West, the province of Manitoba and I don't know how much money that is, I'm sure that he'll let a forensic auditor go in and give us the number one day, but he said that every nickel is going to be spent in the downtown.

I don't know that that sounds like such a bad thing. We had a fellow here from MHRC during the public hearings and named seven or eight initiatives that they're involved with, all of them benefit the downtown in a variety of ways, what's so terrible about this.

We're going to have all of the net revenue from a sub division going to help the downtown and we're going to have a net influx of cash from taxes to help everybody keep our taxes in control and continue to provide appropriate services for everybody.

I don't see any downside to this quite frankly and I'm sorry that others see it a

different way but we live in a democracy and I guess that's why I'm supporting it. Thank you.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt, your next.

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to support the amendment to Plan Winnipeg, you know I think it's important that our language around this particular table be fairly diplomatic and respectful of the business community, the social community that comes together to try and develop our future. So let me just say that I do welcome the comments that we had heard at EPC during the public hearing, when the Council of Women from University of Winnipeg representatives, many of the youth about making a plea for a different process and perhaps a different vision and also from some of the Councillors who have a different point of view.

But it really is important I think to the development of our city that we have moderate language about what I would call a very good news story and I don't want to be too mischievous here, but you know this future development and the development of this city isn't based on developers willy nilly plunking down more single family units or multi family units in an unstructured way.

So I think we need to have a little bit more I think concern and admiration for the business community that's coming forward. We call them developers, but you know they're private sector people who make their living in trying to support and grow this city in a positive way for everybody.

So what we have in front of us is a case that has been made that we're short of lots. Virtuously this provincial government or succession of provincial governments has legislated some land banking and they're in a position to stimulate growth.

Now of all the Councillors other than the inner city Councillors let me talk about the peripheral Councillors if you wish, those who live in the suburbs. Of all of those who live in the suburbs I represent an area that has been arguing for years about growth. Now I hope he's watching, but my former boss and I had the privilege of serving for the great Honorable Edward Schreyer when he was Governor General, as his honorary aid, I hope he's watching and unfortunately I wasn't in politics in those years but I would have loved to have been around a table with him and Mayor Juba.

You know I really think the policies of the 70's and carried on by successive governments afterward has been wrong. We have limited growth in West Winnipeg and I'm not saying all the growth should have been in West Winnipeg but there has been zero growth in West Winnipeg and for those of you who can recall between 1998 and 2000 and three to four years leading up to 1998, lets say a period of 1995 to 2000 there were successive failures of strip malls and businesses were empty, Unicity Mall collapsed not because it makes sense in a marked climate to have an indoor mall and you know it was built in 1974 for a strategic reason, there was growth, there was potential growth for West Winnipeg.

Outside the perimeter remember Headingely was in the city of Winnipeg and we had this bizarre policy by friends of mine in 1993 that allowed Headingely to succeed. For a variety of good reasons for some and I guess I would argue it was the magnitude of the succession that impacted this city. It was much too significant.

Now every city has to have an edge. I understand that, it will eventually get built out, but you know in North America every city unless they have geographic boundaries goes west and south, just happens to be. So you hit Calgary you're not going to go much beyond west of Calgary and Vancouver, can't grow into the Pacific, they no longer can grow up the Mountain, so they grow vertically and we've heard examples and people are saying why don't we look at Vancouver and Montreal and Toronto.

I've come from Montreal, it's an island folks, it's not going to go anywhere else, it will be dense. Toronto has a huge lake to the south of them, it isn't going south and I would love to have the golden triangle growth factors that we've seen since the 60's. It's huge. It develops well for this country. I only hope they can continue to survive the hour and half commute morning and night.

But anyway we are very fortunate in this city to see that we have the opportunity to see growth, economic growth, population growth and it so happens there's an area just immediately to the south of us through Waverley West that can evolve into our next major suburban area and you know there is nothing wrong with suburbia. Its part of our city and eventually it will all be one city because every city has to have please remember this an edge and that leads to a capital region strategy and how people can have choices to live in clusters outside of our city and I think that's a welcome choice as long as they make it knowingly that they will have to pay for their services, pay for their commute, pay for their schools that aren't there and have to commute, etc.

I like the idea of choice because it adds value to our whole community of Manitoba and this capital region.

Now we have issues with the capital region we can talk about them forever but I simply don't want to end up in another enraging debate with my friends in the capital region however they know where I stand without a plan, nothing makes sense, but I'm convinced that I think this government will start working towards this plan and we in a cooperative way will be able to decide and move ahead on how services and revenue sharing and clusters of bringing everybody together to strengthen the region as an economic entity for business, manufacturing, high technology sectors where professionals want to settle with their skill sets and where the people who live throughout our community can support each other and produce growth and some sensible places for their children to grow up and stay.

Look having said all of that I appreciated the comment that Councillor Pagtakhan had mentioned about inner city and about balance. I mean I can easily state here to you my colleagues that I'm a strong supporter of inner city growth and I'm supporting housing in our shoulder neighbourhoods that have been identified for years as needing some assistance.
I think we should be clear in our mind and we seem to shy away from it, you know the federal government has the most significant part to play in evolving our shoulder neighbourhoods in our inner city.

The migration of our First Nations People to the city I think is an asset that has to be capitalized upon. We need housing for them and we need training and education institutions and recreational institutions. When they leave their reserves they become the part of the city of Winnipeg, the fact of the matter is though it's the federal government that has had the mandate and the responsibility for years to support the evolution of that particular sector of our city.

I don't know how we can get it out on the front page there that there is a huge obligation as the federal government wants to move ahead on that particular piece of legislation whether its amending the Indian Act or other things, the fact is that when I look over my period of time in this city, we've gone from a population of about 15-17,000 First Nations people to somewhere between 55 and 65 depending whether you believe the census or the fact that there are other people here.

There's a huge obligation to the inner city, I would be committed to work with you to make sure that we get the right funding as West Waverley makes its profit and it gets shared into the inner city and into the shoulder neighbourhoods.

People are right, not everybody wants to live in the downtown, not everybody wants to live in a shoulder neighbourhood but I think we can have policies that will assist that balancing off the needs of others. Yes, we will have issues about transportation, about schools, moving people from a Pembina and Kenaston

and the Charleswood parkway that goes through the R.M. of MacDonald whatever.

It's a twenty three year build out, please remember that, it's not going to happen over night, I think some people have commented on it as my colleague Councillor Clement this will be built in phases, we will have the opportunity to collaborate with the province, with the developers to guide the process. I think it's very important that we remember that particular point.

So you know this is a good news story, we have not had that significant growth rate as we've seen the last several years for many years in this province and in this city, so we should welcome the challenges that are presented, I welcome some of you who are in opposition to this at this moment in time with caveats, we appreciate that, please participate with dignity and with some science behind your comments about how we can move this ahead.

I will support this one.

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

Councillor O'Shaughnessy: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's a fact that the southwest Winnipeg is rapidly running out of building lots, not debatable I don't think. I think it's equally a fact that if we don't supply building lots in this sector the south and west rural municipalities will. All around the city they've proved a willingness to welcome Winnipeggers with open arms as they enjoy growth with the provincial government picking up the tab under increased costs for sewer and water.

We have only three designations under Plan Winnipeg for land, rural, neighbourhood, industrial. Rural in a city context is only a holding pattern. Cities aren't encouraging converting land to wheat feeds, corn fields, whatever. We're out of building lots in this area, its time to look at this land, there's no other land to look at in southwest, this is the next closest to Portage and Main available land.

Nobody's asked for industrial in this area, they've asked for residential, we say yes or we say farms forever, then we better get in the farm business which we're not.

My ward has an area called the Maples which is now 27,000 people and growing, I think we're up to phase sixty one or something. Part of it's now called Amber Trails but it's still the Maples; it's the 27,000 people, its growing. It is the same size as what this Waverley West area is. It started in 1969 it is now thirty five years later but we're growing faster than we were then, but at the start in the year, 70's this area was growing I would say faster than Waverley West ever will.

You couldn't get houses in there fast enough. It couldn't service land fast enough. You know what problems it caused for us and I bought my first home there in 1972, $17,000 brand new side by side. I've lived there ever since in our thirty five years of marriage, we're looking at our 19th house, I'm not a stranger to moving, I'm not a stranger to new areas but they'll all in this one community, I've seen it all. Your know how many problems we've had, none. No problems whatsoever, this is growth, this is what happens and you know what we get more experienced over the years.

Waverley West will grow, it will grow in accordance with the demand of Winnipeggers, it will start from the nearest corner to existing development. It will move on. Our challenges will be largely limited to making sure that we handle the traffic situation while as it grows. That is the one and only problem that we haven't proved our mental yet in handling. We'll handle police, we'll handle fire and ambulance, we'll handle community clubs, we're used to these things, they grow and grow.

Our ability to handle traffic problems, I think the jury is still out on, I think they've come back and convicted us a few times actually. So we have a challenge, that's what we're hear for. Let's be up to it.

People of Winnipeg want to live where they feel they can put down roots, be the happiest, bring up families in the safest

fashion and they will make that choice and its Waverley West or what. Or Richmond, Tache, MacDonald, we have no lots in the west hence the growth in Headingely, these areas. I don't know what the big deal is. We have land available downtown, Councillor De Smedt will note we are selling inner city lots now, people have started to buy them, there aren't very many and people have started to buy them and every Property Committee meeting we sell another three or four.

A lot of condos are going in downtown and there's a story in the Sun today by the way that says they're sold, pre sold. But you know what I would venture to say that none of those people who bought those have public school age children and I don't think that core area is the greatest place in the world for young families to, you know the high traffic and the high density, I don't think it's the greatest place to bring up kids but if you want to we have room for you.

We're not forcing everybody with young families to go to the suburbs, but it is there.

One last point, one of the people who did the major studies on the Waverley West area used to own a company called City Homes. What he specialized in was taking inner city, old inner city dilapidated homes on 50 foot lots, demolishing them and building two new houses each on 25 foot lots, making these affordable homes available within the inner city context and this flowed out into St. James actually, Councillor Eadie's ward.

There was so little demand for these well priced infill homes that this company went under and the funny things is what is this person doing now, well he did the studies on Waverley West and is contributing still greatly to our city, but the demand for inner city housing, we can take care of it believe me. It's not going to be a problem.

The only other way to increase it is to force people to live downtown, I don't think we want to force people to live anywhere but we're sure we want to give them an opportunity to join us in the city of Winnipeg and that's all this is doing. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor. The final speaker on the closing debate will be Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt that this is a very important issue for our city and it was very gratifying to see each and every Councillor express their feelings on this important matter.

But I think Councillor Clement said it best when he was very specific in saying what today is all about, it's about land designation, that's what we are talking about today, period. And as we went around the table I heard many Councillors express concerns, I heard many Councillors advocate that we support this and I can tell you that I am not without concerns myself. There is no doubt that a problem does exist today with the capital region and as Councillor De Smedt will testify to since he was there with me, we met with Mayors and Reeves of the capital region along with the Premier and there was complete consent that a plan, a proper plan has to be done to make sure that we have controlled growth in the capital region.

But the facts are even with that in place for those of you who may not be aware, there are 5,000 lots that exist there today, they've been zoned and they're ready to build on so don't think for a moment they're not going to be used because they will be. By the same token, hopefully with a plan in place and with some service sharing we can get not only revenues on that but we can share in the taxes and that is something I believe we have to consider.

I sat through the two days; I believe the public had the opportunity to express themselves. I certainly am one who believes that we must have a collaborative approach between the city and the developer and that's how this development will be different. I can tell you some of the concerns that I have. The developer being the province as well as being the regulatory body, yes that

concerns me. Streets, schools, community centres, green space, transit, those are all valid concerns, each and every one of them and that is where the secondary plan will come into play and make sure that we are in charge and I know Councillor Gerbasi expressed concern about loosing our bargaining power. I appreciate that comment, but trust me we believe we do have that bargaining power and that's where it will show, in each and every one of those areas on the secondary plan.

I know Councillor Benham mentioned 30,000 people and all these cars appearing tomorrow, we all know what he's really saying, is over a period of time, its not going to happen tomorrow, its not going to happen next week, whether its twenty years or thirty years, whether this does sell out or not, that will be determined and hopefully within that period of time, we can plan for this growth.

From my point of view growth is important. Progress is important. I think that's what we all want for this city and the bottom line and many people made comment on it and said it many different ways, but what the Premier actually said this morning at 7:42 on CJOB that all the profit will go to downtown and the inner city and you know what, downtown is important, very important and this to me is a positive step.

Would I like to know how much that is, absolutely and hopefully we can find the answer to that. By the same token that doesn't mean in the interim we don't do things to enhance our downtown. As a lot of you know, you know I'm looking to put incentives and new programs in for infill housing, for renovations downtown as well as the rest of the city and we have to do that. But I believe with what we're talking about today, that Waverley West will be a different development. I think it will enhance our city and I think the bottom line is we will all benefit by this and I very much support this. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Recorded vote has been called for.

All those in favour of the clause would you please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Benham, Gerbasi, Smith, Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Deputy Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 4.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's carried. Clause 3. Councillor Steeves sit down until the clerk please introduces it.

Item 3 - Urban Transportation Showcase Program / WinSmart File GC-11

(Councillor O'Shaughnessy in the chair)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor did you wish to introduce or would you like to hear Councillor Steeves on it.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, at this time I think Councillor Steeves could just speak and then I would respond.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'll be very brief Mr. Speaker with apologizes to Council, I know its been a long morning and other things, I did want to highlight this project as a real good news story for the city, the Urban Transport Showcase Program or WinSmart as its become to be known is great news for our city. We went through the maginations of an application process that required the city of Winnipeg submit an expression of interest along with sixty other municipalities from across Canada. We were one of fifteen finalists selected to make a formal presentation to the

federal government in Vancouver that was at least a couple of years ago now.

From those fifteen finalists we were one of the eventual seven or eight municipalities picked in Canada to go ahead with the program with the federal government.

So, it was a long arduous process and there's been a lot of people involved from our Andrew Cowan our former Environmental guru through to James Allum, Hugh McFayden and Linda Black who brought it to fruition and just for peoples edification, this project which will, this program and project which will bring an additional almost four million dollars to the city of Winnipeg in terms of our transportation initiatives will include funding for such things as 700,000 dollars for hybrid diesel electric transit buses, 2.5 million dollars for an eco fuelling station out of a contribution towards the total, over 3 million dollar cost for automatic vehicle location systems for transit. Almost a half a million dollars in real time electronic bus departures and 1 million dollars toward the upgrade of recreational trails, 600,000 dollars in terms of some of the marketing measures we're taking and also another 300,000 dollars for evaluation.

Obviously that is going to be paid for with combined money, much of which is ours, the end result Mr. Speaker is that 3.6 million dollars or so that would not ordinarily be coming to the city of Winnipeg from the federal government is and I want to thank all the people involved in that. It's a good news story for the city of Winnipeg and I hope that we can have unanimous support for this going forward.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I will certainly keep my remarks very very brief given the sense of Council here but I didn't want to let this opportunity pass without congratulating the Mayor and Executive Policy Committee on this money, I think this will help transit as it exists and I will limit my comments to that but say that this is a good thing to invest in transit in the future in all senses and I congratulate as I say the group for bringing this forward and I will of course be supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Benham. Mr. Mayor did you wish to sum up.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried unanimously.

Clause 4, Councillor Lazarenko you asked to be stood down. Mr. Clerk would you introduce the clause first.

Item 4 - Heritage Conservation Tax Credit - the former Oldfield, Kirby & Gardner Building, 234 Portage Avenue File G-3.1.5

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor did you wish to open.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, if Councillor Lazarenko could just express his comments I'd be happy to listen.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko, the floor is yours.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I read through the proposal that is here before us and I had some preservations in respect to some of the, on Portage Avenue I was very concerned about parking, I was concerned about the as to the use of the facility, hours of operation but I understand that this will be going before the proper channels, but I was just concerned that if we were to have had that information and it follows to say that this would not qualify as far as area zoning that in itself would not have to be proceeded with.

I looked at the eligible work, exterior work as repair, the front façade, roof replacement, repair pre pointed brick work, skylight, interior work is basement development into commercial retail space and two residential suites, make for a conversion into night club with a dance floor and stage, second floor conversion into offices and residential units, and I would like to know Mr. Speaker is, what does this curtail because there's certain criteria that have to be met by having a

nightclub with a dance floor and the stage and also with a residential component that falls within the category of the downtown that falls also within the regulations of parking and the rest of it but I understand Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Mayor might be able to, must be able to address or will address this, if this does not, because we're talking about the Heritage Tax Credit, I believe this is the only thing that is before us here but the reports here also and I feel that report maybe should not have been in here because Council now is going to be rectifying on the exterior work and interior work but if that could be explained because this is something that has to be looked at and if this is, will go to the proper channels to have that permit issued and the licensing issued to this particular building cause I know that the traffic, parking downtown is very rough because if that could be addressed you know Mr. Chairman it would save the applicant the trouble also of going and making application for a tax credit of the Heritage Status and then to find out that this is not going to be a go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker, because I've inquired into this issue because it appeared at the Downtown Development Committee, there was some information as tendered by administration, I thought I would just read into the record for Councillor Lazarenko's edification if it helps.

This is from Jim Patterson from our department who states that the nightclub use as identified in the administrative report nightclub with bar and stage is an acceptable use under the downtown zoning by-law. This is within the entertainment zone as identified as a part of Portage Avenue vision and context strategy and the nightclub fits with that concept, heritage bank buildings are often updated to other uses and several former bank heritage buildings are now nightclubs. By fax today, which was I guess this was the 19th we received a letter from the owner of 234 Portage Avenue suggesting that his proposed use for the main floor is now a beauty salon and not a nightclub and he has phoned and advised of this.

A beauty salon is of course a much more appropriate use of the (In Audible); he has planned residential conversion of the 2nd floor if that helps Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor did you wish to sum up.

Mayor Katz: Quickly, yes, thank you for your question. What Councillor Steeves just referred to is absolutely correct. When the delegation appeared at EPC they clarified the fact that the building was to be used for a beauty salon as well as the fact that they were going to redo the façade. This has been approved by our department and EPC has endorsed it.

And this is a vacant building right now on Portage Avenue, formerly occupied by the Canadian Western Bank.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Question, all those in favour of the clause? Contrary? Councillor Lazarenko has asked to be recorded in opposition and then the clause is carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Moving onto motions, motion 3 moved by Councillor Magnifico would be automatic referral.

As motions 5, 6, and 7 would also by Councillor Angus would all be automatic referral, although 5 may be out of order, but we'll let EPC determine that.

All in favour, we're not in favour we're doing it. They're referred.

Motion No. 1

Moved by Councillor Eadie
Seconded by Councillor Steeves

WHEREAS Sharon Martinenko advised the City Clerk on January 24, 2005, that she wished to decline her appointment to the Board of Adjustment due to personal reasons;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Ron Turner be appointed to the Board of Adjustment for the three year term effective February 1, 2005 and expiring December 31, 2007, in place of Sharon Martinenko.

Motion No. 3

Moved by Councillor Magnifico
Seconded by Councillor Angus

WHEREAS Winnipeg's City Council has limited and reduced property tax increases while absorbing inflationary increases in its annual budgets over the last several years;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's budget process for the 2005 fiscal year is scheduled to commence;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's citizens have seen inflation limited to 1.5 through 2.0 % per annum since 1999, as corroborated by the Conference Board's Consumer Price Index statistics;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's 2004 inflation rate is forecasted at 1.6 %;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg Citizens do not want to see any property tax increase but recognize that under certain circumstances may be necessary;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that City Council adopt a Property Tax Cap Policy that limits any property tax increase levied on taxpayers in any given year to be no more then 2/3 of the previous year's rate of inflation as measured by Statistics Canada's Consumer Price Index;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a two-thirds vote of the majority of sitting Councilors be required for any suspension of this policy.

Motion No. 5

Moved by Councillor Angus
Seconded by Councillor De Smedt

WHEREAS Council is seeking to amend Plan Winnipeg to reflect a "neighbourhood area" which if approved will lead to development of Waverley West through the creation of a secondary plan;

AND WHEREAS previous new residential developments have benefited from the input of joint venture agreement;

AND WHEREAS Council has created the Management Committee comprised of the Ward Councillor, the Chairperson of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, senior Civic planning personnel and representatives of the developer;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council adopt a joint-venture approach in the development of Waverley West, including the utilization of a joint venture agreement;

AND BE IT ALSO RESOLVED that Council establish a Management Committee for the Waverley West Joint Venture Agreement, comprised of the Ward Councillor, the Chairperson of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, senior Civic planning personnel and representatives of the developer.

Motion No. 6

Moved by Councillor Angus
Seconded by Councillor Lazarenko

WHEREAS Council is seeking to amend Plan Winnipeg to reflect a "neighbourhood area" which if approved will lead to the development of Waverley West through the creation of a secondary plan;

AND WHEREAS the new residential development could see over 10,000 homes built over the next 20-30 years;

AND WHEREAS the new development will create new traffic on the City's street system in the southwest quadrant;

AND WHEREAS both the City's and the Developer's Cost Benefit Analysis show a return on property tax revenue above and beyond the cost of servicing the new development;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council establish a reserve "Waverly West Regional Street Reserve" to address the regional street requirements as a result of the increased population and traffic requirements;

AND BE IT ALSO RESOLVED that 5 percent of all property tax collected in Waverley West be allocated to this Waverley West Regional Streets Reserve.

Motion No. 7

Moved by Councillor Angus
Seconded by Councillor Lazarenko

WHEREAS Council is seeking to amend Plan Winnipeg to reflect a "neighbourhood area" which if approved will lead to the development of Waverley West through the creation of a secondary plan;
AND WHEREAS new development infrastructure (residential streets, lanes, sidewalks, parks and recreational areas) have a lifespan of approximately 30 years until they require repair and upgrade;

AND WHEREAS every year, capital and operating budgets are subject to significant pecuniary limits and frequently infrastructure repair does not take a high priority;

AND WHEREAS both the private sector and the City's cost benefit analysis of Waverley West indicates a very positive cash flow above and the costs of servicing the new development;

AND WHEREAS 2 percent of property tax with reasonable inflation and interest rate over 30 years will generate a fund in excess of $25 million;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council establish the "Waverly West Renewal Reserve" for the renewal and refurbishing of residential streets, sidewalks, back lanes, park and recreational facilities in Waverley West;

AND BE IT ALSO RESOLVED that 2 percent of all property tax collected in Waverley West is allocated to this Waverley West Renewal Reserve for funding required for Waverly West infrastructure repairs or renewals;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Executive Policy Committee applies the principal of an Infrastructure Renewal Reserve to future developments.

Mr. Speaker: Moving onto by-laws second reading only, your Worship.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mr. Mayor: I move that the following By-law be read a second time, By-law No. 50/2004.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt has asked by recorded in opposition to By-law No. 50/2004. By-laws second and third readings your Worship.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that By-law No. 183/2004 be read a second time.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 183/2004.

Mr. Speaker: Your Worship, third reading.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that By-law No. 183/2004 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: His Worship, the clerk will now move the By-laws for all three readings.

Mayor Katz: Thank you. I'll move that By-law No. 12/2005 be read a first time.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 12/2005.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that By-law No. 12/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 12/2005.

Mayor Katz: I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-law No. 12/2005 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. Move onto question period. We have a fair amount of time here, we may have to suspend it, we'll see, Councillors Magnifico, Gerbasi, and there is another hand, Benham.

Councillor Lazarenko: Mr. Speaker I don't think there be time for the question period because how do you decide for 30 minutes. I move that we recess for lunch and reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko moves we call it noon and adjourn till 1:30 p.m. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Council recessed at 12:00 p.m.

After recess

Council reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We have a quorum, next item of business Executive Policy Committee question period. I have Councillor Magnifico with questions, followed by Councillor Gerbasi, Benham and Wyatt. Councillor Magnifico the floor is yours.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I need some clarification on an issue and I'd like to ask the Mayor. I heard Mr. Alcock's interview on CJOB yesterday and Mr. Alcock seemed to have a very different tone in that show than what we saw in the newspapers over the last few days and it's sort of confused me. As I heard him, he said that the money is still available for transit related projects including anything that Councillor Wyatt's task force might recommend and that Ottawa was looking for a different program to finance the community centres plan.

Mr. Speaker: And your question?

Councillor Magnifico: What I heard, the question is, is in fact at the end of the day, the story I heard telling us we are not only getting the rapid transit money but we're also getting extra money for community clubs.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Magnifico.

Mayor Katz: I never heard that specific interview but with my conversations with Minister Alcock I guess in the previous 48 hours, my understanding is very clear it is number one, that all the monies that the federal government have put up are still there, that's number one the money is still in the pot. Number two, they are looking at ways to accommodate the community centre program that we are working on together and that it appears that there could be more monies available but keep something in mind, right now we do have a rapid transit task force out there. We do have public consultations taking place and they will continue and only then when it's complete and we get a report will we act upon that and that's suppose to take place if every thing goes on schedule, I believe sometime in June.

So, the end result is, yes there could be monies available for everything but by the same token, the monies that are in the pot could be available for many projects and I've heard from some Councillors already who have suggestions, etc. but from my point of view, we were staying the course and if and when I am told emphatically that the monies are not available, you know when the Minister tells me that the monies are definitely not available, only then will we start addressing other options. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Does that cover it Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: That's fine. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In the press conference yesterday the Mayor spoke a bit about the process he envisions for proceeding with dealing with the PUFS study. He talked about community clubs that, who volunteered to be shut down, would be dealt with first in receiving money to build new clubs or something along those lines, knowing that the greater needs in certain areas of the city such as Point Douglas and the North End, knowing that these communities are often less vocal and less well organized etc., I would ask the Mayor to explain how this approach makes sense as a way to prioritize which facilities are built first.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. I believe that what I said was not understood at that particular point in time. What I was referring to in the PUFS report, we've had a long conversation about campus type structures throughout the city in the different zones. We've also talked about urban oasis and what I was specifically referring to in order to make one of those become a reality, we would have to find by volunteerism because we have basically said we will not shut down any community centres, but if a group of community centres came to us voluntarily and said listen our community centres are falling apart, we're prepared to all get together under one big roof and have a campus built in our area that's how we would proceed. The same thing would also apply for an urban oasis.

When it comes to basically renovating and fixing up that's fed right across based on need which we will access it so there are two different parts to that. One is specifically referring to campuses and urban oasis's, the other part is specific monies that would be available to enhance and renovate existing structures. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Supplemental Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Will those areas of the city in greater need as highlighted in the recent Free Press story on inner city school children be given priority in deciding where scarce dollars or recreational dollars will go or not is my question.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mr. Mayor: I believe what we have to do is what we always do, we get public input and all of Council will be involved in this process. We as Council make the decisions. So whatever the priorities are, we will deal with when we have those monies and we have a list of I guess ideas and concepts where they should go keeping in mind that we are working with the Greater Winnipeg Community Centres Group as well and they have also shared ideas with us which I think most of the Councillors here have seen. So this will be a collaborative approach and we're not going to cherry pick, we're going to deal with it as a group which is the way I'd like to see it happen.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final supplemental Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Mr. Mayor do you have a personal commitment to do something about the problems faced by the people in the inner city who do not have access to adequate recreation services, do you have a commitment to focus on that as an issue or is it just thrown in with all the other neighbourhoods that have less problems.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I have a commitment to the inner city on all issues, not just community centres on all issues. I think I've said that from the day I was elected, the day I was campaigning and I think I've been consistent with that. I do have a commitment with them, as well as that I also believe we have to work towards enhancing the entire city but there certainly is a commitment for me

personally towards the inner city. I hope I've addressed your question. Thank you.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker following up on Councillor Magnifico's question, I intended to ask a question on the same topic. So, I'll just go right to my question without preamble. If the city of Winnipeg is allowed at the end of the day to have access to the 34 million dollars in federal and provincial money originally intended for bus rapid transit, if that money is indeed still on the table, still available are community centres still the Mayor's first choice and first priority for that money.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you very much Councillor Benham. Let me address one issue first with a quote from Minister Alcock. There was a concern expressed that if Winnipeg did not proceed with rapid transit, would it loose the 51 million dollars that was dedicated to the program. The answer is no. That money will be available for Winnipeg. That's number one. The other part to your question is that we have all basically, there is a motion moved September 29, we all know what that was. That is exactly what the status is; nothing has changed as we speak. We know that the provincial money is there. We know that the federal money is there, we're waiting to see whether or not that can be accessed and when I get a specific black and white answer from the Minister, obviously if the money can be accessed, we will be using it for community centres. If it cannot, then we as a Council will decide where those monies will go at that particular point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Supplemental Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker and I thank the Mayor for his answer. As I understand it there's now a Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund, does the Mayor's answer mean that he's turning down the opportunity to apply for and get money for community centres from Winnipeg under the Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund keep that money and have the money as well under the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Benham. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I can assure you Councillor Benham as Mayor I wouldn't turn down the opportunity for us to get any monies that come available from the federal or provincial government number one. So no, we will not be turning down any monies if they are available, we will be taking advantage of every opportunity that exists.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final supplemental Councillor Benham.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Has the Mayor applied than for any money for community clubs under the Municipal Rural Infrastructure Fund.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: To the best of my knowledge, I do not believe so but I would be happy to refer that and get a specific answer to that, but my answer right now would be I do not believe so.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I understand this morning somebody was saying that on the radio, I think on CJOB there was an interview by, with the Premier, I'm not a morning person, I tend to be a night person, I tend to be grouchy in the morning as you saw this morning but I, so sorry, I just wanted clarification or I understand that the Premier was responding to an interview conducted with some City Councillor who's well spoken from what I've heard and he was asked the question, are you supportive of, what are you going to do, is this a money grab or not regarding Waverley West and I understand that he responded, I know it's a bit of a preamble, I understand he responded that the

monies are suppose to go to the inner city. In light of that, I think it's probably time to take steps.

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Councillor Wyatt: Secure in writing from the province, specifically my question is well to ensure Mr. Mayor that these are new dollars, that these are not dollars being substituted for existing spending, but they're new dollars as well as these are, these dollars are being raised through the joint venture accountable through the accounts committee of the Public Accounts Committee and open accounting of their ventures so we know exactly what they are making. Just your thoughts.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor the question is what are your thoughts.

Mayor Katz: Councillor Wyatt thank you. I did hear the interview and it was obviously from I believe from Austin, Texas and what was done, a tape of a quote from you was basically played which was not all that complementary to the provincial government, but it was well spoken, thank you for pointing that out and the response from the premier was two fold.

Number one, the city came to us, he was referring to the Plan Winnipeg amendment, the city came to us and we're now agreeing to it so why would they be upset because they ask us and how we're doing it and number two he did specifically say that all profits would go to downtown and the inner city.

Now I will tell you that any time we get a commitment for monies, the first thing that has to be addressed isn't new monies because quite often they're taking from Peter giving it to Paul, it's the same thing, they're just moving it around and I would also like to say to you that on a regular basis we attempt to get these matters in writing as soon as possible.

I have to tell you frankly that is not the easiest task to accomplish but I think it has been said, it's been said publicly over and over again. I think half of the council has already heard that. We just have to at this stage in time take the Premiers word but by the same token, through the process that we will be going through on Waverley West, believe me this will be raised over and over again and we have lots of time to get a commitment and you have my assurances that that will certainly be my objective and I hope I'm able to accomplish it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Thomas: Thank you. I would like to thank the Mayor for the opportunity to be Mayor of the city while himself and the Deputy Mayor go out of town to visit our sister city in the Philippines and actually my question is for the Deputy Mayor, I believe I can ask questions of the Deputy Mayor during this period. I would like to know more about our visit to our sister city in the Philippines. I believe this is very interesting and exciting and there are some sister cities like Setagaya, Japan which we've had a very close relationship and there's other sister cities that we've not heard from for a long time so I congratulate the Mayor on his delegation and I would like to hear a little bit more about what's going to be accomplished while I'm here doing the day to day business. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank my colleague from Elmwood for bringing up the question, East Kildonan Elmwood for bringing up the question. I'd be very happy to talk about the Winnipeg to Manila sister city delegation mission.

As you Mayor Katz and myself and staff along with nine members of the Winnipeg Filipino Community will be embarking to the Philippines tomorrow the 27th and will be there on the 29th of January. The mission itself is a one week mission, it lasts from the 29th of January to February the 5th and we have some specific projects that we're going to be accomplishing.

December 31, 2004 marked the 25th anniversary of the founding relationship of

the sister city agreement between Winnipeg and Manila and it was signed by then Mayor Bill Norrie and it's going to be reaffirmed this year by Mayor Katz and it's a really great project and I'm very happy that the Mayor supporting this project.
We've got outstanding support from our community. Some of the three projects that we are dealing with, the first one is a literacy exchange project and it involves Tyndall Park School in Winnipeg has graciously accepted an invitation from Fernando Maria Guerrero School in Manila and they're both going to be partnering up to exchange ideas, literacy, books, pictures, those types of things.

Our community here in Winnipeg has collected over a thousand books already, new and gently used books and will be shipping those back to the Philippines and Mayor Katz will be making a presentation to the principal of Fernando Maria Guerrero School and actually the school itself is quite staggering. It's got 4,500 students and Tyndall Park School only has a couple hundred, so there's quite a deficiency but actual population of Manila is about 12 million people compared to our medium sized city of about 600 and something thousand people.

So it's really, it'll be a real, it's a first time for me going and it's the first time for the Mayor and first time for some of our youth delegates. We do have a strong youth delegation representing the Filipino Youth Initiative of Winnipeg. We also have members from the Philippine Association of Manitoba who were there during the original signing of the sister city agreement back in 1979.

Another particular project that we're working on is a Winnipeg to Manila video exchange and what's happened is that the Filipino Youth Initiative here in Winnipeg have been working over a number of months to create a picture of landmarks of Winnipeg as well as various activities, celebrations, fiestas that happened in our community and have captured on video with a story line and talks about the profound accomplishments and how we're involved in every sector of society and we're going to be sharing that and dialoguing with Manila youth invited by Mayor Lito Atienza of Manila and we're going to be exchanging that, hopefully we can do the first international youth exchange between Manila and Winnipeg on that front.

Another really exciting project that we're working on, Mr. Speaker is Winnipeg to Manila Youth Art Project and it's a really exciting project because we've chosen an artist here in Winnipeg, his name is Edgar Bercasio from our community and he's going to be working to produce a painting or a sculpture or art piece that symbolizes the ways of immigration of the Filipino Community from Philippines to Canada and to Winnipeg and as well as to depict the hopes and dreams and aspirations and accomplishments of Filipino's in Winnipeg.

He's going to be working with a artist back home whom will going to be meeting and interviewing, we're going to make a selection of an artist back home who's going to work with Mr. Bercasio and the Manila artist is going to produce a painting, its called a truo piece of artwork that will symbolize the identity of the Filipino's in the Philippines and how that, its going to mesh with the artist here in Winnipeg and that piece of work is going to be coming here on June 20th of 2005 and there will be a grand unveiling at the Philippine Canadian Centre of Manitoba.

That piece of work will be showcased there and eventually once the Canadian Museum of Human Rights is completed, it will hopefully will be gifted to the Canadian Museum of Human Rights and one final project that we're working on Mr. Speaker is to establish a student teacher exchange between the high school here in Winnipeg, a public high school and as well some post secondary educational institute here in Winnipeg with Manila. So we've got a number of activities that we're going to be doing, we're all really excited, I'm going to tip my hat off to all the delegates for working so hard and to the Mayor and his staff for really being supportive of this project and to Councillor Thomas for asking the question and for all of you for indulging me in this option to speak on it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have some questions to the Mayor, what is happening within the last week, the media have had a field day with some comments have been made, negotiations and table talks have been held through the media and I have a concern. My first question Mr. Speaker is to you Mr. Mayor do you intend to have some plans in place to be meeting with the Premier of Manitoba on a regular basis so that this way it'll be first hand information received by Council through you from the Mayor, from the Premier himself.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: The existing situation as you know, I have taken over the intergovernmental portfolio and I do communicate with the Premier on a fairly regular basis if not with him, my staff are communicating with his staff. I believe and I'm going by memory, but I believe our next meeting is February the 14th, yes that is Valentines Day and that is when we hope to commence, we've been talking about the need for more monies for the city. We have addressed many potential opportunities that may exist there and its now time for us to get into very serious and in depth conversations so hopefully we can start seeing some monies flowing and being directed from the province to the city. So the answer is, I try and meet on a regular basis, its not always formal, sometimes we are also at functions together and of course we do sit and talk what happens on a regular basis.

Mr. Speaker: Something about politics making strange bedfellows. Councillor Lazarenko, supplemental.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor on the issue of setting priorities I know in the past with former Mayor Bill Norrie, Council used to have seminars and we'd be stressing our needs the concerns we had, the areas that we were representing and it worked very well with his deliberation and his communication holding table talks with then that Premier. I'm going to ask you now are you going to be setting priorities based on priorities that are the needs of each member of Council so you can meet with us and we can communicate to the Premier through you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I would have no problem whatsoever having Council participate in the suggestions and priorities that they feel are definitely ones that should be dealt with between the city and the province, I have no problem with any Councillor you know either meeting with me or my staff and making a list of priorities that are important to them.

I would certainly would be more than happy to bring up you know any conversation, it certainly doesn't have to relate to just you know revenue sharing, it can relate, as you know we're working together on all sorts of different fronts and no I would be more than happy to welcome that and if that is the desire of Council you can consider this right now as an invitation.

If there are certain issues that you think are important to you, your ward, the city please feel free to communicate with me or my staff and I'll be more than happy to be the messenger and make sure these are all heard. I'm sure you can appreciate that there will be a long list and when I was referring to the February the 14th meeting, I was referring to start discussions about, it was more dollars and cents type of conversation but there's other issues, there are certainly many social issues that can be addressed and so on and so forth. So I would welcome that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final supplemental Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Yes thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Mayor it is very important that Council Members participate when you will be holding your table talks with a scheduled time with the Premier of Manitoba or even if you are meeting with the counterparts from the

federal government, that we would be able to participate with you at the same time to have a seminar that we would be able to address the issues and concerns that we have from the other two levels of government. That would be a (in audible) a ship that you would have to set up a date, notify us when we could attend and this way we could have an ongoing, because we used to have that years back. It was a regular and I tell you Mr. Mayor it worked very well.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, this was something that I was not aware of Councillor Lazarenko and I appreciate you pointing it out but I hope you are cognizant of the fact that I have no problem whatsoever with council seminars, usually its sharing information with Council but obviously the reverse is true for Council to share information with me, so if this is the wish of Council, I would have no problem trying to make these arrangements and if you're suggesting this should be done on a, whether its quarterly or whatever the case may be, I don't know if you're thinking monthly, quarterly, semi-annually or whatever your thoughts are I would be happy to entertain them and to make those arrangements. There's no doubt in my mind, the more we communicate the more we can accomplish. So I certainly concur with your message. I wasn't aware of it and I thank you for making me aware of it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Next, Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't anticipate that the Mayor will have an answer for this but I wanted to put it on the record. In 2004, the province is reportably going to gross somewhere in the neighbourhood of nine million dollars from the photo radar red light camera enforcement program and I'm wondering if they've alluded to any safety initiatives that they are going to be contributing that revenue towards.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: At this point in time your first guess was correct. I do not have a specific answer for that, but since you brought it up I can tell you that I do have a meeting set in early February with Minister MacIntosh and I would be happy to address that and see if there is some thoughts or ideas about what they're planning to do and maybe if there are some safety initiatives, I am not in position to answer that right now.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Supplemental Councillor Lubosch.

Councillor Lubosch: Secondary supplementary question on a similar topic, the provinces new privacy act currently prevents the police department from submitting unpaid parking tickets to third parties, to collection agencies for collection.

Mr. Speaker: No preamble on supplementary questions.

Councillor Lubosch: What if any discussions have we had with the Province of Manitoba to amend the privacy act so that we can collect the some four million dollars that may be outstanding in parking ticket fines.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Lubosch. As a matter of fact that matter believe it or not over the last 24 hours was actually mentioned by Councillor Clement, a great deal of frustration, when we just started talking about budget, four million dollars and Councillor Clement did raise that issue. It was something that I was rather surprised and shocked to hear. That's a lot of outstanding revenues and it certainly is something that is on the list. I do thank you for bringing it up and it's something that will very much be addressed and I guess maybe that could be to Councillor Lazarenko's point. If maybe we had meetings and suggestions, like I said, I believe it was yesterday that Councillor Clement mentioned that and that's the first time I knew about it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. No other questions. Oh, Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Just a quick one, I should say for Council's knowledge, my understanding that Shaw cable is delayed the airing of the Scott Tournament of Hearts until we're done and so we just want to throw that out there, a lot of unhappy customers I understand Mr. Speaker. I admit Mr. Mayor I met with Stefano Grande and Rick Joyal of the Downtown Biz. They're interested in moving ahead with some of the panhandling initiatives through the neighbourhood watch. I might ask you Mr. Mayor what do we have planned to address the issue of panhandling in the downtown for 2005.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Steeves. As some of you may know, panhandling was an issue that I certainly campaigned on. I very much believe that we need much better by-laws to enforce that aggressive panhandling does not take place in our downtown. I believe our downtown has to be safe for all people. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that it is not perceived to be that way and in order to accomplish that goal, we need to have a stronger by-law. I have directed administration and the EPC Secretariat to sit down and come up with stronger by-law that hopefully we will be able to bring to EPC and to Council.

I know that in addition to that we obviously still need to work with the province, aggressive panhandling is not positive. We need to rectify it. But in addition to that, there are also, there's an enforcement issue, there's also social issues, these are things I will be meeting with Minister MacIntosh regarding and I know that the Downtown BIZ has been a strong vocal supporter of eliminating aggressive panhandling. I very much appreciate their thoughts and the way they have expressed them. I support it and it is certainly something I hope to see come into effect in the very near future. As you know, we addressed this issue once before, I know it was prior to my being Mayor and for reasons which I won't get into right now, we did back down at the last minute. We know that these by-laws have stood the test of challenges and I think it's imperative that we get stronger by-laws so we can address aggressive panhandling. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Time for questions has expired. We'll move onto the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works, report of January 11, 2005, Councillor Eadie.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED JANUARY 11, 2005

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move the Public Works Committee meeting dated January 11, 2005, Item 1 be adopted as consent.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MOTIONS

Under motions we have a motion by Councillor Benham which I would move automatic referral to the committee.

Motion No. 4

Moved by Councillor Benham
Seconded by Councillor Smith

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Public Works Department endeavours in its snow clearing efforts to serve the best interest of the citizens of the city – mindful of the volume of snow that from time to time falls over the course of the winter months;

AND WHEREAS the impassibility of sidewalks surrounding schools forces children to walk in the streets – a practice that is inherently unsafe and places these precious young lives at excessive risk;

AND WHEREAS the protection of our school children's safe passage to and from school grounds is of utmost concern to all citizens;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Works Department be directed to provision for more immediate and timely clearing of sidewalks surrounding elementary schools on Priority II and Priority III streets in keeping with the active school week.

Mr. Speaker: By-laws Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Eadie: I'll move that By-law No. 3/2005 and 4/2005 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 3/2005 and 4/2005.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move that By-law No. 3/2005 and 4/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 3/2005 and 4/2005.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-law No. 3/2005 and 4/2005 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.

Questions of the chair of Public Works, Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Last week we had some very cold weather and water main breaks taking place and we get this in Winnipeg as we all know and when its very cold and very hot and in 2003 we had a very hot August and I suggested to the department at the time and I don't know if anything's been done with this is to consider having a rapid response team assembled to do these sorts of things or if we can't do it in house to look out of house to have people on basically retainer to respond quickly in the case of what happened in St. Vital, businesses were shut down for two days and employees lost pay checks. So, I'm just wondering are you giving some consideration of this Mr. Chairman and is this something that can be looked at.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I think its certainly being looked at. My knowledge of it is that I think when there is a water main break generally speaking the crews try to get out to it as quick as they possibly can and get the repair done as fast as they can. This time of year it's a real challenge with when you've got the cold weather but let me just take the remainder of Councillor Wyatt's question as under advisement and I'll try to maybe get a more fuller response, I'll check further with the water and waste administration about the sort of rapid response team idea that the Councillor is expressed and I'll get an answer back to all members.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I appreciate the response Mr. Chairman. Just regarding sidewalks and sidewalk snow clearing, we're very good at quickly clearing streets, priority three sidewalks are being cleared now, is there a way that we can look at some options to expand our sidewalk renewal so it's quicker in light of the fact that there are so people that are housebound, disabled seniors.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I don't know if there is really any possibility of doing whatever quicker is Mr. Speaker. I know that with the heavy volume of snow we had at the end of December, the crews were out there as soon as they possibly could get out there and there is an order in our snow clearing policy, there is an order of things with respect to snow clearing, you

know the priority one, two and three streets get done in that particular order.

It's been a real challenge so far this year. I know that right now they are during this week they are trying to finish the P1 and P2 sidewalks and they hope to start on redoing priority three sidewalks which is the residential sidewalks again this week.

As well, there was a general ploughing last week to do the curb lane widening which I think is now completed and as well the crews are getting back to trying to knocking down the high snow banks on our major routes. That is a very slow process because the snow has to blown into trucks and hauled away. So, there is no way of speeding that up.

We certainly, I also know that some of the contractors were a little lax on, in some areas on providing enough equipment and that they've been spoken to by the streets maintenance people and I hope that part will also improve. So, I think all the crews are available with all the equipment they can possibly get they're hands on and they try to move all of this stuff as fast as they can but its, I appreciate that for some folks its not fast enough but I think generally speaking our crews have been doing an extremely admirable job under some very adverse conditions. Thank goodness we're not in Halifax or Charlottetown today.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Final supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, I know they're working very hard and doing the best they can under the circumstances. Would it be possible to get information with regards to our sidewalk or removal program for snow, a lot of it is in house to look at the last five and ten years to see what our resources were ten years ago and what they are today considering the city has grown when it comes to the equipment for sidewalk removal, snow removal.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that information can be provided, I'll ask our street maintenance people to see if they have those kinds of records and we can forward that to all members of Council and certainly after this winter, I'm sure we'll be looking at snow clearing policies again as Public Works usually does to see if there are any deficiencies and come forward to council with policy changes if they're needed.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Moving onto the Standing Policy Committee on Fiscal Issues, the report of January 11, 2005, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED JANUARY 11, 2005

Councillor Clement: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move the Fiscal Issues Committee meeting dated January 11, 2005, Item 1 as consent.

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

Motions none, by-laws none. Questions, Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: My question to the finance chair, what are the plans for our current budget and the budget discussions with the rest of council. Are we going to have priory sessions, are we going to be sitting down as a group. I mean this is going to be one of the most difficult budgets that we might have to be dealing with in recent years. I think that we should be working together, I know EPC is charged with the budget, but that doesn't prevent EPC from working with the rest of Council on coming up with what the priorities of the city should be and when are we going to start doing that tough work. This is most important job we have as a council. So, what's the plan.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Wyatt. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Yes, I'm looking forward to having those meetings and I'm sure that we will start probably having

meetings of that nature somewhere in the 3rd or 4th week in February, something in there, we'll be the, I would guess probably the 3rd week, towards the end of the 3rd week in February would be probably fairly timely in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Since the administration already knows the financial situation we're in. I don't think its any secret. Would it be possible to have a meeting just even to discuss the state of affairs right now with regards to the city's finances. Could we have something sooner than that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: The current state of the city's affairs Mr. Speaker are that we are in a surplus position for 2004 and that we won't have final numbers on that until the next Fiscal Issues meeting which will be the 1st week in February which is when we start tighten our numbers up and getting into them. We have had only one meeting of anybody at Executive Policy Committee on the budget. The administration doesn't have all of their documents in place yet. There's been some discussion and the other issue is that the Mayor is leaving town in about two hours and when he is back we will have another meeting and subsequent to that I believe we will be able to schedule meetings with other Councillors.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Final supplemental Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Will the seminars involve the department heads and separate seminars so we can have a very good discussion about the challenges.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well as you are aware Mr. Speaker the process for a current budget is that we first of all will develop a document and if the Mayor and I haven't actually spoken about that specific process but if it's the same as the capital what will happen is that the, once Executive Policy Committee has a discussion which I believe the date has been tabled for about the middle of February, then we will be able to start the process where not only will or do I believe that all Councillors should be brought in to have some discussions at an early and timely fashion Mr. Speaker, but I also know that part of the process beyond that will be that the current budget will go to all of the Standing committee's where the directors can come right to the Standing Committee and answer all kinds of questions on a line by line basis as Councillors choose at those committees.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I don't want to limit my time by trying to getting into the preamble so I'll go right to the questions. It's seems very disconcerting Mr. Mayor, Mr. Speaker when we hear the Mayor publicly stand up in front of a thousand people suggest to the people that we have a 57 million dollar shortfall, that we're going to eliminate business tax and we're possibly going to be looking at selling off some assets. So I guess my question is why doesn't Executive Policy Committee consider some sort of a group discussion on these priorities giving us more information so we don't generally have to hear it in public and then we can set what Council's priorities might be for EPC to consider the budget before they just give us a fair complete.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Clement.

Councillor De Smedt: I think I said that last year.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, order please.

Councillor Clement: I'm not sure what part of that I'm suppose to answer because I think part of it was might have something to do with the Mayor's speech last week. I'm not sure. I don't think that the process is any different than any other

time. I think I've already answered Councillor Angus's question that we're going to do what we always do, we're going to have some meetings with our administrative people, get a little bit of a handle on some things, hopefully make some of the easier decisions, grab some of the low lying fruit if you like and then when we look at the options of making some of our difficult decisions, I think we will have the opportunity to meet with other Councillors and talk about some of the delicate issues. There have been some expressed.

I heard a couple of things said last week during the Mayor's state of the city address as well and haven't had any real opportunity to have discussion with him about them myself. And don't really know where they're at. I've actually heard or read something in the paper that Councillor Angus has a report or something that's ready to surface to do with SOA's as well. So maybe they know what's going on with that. I haven't been made available to that yet Mr. Speaker that information. But in terms of the budget, the budget will flow, it's my view personally that all Councillors should be brought into the budget process in a timely fashion. The bottom line is that we don't have to pass a budget until the end of March. We have a lot of time and there won't be any or enough documentation in place until EPC meets I believe on February the 15th.

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

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Conditionally we have sent a letter to the administration asking them to reach a particular percentage target in budgets. Have you done that this year and what was that target.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I believe that it's been made very clear by Mayor Katz that his position is that he doesn't want to see any tax increase this year. That he would like to have taxes frozen and documentation that is being prepared will reflect that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Are you aware that Calgary after three years of consecutive zero's had multi years of double, inflationary high, high inflationary increase.

Mr. Speaker: No preamble on supplementary questions Councillor.

Councillor Angus: It's not a preamble, it's an are you aware of making the taxes after the last four or five years after three years of zero, when is this string going to break.

Mr. Speaker: Its two questions. Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: Well, Councillor Angus I'm not clairvoyant but I will say this that we've done very well. I think I've suggested this morning, that a hundred dollar payable in municipal taxes in 1995 is now $95.59 and that's nine years ago and over and above that there's another $10.21 I believe, $21.10 I think it is in inflation that we've chewed as well per hundred over and above that through that time, through growth and any other number of initiatives that everybody in this chamber has played a part in to reduce staff, to find efficiencies and to do things differently that we have in the past.

Bottom line is, is that I don't know what happened in Calgary and Edmonton, I'm not a city Councillor there, we do get this kind of information from time to time, however I think that this Council has been very very clear and Councillor Angus played a part in this last year as well, that we need a new deal Mr. Speaker to deal with some of those longer term problems and when we were dealing with the Province of Manitoba, they said talk to Paul Martin because he is the one that promised all of this infrastructure money and when he says what his deal is then come and talk to us.

Well as I understand it, there have been a lot of meetings between the Mayor's of

the larger cities and the FCM for that matter and Mr. Goodale is handling that issue as I understand it and I'm lead to believe that they're going to start providing funds as early as this year towards infrastructure and hopefully it'll peak out over three years instead of five and once we have documentation and as I understand from the meetings that I've been in at EPC we should have some sort of a document from the federal government between February and March sometime and once we get that documentation we will be able to have a pretty good idea of what we're going to get and we will then have a document to go to the province with to negotiate with.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the chair of Fiscal Issues, we've talked, we had a few questions about the budget process and I'm just left a little confused cause there's been talk of doing things in a more open way with the new Mayor and I guess, I was there for the last six budgets and I've heard an innovative suggestion from Councillor Angus which we actually did do several times in the last few years where we brought Councillors in earlier and I guess I'm just wondering what, am I hearing from you that we're not going to do that and we're just going to do it sort of the same old way that when you table a budget, then will get a chance to know about it or are we going to have a chance to discuss the budget, you know before EPC already decided what's in the budget.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Clement.

Councillor Clement: I guess I wasn't clear to and I apologize for not being as clear as I could. First of all, it was myself last year who actually insisted that we have a seminar for Councillors on the current budget and it didn't make the former mayor very happy about that but anyway I had it in any case. The bottom line is I don't have a problem with that process, I think that that's a healthy thing and I think it's the collegial thing to do. But you do have to have something in front of you before you have that meeting and I guess what I'm sharing with you, is I don't have it yet. There's only been one meeting of any kind on the budget with Executive Policy Committee and it was only yesterday and frankly we were at it for a couple of hours longer than what we anticipated Mr. Speaker as it turned out, so people changed their schedules and things but we didn't even complete the minor league stuff if you like that you get into at the beginning of one of those to start creating a document and you have to have something in front of you before you walk into a Councillors seminar and say, you just can't have a free for all in there and I think we all respect that, so we have to put something together. We've always have had that. We had that last year as well and so that we can show you kind of where we're at, where we're heading and how we're, how we think we might be able to get there and you got to have some of that in front of you. We just haven't got it yet. We will have it and when we have it we'll have the meetings.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Moving onto the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, the report of January 7, 2005 Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 7, 2005

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and I'd like to introduce the Report of January 7, 2005 and move adoption of consent Agenda Item 1.

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

Motions none, By-laws none. Questions none. The report of Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, dated January 10, 2005 Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 10, 2005

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the Report of January 10, 2005 and move adoption of consent Agenda Item 1 to 3 and 5 to 17 as consent and just to report to Council that clause 4 at the request of the developer has asked that this be removed from the application to Council, so it's not there. So, I move 1 to 3 and 5 to 17 as consent.

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

Moving onto the Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development, Report of January 17, 2005 Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 17, 2005

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce the Report of January 17, 2005 and move adoption of consent Agenda Item 1 to 4.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Lazarenko. Clause 1 stood down. Clause 2 to 4 as consent. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause 1 Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 - Acquisition, Sale and Declaration as Surplus - 365 McGregor Street (former YMCA) to the North End Community Renewal Corporation Files FI-2(34) and FI-2.4(34)

Mr. Speaker: Did you wish to introduce the clause Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Just very briefly Mr. Speaker I think Councillor Lazarenko would like to articulate some points on this. I think this is a good news story. I think we do have a private sector involvement to take the lead with a North End Renewal Corporation to rehabilitate the famous North End Y and so I would like to listen to any questions that Councillor Lazarenko has, but I do think this is a very positive initiative. We're already getting under way and simply Council's is being asked to declare this property surplus subject to many other conditions and authorizing the Director to conclude the details with the North End Renewal Corporation.

Just for your understanding the business plan is made whole by WHRA participating in that venture; it will accommodate day care centres plus opportunities to provide programs for seniors and for youth programming. And with that I think I would just allow Councillor Lazarenko to perhaps ask his questions and perhaps also conclude with some of that vision for that community. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Lazarenko.

Councillor Lazarenko: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to touch some face on this proposal that is before us here today. That particular building has been vacant now for close to 10 years. In 1984 when the province or the city paid more than the province we had contributed some funding of $350,000 for the renovation of the Y, we had put in a new day care centre and some work that was done from within the building.

The contractor was in there was good for ten years and then 1994 the Y administration decided to shut the building down, but they waited until after the ten year contract had expired, so in 1995 the decision was made to close it.

Even though at that time there were a lot of people in the community who were very very disturbed that that building was being closed because it's facilities were being provided, recreation for seniors and beyond and the preschoolers. But at that particular time when YMCA got into some financial difficulty when we had the core initiative program, we had allocated something like 4 million dollars to the building of a new facility in the downtown area.

So therefore the north Y was neglected to a point that they did not have the financial capability of trying to meet the standards on that particular building. So what happened Mr. Speaker at that time, there were various groups that were formed, community groups that wanted to keep that Y open but they could not do it because financially there was no monies available. There were seniors that got together, they tried, there was a native organization that tried also, they couldn't meet the capability of the financial requirements till this proposal it was the provincial government had done a survey, a study of 25 million dollars that they allocated funding to get a study underway with the North YMCA with no input from the city at all, even though we actually owned the building at that time because there was a caveat or something, the administration tells me there was no caveat but I remember at that time there was a caveat that was put on that facility.

And the $350,000 my understanding was about a million dollars. Then what happened when we tried to negotiate they had said look, the city said we are protected because we have a caveat and whoever wants to participate will have to pay the money that was invested by the city, but then I understand that the Executive Policy Committee through the request of the administration proceeded to give it a clean slate even though the Manager of EPC services, the Secretariat, a Gordon Vidal of November 20, 2003 had submitted a letter which he had no right to do it in that fashion to submit a letter to say that the city will provide that facility for one dollar and that caused complete confusion.

But I found out Mr. Speaker what was happening that this proposal was going before the Property and Development Committee, I met with the chair of Property and Development Councillor De Smedt and with some of the administrators and I thank Councillor De Smedt for his efforts of trying to reason with the administration also to help me with a concern that I had in that particular proposal.

It had dealing with the Mamawhichita organization that said they'll be having and its kind of a hard name to pronounce, tell me I challenge anybody to do it right. So they had made this proposal and had excluded the concerns that the community had such seniors and preschoolers in the area, they have programs only for themselves.

This all said it struck me Mr. Speaker because the policy we have in place as of last year that any surplus land that is available to be dealt with to be sold has to go through the area Councillor instead of Community Committee, goes to the area Councillor for an input. That was one concern that I raised with the chair of Property and Development and we had proceeded to address the three concerns that I had.

And that was dealing with providing a component for seniors in the community, a component for also the preschoolers and youth in the community and thirdly was that the area Councillor would be so notified and the public consultation has to be held.

The proponents when they came before the committee, the Property and Development this was raised to them and they agreed to it, so now it's good news that we are going to be having public consultations so that people who live in the area for many years, that was the only facility they had anything to the north end by swimming and having recreation for the seniors and the young.

So now if this will be dealt with after Council has declared this land surplus and they have to negotiate and get the funding in place by the other two levels of government and they had said that they will succeed and plus a private fund raising blitz will be put on by MLA John Lavin, on which on Friday I'll be meeting with him this week to some of the concerns I had addressed because if the community would have not been involved Mr. Speaker I can rest assure you that the funding that will be taking place in the north end would have been very slim because people would have been so disappointed, they've been counting on

this like I said its good news, good news for the north end.

So with that Mr. Speaker once again the administration were very helpful especially Mr. Klassen who was instrumental of trying to draft something and with the help of the chair and myself they were able to address something that the proponents were able to accept and they have accepted so now its just in the works of holding a public consultation so that the people in the area will have an opportunity because one thing I've stood fast Mr. Speaker on the issue of not going and having any public consultation.

I've been with this so many times and I did not want to let this one go through, that we go through the in camera process then taken onto the floor of Council, then march it on through Council and bang then its all over. This will give an opportunity for the people for which they have a right to be consulted and any new ideas they may have to help in the reestablishment of a new facility for the people to use and once again Mr. Chairman this is good news for Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lazarenko. Councillor De Smedt anything further.

Councillor De Smedt: Yes, thank you very much Mr. Speaker and just to wrap up I'd like to thank Councillor Lazarenko for his intervention to make sure that what was being proposed was going to be in accord with the wishes and not merely of the Councillor but of his community. I think it's important that this project take off on the right foot. Just for the benefit of Council, I mean this is a 4.5 million dollar project. It has been championed in the legislature, I think by Councillor Lazarenko's colleague, MLA John Lavin. There's some two million dollars being committed by the federal government as I understand, private sector funding will now come to the table.

So, for the benefit of Council I think one of the considerations of course is that it was analyzed by the administration in concert with the PUFS report. I mean we do know that we have to have a commitment to renovate and upgrade facilities available to people particularly in the shoulder neighbourhoods of the inner city and this is in consonance ultimately where we may end up with the PUFS, it adds value to that community and the community recreation context.

So, I think what Council will be doing is declaring surplus and allowing the Director through the PP&D Committee to authorize and to go out and negotiate tax acquisition, it'll be sold for a dollar and we will then proceed.

So I think this is a marvelous opportunity for the city to see an evolution of a piece of property that's been sitting in a desolate state and it's a commitment by many to make it work.

So I would move as consent clause 4. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Not as consent, only moving the clause. All in favour of the clause? Contrary? Carried.

Under motions we have a motion by Chairman De Smedt, seconded by the ward Councillor involved, Councillor Steeves to correct a clerical error in the report of P&D dated June 7 and adopted by Council on July 21st, do we have consent, taken as read, all in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clause all in favour? or the motion, Contrary? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS on June 14, 2004, the Riel *Community Committee convened a Public Hearing to consider an application for a Zoning Agreement Amendment for property located on the west side of St. Anne's Road between Compark Road and Southglen Boulevard under File ZAA 10/2004;*

AND WHEREAS a portion of the intention of the Community Committee was to amend the Zoning Agreement to clearly indicate that any future loading zone area, buffered from neighbouring residential areas to the west by a solid noise attenuation barrier/wall, was to be included in the setback of 50 feet along the west property line of the land;

AND WHEREAS the applicant has agreed to enter into a Servicing Agreement with the City to provide for the construction of a pedestrian sidewalk on the south side of Compark Road between the northwest and northeast corners of the subject property, at the applicant's expense, to be located in the north setback of 25 feet, effectively reducing the setback to 19 feet along the north property line of the land;

AND WHEREAS a revised Report dated June 7, 2004, from the Manager of Planning and Land Use was submitted to and considered by the Community Committee at the Public Hearing but was not officially entered into the record;
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council reconsider Item 9 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated July 9, 2004, as adopted by Council on July 21, 2004;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council rescind its decision of July 21, 2004, with respect to Recommendation 1A. of Item 9 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated July 9, 2004, by deleting Recommendation 1A. in its entirety and substituting therefore the following, namely:

1. That Zoning Agreement Caveat No. 249458 under File DASZ 40/85A dated February 5, 1986, (By-law No. 4314/86 be amended as follows:

A. No buildings shall be constructed, erected or placed within fifty (50) feet of the west property line of the land, with the exception of any future loading zone area which is to be buffered from neighbouring residential areas to the west by a solid noise attenuation barrier/wall, within twenty-five (25) feet of the south property line of the land, within nineteen (19) feet of the north property line of the land, and, that there be a zero setback for buildings along the east property line of the land.

2. That the City Solicitor/Manager of Legal Services be requested to prepare the necessary Amending Agreement to Zoning Agreement DASZ 40/85A (By-law No. 4314/86) dated February 5, 1986, as approved in aforesaid recommendation 1.

3. That the Proper Officers of the City be hereby authorized to execute said Amending Agreement and do all things necessary for implementation of the above."

Mr. Speaker: By-laws Councillor De Smedt.

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

Councillor De Smedt: I'll move that By-laws numbered 1/2005, 2/2005, 5/2005, 6/2005, 7/2005, 8/2005, 9/2005, 11/2005, 13/2005, 14/2005, and 16/2005 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 1/2005, 2/2005, 5/2005, 6/2005, 7/2005, 8/2005, 9/2005, 11/2005, 13/2005, 14/2005, and 16/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I'll move that by-laws numbered 1/2005, 2/2005, 5/2005, 6/2005, 7/2005, 8/2005, 9/2005, 11/2005, 13/2005, 14/2005, and 16/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 1/2005, 2/2005, 5/2005, 6/2005, 7/2005, 8/2005, 9/2005, 11/2005, 13/2005, 14/2005, and 16/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I'll move that the rule be suspended, and that By-laws numbered 1/2005, 2/2005, 5/2005,

6/2005, 7/2005, 8/2005, 9/2005, 11/2005, 13/2005, 14/2005, and 16/2005 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.

Questions of the chair? Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Smith and Councillor Lazarenko could you take the chair please.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT QUESTION PERIOD

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

Councillor Wyatt: I'm asking a question regarding secondary plans Mr. Deputy Speaker. We've just passed Waverley West or its going on, its going to need approval still from the province if they choose to, we going to need secondary plan there. A concern that I have is it's taken some time to address secondary plans in my end of town dealing to get them on the priority list. I want to thank the chair for his assistance on that and making it a priority. It has taken a year and half to get it, Transcona West Secondary Plan to a point now where we're finally moving along. Is there an assurance that we can get that no secondary plans that are working on right now will get bumped by the resources everything with regards to the Waverley West situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, Councillor Wyatt. Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Yes, thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I think the assurance that I can give the Councillor is of course is that the staff that are already under way in preparing existing plans of interest to your area or others will continue. It is our full expectation I believe that the development of the secondary plans or area structure plan for Waverley West will be undertaken very aggressively by the proponent and the developers which is really the private sector plus the province in collaboration with the city. So, yes resources are going to, not necessarily being diverted but they will be working you know full speed to try and bring Waverley West on as soon as practical.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt your second.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I appreciate that response because we don't want to see any side tracking of other work being done. The other question I have Mr. Chairman, Deputy Speaker is, are applications on Waverley West going to be entertained prior to secondary plan being completed and done and voted on by Council or are we going to wait until secondary plan and all the issues being sorted out before we entertain any applications from any interested party in developing in Waverley West.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Yeh, I think if you recall the protocol Councillor Wyatt is that we have to have a secondary plan in place from which we will be guided I presume by the concept of phasing with all the major issues at least highlighted that have to be addressed from which then applications can flow. Now I'm hoping of course like everybody else, that these things will be done in a very practical and quick timely way. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Wyatt you're final.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Do you foresee as part of the secondary plan process an avenue to address issues such as offset various charges since Winnipeg is one of the last cities in Canada not to have offset area charges for offset infrastructure costs and these sorts of issues to be addressed by the secondary plan for Waverley West.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: I'm intrigued by the comment offset development charges

perhaps you could maybe just explain that a bit more and maybe clarification.

You know we all ready have some development parameters and I think it, if you were at the public hearings you would have heard by the presentation by the department that there are costs that are part of the development would be part of the development process and there are some that are triggered by the process and I think in the broader context of development parameters if we are to make changes, we have a process for that, we do have an ad hoc development parameters committee that will probably be undertaking some analysis of other issues and whether there are offset costs or if you're referring to those impost fees that perhaps the Toronto area charges and that particular region charges, will probably will be looked at.

I do want to clarify a point I think made this morning by Councillor Thomas, I don't think it's as simple as saying that in the Toronto area there are some municipalities that are charging up to $30,000 for offset costs. I think that's if what you're thinking of and we're only charging $39.50 which are for the Mylar's.

I think we're not comparing apples and apples and we have to probably address that at a high level way. I thought it was a kind of a chatty bit of information we might have received. I think it was probably not directly related but there are some relationships that we have to look at.

If you recall for Waverley West, you mean the mandate that the Mayor gave us all and as a council we've agreed to and its part of Plan Winnipeg is that this is to be sustainable infrastructure and our overview is that it is sustainable with the infrastructure we have and the long term charges that we will be applying as well as the revenue generated by the properties. If there are other opportunities you can rest assured that this is the time now for us to look at them without, I would have to have a caveat here at least personally and on behalf of you know the people who come forward to develop these projects that we're not going to be trying to find some creative way to take more than what would be fair and equitable for what we've done in the past and what's needed for the future. So there's a balance here.

Okay. Whatever that may be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Smith. Your first.

Councillor Smith: Yes, Councillor De Smedt as you know the West End Cultural Centre bought the two houses next door and have applied for a demolition permit and mean while the department has come and inspected the two homes and is charging a five hundred dollars for each home although no one is ever going to live there. They're slated for demolition. Why are we doing that?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Well, I'll just get a checkbook out. I think Councillor Smith you were at our committee and I think we indicated that we would get further analysis of that particular situation for you, so you know I'm not going to give you a off the cuff reply. If it doesn't make sense then we'll find out you know with some precision how it can be addressed. But I think we've already heard you in delegation and I think we've given some instructions to the administration.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Second supplementary Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Can we speed up the process.

Councillor De Smedt: Councillor Smith I'm always ready to help. Absolutely.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi your first question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask this question in the Mayor's question period but there was so many important questions that needed to be asked that the time got used up.

In the Mayor's state of the city speech, he talked about an intention to sell services

to the capital region and I'm wondering of the chair, if the chair of Planning, Property and Development in light of the fact has a comment, in light of the fact a water park is just a week later announced that they're going to build outside the city limits entirely. Does the chair of Planning, Property and Development have an opinion that selling certain services to the capital region is going to help encourage businesses to build inside the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: What a leading question. Thank you Councillor Gerbasi, I think we all have opinions on the capital region. Let me just simply say that you know I am a passionate supporter, not only of our city but of involving the capital region in a very logical way. I mean we all get troubled from time to time and we hear that there is an application right next door as I call it the edge of our city for development whether it's residential as we heard before Christmas in East St. Paul or as we heard last week up at West St. Paul for something that's clearly a city setting, an urban setting in a rural committee or what we heard in the R.M. of MacDonald for a water park.

Let me just say that and I think the Mayor has stated and I can give him support on this at least certainly my view is that we need from this provincial government and it really doesn't matter which provincial government it was there, so I'm trying to say this in a non partisan way. It is time for us to have a capital region plan. It may not be easily accomplished because there are interests, right. There's a great danger of saying that in politics were going to be good friends with our neighbours. But our neighbours have interests and we have interests. So, I would be a good neighbor but not necessary friends, by that I simply mean is that we have to explore opportunities for growth together after we have a plan from which then it might make a heck of a lot of sense to say, what services do we have that could be provided that are logical, that are environmentally friendly and that allow containment in a rational way of the growth in our area.

You know one of the things that is going to drive us in the future and I think everybody knows that are frankly the environmental issues. High quality water, waste water services and high quality air are fundamental to our success here in Manitoba and is a significant edge that we have over many other municipalities in certainly in central, those who would like to call Ontario central Canada in that, in the golden triangle area. So if we ever had any environmental issues facing our community at large and I include the capital region and I think you better start thinking strategically.

We don't want West St. Paul, East St. Paul, Headingely to face a Walkerton. So if there was quality, water quality issues, I think we would be the first one to make sure that we have a pipe to them immediately for their existing residents. So I'm just trying to think beyond the immediate future. And it's the same for waste water services, if it becomes the norm for them to have to dump sewage into lagoons that go into the river that isn't properly treated, then we on their behalf if it's been verified as a environmental issue should be the first ones to be prepared to look at what excess capacity we may have after we spend all of the money that we have to put in to clear up the phosphorus and the nitrogen's' that this existing government at the provinces layoffs because we're not so sure now what our capacity is going to be in our plans.

So there's, before we move ahead to rapidly and have high-faluting ideas of what we may or may not be providing to the capital region we have to identify that. By the same token, I come back to the point, I think we would be the first ones to offer our facilities if there was going to be an environmental issue that our neighbours replace health issues and so I'm not sure how it will all go except it's a long winded way of saying, I support the capital region but it has a lot of caveat's on it. We need to work together. Some of them may not be happy with our answers but I think we can find a way in time to

move ahead. It may not be in the next immediate months but at some point in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi, your second question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. I think some of the citizens may not be happy with a water park going outside the city of Winnipeg and I guess I'm wondering if EPC has had any discussions or any plans such as asking the province to freeze new developments in the capital region. Have they thought of any ways of dealing with this bleeding out of initiatives we hoped would happen either close to the, within the city of Winnipeg at a minimum, but what boundaries not to mention in the inner city or closer to existing infrastructure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: Councillor Gerbasi I think we have to be moderate in our analysis. I mean I think none of us would like to see a high quality facility that would service all the residents to be on our boundary.

On the other hand it's the remit or the responsibility of the province to discuss that issue. We all know that there is a lot of political tooing and throwing last spring and summer when the issue of the arena sale came about and people wanted to bring in a grand water park. Many people would have acknowledged that that was the sensible thing to do, unfortunately when people don't do proper business plans and its not supported with any rational kind of financial undertaking that how can we consider these things.

That would be the logical place, somewhere in this city, not necessarily the arena place, could it be other parts of the city that you may be able to identify very quickly. Absolutely, maybe Waverley West in the middle of Waverley West, you want to do that instead of housing. I think the payback would be very very low. There is some areas that they obviously considered.

Look I don't think it's our job to go running over to the Minister or the Premier and say Oh, Gary I'm sorry can you just kill this. We have to let things take their place and I have a great suspicion that as the analysis is done, I'm not sure why we would want to drive out McGillivary to go a water park but heh, that's the private sector, if they want to do it and they can defend their case, I guess it'll happen. If not, we'll see where it goes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your final supplemental Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: So Mr. Speaker am I correct in understanding that EPC's approach is to just basically let whatever development happens because it's up to the province to show leadership on this. Is that what you're saying.

Councillor De Smedt: I'll answer a little more direct. When applications are received by municipalities to have conditional uses or for rezoning within two kilometers of the edge of our city, that's the boundary, we are informed. And when we're informed we respond.

As I mentioned to you just a moment ago, we responded very accurately and deliberately to a conditional use hearing that West St. Paul just heard last Thursday for a multi family development right on our boundary, right on our boundary. We were informed, we responded. The province is informed; they get a letter as well.

In this particular case the water park was proposed outside the two kilometer boundary. We had no idea that this was coming until you hear about it in the news. How the private sector wants to advance their particular event is up to them. I mean they choose to do it through the press and they'd already been to the R.M. of MacDonald for a conditional use on the site. I had no knowledge of that until it showed up in the Press, regrettably. Did you?

Councillor Gerbasi: No.

Councillor De Smedt: Okay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Okay next is Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services, Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JANUARY 10, 2005

Councillor Steeves: Thank you very much Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to introduce the Report of January 10, 2005 and move adoption of consent Agenda Item 1.

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

Councillor Steeves: That concludes my submission Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Motions of any. Consideration of by-laws Councillor Steeves.

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

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law numbered 15/2005 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 15/2005.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-law numbered 15/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law numbered 15/2005.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rule be suspended and that By-law numbered 15/2005 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question period, Councillor Benham, followed by Councillor Angus.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Speaker to the chair of Protection and Community Services, in September the Mayor promised all Councillors that his office and the administration would work on a plan to consult the public on the Public Use Facility Study to be brought forward and I quote in six to eight weeks. That was more than sixteen weeks ago.

Today we hear from the Mayor's office, there will be no plan before Councillors until March and that plan will not include holding public forums on this important issue. Mr. Speaker as the representative of our committee on Executive Policy Committee, can the chair explain why the Executive Policy is not keeping its commitment to consult the public on the Public Use Facility Study.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I certainly don't want to speak on behalf of the Mayor's office and whether or not the public will or will not be consulted in a larger way. That's obviously their comments and they can respond to them as they see fit. I guess I'll respond pejoratively in my sense of where the PUFS study is going.

What I believe is going to happen is that all of the Councillors have had a chance probably by this stage to meet with people in their ward and to their own administration on the PUFS study and talk about how it might look for their specific ward and maybe grandeur issues in terms of this city as a whole.

When we talk about public consultation, we have to ask ourselves what exactly does that mean. Is there or is there not a benefit in sort of opening up this thousand page study to some mass public consultation or is our time better spent on

specific ward issues that require public consultation. I guess that's what we have to decide and I suppose again without responding for the Mayor, I don't know, maybe what's being indicated is that rather than go to a larger all encompassing public consultation on that huge document. If we want to talk about whether or not we're going to close the library in St. Vital or close Crescentwood Community Centre for example, maybe a more directed area specific public consultation is what's required.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Benham, second supplementary.

Councillor Benham: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker and I appreciate that the chair has made a valid point which is I'm making him responsible for statements from the Mayor's office because again there was not a chance for a second round of questions during the Mayor's question period and I appreciate the fact that all Councillors enjoy asking questions and I think that's a good thing.

Mr. Speaker I'll just ask one more question of the chair of Protection and Community Services and that is he said he can see no value in talking to the public about the overall strategy or questions the value of consultation on a one thousand, is there a benefit to opening up a thousand page study or is the time better spent. Mr. Speaker the whole idea as I understand it of PUFS was to have some general overall view, why would we not want to consult the public on creating an overall strategy for our pools, our libraries and our recreational facilities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Benham. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Could be. I hope I didn't exactly say that I don't believe I actually said there was no value in public consultation. I guess if I wasn't clear, I guess I'll try to be clearer this time. What I meant to imply was we are going to do consultation, especially if this comes down Mr. Deputy Speaker to the very hard political decisions of having to close facilities in favour of building new ones. Obviously that's going to require some sort of public consultation. I guess where Councillor Benham is having a bit of difficulty with the Mayor's comments is perhaps he's perceived and again not my comments, perhaps he's perceived from the Mayor's office perhaps correctly or incorrectly I'm not sure, that there's no will to consult globally on the massive study.

I guess what we'll have to do ongoing I guess as members of the Protection and Community Services Committee is decide, what we want to push as the public consultation agenda. As a council do we see benefit in spending our time on a consultation process on the entire study as a whole or do we want to focus on the ward specific issues.

The Mayor has said quite candidly I think that he's not really in the camp of closing down community centers against people's wishes. Therefore is it worth us even going to a public consultation process on that question if that's not something that's going to happen.

Frankly I'm open to whatever we want to do ongoing. Administration still has this report, they've taken all the information from all Councillors and everybody has their own concerns in their own ward and frankly I don't envy administration's job on this task. So, I guess I'll leave it at that. There has been from my perspective no final decision on consultation. We'll have to make that decision as to what we're going to do with it. Obviously as everyone here knows, we're not going to attempt to make any of the hard decisions without any consultation. Whether or not the consultation involves the massive document or more specific ward issues, that's what we're going to have to decide on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. That's it Councillor Benham. Councillor Angus your first.

Councillor Angus: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Chairman, can you tell us where we're at with the amalgamation of the Fire Department and the Ambulance services please.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: The Mayor has had discussions with the Chief and the members of the unions, the representatives of the unions ongoing. I am not in a position to say right now where those discussions are. I can tell you that the Mayor has undertaken this issue and will be I guess for a lack of a better term dealing with it and when he sees fit I suppose coming forward with his thoughts on this issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your second supplementary Councillor Angus.

Councillor Angus: Councillor Steeves I don't want to put you on the spot but are you suggesting to me that as the Chairman of the Standing Committee you don't have any communication with the Director of you department, specifically the Fire Department in this case.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I've had communications, I guess what I'm saying is this is a very very difficult issue, no doubt there has been discussions, there's been discussions between, there's been discussions between union representatives, the Chief and the Mayor which I have not been privy to, some information I may have. At this stage I don't know that there has been any decision made and I'm really not in a position to offer up any more information than that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. That's it. Councillor Magnifico, your first supplementary.

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you. Councillor Steeves is it true that our vice, robbery, gang units work days, weekends off presently and any time evenings and weekends have to be manned at set time and a half and would it not behove us to look at that come the next agreement to see if we can get that changed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you for the question. This is fundamentally a question of overtime pay in the police service. I can offer Councillor Magnifico the assurance that during these operating budget discussions we are looking at that very issue. I'm not in a position to I guess give information right now as I wouldn't feel comfortable off the top of my head because I'm not a 100 percent certain as to the hours of the vice or not. I can get that information; I can offer the assurance Mr. Deputy Speaker that we are looking at the issue of overtime costs in the police service right now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, second supplementary Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Steeves when is the next, the current agreement ended and the new one to start with the police.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: We're again currently in negotiations with the police union. I know these are in camera discussions, at this stage I wouldn't want to say anything more than that Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, your final third supplementary

Councillor Magnifico: I just want dates, when does this contract end and when does the next one start.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: December 23, 2004.

Councillor Steeves: The nature of the blurred out sound exactly right to me. I want to be very very careful in this area as we are in the process of negotiating with the police union right now and it is one of those in camera items Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You're right Councillor Steeves. That is in camera. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Councillor Magnifico you got the juices going here. I'll ask a question, with regards to that last May when I met with the Chief and they were conducting negotiations at that time with the present contract that has now expired, I asked whether it was on the table the issue of the requirement to have 24 hour, 2 officer cruiser cars across the entire city, since we're one of the last jurisdictions that still mandates 2 officer cruiser cars in all parts of the city at all times of the day. Is that something that's being considered and put on the table since according to the Chief himself, it could potentially from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. free up an additional 50 percent more officers on the streets of Winnipeg.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves, may I remind you that if that is on the table for the discussions during the negotiations you don't have to answer that because that's not within.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think it's a good idea for me to entertain any questions on what is on or off the table in negotiation discussions.

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

Councillor Wyatt: I appreciate that Mr. Deputy Speaker and Mr. Chairman would it be possible to arrange for those Councillors interested to have an in camera meeting with the chair and with the Chief of Police to discuss these issues since they are of critical importance and it's a huge budget to the city.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Once again, Councillor Steeves that in itself you cannot because it means you have to take all of the parties involved to the table including the room and everybody. They're negotiating now; please don't discuss that issue now. Your last supplementary.

Councillor Wyatt: Would the chair be prepared to call a special in camera meeting of the Standing Committee then to discuss these matters and that it would be done in camera officially as a special meeting of the committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, sorry, can't, rule out of order. Any further questions, if not, Councillor Eadie moves adjournment. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

ROLL CALL

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

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 2:59 p.m.