COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday March 23, 2005

The Council met at 9:37 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Steeves.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: We have a page with us this morning it's Ilana Shapera of Gray Academy who resides in the River Heights Ward, welcome Ilana.

Welcome announcements, none.

MOTIONS

Motion
Moved by Councillor Smith,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,

That Councillor Benham be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Motion
Moved by Councillor Thomas,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,

That Councillor Lubosch be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to illness.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

MINUTES

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith moves the Minutes of the meeting held February 23, 2005 be taken as read and confirmed.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mr. Speaker: We have seven delegations today. I'm going to have to change the order a little bit in order to group them according to the subject that they are speaking on otherwise it would be cheating a couple of you out of a chance to have a question period on a couple of them if I don't as there is only one ten minute question period per subject per side of a subject so if you'll indulge me. First two will be as, first David Saunders on EPC clause 2 of March 9th. David. Welcome back.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. David Saunders: Mr. Speaker, Your Worship and Members of Council and now for something completely different. I am appearing this morning in opposition to item no. 2 of the Report of Executive Policy Committee from March 9th specifically the recommendation that the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to implement a two year assessment cycle.

I should clarify my position; I'm actually in favour of a two year assessment cycle. In fact I would strongly support going to an annual cycle as most other Canadian jurisdictions have done. What I am concerned about is the content of the report prepared and submitted by the Property Assessment Department in support of the recommendation.

Most of the recommendations within the report are simply intended to make it more difficult for a taxpayer to appeal or contest his or her assessment. As usual the prime motivation of the City Assessment department is to protect itself from challenge instead of concentrating on its real responsibility which is to prepare fair and accurate assessments in the first place.

And let me just list some of the department's taxpayer unfriendly suggestions contained in the report before you today. They suggest that there be fees for appeal filing and the only purpose of which is to discourage appeals. The suggestion of the using mass evaluation as the test of assessed

values at the appeal tribunals instead of the current site specific test. What that really means is don't assess properties based on their market value anymore and just use whatever otherwise indefensible number the department's computer generates.

Next point the suggestion for a common form for evidence presented at appeal hearings. What this means is to force taxpayers to limit their evidence to the format preferred by the Assessment department and only those issues which the department thinks are relevant.

Next point to direct appeal tribunals to limit irrelevant evidence; what it really means is direct the tribunals to refuse to hear evidence the department doesn't want to hear.

The suggestion about case management of appeal files. Essentially the department is suggesting that it would blame the Municipal Board and the taxpayers for the fact that the department itself has declared itself unable to staff the backlog of appeal hearings for almost two years now. It's the department. Not the Board. Not the taxpayers.

The suggestion that they should allow the Property Assessment department can make assessment roll corrections and changes. What this means is to give the Assessment department complete arbitrary power and an unchanneled ability to intimidate taxpayers by threatening to increase their assessments. The department already has plenty of authority to make corrections and changes in an orderly manner and subject to review by an impartial tribunal.

The suggestion of the report is that you would have non-residential property appeals heard by the Municipal Board only. In effect postponing the hearing that most appeals of high value properties until after they have been taxed which thereby would increase the City's financial exposure, not what you intend.

And the suggestion that residential appeals would be determined finally by the Board of Revision essentially means to deny residential taxpayers any opportunity for a second opinion except at the cost of going to court.

The suggestion of limiting new evidence; that the Municipal Board is simply to restrict the ability of the Board to make a fair and accurate determination.

A straight suggestion to limit the Board of Revision to hearing all appeals within six to ten weeks. All this can mean is that you wish to sacrifice all pretence about pursuing fairness, openness, understandability or defensibility in the name of speed. This would most likely increase the number of appeals going to the Municipal Board if they are still allowed and anyway the fact is that the Board of Revision already hears every appeal before the City sets its mill rate.

The suggestion that we set the date and format for collection of non-residential market information. Really this is a suggestion to create red tape like you've never seen. Right now commercial property owners try very hard to fill out the department's incomprehensible forms and in the end they just submit their own financial statements and rent flows and frankly when I asked the City Assessor for clarification of these new forms repeatedly over a five month period all I got in the end was an invitation to settle matters in court. But I have to do that.

Council ought to know that the penalty which is currently being enforced against unfortunate City of Winnipeg commercial taxpayers and particularly their innocent tenants is unlimited and it's absolutely outrageous. There is one extreme case finally going to the Court of Appeal next month where the penalty for failing to submit an assessor's questionnaire is presently in excess of $300,000.

The suggestion of linking business assessment and realty assessment. Sounds good but actually what is meant here is to unlink the relationship between the business and realty assessment of particular premises which right now are supposed to be linked based on common market rent for the reference year. It's not the case because the department has

failed to produce a new business assessment roll for this cycle and so our business assessments in the City are in fact now this year, ten years out of date. Or it may mean the need to introduce a whole new process for reporting vacancies as Ontario ended up doing under similar circumstance.

The suggestion that enhancing the open house preview program for the 2008 roll which is the title if you read the text. It actually means to do away with the preview program on the assumption that the assessor is given the power to just change assessments anytime "without the need for the formal and time consuming appeal process."

And then there is some discussion of continued focus on date elements that is the focus on resources and systems to ensure that quality, currency and accuracy of the date elements in order to properly supply the valuation models. That is, the department needs to figure out how to produce a much more accurate assessment roll than the present computer model that it's created. I'm quite sure many of you have heard from property owners who are scratching their heads.

And the fact that increasing efficiency and data gathering requiring taxpayers to self report, whatever that may mean, and then penalize them further for any possible shortcomings in their self assessment.

The final point, staffing and quality management is frankly an admission that the City has still not yet arranged to develop and maintain sufficient, competent assessment staff and to give that staff the support and tools they need to do an excellent job. And frankly the real problem has always been and still remains the very last item on the list; the ability to produce good fair accurate assessments in the first place. Instead of continually trying to prevent appeals and suppress fair hearings I wish the City Assessor would focus instead on building an organization which is able to handle the admittedly huge task of valuing all realty and business property in a fair and accurate manner in the first place.

And so in conclusion I respectfully suggest that Council approve the recommendation before you to request implementation of a two year assessment cycle but that Council also direct EPC to reconsider the contents of this report very carefully. I and others have got an opportunity to appear before committee and make recommendations and answer questions with a view that making a real improvement in the fairness and accuracy of assessment in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Questions? Thank you very much. Oh I'm sorry, Councillor Wyatt has a question.

Councillor Wyatt: Would you agree that we need to review the Assessment Act. It hasn't been reviewed for I'll say 78 or 79, the Municipal Assessment Act, that there should be a full review conducted by the Province.

Mr. Saunders: I definitely agree. It should be, it was redone entirely for 1989—90. There have been a lot of amendments made to it and decisions and precedents set in the last fifteen years which have in my view made the whole process much more unfair than it once was, and I think it's time to fix them. There's a lot good about our legislation, there's a lot good about our system, but there are certainly some things in dire need of improvement.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Next delegation Eric Johansson in support of item 5, the report of Protection and Community Services dated March 7th, Mr. Johanson.

Mr. Johanson: Good morning Mr. Speaker, His Worship Mr. Mayor and members of Council. My name is Eric Johanson; I'm the owner of Soul Survivors Body Art, a body modification studio in Osborne Village. As a long time advocate for the policy change in the body modification industry I'm able to express my immense satisfaction with the substantial strides that are being made here today.

This by-law that will indubitably be passed today is a necessity in lieu of the modern transformations that much of the population is concurrently undergoing. Subsequently the mere volume of people interested in these art forms necessitates and demands with the responsiveness from an appointed governing body.

The population interested in the body modification industry is expected to potentially increase since the current by-law was drafted in 1987 that Portage la Prairie began integrating a new policy to contribute to the safety of this increasing population. The proceeding discourse is unquestionably an affirmation of the inestimable convalescence of the existing by-law. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my thanks to the organizational commitment to the proposition. Given success can only be measured subsequent but not limited to an ongoing assessment in the valuation of its effectiveness.

It seems as though much time has passed since the preliminary rhetoric began in regards to creating this by-law. It's indescribable to know that one's labours and extended efforts to accomplish what had once seemed an impossible objective has become a success all on its own. Today is a historically for Winnipeg as no other levels of Canadian Government has implemented a comprehensive management program pertaining to the body modification industry. This variable alone is indicative of the conscientiousness of this government.

At this time I'd like to proffer my sincere gratitude to Councillor Gerbasi for her extensive efforts. With this objective I consider her involvement to be of essential merit. This by-law is an incalculable development for the body modification industry and is obligatory in considering the safety of the increasing population interested in these age-old arts.

In closing I would just like to say I hope to see this by-law instituted for January 1st, 2006 and I would like to thank you for your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Councillor Gerbasi do you have a question?

Councillor Gerbasi: Just a quick question. Even though that this by-law is going to cost the industry money I just think it's interesting to note that you advocated for this years ago and you took the effort, for a business to take the effort to do something that costs you money, do you want to say anything about that to Council because I think that's really an interesting point that you are prepared to do that.

Mr. Johanson: It's a hard one I've wrestled with that a lot myself but with more population interested, and getting that there is more people offering it and a lot of untrained people putting themselves over as professionals which is causing a, in my opinion, a pretty huge health risk. So if that means you have to pay a little more a year, then that's the way it has to be I guess.

Councillor Gerbasi: Well done.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. Next delegation will be Kate Sjoberg, in support of item 1, Protection and Community Services dated March 11th. Welcome.

Ms. Sjoberg: Thanks, thanks so much Mr. Speaker and Mr. Mayor and Councillors for allowing me to speak today. I am so pleased to have the chance to speak in favour of a project that is so important to me and the people I represent; Winnipeggers for Bus Rapid Transit. But also as Community Liaison Director for the University of Winnipeg Students' Association where we have 10,000 students who are, 70% of whom take the bus three or more times a week.

I also wanted to tell you that I am also incoming President of the UWESA and during my campaign one of the, my platforms was to work with Winnipeg Transit to improve student access to Winnipeg Transit and so a lot of what I'm going to speak on today will involve the conversations that I have had with students.

Now I am usually a cyclist but I took the bus this morning to avoid the usual road splash that's usually a part of my wardrobe and I was surprised at how easy it was to take the bus actually during rush hour. And Mayor Katz I actually live in your neighbourhood. I can't say I wasn't surprised not to see you on the bus, but I imagine that the reasons that both of us don't take transit more often are probably quite similar. With schedules at odds with the rush cycle that transit works on it usually isn't a 20 minute trip downtown to the University or to City Hall, it's usually a 40 minute hassle of wait for the bus, wait for a transfer, get off the bus, wait for another transfer, and so I think we really need to improve that efficiency.

That's not to say though that people particularly students aren't taking transit anyway. Right now UMSU is working on developing a universal pass for students at the U of M specifically because of the high rates of transit use. What is missing isn't people to take the bus. What's missing is a bus system that meets peoples' needs and that is worthwhile and attractive to take, and that is something other than the system we have right now. And that is part of, that part is one of the most important parts for me.

As I said on the bus rapid transit hearings I'm not a transportation expert, but I do know that chipping away at the current service with features like bus shelters, or more benches at more stops, while appreciated, is not what transit in Winnipeg needs. What Winnipeggers have been waiting for is the comprehensive plan for overhauling Winnipeg Transit that has been on the books since the tri-level agreement was signed last year. And in other words what Winnipeggers are waiting for is the spirit of the motion on the table.

I support the motion for a number of reasons. As a born and bred Winnipegger I'm proud of this City as it stands, but I also want the place that I live in to reflect the values that I hold of community assisting ability of reducing environmental impacts. Many students that I have spoken to are very interested in never having to own a car. And that's something that's more cost effective for the City as a whole in the long run, especially as we deal with our infrastructure deficit.

As a woman the job that I get after I am done school will be more likely to evade the traditional 9 to 5 workday and so I will very much value a system that is more friendly to the non-rush hour trips.

Now students rely on transit for a more cost effective way of getting to and from school. But while on that point I want to applaud the City for lowering senior rates for transit. This is a program that has been long overdue. However I want to point out that students and young people rely on transit just as much as seniors do. And students are likely to be low income or in debt and so transit costs for them are much the same as they would be for seniors. And I hope that Council will acknowledge this in the short-term as young people and seniors alike continue to wait for a better transit system.

Now I also support the motion on the table today because I believe that this is a part the way we are going to make public transit more cost effective in this City. When transit is made more attractive through accessibility and convenience ridership goes up. And again when more people ditch their cars our City's infrastructure costs go down. This is a particularly attractive point since a full bus represents 250 cars off the road.

My last point focuses on the City's voice commitment to its young people. I've heard this from this government in particular that you are committed to making this place an exciting place to be, where my colleagues and I will be happy to remain rather than finding jobs elsewhere. Well this is your chance. Young people are interested in all of the things that bus rapid transit represent in terms of enhancing an environmentally friendly transport option and the economic and social benefits of a fully functional transit system. Let's not get confused, bus rapid transit won't be the be all and end for Winnipeg's fate in the next 10, 20 or 50 years. I mean it's taken us a good 50 years just to get to this point in the process. But improving the current bus

system with bus rapid transit is just one chink in the grander scheme of the things as Winnipeg moves towards more efficient use of its space and infrastructure. And I think that this is one of the more important points as Winnipeg and this Council profess to be interested in the youth of the City and keeping us interested enough to stick around and not leaving us with a crumbling wreck of a city when you decide to retire.

Now the youth of Winnipeg that I speak to are globally minded citizens extremely conscience of their role in the world and their potential to make a difference and I really think that their city should reflect that. They want Winnipeg to be, have long-term viability and maybe a certain hipness factor and maybe even they want to see how Winnipeg stacks up against other cities. But planning a city shouldn't be about what Montreal or Vancouver or Toronto is doing. It should be about what Winnipeg needs and what makes sense to Winnipeggers and this motion does make sense for Winnipeg and I urge you to support it, so thanks so much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Excuse me our rules prevent any applause or any comments from the gallery in any way; would you like to stick around for a while when we hear the next up, there may be questions but we will hear the other delegation on the other side of the issue so they can ask of either of you.

Ms. Sjoberg: Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Ken Coffin. You have the five minute slot in there.

Mr. Coffin: Honourable Mayor Katz and Members of City Council thank you for having me here today. My name is Ken Coffin and I own and operate Polar Trail, a receptive tour company here in Winnipeg. I am here today because I believe in Winnipeg and I believe in BRT.

My business caters to international travellers visiting Winnipeg and the surrounding areas. My clients are young and old, students and professionals, coming from various countries around the world. The business relies on clients experiences being both memorable and positive and although most believe our City is interesting, clean, affordable and friendly. I often hear complaints about how inconvenient our public transportation system is. I know this through speaking to my clients who often comment that it's difficult to get to the city's attractions, universities and places of business using the current public transportation system. They complain that the buses are too infrequent, thus waiting times can be long and this does not bid well especially in the colder months and in the evening hours when safety is more of a concern.

I was speaking to one of my clients just last week. She's a young professional woman from Taiwan here to study English and experience our great Canadian culture. I asked if she had been out to enjoy any of our City's evening attractions, the casinos, theatre or Assiniboine Park. Have you ever seen the Leo Mol Sculpture Garden at night, it's amazing. No was the response. Why not I asked. She answered, I would really like to go but my bus does not operate after 6:00 p.m. or on weekends and I don't feel safe walking and waiting for the mainline bus. She is currently living in Southdale. This is not a convenient bus system.

I returned to Winnipeg, my home, after seven years working and travelling and living in Asia and Vancouver. While away I often felt that I was an ambassador of this great City constantly advocating for and often defending it. The latter more so in Vancouver and meetings with other Canadians not from here. I always knew I would come back one day and almost felt a moral obligation to give something back to the City that gave me so much. There seemed to be a wave of optimism here in Winnipeg which began in '99, the year of Pan American Games. The wave continued to build momentum and I decided it was time to go for a ride.

I returned in 2000 to start the new business venture in one of Canada's fastest growing industries international education. We provide home stay and tourist services for international students

working closely with Winnipeg's public and private schools such as Heartland International English School, which by the way made *Profit* magazine's top 50 most profitable businesses in 2003. That's right, right Gary?

At the onset I was full of energy and excitement and passion with new found purpose which seemed reflected in the mood and climate of the city's business community and citizens as a whole. People were reconnecting with our Winnipeg heritage through such great events as our downtown street parties, baseball games in the Mayor's new ballpark and the Winnie-the-Pooh Festival. Winnipeggers and others internationally taking notice of our new bridges, the Inn at the Forks and the MTS Centre and plans for future museums, Portage and Main, the Hydro building, research facilities and BRT on the table. You couldn't help but feel the optimism. It was contagious. Just as contagious as the negative attitude and cynicism this City was plagued with for so many years. Let's not go back there.

We talked about keeping our downtown alive. Why not take advantage of Winnipeg's growing reputation of educational excellence and influx of international students and create a more liveable vibrant downtown with BRT giving quick and easy access to our universities and colleges. Vancouver has done it and according to the Canadian Education Centre Network English language schools there attract an estimated 40,000 foreign students a year and pump $760 million into the local economy. Students pay about $500 million in tuition and accommodation costs with a further $260 million being spent on entertainment, travel and retail purchases generating 2000 direct jobs.

We are not Vancouver we are Winnipeg and we have a golden opportunity. The biggest complaint I hear from friends and clients coming from more heavily populated cities is traffic congestion in their city. Winnipeg should heed this warning and adopt a better way more in line with healthy urban lifestyles; less relying on fossil fuels. The purposed bike paths which are to be incorporated into the BRT corridors are one more step in a greener, healthier city.

I was in Banff two weeks ago and met a 49 year old ex-Pegger on the slops. He was a volunteer ski guide at the resort we were skiing at. He grew up in Winnipeg and worked as a chiropractor here until seven years ago when he and his family, five kids and his wife, left and moved to Calgary. I asked him why did they leave. He said the city was just not progressive enough. He and his family are avid cyclists and enjoy an active lifestyle. Unfortunately the crumbling roads, lack of good bike paths, and Winnipeg drivers didn't make it easy for him to commute by bike or allow him to enjoy their passion, so after much debate and contemplation they moved away from Winnipeg and now live in a community south of Calgary which allows him to commute to work by bike via bike paths in ten minutes.

In closing I would like to remind Council that they have a second chance to not look a gift horse in the mouth and do the right thing for Winnipeg. And Mayor Katz I would hope that you as a businessman and some ways the CEO of this great City would strongly reconsider your earlier decision and realize that BRT is good for Winnipeg and good for business.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Coffin. Are there any questions of either Mr. Coffin or Ms. Sjoberg? No. Thank you very, very much.

Next delegation Glenda Whiteman supporting clause 1, Planning and Community Services of March 11th. Ms. Whiteman. Welcome.

Ms. Whiteman: Good morning Councillors, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Speaker and all other concerned residents of Winnipeg. Thank you once again for the opportunity to be heard in these Chambers. You will find the presentation I'm about to make on the web at crowinc.org and I've requested that you be given a direct link to it from your agenda or from some other manner so that you may at anytime read it and access the sources upon which it is based.

When registering last week to speak before this Council I was asked to declare either support or opposition to the proposed mosquito control policy. That was difficult. I must state clearly that while we are declaring support for some of the recommendations on which you will vote later today, we have serious reservations. It is these concerns and others raised by yourselves last week at your EPC meeting which I bring to your attention today along with information to fill in some gaps in your decision making ability which became evident during your revisiting of the buffer zone question. Finally I will conclude with some recommendations on behalf of Concerned Residents of Winnipeg Incorporated.

Last April the City of Winnipeg advertised for a new entomologist. You were seeking someone to ensure an ecological approach to pest suppression initiatives. Following public outcry and demands for reliable information on July 21st of last year this Council began the process of making a decision to study the efficiency and safety of Malathion among other questions. When the new entomologist arrived on the scene in September he was commissioned with the task of finding answers to those questions and reporting back to you with his recommendations.

We are happy to acknowledge the first recommendation of that report which is to reduce the City's reliance on residential fogging and chemical pesticides for larvaciding. It is optimistic to read of strategies to encourage the return of predator populations and particularly hopeful to hear of plans for the discontinued use of Dursban or Chlorpyrophos for larvaciding.

This Council requested to learn what research has been conducted on the efficiency and safety of Malathion. Sadly, in your document the response to that question is based on the regulations of the Federal Pesticide Management Regulatory Agency, PMRA, this report recommends that Malathion continues to be the primary mosquito adulticide used in the event that residential fogging is required within Winnipeg. Leaving Malathion in the toolbox as an option for adulticiding as Robin Faye pointed out last week to the Executive Policy Committee will fatally undermine the progress made by the other newer tactics in the overall plan.

We recognize that the proposed ASA guidelines offer more flexibility to the entomologist and the department and more ways to avoid spraying which is an improvement over the autocratic and unreasonable guidelines that were followed last summer but it's not good enough. The fact is you are still leaving the door open for political pressure to fog. You sought and found an expert knowledgeable in insect control strategies related to the reduction of urban risk to health. You were quite right to have done this. In fact you have a duty to reduce the urban risk to health caused by pesticides.

We are pleased to know that the Executive Policy Committee shares a concern which has frequently been brought to CROW's attention from concerned residents all over Winnipeg. Some of you may have read about this in the papers. Unfortunately he left, but Councillor Clement raised the issue of the vigilante behaviour of some residents who purchased and used fogging guns with malicious intent. A perfect illustration of the need for a nonessential pesticide use ban in Winnipeg.

We are so grateful to know that this Council finally recognizes and acknowledges the enormous problem caused by private untrained citizens who fail to follow label directions and safety precautions. Innocent people have been victimized, vandalized, abused and bullied with pesticides for years in Winnipeg and that must stop. Everyone has a right to a buffer zone. Everyone has the right to breathe.

I am personally grateful to Councillor Clement also because I believe he clarified the reason for this Council's previous poor judgement on the issue when he said we have to assume that we can trust the decisions of the PMRA, Health Canada. We have to assume they've done the checks and balances. Now I understand. There appears to be

some critical information missing from your ability to make a reasonable decision on this issue. You may actually believe that these chemicals are not harmful. Here are some facts that you and a lot of other people may not know about how pesticides are regulated, registered and marketed in Canada.

PMRA works for the client. No, that's not the Canadian public; that's the pesticide manufacturers. PMRA does no testing of any products themselves. All test results are provided by pesticide manufacturers. Testing is done on only the active ingredient not the entire formulation, not the so called inerts or formulants and sometimes as is currently the case with the proposed re-registration of 24D not even the actual form that is used in the product. Only single acute exposure limits are considered in registration decisions usually of single white males. Testing of combinations of chemicals is never considered. Testing of repeated low dosage exposures is not considered. Immune system dysfunction, neurological, cognitive and behavioural affects, reproductive dysfunctions and chronic disease are not required information to register pesticides.

Most tests are done on animals such as rats which have been shown to have detoxifying abilities not found in humans. It would be unethical to test pesticides on humans because we know they are toxic. In fact they're the only chemicals deliberately designed to be toxic. Here in lies the difficulty in proving a causal relationship.

PMRA is unable to identify either the names or the numbers of pesticides which are no longer registered for use in Canada. Products are supposed to be reviewed every five years. Companies sometimes voluntarily pull products off the market rather than submit new research requirements. Other times products fail to meet newer safety standards. Does this mean they were safe when we used them before? No. It means now we know they were never safe to begin with.

The Sierra Club of Canada explains it further in the truth about pesticides. I quote "although pesticides used and sold in Canada are registered this does not mean they are safe." Even the Federal Government regulators do not claim that registration equals safety. Pesticides are not tested in combination although their synergistic effects may be amplified as much as a thousand times. While pesticides produce acute and long-term health effects porosity experiments done on healthy animals measure and account for only the acute effects. The pesticides that are deemed acceptable for use as a result of these tests do not take into account possible chronic effects.

The House of Commons standing committee on Environment and Sustainable Development recommends that PMRA incorporate cumulative and aggregate risks and the possible interaction between pesticides into their evaluation and more specifically in the determination of maximum residue limits and the cumulative and aggregate risks be defined.

If we could assume that Health Canada is keeping us safe, then doctors would not be allowed to accept gifts from the pharmaceutical/pesticide industry and drugs in this country, like pesticides could and would be monitored adequately once they're on the market and Canada would have in place a system for adverse pesticide effects reporting. The 1982 Clean Environment Commission report of Manitoba states that it was okay for the City of Winnipeg to aerially spray in 1981 with Baygone for the same reason that you are using now because PMRA said so. Well after that spraying 21 babies were born stillborn. Baygone is now one of those chemicals PMRA is unable to name because it's no longer registered for use in Canada. But one can still buy it in Honduras. Do you think that makes it safe?

In misrepresentations from the industry, written for the Sierra Club of Canada, Patricia Runninghorn quotes the report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development…

Mr. Speaker: Time is up Ms. Whiteman, if you would like to make one or two

concluding sentences that would be allowed.

Ms. Whiteman: Alright, thank you. Well I was going to put out that Patty Runninghorn says all guarantees of safety are always qualified by the statement if used according to label directions. According to the City of Winnipeg how should we be dressing…

Mr. Speaker: Excuse me Ma'am, we are continuing with your presentation, one sentence to wrap up.

Ms. Whiteman: One sentence to wrap up. How about one paragraph, my last paragraph?

Mr. Speaker: Okay fine.

Ms. Whiteman: It is time to end the denial. You must support this recommendation to phase out the use of chemical pesticides. Just as importantly though, you must change your own behaviour. You need to lead by example. This summer when constituents call demanding their dose of poison you will need to encourage them to have patience, adjust their expectations, take safe personal precautions and look around for pupal and larval development sites in their own backyard. And you hired a man to do a good job. I hope that you will let him do it and not tie his hands behind his back with the PMRA's purse-strings. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. We may have questions after we hear from Mr. Podolsky so if you would allow, stick around.

Ms. Whiteman: I will. I have some documents that I'd like to leave with you for exhibits.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, I'm sorry, you can leave them you just can't say it. Next delegation Gary Podolsky in the 5 minute slot on the same side of the same issue. Welcome.

Dr. Podolsky: Thank you. My name is Dr. Podolsky. I'm a travel medicine doctor and I was asked to come to speak by Glenda. I just wanted to say that I'm not a member of CROW. I did sign their petition last summer because I agree with the Malathion concerns, but I am here by my own opinion and I've got no other secondary gains or other conflicts of interest.

What I do in my practice is I counsel people before they go on their trips to exotic vacations where they are exposed to pathological mosquitoes, so some of the advice that we give may be applicable to the City of Winnipeg. Some of the things we use are stronger than what the City of Winnipeg would use, but generally I'm sort of concerned about the Malathion issue.

Now the Malathion, it basically can be recommended by the specific organizations that I'm a part of like International Society of Travel Medicine, Borders Medicine Society and usually we recommend the personal protection and we're getting away from the insecticides.

I wanted to talk a little bit about Malathion's safety. In preparing for this talk I did look at the, do some research on it, and I brought some papers from the CDCA World Health Organization to sort of back-up my statements, and I would like to leave a copy of these if you are interested in that.

Malathion has been previously described as safe but there has always been some concerns with it. As a lot of things you are suppose to do, stay indoors, avoid your pets and children to be out there, so there are some concerns. Some of the studies do show now that there is a mounting case reports of people with problems; breathing difficulties, skin irritation and irritation from the eyes. Now there is one paper, it may be weaker but it does suggest genetic damage and that's the most concerning. Long term effects are unknown and I have that paper here as well.

It's because of this, concerns and from people like Glenda that are very worried about Malathion, it is looking to be less of an alternative for fogging. I wanted to speak about some other possible choices,

first of all I've looked at the Leisure Guide and I note that the City of Winnipeg is making good recommendations for preventing puddles, receptacles that contain water where the mosquitoes can breed to limit the breeding potential of mosquitoes. I think this is very positive and is a very good thing and it isn't my intention to criticize the City entomologist past or present, I just want to mention a few things. I think my perspective as a medical doctor is slightly different from theirs.

I just wanted to mention one last point, I want to be succinct here in that there is, there are new agents now that are used for fogging in other countries and there is a specific agent it's a bacteria Bacillus Thuringiensis Israelensis, BTI is the best way to spear forward. Now it is available in Winnipeg and this is a bacteria that you spray on and it actually kills the larvae of the mosquito. It doesn't affect any of the other insects in the environment which is always a good thing because I think it's very dangerous to damage the ecosystem in any way and massive deaths for all the insects at one time is deleterious and it also prevents mosquito control. So this is actually a very useful bacteria. It's supposedly a very, very, very safe by the World Health Organization record on this, but it's not the only choice and I think that there's just other choices out there besides Malathion.

I just wanted to conclude that I am putting together an environmental conference on April 1st and 2nd and I do have invitations and all Members of Council can attend it if they wish. There is a registration fee but I would like to waive it for all of you and that's all I have to say and I'm going to leave all my papers for your use.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions of Ms. Whiteman or Dr. Podolsky? Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Maybe I'll ask the doctor a question there. Thank you for your presentation both of you. This is a tough issue for all of us. What are the chemicals that exist in things like Off, DDT, the over-the-counter mosquito repellent and repellents that people spray on their skin?

Dr. Podolsky: They have different active ingredients so that even a brand like Off has different chemicals and different compounds. They have different active ingredients so you have to actually look at the label because Deep Woods Off may have something else. Some of them are DEET, they're just an insect repellent and then Health Canada has allowed you to put 30% DEET on your skin right now. Previously children were having a lower dose but they felt that it didn't work so the Health Canada guidelines are back up to 30% for DEET.

Mr. Speaker: What is DEET?

Dr. Podolsky: DEET has got a very long acronym and I can't remember it I'm sorry.

Mr. Speaker: That's why it's called DEET, mosquitoes get away from it.

Dr. Podolsky: Yeah, Diethyl-Meta-Toluamide, or something like that and then some of the pyrethroid chemicals those are derivadous of chrysanthanum. They're used overseas more than here and they're used as an insect repellent or insecticide, so for instance if I am sending somebody overseas we always tell them to use good clothing, put insect repellent on their skin, and sometimes I'll add insecticide on their clothing or mosquito bed night. That's not a recommendation from Canada. That way if they bite through you they get killed off by the insecticide. Now that's what the US military uses as triple protection. But if you have double protection it's good; DEET on skin and clothing that's what's really essential.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: This is the dilemma I guess or part of the dilemma in this very difficult issue and I guess as a doctor that I welcome the opportunity to ask you these types of questions because I have to …

Mr. Speaker: No preamble.

Councillor Steeves: As a doctor is there, I mean how do you reconcile the idea that we tell people to rub DEET right onto their skin all over their body and to rub pyryth whatever the term pyrethroid chemicals on to their body all over their body, we tell them to do that but yet we're concerned about the idea of spraying other chemicals into the air.

Dr. Podolsky: That's my opinion and that's for overseas people going to malarias areas. What I meant to say was in Canada we would just tell them to wear good clothing to protect some insect bites on covered skin, loose clothing not tight so the mosquitoes can't bite at them and then DEET on their skin for all children playing outside so they won't get bitten by mosquitoes. The other issue was a side issue the using of insecticide for people going to extremely bad places where there is lots of bad mosquitoes.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplemental Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: I'm not certain I'm clear so just to paraphrase you it's okay to rub DEET whatever it is, whatever the chemical is on to your skin.

Dr. Podolsky: DEET is approved in Canada for personal use, yes.

Councillor Steeves: As is Malathion?

Dr. Podolsky: No, Malathion isn't for personal use.

Mr. Speaker: That's your final question Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: All right.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you and thank you for coming and presenting today. I guess my question is as a medical doctor are you concerned about the way we use pesticides in the City, private property and just the way that they are used in general in the City. Do you think that Council should be more proactive and bring in some kind of a by-law or further restrictions on the use of pesticides in general in Winnipeg? Do you have an opinion on that?

Dr. Podolsky: Part of it's a personal opinion. I'm not sure if the Malathion really works for mosquito control and I'm concerned about the toxicity of Malathion itself so I would say no, I wouldn't recommend that.

Mr. Speaker: He doesn't recommend the use at all of Malathion. Thank you very much.

Councillor Gerbasi: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Final delegation this morning in opposition to the same clause Robin Faye.

Ms. Faye: Hi everyone and thank you. The last two presenters have basically said a lot of what I was going to say and I hope that you will ask me questions.

I'm here as an individual because the use of Malathion really harms my health and because I need to escape it, it also harms my business. It's been a significant financial loss for me and my family for the past five years and continues to be an inconvenience to my clients who are unable to see me during fogging season. So it's very important to me.

I get very ill from exposure to Malathion. The first thing that I will experience is a sore throat and then cold and flu-like symptoms. Eventually I'll become exhausted, unable to concentrate and unable to work. My immune system will become depleted and I will become vulnerable to all kinds of other infections so I have to leave. It's very important.

I'm not alone in this people who I know phone me during mosquito fogging season and say do you have a sore throat because I've had one for a few days. They don't go to their doctor because their doctor, doctors are not all educated in this yet in Manitoba, but we have doctors in Ontario speaking out very loudly against the use of pesticides.

As far as the DEET question is concerned you wouldn't get me to put that on my skin and I don't think it's any better to put something similar in the air because that goes right into my body and even if a person feels that they have a right to spray their personal property, even if they feel that they have a responsibility to protect what they feel protect their children on their personal property that comes into my body, it's a very intimate personal part of me where they end up putting the Malathion. So I really do believe that I have a right to not breathe and take into my body molecules that are harmful to me. If somebody really does believe that pesticides are okay then putting DEET on their skin is, limits it more to them. If I pass somebody in the street with DEET I'll end up with a headache, so I know that DEET is not nontoxic, but I can choose to stay away from people who have DEET on. I can smell it and just take off. So I wanted to let you know that.

I want the City not to use Malathion at all anymore and I ask you if you will consider the information that comes from the PMRA. I would ask you to at least consider equally the information that comes from the citizens of Winnipeg who are negatively affected by Malathion and I know that I'm not the only one. A couple of years ago statistics were kept by the Chemical Sensitivities Manitoba Group at least 100 people phoned with complaints about fogging.

We need our buffer zones at least. Buffer zones don't protect me from having to leave the City when they spray because if there is, if the spraying is done in a neighbourhood and the wind will carry that to, even though their not, sorry, even though the spraying is done when there is not that much wind, but if the wind, as slow as it is drifts in my direction then I will become ill so it's not just my neighbourhood that is affected. So buffer zones won't protect me but they will protect the place where I live.

For example, the year of the surprise fogging all the stuff on the porch had to get thrown out. I dare not wet that stuff and try to wash it because it will reactivate it and I'll become sicker. So you know having the property at least protected is helpful. And if there is a neighbourhood where many people don't want fogging I think it's a good thing. The year that my neighbourhood was not fogged, we had monarch butterflies and we haven't had them any other year before or since. So it does affect the entire ecosystem.

I recognize and really appreciate that you folks are in a really difficult position because people have been trained to except chemical management of our environment and it will be a process, a public education process and a gradual thing for people to understand that this actually isn't in their best interest.

Someone that I know told me living here in the 50's received a pamphlet in school that said literally chemicals are our friends and there was a big promotion for people to understand that it was okay. Our whole province, our agriculture is all based on chemicals and we need to back away from that and I personally would rather back away gracefully than try to lock horns with the forces of nature which are actually much more intelligent than we are when taken as a whole, so we don't really stand a chance.

I don't want to, like you folks, I don't want to see neighbours fighting with each other and spraying each other. I don't' want to see protesters risking their health by putting themselves in front of spray. I don't want to see people who are made ill by mosquitoes made more ill and I don't want to see residents doing their own fogging unsupervised and untrained. So we really need to work together to get the word out there into the general public what the risks are and how we have this new approach.

You know, as we've been learning the most effective way are the personal methods that you've already been promoting and I think that those people who feel they should be able to come home from work and lie in their backyard with shorts on and drinking sugar and alcohol, they're making themselves a trap for mosquitoes and we need people to understand that we do live in an environment and we can learn to move

with it in a way that keeps us comfortable as well.

So effective public education I think will help with understanding and understanding then will help with the conflicts and the friction that is between people on this. So I do think that's really important and I know that you've been working towards that already.

The plan that you have seems to be really carefully thought out as a compromise. It seems like a compromise to me because it has got innovative new ways to potentially phase out the use of chemical pesticides but at the same time it still holds Malathion and I really believe we need to let go of the Malathion because the phasing out itself is a compromise. I would like to see all chemical pesticides drop right now today, but I know that most people won't go for that so if we phase them out that is the compromise already. We don't need to attach Malathion as part of a compromise. So I think we need to go further having a municipal by-law banning cosmetic use of pesticides, preventing residents from doing their own fogging at all with penalties. And just checking my notes to make sure I've got everything, that's it. Thank you very much, very much for your work and your time.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Ms. Faye. Questions? Okay now, excuse me, on to the report of Executive Policy Committee dated March 9th, Mayor Katz.

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 9, 2005**

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the Report of Executive Policy Committee March 9, 2005 and move adoption of the Consent Agenda items 1 through 5.

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

Report A of March 16th Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT "A" OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 16, 2005**

Mayor Katz: Thank you. I would like to introduce the report of Executive Policy Committee March 16, 2005 and move adoption of Consent Agenda items 1 through 10.

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

Motions of which notice has been given, none.

Councillor Gerbasi: There is a notice of motion.

Mr. Speaker: There is none on my agenda.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, notice of motion Councillors.

Mr. Speaker: I'm just saying it's not on my agenda. The category is here but there is nothing under it on my agenda so if we could get a copy from the Clerk.

Councillor Steeves: It's on the agenda Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It's not on my agenda on my screen, there's nothing on my screen.

Councillor Steeves: Did you click on Executive Policy Committee Notice of Motion.

Mr. Speaker: EPC Notice of Motion which notice has been given, okay. Moved by Councillor Gerbasi, I believe is now seconded by Councillor Thomas. The motion was put forward at our last meeting, taken as read. Please introduce your motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS OF WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

**Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Thomas,**

WHEREAS it has been made clear by Minister Reg Alcock, President of the Treasury Board, that the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund must be used for major projects that qualify and that community club upgrades do not meet the criteria of the program;

AND WHEREAS the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Funds originally earmarked for Rapid Transit in Winnipeg are not yet reallocated;

AND WHEREAS a Rapid Transit Task Force has been put in place to recommend a plan for Rapid Transit in Winnipeg in 2005;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor advise Minister Alcock and Premier Doer that the City requests the remaining dollars in the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund be set aside with the intent of using those dollars for Rapid Transit, until the Rapid Transit Task Force report is tabled.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to introduce my motion. Well it's hard to relax around here and sometimes it's kind of lonely you know.

Mr. Speaker: I am here to protect you.

Councillor Gerbasi: And I appreciate that, I really appreciate your support Mr. Speaker in allowing Councillor Thomas to second the motion as Councillor Benham who was part of this was unable to be here today.

It was a year ago this month that the tri-level agreement that would have funded the rapid transit project, the Kenaston underpass and the sewer project was announced. And as far as I am aware that agreement has not yet been signed off and remains uncertain. It concerns me greatly that time could even run out on this whole agreement. When the City voted in September not to proceed with the bus rapid transit project it left a big hole in that agreement which has not yet been sorted out. And I don't know how this money will be spent and I haven't been able to obtain that answer.

The motion before you addresses this problem and is quite simple. There were funds allocated from the Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund for the proposed rapid transit proposal that would have been matched by the Province to a total of $34 million dollars. The City has been told clearly by the regional minister, Minister Alcock, that these funds cannot be used for community centres and we are all aware that the Mayor is seeking other sources of funding to address the recreation issues.

But while Council is dithering around with the *PUFS* report and no decisions or public process have been announced we are getting nowhere fast in terms of allocating these funds to something. There have been no discussions with Councillors unless EPC has discussed it, all of Council certainly has not had any discussions on what to happen with that money and that's a total, this total of $34 million dollars is a big question mark. The Province was very willing to match the Federal contribution of $17 million for bus rapid transit and I'm convinced that nothing would change if we changed our mind. With our $7 million of existing transit improvements the project only required $10 million of capital from the City to match the $34 million as a three level agreement. If the City would reconsider its decision to turn this funding away I'm quite confident both levels of government would be delighted to give us that money. The Canada Strategic Infrastructure funds have yet to be allocated for any project and all this motion asks is that we request the other levels of government to hold onto those funds until the Rapid Transit Task Force tables its report. This is a reasonable request for several reasons.

It is a long and difficult process to make any large capital project happen. The feasibility studies, then the detailed

design, the extensive cost benefit analysis, all these requirements can take years to complete and cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. In fact, I believe we have spent at least half a million dollars on this already, if not more. I can't remember the numbers right now. Then there is the skilled political negotiation and the need for the planets to align so that all three levels of government are prepared to commit funds to the same project at the same time.

With all that in mind it makes sense to hold on to these precious funds that all at one point all three levels of government had agreed to use for rapid transit. A task force has been set up and is suppose to report in a few months. We can't prejudge what it will recommend. If the Rapid Transit Task Force comes up with a plan that can be acted on immediately it would make sense to have that funding in place. I'm glad you're all listening. I don't think anybody is listening. Except the Mayor, thank you.

Supporting this motion would also send a clear and positive message to the other levels of government that we are serious about building rapid transit. The result of the public consultations of the Rapid Transit Task Force released in February showed that 95% of the participants believed that we should be building rapid transit.

Supporting this motion would restore our credibility that we are generally committed to it. As cities smaller than us such as Halifax move forward in their plans to build bus rapid transit Winnipeg is slipping behind. Our current spot as the number 8th city in Canada could be lost. If we truly want to be a major Canadian city we need to be seen as innovative and forward thinking as most other cities are.

Winnipeg is a leader in so many areas; social policy, environmental innovations in technology, in the arts to name a few, but we risk our status when we fall behind in planning transportation with the future in mind. You are all aware of how many years it takes funding to get funding in place for a major project, let's not start the clock back to zero and waste another 20 or 30 years to get started.

All this motion does is communicate to the other levels of government that we do in fact want their money and we do support a modern transportation system. What is the point of having the Rapid Transit Task Force if its recommendations can't be put in place because there's no funds? It is totally reasonable to set aside this money at least until the report is ready and I'm quite confident that the other levels of government will be very amenable to that.

I urge you to allow common sense to prevail and make rapid transit a priority for Winnipeg as has so eloquently stated just the other day on CJOB by the Mayor, that he supports rapid transit. So if you support it put your money where your mouth is, go and talk to the other levels of government and ask that they set aside this money until this task force, this $200,000 task force reports, that its report can be put to use because it will be money to fund a project. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor, please. Speakers? Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would just like to say if there is any chance that we might lose these funds then I agree with Councillor Gerbasi that we should allocate those monies to BRT or to whatever fund it must be allocated to make sure, to ensure we have that money and I would suggest the Mayor either reassures about these funds or allocate them to BRT as Ms. Gerbasi has suggested.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I going to ask you to enlighten me because of your years of experience you can probably help me solve a major dilemma. On many occasions over the last six months I have heard both Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Benham make reference to the fact that this money is gone, this money is

lost. I've heard that many, many times as every Councillor in this room has heard. I guess what I am trying to figure out if what they were saying is accurate then what money are they talking about because if it's gone it's gone. We all know the truth because Reg Alcock, the Minister, specifically said the money is there. It's not going anywhere, that's number one.

Number two, rapid transit plans of any sort rank a potential of massive capital expenditure. The City is right now dealing with a $2 billion dollar infrastructure deficit and the discarded bus rapid transit plan was nearly added to that without Council having a chance to consider and vote fairly and openly. Lack of transparency and debate was a major flaw in the old rapid transit plan.

I will commit to Council that whatever recommendation comes from the Rapid Transit Task Force, you have my insurances that each and every one of you will have the opportunity to openly discuss and debate the matter and then make an intelligent decision. The bottom line is I wasn't elected to build monuments to myself or to Council. I was elected to act in the best interest of all taxpayers.

For six months now this has been going on. We've sat in Council, we could be discussing panhandling, we could be discussing libraries and somehow Councillors were able to weave in bus rapid transit into that discussion. A decision was made, a very wise intelligent decision was made by Council and I would expect every Councillor to respect the decision of a democratic process. That's what it's all about.

In addition to that Mr. Councillor, it's interesting but just last week I believe Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Smith and I believe Councillor Benham was probably ill at the time had their own seminar on our recreational facilities. Obviously by doing that they must have considered that to be a priority.

Well you know what I think it's time for us to side what our priorities are. We only have so much available and let's deal with the priorities. This Council decided that our recreational facilities and community centres was a priority. I can also tell you I take exception to the fact that we're not doing anything. That's an insult to administration, they've been working very hard on a plan and I believe all Councillors should be aware of the fact there is a Council seminar coming up in the month of April to deal with that issue.

So from my point of view this is a matter that's been dealt with. Why it's been brought up over and over and over again I cannot comprehend, I'm hoping today will be the end of it. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Wyatt I believe you wanted to speak on this matter, followed by Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I want to first of all say that I appreciate the Mayor's comments. His support for the task force and the work going on has been very appreciative. Maybe I can just speak to that because that is a big part of this motion Mr. Speaker.

The work of the task force has been extremely extensive in a very short period of time. To put that in perspective in real numbers we've in 2-1/2 months we've had over 25 or 27 meetings of the task force with regards to pulling together the technical information and hearing from the so-called experts in the different fields. These meetings are fairly intensive Mr. Speaker, they last anywhere from 3 to 4 hours and the information is not exactly light information, it's quite extensive.

On top of that we, on top of the 27 meetings we had about 10; we had 10 public meetings across the city in the evenings. These meetings were held across citywide in all the communities of Winnipeg Mr. Speaker.

Further to that just coordination of the work of the task force mostly involving myself and the staff there's probably been another 24 or probably two dozen to 30 meetings of that alone to coordinate the work of the task force. So in a very short

period of time a lot of work has been done.

I want to thank the members of the task force Mr. Speaker. The Councillors who are sitting on the task force Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Pagtakhan for their dedication of work on top of their regular duties that they have as a City Councillor and also thank the citizen members Mr. Speaker. These citizens who are on the task force we should be proud as Winnipeggers that we have citizens such as this who were prepared in such a short period of time to dedicate so much energy towards this. Everybody takes the work extremely seriously. They realize that what we are talking about is a future vision for rapid transit in the City and the wellness of the City.

And I think, you know, having attended all the meetings Mr. Speaker I think I'm the only member of Council who attended all 10 public meetings in the evenings and heard from the public. The citizens of Winnipeg are very passionate about transit and about making a better transit system. There is a strong feeling and I heard from a lot of the young people that it's not just a question of building a better transit system. It's not just a question of improving our system or modernizing and having rapid transit system, but it's also the overall question of the image of the City and the image of the City not just to ourselves locally here but nationally. And it's quite right you know we are one of the last cities in Canada not have a rapid transit system so I think we've gone beyond the point of saying you know do we have rapid transit or not. I think the question is yes we are.

The motion coming from Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Benham Mr. Speaker they are obviously very eager to get on with the job and to move forward. There is no doubt about it. But to my concern Mr. Speaker is the terms of the motion are referring specifically to the old project referring to a Canada Strategic Infrastructure Fund and what was negotiated for the old project that presupposes what will actually come forward from the task force. And in some ways it could be seen as undermining the work of the task force. And that is my concern Mr. Speaker.

The terms of the negotiated agreement between the three levels of government were on the basis of a certain system, a certain BRT system that was to be installed around confusion corner and south to Jubilee and that was the terms of what was negotiated. To now turn around Mr. Speaker and say right hold those funds, keep holding what we negotiated and by the way wait for the report of the task force contradicts itself because now the task force has to, it presupposes, come forward with a recommendation which is basically the same in other words to secure those funds. And I think that undermines the task force Mr. Speaker.

The purpose of the task force was to look at the existing solutions, existing proposals that came forward from the previous Council or the previous Mayor but also to look at other opportunities in the City and that was why we went to the public. And I think by doing that Mr. Speaker we would undermine the task force's work and we would undermine the actually recommendations coming forward.

I believe that there is no doubt that the strategic, that Canada's Strategic Infrastructure Fund Mr. Speaker, it is not going to disappear. It is here. The Federal Government has committed to us. The Federal Government has said over and over again that they want to see funding of transit systems across the country. We know that we will be able to knock on the Federal Government's door and say again look these are our choices now. We as a Council have gotten our house in order. We as a Council have decided what form of rapid transit and what type of transportation system we want for the City of Winnipeg and when we have our own house in order we can then knock on their door and ask them for support and financial support. And the same goes with the Provincial Government as well Mr. Speaker.

So I, you know the motion is it's a good debate, it's a healthy debate. I congratulate the two Councillors for

bringing it forward you know this is always, it's always good to discuss transit because to me it's you know I've gone through a bit of a conversion actually Mr. Speaker in the sense that through this process of the task force and going to the public meetings you know I've gained a great, I can say I've gained a greater appreciation for the issue and for the challenges facing the City and a greater appreciation for the need to do something on this matter.

We, you know, it's no longer, it's not a, so it's not a right or left issue Mr. Speaker, this is coming back to what I think is just simple basic common sense which is we have a challenge in our City, we have an opportunity with regards to the congestion levels right now. They are not exactly as high as other cities. We have an opportunity to do something unique in Winnipeg and we know that we have an obligation to do something unique, because the growing concerns not just locally but globally with regards to Kyoto, with regards to global warming, with regards to the environmental impact of all our actions that we have in every community of our country.

And so I think Mr. Speaker the movers of the motion, their intent may be good, clearly their energies right now are misdirected. The energies should be towards working towards achieving a report and finding a solution for our City and then being able to go forward with the request for funding. And so those are my comments Mr. Speaker and in light of that I won't be supporting the motion, but I hope that Council takes an active interest as all Councillors have so far.

And I want to also thank before I forget Mr. Speaker, thank all Members of Council for their active input as well into the task force. Many of you met with the task force. Many of you met with the consultant working on the task force and all your views and your concerns and your ideas have been taken very seriously by the task force members, so I want to thank you all as well. And thank the delegations too Mr. Speaker. The delegations who come, are coming forward. They are the ones who are driving this issue to a larger set across our City. The folks, the citizens, they know that we need to do something and they are reminding us over and over and over again we have to do something. This issue is not going to go away. We are going to have to address it Mr. Speaker and the sooner we do it the better.

So those are my comments and I thank the Chamber.

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

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I also share Mayor Katz's frustration about the subject returning in a repetitive way. I think if people recall what really we had decided to do last September was to have second sober thought on a major initiative that the City is planning on taking.

I do appreciate from time to time Councillor Gerbasi's passion about the subject. I mean we were together on the study of 1999 that made the initial recommendations for a BRT system and that's fine to hang your hat on one particular report. So in fact I do welcome the review that's under, that's undergoing right now. I think it will be a wise one. It probably going have a wider base of consultation and I don't want to situate the appreciation as they say and anticipate what the results are going to be, but I'm certain that we'll see a large component of it continue to be BRT. I mean we have the foundation here and we have opportunities in the years ahead to have some rapid transit routing systems that are available through railway paths.

But it is frustrating to keep going over the old issue. The City has a challenge in many infrastructure areas we know that. So I think the decision was wise to have another look at it. I think the Mayor has appropriately provided leadership on this issue. That it made sense for us to re-look at it in competition with all the other priorities that we have. We have the floodway; additions that we have to do to make the floodway work for the City of Winnipeg. We have wastewater

treatment additions that we have to do declared by the Province as a new requirement for licensing of our wastewater facilities. These are significant funding requirements and we have the public utility, *Public Use Facilities* study which describes the status of our community centres and recreation facilities and that needs a major investment as well.

So you balance this all off and there isn't enough money to go around. We know that. And we appreciate that the Federal Government has a significant initiative about greening projects and rapid transportation. Urban transportation is a vital issue that has to be addressed. Clearly all of these are valuable commodities for the citizens of this City but on balance you have to make choices. And I think it was wise for us to reconsider at the point of time that we were before we ended up going down a path that we were not all certain would give us the returns that we were expecting and maybe there is a better way.

Will there be other money? I think my expectation considering the Federal Government's commitment to infrastructure renewal that there will be other money. So I think this has been wise for us to consider the alternative and I'm trying to encourage the colleague sitting to my right to say that I think it's important from time to time that you exceed to the will of Council when there is a majority vote and let's concentrate on perhaps more important issues until the report can be brought forward by the chair of the ad hoc committee on transportation.

So thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too think this is a motion that is worthwhile speaking about and I plan on making my comments right now and I think that's timely. I am going to put this concern on the record though Mr. Speaker that I know this motion is coming from a good place. I know it's coming from some strong philosophical beliefs.

I am becoming a bit concerned that our constant debate on this issue is actually having the real political effect of polarizing this community and is actually putting, pitting a lot of people against BRT which I think would be an unfortunate side effect to the acrimony that exists. I hope throughout the course of this debate that we can to a certain extent at least hang together and put some faith in this process that the end of the day we are going to come out with something that is going to work for Winnipeggers. I mean there always is the risk I suppose that issues are going to become political footballs and that the actual issue and subsense behind them is going to be lost. That is a concern of mine and I hope that's not represented in reality.

The motion itself is dealing with the money which I think is a reasonable topic and the allocation of the funding and sort of trying to secure that funding. A couple of comments I think need to be made with respect to that.

The first being that we did, my understanding at least, is that we did leave some monies in the kitty as it were around $7 or $8 million with respect to this or some other like project. That's the City's portion. So some monies do exist in terms of a start-up fund already so I don't think the situation is quite as bad as we think. Especially when you consider the reality that although we talk about a budget process that goes beyond the current year there actually is no set in stone budget obligation that exists with the City of Winnipeg.

That the Transit department felt that they could find monies two years, three years, four years, five years out, if they said that a year ago they can say that today. Now if those monies exist and they can find those monies within the Public Works department or within the Transit department on a smaller scale if that is the reality it's a reality today, it was a reality yesterday, it will be the reality tomorrow or a year from now.

So we really haven't lost anything from in terms of that perspective because the City's money is the City's money. If we

were going to set it aside and we were going to set it aside in the future we'll, we can set aside to whatever we want to and it could be set aside for that. It's not a big, big, it's not really that big of a problem. It's really only accounting. We have to make that decision at the appropriate time.

The Province would have to come up with their portion but we've had some concerns about the Province in the past in terms of allocations towards transit funding. Of course they did allocate some monies towards this project but I would hasten to remind that on a yearly basis we continually run up against the roadblock of not being able to find new money from the Province for transit in this City. And we talk about it every single year. Every single year and I might make the respectful suggestion Mr. Speaker that while we're debating this BRT continually, continually, continually and in my estimation undermining the work of this committee, while we're doing that perhaps some of this energy even a tiny bit of it could be focused on the Province and their ongoing funding to our transit utility that we are trying to run in a robust fashion ongoing.

If you've heard the concerns of some of the delegations as told today they have nothing to do with BRT. When Ken Coffin came up and talked about the problem of his client living in Southdale not being able to access a robust transit system, well the first leg of BLT that's going to go down Pembina Highway is not going to affect that one lick. It's not going to make one bit of a difference. The only way that we are going to truly affect that person's reality is by pumping more money on an operating basis on a year to year cycle into the transit system. It has nothing to do with BRT, not at that stage and there is a million antidotes and there is a million stories like that that exist. So when we talk about a robust and strong transit system BRT is only a small piece of that.

The rest of it has to do with ongoing funding and we're locked and we're frozen in terms of the money that we are receiving from some of our friends in other levels of government and that's a real problem. And frankly a problem that we haven't really been appreciably able to address despite a yearly debate on every time we come to the nickel transit fares. Those are the types of things that are truly going to affect transit service in this community.

I would also remind that where we have had some success is with the Federal Government. The Federal Government has stepped up and after years of us asking has declared that finally municipalities are going to be receiving a proportionate share of gas tax revenue in this country and that's coast to coast. That's been a real success that we've actually achieved. Now and I just made, I like many people in this Council played a small part in that. But that's the way these battles are going to be won.

I would also add that if you read the fine print of some of that allocation it does state that programs like transit are going to be given priority in some instances to, for that funding. Those monies may well exist. I mean I just, what's concerning about this whole debate and sort of in conclusion Mr. Speaker is that we continually come back to this as if it's a dead issue.

I had a chance to sit down with the representative from the committee. Her name escapes me but she is one of the consultants that is running the process. Very, very nice person, very, very competent, Susan Russell and I talked to her about some of the realities that I would like to see addressed. We kind of got boxed into this BRT idea and I'm not blaming anybody for it but I think everybody in this chamber would agree that the way that it happened was not the best way that it could have happened.

I mean there was an agreement signed in which none of us really participated and these things happen I understand because sometimes with First Ministers and the Premiers that's the way it has to be. And then immediately after that there was a change in regime, there was agreements that weren't signed, there was just a lot left undone. It wasn't an optimal situation and I think that situation

had to be and is in the process of being corrected. I mean this is a reality that we have to live with I'm afraid and I think that's what we are doing.

So people who are concerned about BRT I hope they try and understand that reality of this council is trying to live with is that there was after a fashion a press announcement of a potential BRT project along Pembina and off it went. There was no agreement signed, the then Mayor left, new regime came into place, a lot of things weren't signed, plenty of t's weren't crossed, plenty of i's weren't dotted. That's were we were left. This whole process, this whole committee is an attempt to rectify that fairly unfortunate situation, very unfortunate situation.

When I talked to Susan Russell I talked about things like are we locked into that current plan because I know we talked about it a lot but there is a lot of different options that I have to admit I find more exciting. I mean the City of Ottawa they fought with their administration for a long time before politicians finally said you know what we're just going to appropriate an existing rail line and start running a train up and down it just to get used to the feel of that in our city. And in my opinion it's made a huge difference for that town. And it's got people sort of thinking along the lines of more mass rapid transit. These are the types of things that are available to us. You need to look no further than Letellier line which is the second line of our rapid transit system. All sorts of options Mr. Speaker are available.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Steeves: I would simply conclude Mr. Speaker by encouraging again everybody in this chamber and everybody and I include all the folks who have gathered in the gallery to sort of remain married to this process. And I know that it makes for good debate on an ongoing basis but as a city if we decide that rapid transit is a route that we want to go down we have not lost that option. In my opinion there is going to be more options on the table.

At some point this Council is going to have to make a very, very hard decision as to whether or not we actually want to fund. That is going be a difficult and hard debate because I know there is going to be people in here that might not see that as a priority. There may be some saw-offs there may be some compromises. We should let this committee do its work. Let them come back with some ideas and at that time we'll throw them on the table and I'm sure this gallery will be packed for the debate when it should happen, after we know what's available, after we know it's possible. Thanks Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor Steeves. Councillor Gerbasi concluding debate.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's been very fascinating to listen to the comments, no I'm going to use my five minutes, even though some people don't think this issue is important 95% of the public that participated in the workshops felt that Winnipeg should have rapid transit so I am speaking for the citizens that do care about this even if this Council doesn't.

Bus rapid transit, it was very interesting to hear the Mayor say that rapid transit was not a priority; that is what he said when he cancelled this project. And I guess that is still what he must really believe.

This motion is asking for sober second thought Councillor De Smedt on the decision to put at risk a money that is out there from the Federal Government. It's not them who cancelled their commitment to rapid transit. It was our project and the City lost its political will to proceed with it. The beauty of this motion is that it doesn't prejudge what the Rapid Transit Task Force says. All it says is that other levels of government had money that they wanted us to build rapid transit. We can see what the task force recommends and we could possibly have some money already in place. That $7 million dollars Councillor Steeves and you should know this as the chair of the Environmental Committee you should have followed this a little closer, that that $7 million is for existing transit improvements and was

used to lever money it wasn't part of the bus rapid transit.

I've spent a huge amount of time as part of this Rapid Transit Task Force. You heard Councillor Wyatt talk about how much time they've spent. I've been one of the most active members of that task force. I put my heart and soul into working on this and I wonder why. I really wonder why today because even if we were to recommend bus rapid transit this Council is not committed to setting this, this task force is supposed to report in a couple of months and what if they recommended that we go back to a bus rapid transit project then we'd already have some money in place but it's clear to me that the emperor or the Mayor or the Councillor have no clothes because they really don't want to proceed with this now.

I've heard Councillor De Smedt has said it's not a priority. It was wise to reconsider that priority. So why don't we just be honest that this Council is not wanting to make this a priority. That's what you are doing by not supporting setting this money aside, setting this money aside until the task force reports. Why do we have a task force?

In my speech earlier I talked about the process it takes to get funding in place. It will be years and years and years till we see rapid transit in this City and if you're, if you're not committed to it then why don't you just, well I guess you are coming out and saying that, by not supporting this motion today.

This motion doesn't even refer as Councillor Steeves said that it referred to that previous project. It doesn't. It simply says that the money be set aside with the intent of using those dollars for rapid transit until the Rapid Transit Task Force is tabled. It is a very reasonable motion and I'm unbelievably disappointed that there is so little support for it.

There has been all kinds of misinformation tossed around and the three level agreement I'm very curious if Councillor Steeves is saying that that whole agreement was not negotiated openly and Council didn't discuss it enough. Are you also giving back the money for Kenaston and the sewer or is it just rapid transit, cause let's be honest. Well I'm sure we'll proceed with Kenaston and I'm sure we'll take the Canada Infrastructure money and we'll spend it on widening Kenaston or something else that's a real priority of this Council that doesn't really acknowledge the importance of bus rapid transit or a rapid transit system and I'm sorry that we keep boring you by bringing it up. But the fact is that the public does care about this.

Someone has to be forward thinking around here. Someone has to have a vision and I'm sorry that there's a minority of us who are trying to get that message across and it's very disappointing and I hope that some of you will consider supporting this. It's just saying, we haven't decided how we are using the money anyway. All it's saying is let's wait till the task force reports and even that small step you are unwilling to take shows that there is no real commitment and I really wonder why I'm on this task force which by the way most people are coming to the conclusion that BRT makes the most sense. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you Councillor. Order please. Question on the motion? All those in favour of the motion?

Councillor Gerbasi please rise we'll have a recorded vote since you wrote it.

Madam Clerk.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gerbasi, Thomas.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 2, Nays 11.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is defeated.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Eadie
Seconded by Councillor Steeves

THAT the Councillor elected in the St. Norbert Ward By-Election being held on April 14, 1005 be appointed to fill the vacancy on the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works for the term ending on November 2, 2005.

Mr. Speaker: Moving onto motions. We have Motion No. 1 moved by Councillor Eadie to appoint, to be elected, new representative of St. Norbert ward to fill the vacancy on Public Works.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mr. Speaker: By-laws. By-laws for first reading only. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I would like to move that by-law No. 46/2005 be read a first time.

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

By-laws for all three readings.

Mayor Katz: I would like to move that the following By-laws be read a first time,
By-law No. 53/2005, 54/2005, 55/2005 and 56/2005.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 53/2005, 54/2005, 55/2005 and 56/2005.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I'd like to move that By-laws No. 53/2005 to 56/2005 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 53/2005 to 56/2005 both inclusive.

Mayor Katz: And I would move that the rule be suspended and that By-law Nos. 53/2005 to 56/2005 both inclusive 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.

Mr. Speaker: Questions, Councillor Gerbasi.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. There's only the Jen part of Jenham here today so you'll probably get off easy. My first question is the motion on the mosquito buffer zones was laid over at EPC last week and I was kind of surprised the standing committee moved that that motion be filed and indicating that there's support on that committee that most citizens recognize that there are people who want to have that option of a buffer zone and I guess I'm curious as I wasn't at EPC, what was your thinking as the Mayor in terms of this notion, are you actually looking at the notion of eliminating buffer zones completely or talking to the Province about doing that because if you are doing that you know I would be concerned but I'd like to know where you stand on that please, thank you.

Mayor Katz: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. As you probably are aware there are some Councillors who obviously feel the buffer zone is advantageous, there are others who have a different feeling. What came as a result of last Executive Policy Committee was that there is ongoing dialogue right now between the Province and our administration and to have a conversation just to see what the thinking is on that and it could remain the same, it could change but I can assure you that nothing will take place until all Councillors have their input. So there is no immediate action but there was an existing meeting that was scheduled and it was decided to let administration talk to

the Province and see what their thinking was at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: Supplemental Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Do you as Mayor have an opinion at this point as to whether buffer zones should remain or be removed, are you open to the idea of removing them at all or are you yourself convinced that they should stay, do you have a position on that issue?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: I try and come to every Council meeting with a completely open mind. Since I've been here for the last approximately nine months, I have heard arguments why it should be what it is, I've heard arguments for making it less, I've heard both. I'm trying to maintain an open mind; I have not made any decision whatsoever in my mind on what the buffer zones should be. I'd like to hear from the public.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplemental.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm going to ask a question on a different tact. Regarding the three level agreement for the infrastructure which includes Kenaston and the sewer and the unknown project, what is the status of that money, has it been signed, when is it going to be signed, is there a deadline looming, what is going to happen to that situation, it can't go on forever, it's been a year. Thank you.

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

Mayor Katz: The unknown project as you referred to it is not unknown. I think everybody in this chamber knows that that project is recreational and community facilities. As you probably are aware and if you haven't received an email I believe you should have received one referring to a Council seminar I believe on April the 19th, if my memory serves me well. I'm hoping everybody has received that. As far as that money is definitely there. The Province and the Federal Government are waiting for direction from City Council. After that seminar we will be in a position to give them direction on what we feel is best on how to solve our community and recreational centre deficit when it comes to infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, thank you. No other questioners.

Moving on the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development March 7th, Councillor De Smedt.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MARCH 7, 2005**

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move the report of the Standing Committee of March 7th, clauses 1 to 20 as consent.

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

Motions, none. By-laws, Councillor De Smedt.

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

Councillor De Smedt: Mr. Speaker I would like to move for the first time all in 2005, By-laws numbered 35/2005 to 39/2005, 43/2005 to 45/2005, 47/2005 to 52/2005.

Mr. Speaker: All those numbers both inclusive. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws no. 35/2005, 36/2005, 37/2005, 38/2005, 39/2005, 43/2005, 44/2005, 45/2005, 47/2005, 48/2005, 49/2005, 50/2005 and 51/2005.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor De Smedt.

Councillor De Smedt: I would like to move that By-laws numbered 35/2005 to 39/2005 both inclusive, 43/2005 to 45/2005 both inclusive, and 47/2005 to

52/2005 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws numbered 35/2005 to 39/2005 both inclusive, 43/2005 to 45/2005 both inclusive and 47/2005 to 52/2005 both inclusive.

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

Councillor De Smedt: I'll move that the rule be suspended, and that By-laws numbered 35/2005 to 39/2005 both inclusive, 43/2005 to 45/2005 both inclusive, 47/2005 to 52/2005 both inclusive 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? None.

The Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services the report of March 7th, Councillor Steeves. Councillor Lazarenko, would you come and take the chair for awhile.

(Councillor Lazarenko in the chair)

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MARCH 7, 2005

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay Councillor.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. Regarding the report March 7, 2005 I like to introduce report, move the adoption to consent items 1 to 6.

Councillor Gerbasi: I'd just like to pull out 5.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Item 5 Councillor Gerbasi.

And the rest are all consent agendas. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item No. 5 - Body Modification By-law No. 40/2005 File EH-1

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Steeves.

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker. By-in-large I'll wait for the comments from Councillor Gerbasi but as the committee is aware the rest of Council is aware rather, this body modification by-law is a new by-law designed to regulate body modification accepting standard ear piercings in the City of Winnipeg. The report is fairly substantive I think and I think fairly well supportive.

And as Councillor Gerbasi pointed out in her questions to the delegation based to the largest extent on the comments as received from the industry itself. What that means of course is that the industry representatives thereof approached the City at some point with the intention of working with the City with a view to correcting what they saw in the community as some dangerous practice that were occurring.

Obviously there has been a bit of an aligning of the stars I think in this issue in probably not only the City of Winnipeg but right across the continent indeed to a certain extent right across the world whereby with the unfortunate advent and advancement of rather grievous and serious blood born diseases, and b) with the advent incredibly in my opinion with the increased popularity of body modification practices, branding, tattooing and the like, these two items crossed present a rather dangerous situation in all of our communities not just the City of Winnipeg.

This is designed to impose more regulation on the training of the people who are allowed to do these processes in our community as well as some parental consent issues and the like. So with that and with an introduction I'll ask members of Council to offer their comments and I'll do what I can to respond.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief. I just wanted to thank Council for supporting this by-law and it's been about 3 years in the making and I'd also like to thank members of the community that are in the audience who participated in drafting this by-law. As a parent of teenagers I am comforted to know that there is going to be stronger restrictions for body modification because it's certainly real and it's out there and it's a public health risk that I think Winnipeg can feel good that we are taking a lead on, we are actually the first municipality in Canada to have this kind of a by-law. So with that I thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions of clause 5? All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Report of March 11th, Councillor Steeves.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTON AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED MARCH 11, 2005

Councillor Steeves: Thank you Mr. Speaker, with respect to the report of March 11/05 I am pleased to move items 1 through 3 as consent items.

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

Councillor Steeves: Mr. Speaker with respect to, yes I'll do by-laws I'll just bring them up here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By-laws.

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

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the following By-laws read a first time, By-laws No. 34/2005, 40/2005, 41/2005, 42/2005 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 34/2005, 40/2005, 41/2005 and 42/2005.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that By-laws No. 34/2005, 40/2005 and 42/2005 both inclusive be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 34/2005 and 40/2005 to 42/2005 both inclusive.

Councillor Steeves: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 34/2005, 40/2005 to 42/2005 both inclusive be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

Question Period. There is none.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Public Works, the report of March 8th, 2005, Councillor Eadie.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DATED MARCH 8, 2005

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move that the report of the Public Works Committee for March 8th be received and that clauses 1 through 4 be adopted by consent.

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

Motions, none. By-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker I'll move that By-law No. 59/2005 be now read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 59/2005.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move that By-law No. 59/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 59/2005.

Councillor Eadie: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 59/2005 be read a third time and passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Question Period. Councillor Magnifico.

Councillor Magnifico: Mr. Speaker I just wanted to mention something that probably is affecting everybody's ward. I'm inundated with phone calls about the poor condition of the roads and lanes due to our inability to clear the snow properly this winter after having one weekend of large accumulations of snow in the whole winter. I've lived in Winnipeg a long time and I don't understand what went wrong this year and I would like to know as we progress with this statement, the question is coming, I would like to know if the Public Works department is checking this out to make sure it doesn't happen again next year and b) if there is considerations being made for the problems we are having right now with the calls coming in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Mr. Speaker nothing went wrong except the weather and that was a problem but what I will say is that the Public Works department is undertaking a review of our snow clearing policy and that report will be coming forward to the committee I think early this summer. And depending on the volume of it, it would be my intention that we would probably arrange a Council seminar around that before we bring any policy changes forward to Council. But the whole snow clearing policy is under review by the department. Hopefully if there is going to be any changes it will be implemented by, approved by Council before the onset of next winter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie.

No further questions? We continue the Committee on Fiscal Issues, Councillor Clement.

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES DATED MARCH 8, 2005

Councillor Clement: Mr. Speaker I'm pleased to move clause 1 of the meeting of Fiscal Issues March 8tth as consent.

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

Motions? None. By-laws, Councillor Clement.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FISCAL ISSUES CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Clement: I'll move By-law No. 58/2005 be read a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 58/2005.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that By-law No. 58/2005 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 58/2005.

Councillor Clement: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 58/2005 be read a third time and that same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

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

Question Period. No questions.

Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Councillor De Smedt.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED FEBRUARY 28, 2005

Councillor De Smedt: Thank you Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to move the Standing Policy Committee report on Downtown Development of February 28th, as clauses 1 and 2 as consent.

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

Motions? None. By-laws, Councillor De Smedt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor De Smedt: I would like to move that By-law No. 57/2005 be read for the first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 57/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I would like to move By-law No. 57/2005 for the second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 57/2005.

Councillor De Smedt: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and move By-law No. 57/2005 for a third time.

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

Question Period.

Councillor Eadie moves adjournment.

All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

ROLL CALL

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

COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 11:25 a.m.