

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, May 29, 2013

The Council met at 9:35 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 Swandel.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, and Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Speaker: Well, good morning and we're joined today by our Page, Madison Fedyck from Glenlawn Collegiate who resides in the North Kildonan Ward. Thank you for being here today, Madison. (Applause) And we'd like to welcome guests in the audience. We have a group from the Seven Oaks School Division. I understand it's Garden City Collegiate and they're grade nine students in what they call, the Division Met School if you're with us here this morning. Congratulations, thanks for joining us. (Applause) At this time, I'd like to recognize Mayor Katz, if you'd like to have a comment, sir.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, May is Multiple Sclerosis Month, awareness month in Canada and today, on World MS Day, we're wearing red carnations to show support for all those who are courageously living with the challenges of this disease. Multiple sclerosis affects the lives of 3,000 Manitobans and their families every day. It is a complex and often disabling disease that targets the central nervous system affecting certain cognitive and physical abilities and skills. It is estimated that every day, three Canadians are diagnosed with MS. Although MS can occur at any age, it is usually diagnosed between the ages of 15 and 40. There is still no known cure for MS and the unpredictable affects last a life time. With hard work by our scientists and researchers, we will find a cure. I invite all members of Council to join me in wishing strength and hope to all of our citizens affected by multiple sclerosis. They and their families are not alone in their fight. I would now like to invite an ambassador from the MS Society of Manitoba who will say a few words, members of Council, please welcome Lizelle Mendoza.

Lizelle Mendoza: My name is Lizelle Mendoza and I have lived with relapsing remitting MS since I was 18 years old. I was just 11 though when I had my first symptoms. I am now a full time nursing student and an MS ambassador for the MS Society speaking to students in groups like yours, about MS, its affects and my hope for a cure. MS most often strikes people in their 20s and 30s when they're completing their education; establishing their careers and starting with their families. Five percent of people living with MS are under the age of 16 and the disease can affect children as young as two years old. Women are three times more as likely to develop this disease and every day it estimated 50 to 75,000 Canadians live with this disease. May is MS awareness month and today is MS World Day. Your support on this monumental day means so much. By wearing your red carnations, the MS Society's traditional focal point, you show those living with MS in our province that the City of Winnipeg cares. During the month of May, we encourage people to share their story of how MS has affected them. My hope is that you are empowered to talk with that at least one other person today about multiple sclerosis and how the disease has affected you personally. Perhaps you know someone with disease; perhaps someone you...something you heard today has resonated with you. I encourage you to become the MS champion. In order to conquer a disease like MS, meaningful partnerships and deep relationships are needed. Today we can change the lives of thousands of people and together we can look forward to a tomorrow where everyone affected by multiple sclerosis stand side by side and looks into a future free of MS.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks for joining us today. Mayor Katz, you have another announcement?

Mayor Katz: I have actually two more, Mr. Speaker, a long one and a short one, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to take an opportunity to, I think we all know the friendly face of Fred Young. He has been away for quite a while and I very much would like to welcome him back and I'm sure all members of Council just want to say we're very happy to see you back, Fred, and wish you a speedy, speedy recovery. (Applause) Mr. Speaker, June 1st marks Canada's fourth Annual Intergenerational Day. IG Day was created to remind people of the importance of bridging the gap between generations and to raise awareness of the many benefits intergenerational connecting brings to education, health and community.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 29, 2013

Celebrating IG Day is as easy as taking a few seconds to smile or say hello to someone from a different generation, making a connection and making someone feel special. I take pride in knowing that Winnipeg is an age friendly city and I hope that IG Day will inspire its citizens to seek simple meaningful ways to connect children, youth and older adults throughout the year. This is also perfect time to mention the Mayor's Senior of the Year Awards. The annual awards are given to deserving seniors who have made a difference in our community through volunteerism and working with our young people. I would like to encourage all Winnipeg students to recognize a senior that has made a difference in their life by nominating them for an award. Further information can be found on winnipeg.ca or by contacting the Mayor's office. Nominations must be received by June 21st, 2013. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gerbasi. You have an announcement.

Councillor Gerbasi: I just wanted to acknowledge a special guest who's with us today. Sam Toles is a City Councillor from Cathedral City in California near Palm Springs and he is the son of my brother in law, George Toles, who's a well-known film professor and a screenwriter in the city. And Sam as a visiting Councillor, I wanted us to acknowledge and that...Give us a wave, Sam, welcome to...see another city council in action. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Welcome sir. We have two sort of in house items here that won't mean a lot to the community at large but one is in particular, a condolence motion as you all know. My assistant Sean's father passed away earlier this year or this month and Dave Lyon, was a really, pretty special Winnipegger. He was a four time Olympic coach, six time Pan American coach. He was an educator, high school teacher at Elmwood and Gordon Bell Collegiate. He was dad and to Sean, we just say our condolences for your loss and best wishes. There will be a memorial service for Dave on June the 15th at the Assiniboia Christian Centre at 11 o'clock in the morning. And on a happier note, I'd like Marc Lemoine just to rise for a moment. We'd like to make recognition of one of our own. A week ago today, Marc was inducted as the International President of the International Institute of Municipal Clerks, which is an organization of over 10,000 municipal clerks in North America and 15 international countries. It really is quite an honour and we want to offer our congratulations as you lead their organization from a far for the next year and that you know that you will represent the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba, your Canadian brothers and sisters in the Clerks' business really well and we're really proud of you, so congratulations.

MINUTES

Councillor Wyatt moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on April 24, 2013, be taken as read and confirmed.

All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Mr. Speaker: I guess we'll move into our delegations if there's no further business and we will start with our...I'm sorry Jenny, yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask Council to move a motion to waive the rules to hear five additional speakers for...on the golf course issue. I've submitted the list of names to you. Five minutes without questions as our usual custom. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All those in agreements, say aye. Opposed? Motion carried. We will suspend the rules once we get to the portion of the delegates. Moving forward with the first delegation, Mr. Tom Ethans from Take Pride Winnipeg. Tom, Oh, Councillor Steen.

Councillor Steen: Mr. Speaker, I must excuse myself from the Chamber at this time due to a perceived conflict of interest of a personal nature in relation to Item 1, the report from the Alternate Service Delivery Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Steen. We'll see you after the delegates. Now, where is Mr. Ethans? There you are, Tom. You've got 10 minutes, sir.

Tom Ethans: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Tom Ethans. I'm the executive director of Take Pride Winnipeg which is a non-profit organization dedicated to inspiring community pride, raising public awareness and promoting citizen responsibility in making Winnipeg and Manitoba clean and beautiful. Littering and illegal dumping is an issue that affects

every neighbourhood of the City of Winnipeg. It is time that we as a city took action against those who litter. People have many excuses for why they litter. They don't care. They don't realize that some of the items are litter like cigarette butts which actually account for 28 to 30 percent of litter on our streets. People will litter where they see other litter is the broken windows theory. Abandoned garbage increases health and environmental risks, encourages more illegal dumping and sends a message that illegal activity is okay in your neighbourhood. Recently Take Pride had five volunteers working on picking up litter from Ellice to Sargent on one side of Omand's Creek. In three hours, they picked up 20 bags of litter and recyclables. Take Pride Winnipeg does an annual litter survey every spring, driving up and down over 500 kilometres of city streets. Our rating scale is based on one being "absolutely no or very little litter" to "four being so much litter that would take several volunteers hours to clean up the mess". We have many "fours" every single spring in our city. Some of the worst streets are major routes such as Kenaston and Lagimodiere, but there are also residential streets that are "fours" like Burrows and Dale Boulevard. It's just not one area of the city where people are littering. And illegal dumping in our back lanes continues to grow. Couches, beds, construction materials et cetera litter our lanes and it's time to stop. Putting fines on littering and illegal dumping is an important step. There has to be consequences for this action but having the fines on the books is only good if there is enforcement and citizens are wanting to help. I was recently on CJOB talking about litter. A woman e-mailed me two days later telling me that she saw someone throwing a piece of litter on the ground, she confronted them in a nice way, asked them to pick it up and told them that there may be fines coming. The person picked it up and said thank you and maybe she changed his attitude about littering. Other cities in the world are using fines for littering. In Nottingham, England, the latest figures revealed at 5,454 fines were issued in Nottingham in 2010, 2011, 2012 compared to 6,940 fines the year before. It's a 21 percent decline in fines meaning that more people are getting the message that littering anything or illegally dumping could result in a fine. Littering can cost drivers and passengers a misdemeanor and fine of 500 dollars in the State of Arizona. Just think about that for a second. You get a fast food, ten dollars. You throw it out your car window and you have to pay a fine of 500 bucks. That's a lot of money. In western Australia, there are now 65,000 litter rangers who are volunteers that are registered in the community and if they see someone throwing something out of their vehicle, they can now take a licence plate and get it addressed by the city and the state. I recently met with some students from Seven Oaks Middle School, Megan, Carly and Raquel contacted Take Pride Winnipeg with an idea they had to change their school ground. They have a project that they have called "Imagine a place". They want to keep their school and school yard litter free. They are looking for garbage cans and recycling containers so they also want to plant a garden. They're here today and I've got Carly here who is going to say a couple words about why they want to have litter fines. Carly.

Carly: Hi. I'm Carly from Seven Oaks Middle School and we've basically done a lot of work to try and stop the littering. Actually Rachel and I, we did...well, actually our entire school did a community clean-up and Rachel and I, and another friend, we did above and beyond on our community clean-up. We picked up so many things that other students have missed and we took our time and our teacher was about to rip off our heads and scream at us and she had saw how much garbage we brought back. We had two bags and a giant cardboard box that could be recycled and used for something else, so it's really is important. (Applause)

Tom Ethans: Other citizens also care. We just had a recyclathon at Garden City Shopping Centre on Saturday where we had people bring back their electronics, their paint products and their used oil. We expected about 500 people would show up. Over 1,020 showed up with electronics, paint, fluorescent light bulbs and used oil. One couple even took a bus from Elmwood to Garden City with some electronics to recycle, so people do care and that's great to see. Containers. This is an area that I would like to talk about real quickly, both for litter and recycling. I've stated this before in various committee meetings. We need more containers on the streets of our city and more frequent pickup. In our estimation, we need about another 2,000 containers out there. There are many cases where you can walk for blocks and blocks without seeing a litter container. On St. James Street, which is a major street in our city, there are no containers on the four corners of Sargent and St. James. One container of the corners of Ellice and St. James and no containers on the corner of St. James and St. Matthews. Unbelievable that there is that much space between a container. And we also got to look at cigarette butts. Cigarette butts are not biodegradable. They end up hurting our wildlife. They end up being in our rivers and our lakes. Even if there's cigarette receptacles, people tend to just continually throw their butts on the ground because they don't realize how bad this litter is. There is a cost for putting more containers on the streets; a cost for picking up a litter and a cost for picking up illegally dumped material, but having a city look like a garbage dump in the spring is a lot worse in my estimation. And it's not just individuals but businesses as well as some of that litter comes from around their stores, around their construction sites or businesses that illegally dump on our back lanes, so fining them is also important. We'll all have to work together to make a difference, like the students here today, we have to be part of the solution to having a clean and beautiful city. For those that need a little encouragement to change our habits and stop littering, we are in favour of creating a three tiered system for the accumulation and illegal dumping of garbage with subsequent minimum fines for each category. Let's all take pride in our city of Winnipeg. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie has a question.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 29, 2013

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, I just wanted to...I appreciate the Seven Oaks Middle School and all the great work they do and I was just wondering if I could ask the student a question and that is simply today marks the beginning of the Arts in the Park in Kildonan Park and I'm wondering, have your teachers been talking about appropriate actions for all the students in terms of littering in our green spaces.

Carly: Actually, yes, we have. We have since...we've started doing Arts in the Park, we're actually missing it today but we missed it to come and talk about this because it does mean something to us. So, yes, they're...our teachers do talk about that.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I have the question to Tom that was very eloquent from Carly so switch over to Tom. I have the good fortune of chairing the Mayor's Environmental Advisory Committee and we had a strategic planning meeting recently and one of the main things that came up starting about littering in a couple of different ways; lack of receptacles. We have a fellow from Ireland who talked about the tidy towns campaign they used to have in Ireland so a lot of ideas being generated. Just want to encourage you and ask you to come forward with if you have numbers, if you have budgetary suggestions, please come forward with that to our committee or in the budget process because I think some of this is very much getting into people's consciousness that we need to take a look at the number of receptacles and other issues.

Tom Ethans: We will do that. We really think that people are starting to get the message slowly that littering is bad but I think that starting to do something like fining people for littering will make a big difference very quickly and we would like to see that happen soon rather than later.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Tom, I think the effort is great but I'm wondering really about the minimal fines, for example, tossing ...gum on the street, I mean, our Mayor was even involved in this and so you know, I think it's a change of the attitude that how you're going to get that changed? How we're going to catch people throwing their gum on the street.

Tom Ethans: We see people doing it all the time and this lady who saw somebody littering went and talked to them. People can phone in and report somebody tossing something out of their car window to 311 and we've got to be doing more and more of this all the time. This lady even wants to start taking a camera so she can take pictures of people littering and so this is stuff that's going to be happening and more and more people want to get involved in helping to make our city litter free. The posters that I sent around to all of you are going to be going in every school in Manitoba about stopping littering. It took us a long time to get those animals to stand still for that poster so I think you'll appreciate that poster but it's something that we need to get the kids learning, but it's not just the children that are littering, it's everybody.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further questions and Gordon Sinclair is not here so we'll...

Tom Ethans: I didn't mention....

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, Tom. Appreciate it. All right, our second delegation. Our second delegation today is Mr. Harold Shuster on Item 15 of the Policy Committee of Property and Development on the first reading of the Precinct Q Plan for Ridgewood South. Mr. Shuster. All right, before you commence, I will just warn you that this is with regards to the first reading of the presentation, it's not about the nuts and bolts of the project.

Harold Shuster: I'm fully aware of. I will not be speaking to the merits of the plan.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Harold Shuster: Your Honour, Mayor Katz, members of City Council, my name is Harold Shuster. I'm a resident of Charleswood and I've come before you today seeking time. You're being asked to send a development plan for Ridgewood South Precinct Plan to Assiniboine Community Committee for debate and discussion; critically important debate and discussion by residents of Charleswood and all citizens of Winnipeg on a major new housing development on the western edges of our city. It is important that these discussions take place as a provider, open forum, for citizens to share their views and for the area Councillors to gauge citizen support or disapproval for projects related to the future growth and development of our city. But before these discussions take place, citizens need or rather should be entitled to have all the necessary information available so they can make reason judgments on the merits of the plans being put before them. It is my view that there are still far too many important unanswered questions regarding Ridgewood South.

Answers would help the citizens in their evaluation of this plan. And it is not just me who is raised in need for answers to some important questions. Councillor Browaty, the chair of Property and Development Committee in a May 4th Winnipeg Free Press article stated that servicing is going to be an issue. Councillor Havixbeck, the Councillor for the area, in that same Free Press article, raised a number of challenging issues, drainage, traffic and preserving natural habitat and perhaps the biggest concern, where is the 60 million dollars needed for the extension of the William R Clement Parkway going to come from. When the members of your own Council who are the closest to the project are raising serious questions, don't you think you should take the time to answer them? I've been told that I can't speak to the merits of the plan. Here's a spoiler alert: I don't think there are any, but here are some of the facts related to Ridgewood. Once completed, there would be as many as 4,000 new houses, an estimated 8,800 new people and an additional 4,000 vehicles on our streets every day.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Mr. Shuster, I'm going to just sort of stop you right there. At this point, you know, none of those issues are about the first read.

Harold Shuster: Yes, it is. It's about why I don't think it could go to Assiniboine Community Committee. If I could be given a privilege to continue...

Mr. Speaker: Well, I'm just going to warn you that it has to stick with the specifics of the first reading and whether or not we even bring it on to the floor.

Harold Shuster: And my argument is that I don't believe that it should be brought forward because I don't think they're answers to questions that citizens need in order to make the reasoned judgments, that when it does come before a community committee.

Mr. Speaker: Well, there are many committees that will go to before it gets back to this Council, so at this point, I'd like you to speak to the first reading.

Harold Shuster: I came here asking for time, time for two reasons. First, to give yourselves time, time to really find out what has been happening in our city that developers behind Ridgewood are basing much of their arguments in need of this development on projections of population growth in the planning document, OurWinnipeg. That document estimated that Winnipeg will grow by 180,000 people by the year 2031. That may be true but changes to the Provincial Nomination Program, and other global trends may no longer support that amount of growth and even if that is still true are the types of houses going into Ridgewood going to be the kind of houses that are projected population growth is going to need and being in a location where they are wanting to live. There are currently a number of major development projects on the go. Just this past week, two articles in the Winnipeg Free Press outlined Transcona transformation and St. Norbert sees condo booms spoke to that. There are thousands of new homes being built all over the city, give yourself time to travel in an area of the city you're not familiar with and I guarantee you will be amazed at the number of houses under construction are recently built. We also see that many of the developments are leapfrogging leaving vast green space, green fields, the results that result in huge cost to the city. A prime example is to travel down Waverley. We run infrastructure and services to these new neighbourhoods and they run passed vast empty spaces. To quote my former political science instructor, Chris Leo, "Planning is in reality. A clean-up operation design to legitimize decisions that are driven primarily by developers and that prioritize the interest of those developers and if the residents of their new neighbourhoods over the interest of the city as a whole". So give yourself time to make sure you're making the decision that is in the best interest of the city as a whole and not simply appeasing the interest and demands of Qualico. Secondly, I'm asking for time for the residents of Charleswood and the citizens of Winnipeg, so they can have answers to the important questions raised earlier in this presentation. If you have been following the stories pertaining to Ridgewood in the Free Press, you might be led to believe that the citizens of Charleswood have had plenty of opportunity to provide their input in this development. Donovan Toews a planner with Landmark is quoted as having facilitated no fewer than 50 meetings between land owners, residents and community activists. I have no doubt that Mr. Toews has been a very busy man. He's met with the RMs of the Headingley and Macdonald, friends of heart trail, public schools financing board, the Varsity View and Roblin Community Clubs, Springers Gymnastics Clubs, Charleswood Rotary and a number of other interested groups, but in terms of actual inviting citizens to view and voice their opinions on Ridgewood, there have been three open houses. You must understand that these open houses are really only window dressing, part of the cost of doing business, a necessary but totally ineffective means by which citizens can have their views and opinions taken seriously. These open houses all had dozens of display boards and various options for what Ridgewood could look like, all slightly different variations of the same thing. There were city staff there to answer questions. Mr. Toews was at at least one that I saw. I have no doubt that the final version will be based on the feedback offered by the citizens who attended but when asked the most frequently repeated comment of these open houses has been "we don't like the development, period". Aside from rejecting the plan out right the major concern among Charleswood residents have been the preservation of green space. Shortly after Ridgewood hit the radar, Charleswood citizens for habitat preservation formed and has been working very hard with the developers and

organizing the community to put pressure on Landmark and Stantec to increase the amount of green space in the plan from the City mandated minimum of 10 percent. This has been completely ignored and as a result, will seriously threaten the natural environment that makes the Harte Trail the nature trail that it is. It remains in the Precinct Plan but will be a trail in name only. Let me remind you that the City has undergone some very comprehensive consultation processes to develop planning documents to guide our growth and provide for the future. I ask you, does this meet the principles of Plan Winnipeg? Would this create a complete community as outlined in OurWinnipeg? Is further suburban expansion into the farthest western edge of the city really the place to be investing limited civic revenues? Another reason article headlined "cultural transformation", talked to the value and importance of creative industries and how support for them can be real drivers of the city's economic engine. These creative industries that Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra, the Winnipeg Art Gallery, the Museum of Human Rights...

Mr. Speaker: Sir, I'm going to, you know...this has got nothing to do with the Precinct Plan. I want you to speak to the first reading of the plan, if not, then I'll have to excuse.

Harold Shuster: I will conclude by saying I came here seeking time, I implore you to take the time to find answers to the important questions, not only raised by me but by fellow Councillors as well. I ask that before you send this to community committee, you are comfortable that this plan serves the future needs of Winnipeggers and is in compliance with the planning documents created to guide our development. Talk to your planning department and ask them if they think this is the best plan for Winnipeg. Give yourself the time to ensure that before you send this to community committee, it contains all the necessary details that the citizens will need so they can provide informed opinion on this development plan. To paraphrase the Mayor, speaking on another important issue that will come before this chamber. In the past, you've seen a lot of misinformation and inaccurate information. I think the key is to make sure the public and you are aware of all the facts. Make this your time to be praised. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Just to say, sir, that the public hearing that will follow this later in June will be for that very specific reason, that the community can have their say and share particularly with community committee, their thoughts. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, Mr. Shuster for speaking to us about this today. I guess the decision in front of us today is whether or not to proceed to the next level of public hearing where all of the issues you are talking about will be discussed and that's true. I guess it's your point in coming here today to tell us that you think it's obvious from the amount of infrastructure and millions of dollars needed to be spent on new roads and other servicing that you think it may not be wise to proceed with even considering this development at this particular time, it is premature to consider developing on this far edge of the city considering the infrastructure issues and others you've mentioned.

Harold Shuster: Absolutely. I don't believe the City needs this kind of development plan now and perhaps not even in the future, but more importantly what I was trying to say is that there...within the plan as it is being presented now, there's serious questions. Members of this Council have raised serious questions about this plan and I don't feel that it's fair to send it to the community for input and discussion when there are some very important unanswered questions that...what I think... that they should have the information for before they can make informed decisions on whether or not this plan has merits to go forward.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Am I allowed to speak on this item?

Mr. Speaker: Well, technically not because you are going to be hearing...

Councillor Havixbeck: Well, so will everyone in this chamber at some point.

Mr. Speaker: At some point.

Councillor Havixbeck: Right.

Mr. Speaker: So, I'll allow you to...

(Inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Havixbeck: Okay, so, the next point in the process is the June 25th Hearing which we would welcome you to come out and be heard and that is the responsibility of the committee to hear from all delegations. So, my only comment.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Shuster for coming. Is...do I understand you correctly that yourself and other residents are against any development from occurring in Ridgewood? Is that your position on this matter?

Harold Shuster: My personal position is yes. I don't believe that Ridgewood at this point in the city's time is the place that development should be happening and there are certainly a number of other Charleswood residents who share that concern. My fear is that for most of them, they don't think you can fight City Hall. I'm not sure if we can either, but I'm prepared or I came here to ask for the time to make sure that before this goes forward that there is the necessary information, so citizens can have the all of the details they need to make the informed decision on this particular plan. I suspect that the City will at some point need to be further development. I think there are...currently, there are green spaces that should be filled in before this goes forward, in terms of a development plan this makes sense because it's contiguous with other housing currently there. So you're not going to have the vast green spaces that you have in other parts of the city.

Councillor Wyatt: Then your position is that the lands known as Ridgewood which is really southern Charleswood that have sat vacant or relatively low populated, low density for a long time, should not be developed now or never be developed?

Harold Shuster: (Inaudible) and the lands that are in Ridgewood don't currently have houses on so it's not that it's even low density but there is some very important natural environments there that are important to the citizens of Charleswood. Part of why people have chosen to live in Charleswood is that because they have that readily accessible, access to nature. You walk on the Harte Trail. You see deer, you hear birds, you hear...there's species of frogs and amphibians that exist nowhere else in the city. If you develop around that and you keep Harte Trail where it is. It's going to be a trail but it doesn't...it's not going to have the nature that it has now. It's part of the TransCanada Trail. It's an important piece of our city's infrastructure that I think needs to be saved and protected so there are lots of other areas in the city and I'm sure there are other cities that contain natural environments but that area of Charleswood is certainly not needed for the city's future development plans to throw another 8,000 houses on.

Mr. Speaker: Well, last question.

Councillor Wyatt: The impression I get is that...that in the foreseeable future, there should be no development...

Harold Shuster: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: Or...is what you're saying. Okay, thanks.

Harold Shuster: Short answer, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Well, this is the 1st step in the process, Mr. Shuster and there will be other meetings that you will be able to bring your ideas forward which aren't maybe not as restrictive as this, so we appreciate you spending the time today and as much as possible staying within the boundaries, so thank you.

Harold Shuster: I appreciate your indulgence.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. (applause). I'm going to invite Janine Carmichael. Janine, are you here? And...because your previous presenter that was scheduled is not able to join us today, Colin Craig is actually graduating and getting his MBA today, so he didn't know it was the same day as this, so you're going to have...you get his 10 minutes. So if you can fill 10 minutes, it's yours.

Janine Carmichael: Okay, good morning Mayor and Councillors. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this morning. I am here today representing more than 1700 small and medium sized businesses, members of CFIB, each of those businesses independently owned and operated. And I want you to know that small businesses support the city in finding creative ways to reduce spending; focus more on core services; and less on managing services that are traditionally or predominantly provided by the private sector sticking to essential services is what is going to allow the city to focus on delivering the quality of services that taxpayers expect and so for this reason, I am here to express our member's support for the sale of Blumberg and the private leasing of the four other golf courses. Further, our members

support Alternate Service Delivery as a means to reduce unnecessary cost and the burden on taxpayers, increased efficiency and enhance the quality of services offered by the city. We hope to see a continued focus on ASD in the months and years ahead. That being said, we'd like to express again our strong disappointment with the approach taken in the Responsible Winnipeg campaign, namely asking citizens to ask you to vote in favour of this proposal. We think that this policy has merit on its own and that the way that this was done has tarnished, what is a very solid policy direction. I can appreciate that all of you consistently face requests from your constituents for new spending and more spending and as part of that it's important that we also look at existing spending and ask ourselves that question what do we still need to do and what can we do in a better way. And I would put this golf course issue in that category and so I would urge you to not let the process get in the way of what we think is a really solid policy direction. Thank you for your time today. Didn't even need my five minutes. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you very much, Ms. Carmichael, for coming before us today speaking and...in terms of you know, bringing forward initiatives to this Council with regards to Alternative Service Delivery, it's...every time a proposal seems to be brought forward, there seems to be hue and cry that we cannot do this for various reasons, that it cannot proceed, that the sky is falling and this is going to be the end of the city as we know it. And there is a sizeable part of the community that responds to that message and unfortunately, the misinformation, for example, a lot of folks think that we are actually eliminating green space within the City of Winnipeg with this proposal which is absolutely, it's a contrary yet these are the e-mails we've been receiving. Is there any thoughts or suggestions on there? Do you want to maybe speak to that at all? Do you have any comments with regards to that?

Janine Carmichael: Again, our members support the City looking at creative ways to do things, and of course it's the job of the City to communicate those in clear ways about what we're trying to do and what we're not trying to do and quite frankly, what we already do in this case, having some leased golf courses already in the city. And so, I think that that clear communication, of course, is very important but let me be clear that our members support this approach of the City looking at things in a more creative way and really being more efficient and respectful of taxpayers.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you and the members you have in the event that the clause should fail which is a possibility requires two-thirds of a vote of Council, part of it requires two-thirds of a vote, it should fail, will you be informing your members of the decision made by this Council?

Janine Carmichael: Of course, that's our job is to communicate regularly with our members. At CFIB, we are a survey, research based group so we get our direction from our members and it is our job then to communicate back to them about how things have gone, so of course.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Wyatt: And chances are we will be recording our vote. Would you be passing on to them who voted for what on this item? (Inaudible) it's just, I just...is that something that you've given much thought to?

Janine Carmichael: I haven't given thought to that specifically.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie, Councillor Havixbeck. Councillor Eadie, go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Ms. Carmichael for coming out and presenting a small portion, I think, not all the small business perspective in this city of Winnipeg. My only question is you just mentioned that you talked about that we do have private leasing and I don't know if you are aware but in this debate I heard about how bad a condition the John Blumberg golf course is in and that's been under private management for some time. Do you...what is your opinion on that perspective? Do you think that private leasing arrangement is a failure?

Janine Carmichael: No, I don't. And I think that we need to really, really think about what is the job of the City and is it to do this? And our members say no, and so we think that there are opportunities for the City when they are negotiating these leases to develop the appropriate criteria, to be measuring these things, to be checking in, but we really feel this is a solid policy decision to move forward with.

Councillor Eadie: Is it the CFIB's position then that we should not be in the swimming pool business, the park business, the...all the various services other than roads, police, fire and ambulance? Is that the position of the CFIB?

Janine Carmichael: It's a good question. I hear you where you're coming from. Of course, our members think it is ultimately the job of government to focus on core services, services to property, those are core ones. We don't have

direction from our members on all those other ones as I said we are a survey research based group. We take direction from our members and on this one we have clear direction from our members.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Eadie: Last question, you used the definition of core service. What is the CFIB's definition of core services?

Janine Carmichael: Yeah, I think at the municipal level, it's a key focus on roads. It's that type of core infrastructure. Those are the types of things that our members tell us. Bridges, filling potholes. Those types of thing is what small business owners want to see the City focusing on.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Just...I have two questions. Number one is how is your organization funded?

Janine Carmichael: It's a great question. Exclusively from small and medium-sized businesses. We do not take a penny from any other source not from government and again all of our members are independently owned and operated businesses.

Councillor Havixbeck: So, have you asked, or maybe you know, how they feel, how the Manitoba businesses in particular feel about an Ontario-based company coming in and leasing four of our golf courses?

Janine Carmichael: Don't have clear direction from our members about that piece, but we know that what they want to see is the City focusing on core services and they would like to see this move forward with the golf course and so they expect the City, again, to be creating the appropriate RFP that is going to find the best provider of that service.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Ms. Carmichael? Seeing none.

Janine Carmichael: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. All right, okay, we will begin now the delegations in opposition to the item with regard to the Alternate Service Delivery Committee. And at this point, there will be the two registered delegates, Mr. Mike Davidson and Dave Sanders followed by Ron Mazur, Kelly-Ann Stevenson, Louise May, Dave Sauer and Kevin Rebeck. And Councillor Orlikow quite rightly suggested that this is a chamber of business, this is not entertainment, so I would ask the gallery to refrain from applause or hooting and hollering or any such behaviour. We would like the respect of the chamber to be mandated so we will ask Mr. Davidson, ten minutes, sir.

Mike Davidson: Good morning. Local 500 always appreciates the opportunity to come to City Hall and express our views. CUPE. Local 500 opposes the proposed lease arrangement and contends they should remain publicly managed and operated. We do not believe the City's recommendations make sense. In short, the move to privatize these services is poor policy options for the following reasons. We firmly believe that the municipal golf courses are and can remain profitable assets to the City of Winnipeg. They do not lose money. Based on recent findings, direct revenues exceed direct expenses. The City then allocates an additional 35 to 40 percent cost that accrues to the City, property tax equivalencies and other taxes that other City entities don't pay. Some of these are real expenses such as pay roll and office space but the allocation is in control of the city itself. These are not losses, these are transfers to the City's general revenues which would likely vanish with contracting out these golf courses. The golf courses pay more than their own way and have provided a reasonably priced, accessible sporting option for Winnipeggers for the last nine years. The business arrangement as it now stands for semi-privates must be revisited and in our view, we believe the City could no longer afford these type of business arrangements. Unfortunately, the City owned and operated golf courses have been badly neglected in terms of capital improvements. In the mid-90s, the City began to levy a dollar per round levy to begin a golf course improvement fund type of situation. And the media reported in 1995, a dollar from every round of play on a municipal golf course was deposited into a reserve which was meant to fund capital improvements to the course. When a golf services, when golf services became an arms-length agency and this would been four years ago at that time when this was written. Those deposits had stopped. Now the balance at that time, Mr. Speaker, was 1.8 million and that was reported by the Free Press. On February 21st, 2013, the media reported leasing City-run golf courses to reduce reliance on taxpayers, states in part the following. In an operational review of City golf services, the City Auditor noted that offering golf services is increasingly unaffordable and unsustainable and costly to the City. These figures do not include the needed capital improvements currently estimated at 4.6 million. Now ending that dollar per round capital levy in 2002, was a mistake in our view. It has cost the City well over a million dollars in badly needed capital resources. Had the City left that levy in place and had it been indexed to the golf course green fees, the City would have the necessary funds to meet the public course capital requirements, 4.6 million as reported in 2013 without imposing any burden on city existing capital budget. And in terms of public input, in this whole process, there has literally been no public debate,

no community engagement initiated by the City with respect to the municipal golf courses. I think the only thing that I can remember actually hearing was a radio talk show where people had an opportunity to phone in and express their views in fact, the operating budget which was tabled on January the 9th, 2013, contained no mention of any proposals to privatize City services. Had the City included this, this whole issue of golf services, we believe that many Councillors would not have voted in favour of the budget and we question why this wasn't part of the City's operating budget. This is a big ticketed item. It should've been in that process. In conclusion, our municipal golf courses play an important role in the lives of the citizens of Winnipeg. They are an entry door for beginner golfers and for the people who cannot afford green fees at a private golf course. Many seniors use our golf courses. Many families are out there. Many families going back three generations golf together at golf courses like Crescent Drive. Each of the City golf courses has its own unique qualities and benefits that appeal to golfers at every skill level and age in Winnipeg. They have provided affordable recreational opportunities for local residents and should continue to be publicly owned and operated for the enjoyment of everyone for years to come and if the City is looking for savings and we've heard this argument before, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look for savings, I would say this: we've asked for many times that the City should be conducting an outside audit on garbage and recycling services. Many municipalities have brought this service back in-house and passed those savings along to citizens of those respective municipalities. St. Johns New Brunswick is saving \$500,000 a year by bringing that service back in-house. Sherbrooke Quebec is saving \$750,000 per year. Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa, saved nearly \$5 million over 4 years and passed those savings along to the citizens of that city. We respectfully request that Council reject the lease proposal. They should...these golf courses should remain publicly managed and operated. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, order, order. I asked nicely the first time. Mr. Sanders, please. We will have questions for Mr. Davidson and Mr. Sanders together. Stay, stand by the mike. Mr. Sanders, you have five minutes.

David Sanders: Thank you, sir. Mr. Mayor, members of Council. My name is David Sanders. I've been making presentations to Council and its Committees fairly frequently during the last three months. Previously, I opposed a seriously misguided decision to divert the southwest rapid transit corridor in order to enhance the future value of certain developer's lands. Today, I'm hoping that at least six Councillors, hopefully eight will have the common sense and courage to stand up for their constituents and future generations of Winnipeggers and vote no to the privatization and eventual conversion of our city owned golf courses, course properties, for private use and commercial development. Who am I and why do I care, and why should you listen to me? I am a citizen of Winnipeg and that should be an answer enough for all three questions, but for the record, I've been a keen observer of City Hall since I first sat in the press gallery up there in 1965 as Metro Council and City Hall reporter for the Winnipeg Tribune and when the City of Winnipeg was unified on January 1st of 1972. I joined the new provincial department of urban affairs with responsibilities of coordinating all provincial / city financial relationships and the ongoing amendment for the City of Winnipeg Act. I subsequently served as deputy minister of urban affairs twice, assistant deputy minister planning and municipal affairs, chair of the Provincial Inter-Departmental Planning Board and co-chair of the Canada Manitoba Winnipeg agreement on the Red River Corridor. And I did also chair the Canada Manitoba Winnipeg officials committee which developed the first Winnipeg core area agreement which secures the initial funding and land acquisitions for the Forks and Steve Juba Park among many, many other good things. I have a master's degree in political studies and economics, half an MBA plus a law degree, I'm a practicing lawyer for pro bono cases. I've been a certified management consultant for the commercial real estate agent. Over the past 18 years, I've conducted property and business assessment appeals for almost every major commercial and institutional property owner in this city. I've designed and taught postgraduate courses in city planning, political studies, public administration in natural resources management and certificate courses in public sector management and purchasing management. One of my students is your clerk. So why do I care about these issues now before City Council? It's been a long time since I've played a round of golf or rode a bus, but I continue to believe that our City government exists to serve the very needs of our diverse community and to ensure that all citizens now and in the future have access to those facilities, services and experiences which will enhance the quality of life we all enjoy and that's why I and my fellow citizens I prepared to pay more taxes to finance the full array of municipal services and programs provided that the funds and City resources are well managed and here is my message for today. Based on my recent experiences with the rapid transit and golf course issues, I very much regret to say that many City Councillors and many senior administrators are either intimidated or grossly incompetent when it comes to making financial decisions. Yesterday I watched the spectacles of the City Auditor refusing to answer a straightforward and a very important financial question posed by Councillor Vandal, either because the Auditor was intimidated by the Mayor and other Councillors or because he simply doesn't understand how to construct a basic financial impact statement for a City decision. If Councillor Fielding, I'm not sure if he's gone, will examine the April 24th, 2013 financial impact statement on page 13 of the ASD committee report you have before you today, you will see that there is no savings of \$1 million to be achieved through privatization and especially if you also add in an account for the projected loss in tax revenue. Yesterday, I asked the members to put a number of other very simple financial questions to the City Auditor. For example, I wanted to know if he agreed that since 2002, the City of Winnipeg municipal mill rate on real property has not been used to provide any subsidy to golf services whatsoever and unfortunately no member of EPC had either the courage or the curiosity to ask that question. Frankly, I think that Councillors should ask themselves why golf services is

projected to, quote, "lose \$768,000" in 2013 while Parks and Urban Forestry doesn't lose anything at all, that division just requires mill rate support and contribution of 36.6 million this year. Like transit and libraries and every other civic service in City funded organizations, we citizens value and support whether or not we use them personally. The golf consultant was absolutely scathing in its criticism of the unqualified management and the financial straight-jacket imposed on Winnipeg golf services. Council should finally address those issues and should be able to find managers capable of operating the courses, at least as efficiently as the private operator and Council should not be bullied into proceeding along the path to privatization by an administration which cannot or will not do the job that which has been expected of them. And as for the proposed sale of John Blumberg golf course, there's absolutely no need for Council to feel, it must make such a major decision at this time. On the contrary, the push to make such a major decision makes a mockery of the objectives and principles of OurWinnipeg, of Complete Communities and the promised parks, places and open spaces strategies and plans. And furthermore, when the Ernst & Young Real Estate Management Audit Report is expected to be delivered in July, one must be highly suspicious of this inexplicable attempt to sell one more city asset before the door is slammed shut. I asked these Councillors to search his or her consciences and then vote no to ASD report today and Council might also censure those responsible for the surreptitious and misleading Responsible Winnipeg ad campaign. I hope I never see such an abusive of taxpayers' money again. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we have questions. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: I have questions for each speaker. Is that going to be allowed?

Mr. Speaker: You have three questions.

Councillor Havixbeck: Three questions. All right. Mr. Sanders, I'll ask you while you're up at the podium. In your time following City Hall and in your close relationship that would be apparent, for many years, have you ever seen people excluded as they have been at Standing Policy Committee meetings of late, probably from about last February onwards in relation to this file?

David Sanders: I've always seen Council suspend the rules to hear people who had taken the time and energy to come down and speak their mind. The first time I ever saw that practice not followed was at the meeting of the ASD Committee in where I and others were not allowed to speak even though we of course had asked in advanced but not a day in advance to appear.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Havixbeck: I would direct this question to both of you. Are there circumstances, because we are here contemplating this report because of the Auditor's Report that was provided back in 2011 that was on the EPC agenda yesterday, stating that the golf course services were losing money essentially? Are there circumstances where you could see opportunities for improvement? And there were a number of recommendations put forward, one to nine in fact and we're now contemplating ten here, such as turf management specialists.

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Councillor Havixbeck: This is my preamble, so I'm getting to it. To your knowledge, did the turf management get contemplated, the CPGA Professional? Any other initiatives and I look to you, Mike, more specifically, within the organization, engaging front line employees to actually find some savings?

Mike Davidson: Well, some of the suggestions that we had go back quite a ways, but even back in the early days going back to Kildonan, back in the early 1920s, they sold season passes. They sold strips of tickets, monthly passes as well. We suggested that they adopt those practices again because they helped for operational accounting so they know exactly how much money is coming in in advance as opposed to just paying your green fees when you show up. There's a number of things that we've also suggested, too, such as upgrading our equipment. In many cases, the equipment's very outdated. Our employees have kept that equipment running and some cases with bubble gum, just because it's falling apart. Our members know what they're doing there, but you know, for example, a green itself has to be really rebuilt after 60 years. That hasn't been the case in our golf courses and by taking away that \$1 per round and not having the ability to put infrastructure back into the golf courses and I'll point out again that \$1 a round wouldn't have burdened any other department or the citizens of Winnipeg, it would've been running on its own. They could implement that dollar a round again and that would go a long ways to starting to put money back into the infrastructure renewal which is required at the golf courses.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: To either of your knowledge, do you know where that \$1.8 million has gone, that dollar a round that accumulated to \$1.8 million?

Mike Davidson: No, I would be guessing to say it went back into general reserves but the Chair of Finance would...he would probably know where that went. I don't have the answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty. First question.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This question is for Mike. Yesterday, at the meeting there with the Auditor, Deputy Mayor Wyatt suggested and you didn't have a chance to respond to this accusation the other day, it seems preposterous. We suggested that on a holiday, the lowest paid worker at a city golf course is paid 51.54 an hour. Is that number correct?

Mike Davidson: I'll answer your question. There's a provincially, in law, there is an Employment Standard Act whether you have a collective agreement or not you have to adhere to that. Second thing, on our collective agreement, every councillor here agreed to that. I think you did as well to those rates of pay. I think that's fair to say that you agreed to that. A deal is a deal. Third point, there's maybe a handful of people that work on a stat day. Do you really think that brought golf services to its knees and brought it to its brink? I don't think so.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Browaty: How much do you think the average worker was being paid at a private course on that same day? I'll tell you the answer. Excuse me. I'll tell you the answer. Most were sent home because it was raining.

Mike Davidson: We have a provision in our collective agreement as well for rain days. The other day when it was raining, they sent workers home. If they can't get on the boulevards with equipment, they're not going to tell them to get on there, they're sent home as well. We have that provision in the collective agreement and I would say to you, Councillor, look through the collective agreement because you vote on it. And at the time, you know, when we go through the bargaining process, we jointly agree to the terms under that collective agreement. That includes you as well.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for the two gentlemen who are speaking against the Alternate Service Delivery report? Seeing none, thank you gentlemen.

Mike Davidson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right. I did read off the five folks that we've suspended the rules to hear. Ron Mazur, Kelly-Ann Stevenson, Dave Sauer and Kevin Rebeck and it's five minutes, no questions each. Proceed, sir, Ron Mazur.

Ron Mazur: Thank you very much. I'm Ron Mazur, co-chair of OURS Winnipeg. Mr. Mayor, Councillors, I'd like to thank Councillor Gerbasi for moving the motion to allow me to speak. OURS Winnipeg Outdoor, Urban Recreation Spaces Winnipeg is a community based group dedicated to the preservation, protection and enhancement of Winnipeg's public's green spaces. OURS Winnipeg demands timely and meaningful public consultations prior to any decisions regarding the future of City owned public golf courses. The future of the City owned golf courses is on the line. Council is considering a motion that declares John Blumberg golf course as surplus. This is the first step in the sale of the 27 whole golf course on 81 hectares of river front property in Headingley. Council is considering leasing the City owned golf courses at Kildonan Park, Crescent Drive, Harbourview and Windsor Park. The leasing out of these golf courses to private management will involve the massive conversion of public land to de facto private land for at least 20 years. All of these plans for the privatization and sale of green space have not undergone public discussion and consultation. These public green spaces are owned by all citizens of Winnipeg. The attempt by the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and some Councillors to sell and lease these public lands without any public consultation is an affront to democracy in Winnipeg. OURS Winnipeg would like you to consider the following. One, golf courses can and do make money. Profit depends on good management and City administrative decisions. Winnipeg courses covered their costs before they were moved into the Winnipeg Golf Services Special Operating Agency in 2002. Revenue generated by the golf courses has been transferred to the general operating budget since then. The losses have been exaggerated and the revenue and profit potential has been constrained by decisions of the City administration. Two, public supports public golf course lands being kept public. OURS Winnipeg presented Council with a petition with over 8500 signatures asking for consultations and demanding that green space be protected from commercial and residential development. Three, thousands of people particularly seniors and students, use the municipal golf courses attracted in large part by affordable fees. Golf is not an elitist sport when played on municipal courses, rather it's an affordable sporting activity for all ages. In winters, skiers, school programs and others use the courses as well. Year round use is important to ordinary citizens. The public wants and deserves access, affordability and accommodation of public interests. The tidal wave of baby boomers will

significantly increase the future demand for affordable, recreational opportunities. Four, golf courses are an important recreational and health asset for the community. Green space is a recognized benefit for any modern city seeking to attract companies, families and professionals. Green space becomes more valuable as urban density increases. The few natural amenities of Winnipeg include parks, public green spaces and golf courses and river corridors. These amenities deserve to be protected from development and from privatization. Who gains and who loses if golf courses are privatized? Clearly, golf courses can be profitable. So who should benefit from these assets, private companies or the public? An Ontario company or Winnipeg families, developers or ordinary citizens? Selling off assets is short sighted, bad management. Council needs to raise revenues, but eliminating revenue potential exposes a lack of vision in creative thinking and dealing with the City's major needs now and for the future. We know that Mayor Katz and some City Councillors have a plan to ultimately sell public golf courses to private interest. City consultants, the City Auditor both recommended a two-stage approach to the sale of these green spaces. Stage one is the short-term objective of leasing public golf courses to private management. Stage two in the longer term, the objective is to divest public golf courses for commercial and residential development. The public has been denied their voice. Twenty registered delegations including OURS Winnipeg were denied time to speak to Property and Development Committee back in February of 2012. Since then ordinary citizens wanting to speak against the leasing and sale of the golf courses have been denied an opportunity to be consulted. Over 8500 signatures on an OURS petition asks for consultation and City Hall appears closed to all except developers and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Wrap up please, sir.

Ron Mazur: In closing, I would like to suggest that the most important item facing you is the future of golf green space and what you leave as a legacy for future generations. So I would ask you to consider a vision that leaves something of substance to this city in coming years and that substance that you want to leave to future generations is the beautiful green spaces that we have in our city. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Kelly-Ann Stevenson.

Kelly-Ann Stevenson: Good morning. Good morning, Mayor Sam Katz, City Councillors. My name is Kelly-Ann Stevenson. I am the president of the Council of Women of Winnipeg. And for those who don't know the Council of Women of Winnipeg, is a volunteer, non-partisan federation of Winnipeg organizations and individuals. We advocate for women, children and families and the welfare of our community. Today, on behalf of the Council of Women of Winnipeg, we are in opposition of the sale of John Blumberg and the leasing of our four municipal golf courses. We believe that the leasing of our public golf courses to a private sector, our fear is that private sector equals profit. Public equals accessibility. Let me repeat that. Private sector equals profit. Public owned means accessible. The loss of accessible and affordable leisure activity for our citizens is in total...goes totally against what the Council of Women of Winnipeg is for. we want to ensure that women, children and their families and citizens of Winnipeg have accessible and affordable access to leisure activities and this leisure activity happens to be golf. We all know that golf is sometimes coined the leisure sport of the rich. And not too many kids that I work with in the inner city have memberships to private courses. The other thing you need to keep in mind and that the Council is in fear of, is that if these public courses go to a private sector, what is the long term effect of that? Are we going to lose accessibility to these courses, not just affordability but access? Because right now many of those courses are accessible by our public transportation system. We ask that you carefully consider the motion that's before you to defeat it, because really, we propose that before any sale of any Winnipeg golf course, that the democratic process be followed and adhered to. That we have the opportunity to participate in public hearings and consultation and that any future attempts to privatize our publicly owned assets be done in an open and transparent manner. I thank you for your time. (Applause).

Mr. Speaker: Louise May.

Louise May: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Councillors. Mayor Katz, not present, thank you. I'd like to address this as a community activist who has fought against, twice, private golf course development in my community and community in St. Norbert. In the early 90s, we were faced with a development proposal of a private golf course that would have wiped out 78 acres of pristine river bottom forest and as a community we rallied together and fought against it and as a young activist, I learned some of the ropes and was...appeared here and started to understand some of the machinations of City Council. We were able to save that 78 acres that continues to remain as an ecological preserve in the community, a very important ecological preserve. Later on though, we were not as fortunate and we lost some precious land through the development of the Southwood Golf and Country Club, which no thanks to some terrible representation by our incumbent Councillor Swandel.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Louise May: that we were not able to save that.

Mr. Speaker: You know what, that's not appropriate, no you're not allowed to...

Councillor Swandel: (Inaudible)

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Louise May: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Justin, thank you, you, too. So carry on ma'am, but we leave personal things out of it and...

Louise May: We have a flaw in City Council that resulted...

Mr. Speaker: Okay, all right, ma'am, address the issue of the golf courses, please.

Louise May: Private golf courses have a certain mode of operation in the community and publicly owned golf courses are critical. I am also here as a business person though I am not a member of the CFIB and I definitely feel that the CFIB wants to present here, they need to have a core...definition of what core services are. And I think that recreation has always been a core service of City Council. I don't understand why it's suddenly under debate. So I think that it's really important that we look at how the private and public golf courses are operating in our city and that we make sure we don't lose any of our public golf courses. I think they're important green spaces and I think they remain affordable. I'd like to speak to the larger trend of losing our public services. If the City Council is not here to manage public services, such as recreation, such as waste, such as sewage, what is it here for? We've seen through your leadership, Mayor Katz, lack of understanding of what those core services are. We need to focus on what those core services are. If I were Mayor of the city, I would be focused on two questions. One of them is how are we preparing ourselves for the environmental crisis that is coming? The second question is how do we protect our most vulnerable citizens? Those are the two main questions and I urge you to see in context.

Mr. Speaker: But the question, ma'am. Ma'am, I will interrupt you. Well, listen, I will excuse you if you don't listen. We're talking about golf here, okay? We're not talking about the environment, all right. So...

Louise May: Yes, we are talking about the environment.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, then I'll excuse you. Thank you.

Louise May: And I look forward to the next election.

Councillor Gerbasi: ...and I challenge the ruling of the Speaker to dismiss that delegation. That's outrageous, thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion put forward by Councillor Gerbasi, please rise.

Councillor Gerbasi: To challenge the ruling of the speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All those in support of the speaker? Motion carried. Thank you. My next speaker will be Mr. Dave Sauer.

Dave Sauer: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Good morning, everybody. On behalf of the Winnipeg Labour Council, I wish to thank the Council for the opportunity to speak and present the views of the Winnipeg Labour Council. We represent 74 affiliated union locals here encompassing 46,000 working men and women in Winnipeg including members of CUPE. 500, Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1505, MGEU Local 911 and United Firefighters Local 867. I just want to give a few little kudos out here because CUPE. 500, you heard from them very respectfully this morning. We know where their position is. ATU 1505, I spoke with that executive last week and they're in favour of the Council's position today. Yesterday I had an opportunity to be at the Paramedic Association of Manitoba's golf tournament with Chris Broughton from MGEU Local 911, had a good chance to talk to him about this as well. And he is also in support of the Labour Council's position and this morning, President Alex Forrest of firefighters of Winnipeg posted that he was also in support of public golf courses and maintaining the services that we have here so I want to thank him very much for that opportunity in and for sharing those views as well. So the contracting out of in-house golf operations and sale of John Blumberg is cause for concern. Our public golf courses have been around since 1921 and have a long and proud history of providing accessible and affordable golf in our city. They have been a special part of Winnipeg's landscape and for many decades are essential to the quality of life we enjoy here in our city. Unfortunately, due to lack of investment and political will, Winnipeg's golf courses have been allowed to deteriorate and fall into disrepair over the years. Transferring management of these courses to a private, out-of-province entity limits public access and control of public assets.

Private entities operate to make a profit. I don't buy the arguments that market rates are similar, existing already here in the city that if you go to a private course, you're going to get the same price as a public course. If you eliminate the public courses from that equation, all prizes will rise in the city because there is no check and balance that is put in place to ensure that golf is affordable and accessible. Fees will increase and corners will be cut which could further leave our lands in disrepair and discourage greater participation of golf...in golf from the public. The greater concern is that this could be a first step to the eventual sale of these lands. What is most concerning about this report is not the language that's been contained within it, we do strongly oppose it, but the methods in which the City approached this entire issue, aside from lackluster public consultation, many other maneuvers at City Hall have demonstrated unwillingness to hear opposition. Citizens who have taken time out of the day to present before Committee have been refused the opportunity via technicalities. The use of this Alternate Service Delivery process as opposed to the annual City budgetary process where in the citizen has more of an opportunity for input is another example. Most troublesome though is developments, as the development around the Responsible Winnipeg Campaign launched a week and a half ago. Certain members of the EPC appeared to have taken it upon themselves to use taxpayers' dollars to push a political agenda. The irresponsible establishment of a website meant to send a pre-scripted e-mail to their City Councillor is nothing short of intimidation and bullying. Ninety thousand dollars of taxpayers' funds were used in this manner and I've expressed a lot recently about how disgusted I have been that this Council voted to remove \$85,000 from United Way of Winnipeg's budget and unfortunately this is where that money went to it appears, \$90,000 for that. So let's reinstate the money to United Way and get rid of that horrible ad campaign. So in effect, the well is poisoned around this issue regardless of a Councillor's support for the proposal on paper, the process in which they have presented and pressed upon the public and fellow Councillors is untenable. A vote for these proposals is in effect, an endorsement of that method and the methods that have been exercised. The means do not justify the ends on this one. Winnipeg Labour Council believes the citizens of Winnipeg deserve quality public and recreational services. It is for these reasons, we oppose the recommendations put forward today. The current state of Winnipeg's golf courses calls for actions but not the action proposed in this report. Finally, taxpayers' dollars should not be used to mount campaigns to influence votes at City Hall. Citizens are aware of the issues at stake and take responsibility. If the response is not to the liking of members of Council in positions of power, they have no right to use public money to bully other members of Council who are responding to the will of their constituents. If there are organizations and individuals that are opposed, or sorry, that are in favour of the proposals being put forward here, let them foot the bill for a campaign. You heard from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and how they are support of it. I know Colin Craig was supposed to be here from the Taxpayers Federation. They also support it. Why can't they be the ones who foot the bill for a publicly...or public campaign about an issue? It should not be handled through City Council. Frankly, as I said, the well is poisoned on this and it's irresponsible to drink the Kool-Aid that's been made from that well. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Kevin Rebeck.

Kevin Rebeck: Good morning. I'm Kevin Rebeck, President for the Manitoba Federation of Labour and we represent within the City of Winnipeg, 70,000 workers. I'm here this morning to oppose the motion to contract out the operations of publicly owned golf courses and the outright sale of John Blumberg Golf Course to a private developer. There are two main points I'd like to make. The financial issue has become so clouded by those supporting privatizing and selling off our assets owned by the people of Winnipeg, that the only fair comment I can make there is shame. I believe that the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor and the City's Chief Administrative Officer have deliberately adopted a strategy of profiling the worst possible financial face in order to convince the people of Winnipeg that maintaining and operating these important recreational facilities ought to be gifted to the private sector. Selling off public assets to private developers is a story we've seen from Winnipeg City Council all too often over the years. It's not enough to say that you only plan to sell John Blumberg Golf Course and lease out the others. In our experience, leased public assets seem to find their way into low profile sales not many years after. But even before that occurs, the public's ability to control what they own usually disappears beyond the privacy wall of privately held business interest and what's out of sight is out of mind. Local 500 of the Canadian Union of Public Employees' analysis of the financial picture of our golf courses is one I trust far more than what I've heard spun by the privateers. They don't lose money. The publicly run golf courses bring in net revenue for the City and it should be noted more than the semi-private ones. There's a number of questions that you as Councillors as we in Winnipeggers should feel comfort having had answered before this deal would move forward and before you vote. What does the Mayor and ASD not look at the sweetheart deals of a dollar a year lease that semi-private courses have as an option to invest in our public assets? Bringing that deal, those deals up to market rates would generate significant revenue for the City. Why won't the City prove when they enter these deals that they do what they say they'll do? There's been numerous calls for an external audit of garbage collection to show that these secret private deals deliver the financial promises that they say it will but that's not been acted on. Why doesn't this Mayor and this Council support more public consultation and accountability? You know, when a Judge says that you're guilty of bad political and ethical behaviour, how do you justify spending at least \$90,000 to launch a phony campaign to justify the position on the deal? Was it \$90,000 of taxpayers money that was wasted on this campaign designed to trick the public and how will Council ensure that that's being held accountable for that decision. Mr. Mayor, you continue to demonstrate that your vision of

the city is not on the best interest of working families. It appears your vision of the city is one that provides police and fire services.

Mr. Speaker: Sir, I'm going to interrupt here. I'd like you to stay on track about the golf report and the Alternate Services.

Kevin Rebeck: Fine, I will speak to the values then here.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Kevin Rebeck: The values of a golf course publicly owned and run is one that I think is shared by Winnipeggers. One that brings in revenue for our city. One that provides affordable, accessible golf services. I don't share the values of what's being proposed and I don't think Winnipeg does either. For once, we should see...do what's right and believe in our city and infrastructure, invest in it instead of starving it and be accountable for making things better diminishing our city, our assets and our services and I rest assured...Councillor Wyatt asked the question earlier, you know, will you be letting your members know who voted how and what? You can rest assured that we'll be doing so and at the beginning of this session, you reminded us that this is a chamber of business and I want to remind everyone here that this is a chamber of public interest, not business. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Speaker: Thank you, that concludes our delegations and we'll move into the report from May the 15th, Executive Policy Committee. Mayor Katz.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED MAY 15, 2013

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 and 2, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. May 22nd.

Mayor Katz: I'll introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 to 4.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, Councillor Eadie wants to stand down no. 1. Seeing none, we will vote on 2, 3, 4. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Mayor Katz, would you like to move no. 1.

Item 1 – Citizen Member Appointments

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I very much love to hear from Councillor Eadie and then I certainly would address any issues or concerns he may have.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Speaker Nordman. I just wanted to...I will be voting in favour of this citizen appointments. This is about the new Winnipeg Police Board and the members that sit on it and I was looking through the list of the people who had been indicated to participate on what will become a very, very important board in guiding the City towards fighting crime. We know that we have a good Police Chief in place who's working directly in the community and doing the best that he can to formulate a plan and to continue, actually what the Winnipeg Police Service's been doing and they are doing I think a fantastic job with what they have to do to deal with some of the real serious violent crime and crimes that are happening throughout the city. So when I looked at these citizen appointments, I appreciate we've got a solid business person here, we have a solid lawyer, we have a solid corporate person of aboriginal decent and we have a very qualified chairperson in Councillor Fielding. We have Councillor Steen who is a very well-meaning and I think comes more from a prevention side of dealing with crime. I think that's very important, but I just wanted to indicate although I am voting for the citizen appointments, I do have to say, I am somewhat disappointed that I don't actually see a representative on the Police Board that would represent any of our neighbourhood residents associations or organizations that are on the ground, trying to stop the violence. People, for example, like Michael Champagne or...although I don't know if he applied, but there seems to be a lack of that kind of representation on the Police Board. I hope that that doesn't mean though, that there won't be great acknowledge and listening to those people as I believe the

Police Board will in terms of moving forward with a strategy, will consult with the community. So having said that, I appreciate these citizens. It's going to be a lot of work that they're going to have to do and I will be voting for them.

Mr. Speaker: Any other comments? Seeing none...oh, Mayor, Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Yeah, I'll be brief with this, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I thank Councillor Eadie for his comments on it. I'll also be speaking more to the Police Board. First of all it is a big honour for me to be the first chair of the Police Board. It's something that I'm very passionate about in terms of the policing, what's there. I've been working closely with the Police Service and Police Association too as well, Mike Sutherland who is doing an excellent job for the men and women in the police force. We have in the city, a lot of challenges and there's also a lot of opportunities. There's lots of great things that are going on the Police Force that are there, and we know that the creation of the Police Board was established by the Police Services Act and really what this is, it's a way for a citizen-led board to have participation with the citizens and to really address these things. We know the Chief of Police has been out in the community. I think he's done 10 out of 20 consultation sessions. He is in a both our wards, Councillor Nordman, just last week with both ourselves and another representative support. He's a man that I very much support. I like his philosophy in terms of the approach to policing. You know, I see it as a three-pronged approach. You have officers in the streets and cadets are in the street which is very important. I think you've got the crime prevention aspect that's there. You've got things like Citizens for Crime, you know, citizens...Neighbourhood Watch essentially, you've got Crime Stoppers, you've got programs like the CAN Program. But you also have the LiveSafe Program, which is very good programming and that's to address root causes of crime so. I think it's a three-pronged approach. In terms of the people that are part of that Board we tried to have people from all walks and backs of life. There's of course two City Council appointees, Councillor Steen is obviously one of the members on the committee, and also has obviously extensive experience in recreation, although I understand that there's other members of Council that learned from hockey as well that was brought forward the other day. That's a joke. But...and part of that too, we also have financial...we've got people with financial background, people with law back...experience, people that are involved in the community in with an aboriginal component that's there that we can learn from and be a part of and we're very happy to see that happen. A part of the board, there was some concerns in terms of the background checks that are there. We came up with a bit of a compromise proposal that allows that background checks to happen from the third party organization, the R.C.M.P. that would be part of that, and so that's something that we'll incorporate in terms of the board's selection, the background checks for it. You know, this is the first start of the board, so we're going to see where it works, at the...will be the appointment of the end of Council. At that point, if we need to expand to the board, some are seven, some are nine. And I was just in Edmonton with some of the Police Services looking at their models and they've got a fantastic model that's there. So if we need to expand and look at items that you know, Councillor Eadie had mentioned, we're very much open to that. So, with that, very pleased to be a part of it. We see a swearing-in ceremony probably happening on Friday, June 21st. We're left with...to make sure we get out of the facilities that's a part of it, but I think it's a very exciting opportunity, and I'm excited to work with all these folks and also the Police Service and Police Association to help make the community a little bit safer and it really is, you know, it sounds like kind of a cliché but you have the men and women of the police force that are there. You know, they're stopping crimes and really taking...could take a bullet for us and I think their support and working with them makes sense. The police boards are something that are used throughout the country and I think it's something that can be good for citizens and good for service, so thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting this.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz, close.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do appreciate the comments of both Councillor Fielding and Councillor Eadie. Just to address Councillor Eadie's concern right towards the end, just to make sure that I believe he and everyone should be aware of the fact that the Provincial Government also has two appointees. My understanding is one of them has been appointed. There's still one to go and maybe that issue that he put up could be addressed by them appointing someone that does have a touchstone to everything he mentioned earlier so that could be a solution to that as well, Mr. Speaker. So I just want to add that.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further comments, all those in favour of Item 1? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MOTIONS

Mr. Speaker: We have several motions and three of them are for automatic referral. That would be motion 2, 3 and 4. So we'll put those forward and Councillor Fielding, you have a motion.

Motion No. 1

**Moved by Councillor Fielding,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,**

WHEREAS pursuant to By-Law No. 148/2012 (the "By-Law"), Council established the Winnipeg Police Board (the "Board");

AND WHEREAS Council is considering the appointment of members to the Board at its meeting of May 29, 2013;

AND WHEREAS certain amendments to the By-Law are required in order to facilitate the operational requirements of the Board;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

- 1. That the amendments to the Winnipeg Police Board By-Law No. 148/2012 attached hereto as Appendix "A" be enacted.*
- 2. That the Proper Officers of the City do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Motion No. 2

**Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Gerbasi,**

WHEREAS elected City Councillors are held accountable for spending of Councillor Representation Allowances through the Governance Committee and City Auditor by application of criteria for spending;

AND WHEREAS the mayor of Winnipeg is elected in the same manner as City Councillors;

AND WHEREAS any elected official should be accountable for financial expenditures of funds set aside to represent the office, develop policy and communicate the activities of the Mayor's Office and selected Executive Policy Committee members;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Auditor with any resources needed, develop a set of criteria, similar to that for councilors representation allowances, for expenditures under the funds set aside for the Mayor's Office and EPC Policy Committee and Communications functions outside of staffing;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Auditor, with assistance of the City's Legal Department, recommend to the Audit Committee any steps required to have these criteria established in by-laws and policies or in legislation if need be.

Motion No. 3

**Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,**

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has been criticized of late for not having open, transparent government for citizens;

AND WHEREAS citizens have a right to be informed about services, programs and events related to the daily operation of the City;

AND WHEREAS the Open Information does not currently adequately allow disclosure of internal records that are of interest to the public and requests through the Freedom of Information process are lengthy, expensive and discourage citizens from seeking information;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council be provided a report back within 60 days about how information can be more easily accessible and transparent to the public using the Open Data Catalogue that is similar to other jurisdictions such as Regina.

Motion No. 4

**Moved by Councillor Havixbeck,
Seconded by Councillor Smith,**

WHEREAS the Mayor and Deputy Mayor authorized \$90,000 to lobby other Councillors to support the golf course outsourcing initiatives through a website called Responsible Winnipeg, which in fact, was the City of Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council be provided a detailed accounting within 60 days that provides a list all expenditures made to Direct Focus and other payees, and a detailed list of all expenses of Direct Focus, including their sub-contractors such as newspapers, radio, billboards and amounts.

Councillor Fielding: Item No. 1 was brought forward here, Mr. Speaker, it's very much a housekeeping amendment. When we drafted the by-law, a part of the by-law, we need to ensure that we can do some pre-spending for instance. There's some parameters to advertise when we actually have the meetings. I think you need 21 days if not mistaken ahead of a meeting that's there, so some just initial spending that needs to happen part of it. We...it's on, I think we handed the section up, but essentially we want to follow all the procedures and policies and standards that are laid out by the City. So there's nothing strange, just adopt basically those policies. We do need two-thirds of Council to support this, but it's very much a housekeeping amendment and you want to thank Phil Sheegl and their team and his administrative support in terms of helping us to address the...a bit of this oversight that's there.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. So, we need two-thirds support here to suspend the rules to deal with motion 1. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Now, voting on the motion, which you have there, EPC motion 1, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you very much and that concludes motions 1 through 4. By-laws, Mayor Katz.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I'll deal with the by-laws first and then I'll ask for the rules to be suspended after we (inaudible). So, I'd like to move that the following by-laws be moved a first time, By-law No. 63/2013, 64/2013, 78/2013 and 80/2013.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 63/2013, 64/2013, 78/2013, 80/2013.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I move that by-laws numbered 63/2013, 64/2013, 78/2013 and 80/2013 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 63/2013, 64/2013, 78/2013 and 80/2013.

Mayor Katz: And I'll move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 63/2013, 64/2013, 78/2013, 80/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: And all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Mayor Katz: And Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 81/2013 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we have to suspend the rules. So all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you.

Clerk: By-law No. 81/2013.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I move that By-law No. 80/2013 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 81/2013.

Mayor Katz: And I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 81/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Okay, we have question period for the Mayor. Councillor Gerbasi followed by Councillor Havixbeck followed by Councillor Eadie and Councillor Wyatt. Mayor Katz.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Gerbasi: You're not a mind reader. Thank you Mr. Speaker. On April 27th many Winnipeggers awoke to a rather terrifying article in the Winnipeg Free Press. Mr. Mayor, through the Speaker to you, your appointed Deputy Mayor and Chair of Finance announced that he was considering proposing massive budget cuts in our City, and he gave the media a list of 26 items that could be on the chopping block. The list was a shock to many people and included complete elimination of the Winnipeg Arts Council funding, cancelling Rapid Transit, cancelling all funding to the youth and community programming in the West Broadway community. It also included all museum funding, the Aboriginal Youth Strategy, the Canada Summer Games, inner city housing and Economic Development Winnipeg and many more items. Ironically, these massive proposed changes to the budget even included cancelling funding for budget consultations. Many members of Council have been put in the very awkward position of trying to explain how such a de-stabilizing and fear-creating announcement was allowed to take place and how it can be that in its aftermath there is very little meaningful response or re-assurance from the Mayor who is the leader of this Council. The main response from the Mayor and the media was to acknowledge his Deputy Mayor and Finance Chair was frustrated as if this is somehow an understandable and acceptable reason for scaring the living daylights out of hard-working community members and citizens across this City. I think that Winnipeggers have a right to know what our Mayor really thinks about these proposed cuts, and my question to the Mayor is this. Do you believe that the approach taken and the proposals put forward by your appointed Deputy Mayor are appropriate?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, first of all let me make it very clear. Unfortunately Councillor Gerbasi wasn't paying attention to the news the following day. I did make it extremely clear that I was not supportive of these moves, that's number one. Number two, I also stated very specifically is that obviously there is genuine concern from the Councillor about the fact that being abandoned by the Provincial Government as far as getting any share of revenue, trying to point out that this Council is going to have to make some serious decisions down the road. Either find more revenues, whichever way you can, and you know our biggest source is to increase taxes, or basically make cuts. Number three Mr. Speaker, every member of this Council is elected by the citizens of Winnipeg and they have the right to express their opinion just like anybody here has in the past and will continue to do, and that's basically it on that topic Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mr. Speaker, and in my defense I do read the news every day. But many citizens are asking what was Responsible Winnipeg and will anyone take responsibility for it. We know that \$90,000 was spent on a P.R. campaign in which a fake community group was created, or the impression of a fake community group was created by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor. Ads went out that were intended to pressure Councillors to change their vote on a controversial policy issue. My question to the Mayor is this. Do you support this sort of approach and will we be seeing this again? Do you feel this is an appropriate use of public funds?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Gerbasi, I thank her for that question. As has been said on many occasions and actually one of the delegations here talked about addressing scenarios where there is misinformation, dis-information, inaccurate information, I believe that all members of the public have the right to know what the facts are. As you've heard here from many delegations today, they don't accept the Consultant's report, they don't accept the Auditor's report, they don't accept the fact that we have an outside audit...auditor doing an audit on our books and they

agreed with that, so obviously a lot of people don't accept that, and I guess that's their prerogative Mr. Speaker but the reality is, we have delegations coming before Committees, Council, on a regular basis. There are many people who I think today I've seen for the third time, which means they have that opportunity. I think it's important for them to know the facts. If they don't accept the facts and just say that they're wrong or they're no good or they did a poor job, I guess that could apply to just about any audit or any consultant down the road, and just imagine the chaos that might cause Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Gerbasi: My last question is that we have been promised that there will be budget consultation launched very shortly, and that citizens are being...will be asked to participate. Councillors are aware that this is going to be happening as we've been contacted by the Consultant in a very short time frame. There's going to be a budget consultation and again, with what has taken place in the past with Councillor Wyatt's hit list, even if it's just his list, he is the Chair of Finance, he is the person you have appointed to oversee the budget process and to oversee the consultations and together with that hit list, which a lot of my people in my community are very disturbed by, with a failed Responsible Winnipeg campaign, how do you propose to restore trust in the citizens who are questioning more than ever the sincerity of our public consultation, that this consultation process is a legitimate process?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I believe that number one, this is a very genuine process. This is actually something that's never happened before Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative that we are taking. This is something that was actually championed by Councillor Wyatt. I know that the previous Chair of Finance, Councillor Fielding, also went out and got as much public consultation as possible. As most members of Council, I would hope, would know, that we did put out an R.F.P. It has been awarded to a professional who, it appears according to Councillor Gerbasi, has already contacted the Councillors. They do have a schedule that they put forward as well on making sure this process addresses all the issues and does get input from everyone, so I have no doubt in my mind this will be ground breaking and it will be very positive Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to add as well Mr. Speaker, keep something in mind. On any issue that takes place, every member of Council gets one vote. So no matter what your thoughts are, you get one vote. You don't get more than one. Regardless of whether you're the Mayor, you're the Chair of a Committee, or you're a Councillor. You all get the same one vote Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. On Saturday morning of the May long weekend, the Mayor called me to apologize for his Deputy Mayor's behavior the day prior, in not allowing me to speak in delegation at the A.S.D. Committee. During that conversation, I was assured that this wouldn't happen to me or to citizens coming forward and that citizens wouldn't be shut down at Standing Policy Committee meetings, yet the Deputy Mayor continues to do so and we saw that at the very next Finance Committee meeting. My question for the Mayor is, what does he intend to do about the lack of ability to have tough questions be heard at Standing Policy Committee meetings in an era when every other Chair would find it acceptable for me or citizens to come forward to make this more consistent?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I did call Councillor Havixbeck. I did apologize. I told her that I thought it was wrong for Councillors or citizens not to have the opportunity to speak. It's quite normal to basically suspend the rules and hear delegations. We do it here. We've done it a thousand times and I told her that would never happen at Executive Policy Committee which I Chair and that never has happened. That's number one. Number two, I also understand that Councillor Wyatt also called Councillor Havixbeck but unfortunately never got a return phone call so we don't know what would have ensued there, what was going to be said, but the realities are, I can speak for my Committee and I can speak exactly what happens at E.P.C. and what happens on the floor of Council when you're here Mr. Speaker. And I think it's very clear that we want to listen and hear what our citizens say. As I've said before Mr. Speaker, most of the people that were here today we've all heard three or four times before, so I don't think anybody can say they don't have the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Havixbeck: My next question relates to the Responsible Winnipeg campaign, and my question is a very direct "yes" or "no" kind of question. Was any money paid by the City of Winnipeg either to the Goldeyes or its subsidiary companies for the advertisement placed on the Goldeyes sign outside the ballpark during the Responsible Winnipeg campaign? "Yes" or "no" would suffice.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: No.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Also related to the initiative of the golf courses before us, and particularly to the Blumberg Golf Course. The Reeve of Headingley has been reported as saying that the municipality is not in a position to be able to afford the purchase of the course. Can the Mayor tell me whether he or any of his representatives have discussed with potential developers or other individuals, a purchase?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, I can only speak for myself. I definitely have not. Maybe Councillor Havixbeck has but I definitely have not.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you. I'm having a bit of technical difficulty so I'll ad lib. Speaker Nordman, to the Mayor, it was my concern that the abandoned bulk waste would not be solved by the garbage and recycle plan that we had passed some time ago, and also...and that has really demonstrated itself in what's happened this spring, which in spring it does kind of get really bad and we had a number of situations where actually some fires were set and there was a lot of bulk, abandoned bulk waste like couches, mattresses, that were piled up really over the whole winter and I guess hidden by snow so nobody was able to identify them, but in the spring of course they're there, but I do know through experience as a City Councillor for one of the troubled areas that the abandoned bulk waste is not going to go away, even when we get into the summer. I think that there has been some mistaken beliefs out there from some people commenting on this issue, and I would just like to ask the Mayor if he can tell us what he's doing to help us deal with the abandoned bulk waste in some of our more difficult neighbourhoods.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie I thank him for the question and it most definitely is an issue that has to be dealt with. As you know there's obviously a motion coming forward later on Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you that I have had citizens email me and actually sent pictures of bulk waste lying in back lanes and streets and I'm talking about, you know, sofas and bags of who knows what along with mattresses etc., etc. And I think we all know what this leads to. It leads to arson. It leads to our resources being used up. It leads to people's lives being in danger. I can tell you on that particular instance I did, after being contacted by a citizen, I did contact the C.A.O. and made him aware of that and I can tell you later on that day I got an email thanking us for the quick action that in one of those locations already they've seen that it had been removed, and I know there's much more of that. What I think we need to do, and I can tell Councillor Eadie through you, that we actually have had a meeting with Water and Waste, with members of the W.P.S., with members of Fire and Paramedic. If you recall a few years ago we had a real serious issue with arson where people would...whether it was the bins they'd light on fire or whether it was bulk waste sitting, leaning up a fence or garage and lo and behold, there were a lot of fires taking place. We know that's wrong. We know people shouldn't be doing that but it is happening, so we've asked them to be proactive and I can tell you that we do have firefighters going out there into those specific neighbourhoods as has been identified by Councillor Eadie. Go out there and be preventive, identify the problems, and once again work with the departments and get that removed as quickly as possible, and I can tell you my understanding is right now, all the departments are working together as they should be expected to, and I think you will see quicker action than has been taken in the past, but this is an issue that, unfortunately, does need to be addressed because of the inherent dangers of arson.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. Thank you to the Mayor for those efforts, that's really appreciated from my ward and I'm sure from Councillor Smith and other people's wards.

The rhetoric aside, I'm wondering if the Mayor believes that all political offices, including his own, should be accountable through the kind of policies that the Councillor Representation Allowances are. So is the Mayor...does the Mayor believe that his office should, as well, be accountable in meeting certain criteria and expending the public's money.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker I believe quite a while ago I answered that question by being the first elected official I think in the Province to actually post expenses on the website and make them public and then later on others did follow, so we've been doing that specifically to address those types of issues.

Mr. Speaker: Last question?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you. My final question is simply, I do recall some other huge budget processes in the City. Would you agree though that this budget process sounds like it's going to use the latest technology in ways to reach the citizenry to find out what they believe our budget should look like?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, what I believe is that a top notch professional who has expertise in this area has been retained, competed against many others and they were selected, and I certainly believe that they will have a thorough complete plan that will address any issue that any Councillor has and make sure that we do get the type of feedback from all of our citizens, and I think that's exactly what I believe Councillor Eadie and everybody else is looking for, and once again, okay this was an initiative that was led by the Chair of Finance, Councillor Wyatt.

Mr. Speaker: Speaking of which, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It is the end of May and back in December, prior to the budget, we had a special announcement at the Osborne Street Transit Garage with regards to the City's commitment to finishing the Southwest Transit Corridor and opening it by 2018, and we very much gave notice to the Province to include funding for that to ensure that that project could move ahead. The request was for \$137.5 million to match our \$137.5 million which we placed in our 2014 \$10 million and the balance in our 2015 budget forecast. In light of the fact that it is now the end of May and from what I understand the Department has to file with P3 Canada for the P3 funding by June the 15th, which really means they have to do the paperwork now, they have to be working back from that day. We have, for all intents and purposes, missed the 2018 time frame to have the Southwest Transit Corridor open, thanks to the fact that the Premier has refused, number one, to match our funding commitment, and number two, to borrow the money himself rather than having the City of Winnipeg borrow those funds when he has the funds now, especially with this sales tax increase. Mr. Mayor, will...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, have we got a question?

Councillor Wyatt: My question is this. Will you bring forward a motion to amend the Transportation Master Plan so that the Southwest Corridor is now reflective of not, I believe 2016 opening, but rather a 2019 which is at the very earliest and the fact that the funding for this project has probably gone up five or six percent, about \$20 million thanks to this delay.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: I'm just absorbing that all Mr. Speaker. Forgive me. Well let me answer the question this way Mr. Speaker. Number one, I'm not going to deny that 2018 is not in jeopardy. I will point out that we do have the ability to put an application in, but the realities, we put that application in, and if it's not supported by the Province it doesn't go very far to be very frank with you, so it would be an application without support which would not get a very positive response. I know that we have communicated with the Provincial Government. We have pointed out that time is of the essence, as well as costs are going up and we need to know right away that they are supportive of this and they are prepared to match the money and go 50-50 with us. As you know the Federal Government is looking, I think, at \$75 million for that specific project. You know, I can tell you that, you know, there has been some dialogue with the Director of Transit and you know, even at this particular point in time he is extremely skeptical that 2018 is realistic. I don't think there's anybody on the floor of Council that is not cognizant of the fact that the longer you delay, the costs will go up whether the construction inflation is six percent or eight percent, I don't know. But there's no question whatever that cost was, if you delay it a year, it certainly is going to be more for sure and we do need an answer from the Provincial Government and unfortunately I've had talks with Minister Lemieux on this on many occasions, you know. I know that he has said that his cabinet has approved the one-third, one-third, one-third and of course I made it very clear, well but that's not the deal that's on the deal. That wasn't the deal the way we did the first leg of Rapid Transit. We're following the exact same model. We get the contribution from the Federal Government. Whatever they contribute after that we go 50-50 just like we do with Transit. The other part of it, which I think is a very serious issue, is the first go-around Mr. Speaker, after making the announcement of the first leg of Rapid Transit, which Mr. Doer and I did, and we were very enthusiastic about it, later on it was revealed that they wanted us to borrow the money and they would make payments to us over a period of time. Well I can assure you that I have been told by our Chief Financial Officer that that is debt on

our books. We can't put anymore debt of that ilk, we have other projects that we're working on that are priorities for this Council, that whatever money is coming from the Province that they should be funding it wherever they get their money from. That certainly is their prerogative, but that would phenomenal pressure on the City of Winnipeg if that was even entertained, and I made it very clear that I did not believe that this Council would support that.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the fact that we have missed the 2018 window, thanks to the Premier's refusal to come to the table, will the Mayor be requesting that in the event Council decides to keep the project on the books, that the Premier should bear out the extra cost thanks to the construction inflation that has now definitely taken effect, whether it be four percent, five percent or six percent. Is that a request that will be made and that will be an expense by the Province of Manitoba and not the ratepayers of the City of Winnipeg?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: You know Mr. Speaker, Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Havixbeck asked much easier questions. I want you to know that. You're welcome. Mr. Speaker, the realities are, I would not make any specific comments at this point in time until we actually miss the deadline okay. The deadline is still about two weeks out. We're still working towards that goal so we haven't missed it yet. Is there a possibility? Yes. To try and specifically answer the question, is that if what Councillor Wyatt has said becomes a reality, I would certainly during our discussions point out that who's responsible should definitely, you know, bear the brunt. I think that's only fair and reasonable at this particular time. If that becomes reality, by the same token Mr. Speaker, you can always ask. It doesn't mean you're going to get it.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Wyatt: It doesn't mean the project will proceed either. The other question I have is in the budget, we earmarked \$3.8 million towards recreation per ward, \$271,000 per ward. In the last week I've heard from staff that the Province has yet to sign off on the use of that funding, holding up key projects like playgrounds and parks in the various wards in the City. When is the Provincial Government...they had time in the last week to announce a \$7.5 million funding grant for recreation out of their budget but they cannot sign off on the 3.8 million. Is there any idea of when that will happen so that these projects can move forward because our staff can't proceed until the Provincial funding is agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the realities are that we did pass that in our budget where every Councillor had some priority recreational projects they wanted to get done, and there has been a communication with the Provincial Government. I can't tell you that as we speak right now, we have sign-off but we certainly hope to get that. These are projects that every Councillor has identified in their ward. I don't think there is anybody who is closer to the community, closer to the public, than City Councillors. I think they know what the priorities should be. I'm hoping that in the end, that common sense will prevail and there will be a sign-off, and as soon as I hear something positive or negative, I would be happy to get back to Councillor Wyatt, but I can't give you a definitive answer right now as to when that's going to happen, but we do know time is of the essence. We do know when the construction season is happening. We do know that we've already lost some very, very valuable time and I think that's extremely unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow followed by Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. Mr. Speaker to you Mr. Mayor, just some clarification regarding the Responsible Winnipeg campaign. My first question is who authorized the spending?

Mayor Katz: As I think has been said many times before Mr. Speaker, that did come out of the communications budget and the realities are there was a discussion that took place between yours truly and the Chair of A.S.D. and the Chair of Finance, and the expenditures have been...obviously money was spent and, you know, I hope to have that exact number very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. So regardless of the lack...the sole authority to spend the money, which I think as a public official, concerns me for any politician to be able to spend that much money arbitrarily. I guess my follow-up question to that is why was this opportunity not publicly tendered?

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, what I will share with you is that the process has been followed. We certainly have checked with the administration and of course the process was followed.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Orlikow: I'm glad to hear that. I've asked the administration those same questions and have yet to receive that answer, so I hope to get concurrence later. My next question is regarding the budget consultation that is upcoming. I have met with Meyers Norris Penny. I had a very nice meeting with them but I did raise some concerns, and my concerns were around the timeline, the lack of knowledge of the content and the lack of knowledge of the tone, especially in light of Responsible Winnipeg and how this is rolling out. So one of the recommendations I did ask the consultant if it would be possible was allowing Councillors, all Councillors, not just E.P.C., not just the Finance Chair, not just yourself or the Administration, to be able to view all the content that's going to go publicly out before it does so. She said she would look into it, however, since the timeline is something like four weeks to do this, I'm not sure how she will. I think the timeline is ridiculous. I think it's doomed to fail just because of that, however, having the ability to see the content internally and all kind of talk about it before it goes out I think would go a long way to making this process work. Could that be something you'd look into for us?

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, through you to Councillor Orlikow, yeah. I'm not aware of the dialogue that obviously the Councillor has had with Meyers Norris Penny and this is the first time I've heard that conversation. I certainly have not spoken to any representative of Meyers Norris Penny. I would also point out Mr. Speaker that keeping in mind that we do have an end goal, and the end goal is to get the budget done so we can get a lot of our capital costs out as quickly as possible and to certainly get the best price as possible because we certainly haven't been doing that over the past several decades, so I can see why there is a goal set as far as timing, and you know if it's a four week period of time I would certainly, you know, be happy to converse with the consultant to see if they believe they can accomplish that and I would certainly get back to the Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Mayor could let us know...I have noticed driving throughout the City and in particular in downtown, quite a substantial accumulation of winter sand still on our sidewalks and our streets. I'm wondering if this has been raised at the Mayor's Office and perhaps raised at E.P.C. and if there is an issue this year, there's different from any other year because it seems that there still is quite a bit of winter sand out there on the streets and if anything is going to be done to pick up this residual sand that seems to be out there.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Katz: Mr. Speaker, the one fact I do know is because of the weather that we had and winter went on and on and on and then even when it got a little warmer during the days it froze at night, we certainly did delay what we call our normal spring cleanup. I know that I have seen our trucks out there on residential streets everywhere basically cleaning. If there is more sand that exists right now than normal, I would be happy to talk to the department and find out if that's the case. That's the first I've actually heard of that but it certainly could be in different areas of the City of Winnipeg and I would certainly be happy to follow up on that for Councillor Swandel if that is his wish. That is fine with me Mr. Speaker. The other thing Mr. Speaker is that I can tell you the other side of the story is, I've had many citizens contacting me complaining about the inconvenience of the street cleaning as well, so I guess there's always two sides to every equation.

Mr. Speaker: Okay that concludes question period. Thank you very much. We have 10 minutes till 12:00. What's the will of Council? Let's break for lunch and be back at 1:15.

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, sir.

Councillor Eadie: If we could deal with PCS, it's only one item.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, okay, that's fair enough. Then we'll...okay, anyway, we'll break at 12:00 and whatever we've got done by then. All right, the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services, Councillor Fielding.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED MAY 6, 2013**

Councillor Fielding: Sure. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move the report of May 6, 2013, be taken as consent agenda item 1.

Mr. Speaker: Discussion? Oh, Councillor...all right, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just quickly speak to it. I think, Speaker Nordman...I just...

Mr. Speaker: Just two sec.

Item 1 – Accumulation and Illegal Dumping of Garbage

Councillor Fielding: Then, I've got to introduce it?

Mr. Speaker: Introduce it.

Councillor Fielding: Sure. First, I'd like to introduce this motion. First of all, I want to thank Councillor Eadie for his role in this project. I think it's ...on this change rather, and I think it's taking a leadership position and we're fortunate we've got a fantastic Committee, Councillor Smith and Councillor Steen, of course, joining us on that Committee and we had a unison in terms of a policy which I think makes sense going forward so I want to thank Councillor Eadie and let him take the floor on this because this is really his issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. And while I had the pleasure of moving this motion and with the support of people from various parts of the neighbourhoods in my particular ward, seconded by Councillor Vandal, the Chair of Public Works, I just wanted to say, to start off by thanking the head of By-law Enforcement for really taking a hold to this with his colleagues and other senior managers to look at a better way of dealing with finding people who are dumping and abandoning waste in the neighbourhoods that deserve a lot more respect than they're getting and we're going to catch them and when they do get caught, they're going to be paying some serious fines. And that's because of the efforts of our city staff and our administration, By-law Enforcement and I really have to stay kudos as well to the efforts, the plan that has been put together by By-Law Enforcement, the dedication and hard work of the employees that work in By-Law Enforcement. They've been out there, you know, they're digging through garbage to catch these people and you know, I appreciate that they understand that we respect our neighbourhoods around the city and so I just want to say thanks and I'm sure that everybody unanimously supports this new changes and we heard from Tom Ethans from Take Pride Winnipeg. We have clarified how the littering laws work, the littering fines work and there's new provisions there and I think that these are the sort of things that we need to do to make our city of Winnipeg actually beautiful, one that I don't hear from other people from other cities saying what a dirty place Winnipeg is because Winnipeg is one of the best cities to live in and with this particular by-law changes and enforcement and as well with the kind of motion that Mayor Katz has assisted in moving forward quickly. This kind of plan is going to help us clean up our neighbourhoods. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding to close. Oh, I'm sorry, Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Mr. Speaker, this has been a problem in my area and other parts of the inner city for a long time and I have brought it up time and time again. And what I'm concerned about is the fines are good but it seems to me that when we fine people who break the law, who are fined substantially, I'd like some publicity with that on them so people know the offenders. So, like, you know, if there is more we can do to deal with the problem of illegal dumping. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Anybody else, no? Councillor Fielding, now to close.

Councillor Smith: The Councillor here just suggested flogging. I rule out...I rule out flogging.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: I'm glad you didn't say water boarding, but that's a...anyways, I just want to add a few comments to this and once again, you know, I think this is important mainly by Council. You know, the City is really is taking a zero tolerance approach to this. I think this can make a difference in terms of our community and we know that there is ability through the provincial, to the court system, to do some sanctions et cetera. There's some talk of how you take a look at that from a Provincial or from a City system in terms of on property tax bills, I think we'll review that and talk about that. So if there's some sort of way we can incorporate what Councillor Smith has said beyond the you know, other piece Councillor Swandel chimed in at in some capacity, we're open to take a look at that and I think what's important to realize is all revenues from this two goes back into enforcement. Tom Ethans was here. He might still be here in the audience, that talked about enforcement piece which I think is important so that revenues go to drive enforcement to make this a reality. I want to thank the committee for your support in bringing this forward and also our city administration for reviewing this and supporting this, so thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further comments all those in favour of Item 1? Motion...opposed? Motion carried.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
MOTIONS**

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Katz,

WHEREAS the Garbage and Recycle Master Plan was developed to work on a city wide basis with fee for service bulk waste collection according to the collection days of regular garbage and recycle pick up;

AND WHEREAS a number of neighbourhoods have dangerous levels of bulk waste accumulating in back lanes and on the street where there is an increased potential for fires;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's fire and police services use resources to deal with these fires which take their attention away from other emergencies;

AND WHEREAS By-law Enforcement has a new plan for catching and fining bulk waste dumpers;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the public service develop a plan for a bulky waste and abandoned garbage collection service that targets problematic areas of the City in an expedient manner and report back in 30 days.

Mr. Speaker: We do have one motion, which is an automatic referral, and we have a couple of by-laws, or one by-law. Councillor Fielding.

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

Councillor Fielding: Sure. I'll move that the By-law No. 65/2013 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour?

Councillor Fielding: I'll move that the By-law No. 65...

Clerk: By-law No. 65/2013.

Councillor Fielding: Sorry, getting a little ahead of myself. I'll move that the By-law 65/2013 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 65/2013.

Councillor Fielding: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law 65/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: We have five minutes left. Any questions? Councillor Havixbeck. Councillor Smith next.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In the 2012 budget, there was approved monies dedicated to upgrading of the police radio system. Within that funding there was no funding added for support services. Recently, there were incidents where the mode of communication among police officers had to be switched back from digital to analogue. It was analogue upgraded to digital but has recently been switched back, and it seems to me that the problem was that perhaps the support wasn't purchased. Is there going to be any discussion among the Protection and Community Services Committee about how to restore that and whether or not this would be factored into the next budget.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Well I guess that's something obviously the Police Board will have to discuss, and once we form and have our first meetings we're going to set priorities, strategic priorities on that. I'd like to get some further background I guess from the police in terms of that, what the implications are. Sounds reasonable to me but I don't have the background to give you the rationale why things were changed in terms of the operational piece of it, but I can get some more information and get back to you Councillor.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you. A critical issue related to the new police headquarters downtown is going to be parking for police officers. Police officers have already felt the effects of not being able to park in the Public Safety Building parkade due to its decline, and recently I became aware of an off-duty officer and a Winnipeg Police Service admin person being assaulted as they left. Will this Committee, the Protection and Community Services, be making parking a priority for officers at the new headquarters facility at an affordable rate?

Councillor Fielding: Well I would refer that motion to our good friend, the Deputy Mayor Councillor Wyatt, who I believe is responsible for the Parking Authority that would be a part of that. So we can take a look at some of these initiatives there. I don't know if that answers your question but you know, we want to ensure, obviously, officers that are there have access and are able to get in to and fro the police station, so not sure that answers your question but it might be more appropriate to talk to the Deputy Mayor who's Chair of Alternate Service Delivery that handles the Parking Authority and issues like that (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Last question? No? Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Councillor Fielding, why have you not presented information on the trial use of larvicide LUV 7067 this summer to your Standing Committee? Why have you kept your Committee in the dark?

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Councillor Fielding: Why haven't I? Well first of all I believe Taz was out announcing it earlier in the week if I'm not mistaken in terms of the background for it, so we actually have it at a Committee meeting since the announcement. Would you like an update at the Committee meeting? Is that where you're going on this? Sure, why not.

Mr. Speaker: Second...Second question.

Councillor Smith: I asked that question because I find more information from your department in the newspaper than I do at the Committee meetings, and I think it would be a good idea for us to have a presentation and have the information before we have a news story. My second question, Councillor Fielding, why among major Canadian cities is Winnipeg the only one that closes its libraries on a Sunday during the summer months? Can you explain?

Councillor Fielding: Well I think that number one, part of some of the help that you had talked about I think two budgets ago, we changed around some of the hours that were a part of it. So we have increased some of the hours in terms of access to the public libraries and so I think we're at an appropriate level. What I could do is find out from our Administration a report back from the Director in terms of what hours compare to other jurisdictions, so I think we should be similar to other jurisdictions in terms of what the hours are, so maybe a part of that we could bring a report back that talks about a comparison in terms of hours of operation that's there, but I was proud a couple of years ago to increase some of the hours that we have at some of the public libraries that were a part of that. I think that was driven largely by you Councillor, but...or one of you anyways, and so we'll bring something back to Committee and take a look at that but you know, I think we should be in the realm of what other cities are doing.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions for Councillor Fielding? Seeing none. That concludes the Policy Committee for Protection and Community Services and we will adjourn and be back at 1:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of Winnipeg City Council of
May 29, 2013, at 1:30 p.m.**

Mr. Speaker: We'll call the meeting today back to order and we will move now to the Standing Policy Committee for Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Vandal.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED APRIL 30, 2013**

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to move items 1 to 4 of the meeting scheduled for, dated April 30th as consent.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing...Consent, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We have one motion which is an automatic referral. and we have one by-law.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS**

**Motion No. 6,
Moved by Councillor Smith,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,**

WHEREAS it is inappropriate to penalize the victim of crime and accidents;

AND WHEREAS many businesses factor in loss into their pricing and cost to do business such as McDonald's and any manufacturing operation;

AND WHEREAS many people in the City cannot afford to pay a penalty for being a victim of crime or accidents;

AND WHEREAS the monthly 311 reports can supply data about how many carts are being ordered due to crime and accidents;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Solid Waste factor in loss in its budget for replacing garbage and recycle carts that get vandalized or wrecked in an accident in order to cover the replacement cost for properties covered in Winnipeg's garbage and recycle system.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 29, 2013

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Vandal: I will move that Bylaw No. 69/2013 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 69/2013.

Councillor Vandal: I will move By-law No. 69/2013 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 69/2013.

Councillor Vandal: I will move that the rules be suspended and By-law 69/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Okay we have question period for Infrastructure Renewal. Okay Councillor Smith, Councillor Mayes, Councillor Havixbeck. Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Through you Mr. Speaker. Councillor Vandal, we have received in our office a concern expressed by several of our residents that they saw Emterra workers throw the recyclable cart contents into the same garbage trucks with their garbage. Why is this happening and how are you going to prevent this from occurring?

Councillor Vandal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would request Councillor...it shouldn't be happening first of all, let me say that. And I would request Councillor Smith send the complaint to the Director of Water and Waste as well as myself, and she can cc us on why this is happening if in fact it is happening.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Smith: Councillor Vandal, we've had numerous reports about yard waste not being picked up, and when reported repeatedly to 311, the yard waste was picked up ten days later. Are you aware it is taking Emterra this long to pick up missed yard waste?

Councillor Vandal: I have received some complaints in my office. I have sent those complaints to the Director of Water and Waste and she has followed up on it. There definitely...the whole spring yard waste issue is relatively new; in fact, it is the first time we do it in the spring, although we did it in the fall. There's really...there should be no excuse for that. We need to do better and I concur with Councillor Smith that we'll do everything we can to do better on the yard waste pickup.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes:

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Two questions. One of the advantages of digging up that audit report from the May 2011 Council meeting was the next item to it, I realized, was an exciting discussion of gravel back lanes, which is of particular interest in my ward and Councillor Vandal's ward, and there was talk in that May 2011 Council minute of a new policy to be developed on gravel back lanes. I know Councillor Fielding has accelerated some of the funding when he was Finance Chair. We got a lot more done in terms of re-gravelling, but I wonder if we can get an update at some point on when we might be expecting this new policy on gravel back lanes.

Councillor Vandal: To Councillor Mayes through you Speaker Nordman, I will certainly bring that up with the Director of Public Works; in fact, we just had an Infrastructure meeting yesterday, and would have been the opportune time to discuss that, but we will follow up. We know back lanes are a big concern to Winnipeggers. We know we just approved some significant funding for back lanes. We're doing 11 lanes; 7 of them are in Councillor Harvey Smith's ward I may

add. But we need to do better. We need to find more money, but I will work with Councillor Mayes who, we're both on the Committee to develop the new policy.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, I think some of that I may have not been quite clear...yeah there are some...the gravel back lanes are not part of that package we just approved and some of that package was Councillor Smith's ward I think, but yeah, we are...thank you for the provision on the gravel back lanes. My second question is more of an "are you aware". That earlier question from Councillor Smith about the recycling and garbage going to the same truck, I had the same concern come up from part of my ward south of the Perimeter back in the fall, and so...was Councillor Vandal aware that there are some Emterra trucks that serve for emergency pick-ups and serve more rural areas like south of the Perimeter in St. Vital that have both compartments in the same truck? Not saying that would have happened in Councillor Smith's ward. Not a rural area, but there are some trucks in the fleet that can handle both garbage and recycling.

Councillor Vandal: Now that you remind me, I am aware of that because that happened to me in the fall. I followed up and there are trucks that handle both yard waste and garbage and recycling, but with a reminder I am aware, but you know, I'd urge all of Council with complaints such as these, go directly to 311 and the Director and, you know, let's do better. Let's get some answers.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question, my first question, is along the lines of Councillor Smith's question. I've had a high number of complaints about missed pick-up, missed yard pick-up and the pick-up day was May 16th. That pick-up didn't occur until the 27th in most of Charleswood. Well I asked the Manager of Solid Waste and the Director for a list of what had been missed and it was Academy to Chataway, Wellington to Tuxedo, Charleswood from Wilkes to Wyper, I mean essentially all of Charleswood and Tuxedo. Whyte Ridge, which happens to be picked up on a Monday, never has a problem. Very rarely has a problem. So I'm wondering what we're doing and is there a process in place and could the Chair explain it for us about whether a foreman actually goes out and checks and re-checks, and at what point something is considered late. I have heard from residents who called 311 six or seven times. They literally have six or seven incident numbers for the same pick-ups. Garbage, recycling and yard waste.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: There is a process in place. In my ward, when people call sometimes at my home and tell me that this hasn't been picked up, I call 311. If that doesn't work within a reasonable amount of time, I call the foreman. I shouldn't be doing that but you've got to perform for your residents. You've got to take care of your residents. And it's usually 98 percent of the time it's picked up right away. There is an administrative process in place. I think it's important to call 311, speak to the Director, Diane Sacher, get your concerns on the record and the administration keep a log and there is a process in place.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: Yes I'm wondering too. I've been watching this process and hearing from many people, the lack of automation. When we implemented this process we were told that these bins would be picked up. All I see is manual pick-up, and I'm wondering is there's a plan to transition it or is this it?

Councillor Vandal: I would...yes. We contracted with Emterra on automated pick-up using compressed natural gas vehicles. That's what the contract says. That's what should be occurring. If it's not happening, we need to sit down with our Director of Water and Waste, make the Standing Policy Committee aware. Perhaps bring it to your Community Committee, and we need to make sure we ask the right questions why that's not happening, if indeed it's not.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Different topic from garbage and recycling. Street sweeping. Large areas. I'm specifically referring in Charleswood to River West Park. I had complaints about it, I looked at it, and I got it reswept. My question to the Chair is, however, when residents call 311 at this point in the year, are they in fact, and is there a policy, that they're to be told, because the residents are telling me this, that no second sweeping will be occurring.

Councillor Vandal: I think Councillor Havixbeck has demonstrated that there is no such policy. If the service that we've contracted with is deficient, it's up to the contractor to take care of the deficiency. Again, talk to the

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 29, 2013

administration, go through 311. People who contract with the City of Winnipeg have a responsibility to deliver good service. That's the contract and if it's deficient, they will make it right.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Mr. Speaker. First one is an "are you aware". In areas where there are some back lanes and some front pick-ups, are you aware that one truck will use...will do both areas? In some cases you will always see a manual styled truck where they wheel the cart to the back and use it because there are either streets in the immediate area with lanes?

Councillor Vandal: No.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you. I too have seen quite a bit of problems in recent times with zones and areas being missed for various types of pick-up whether it's garbage or yard waste. Do we have any reports or updated information that the Chair could provide us in terms of fines that Emterra's paying?

Councillor Vandal: Actually we moved a motion quite a few meetings ago, at least three or four meetings ago, for an administrative update on the fines that would come to our Committee in camera. I'm still waiting for the administration to come forward, so I believe that the CAO's in the room so we'll take this as notice that the Policy Committee is expecting a report to come back in camera on fines for all of our private waste providers.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Speaker Nordman. An "aware" question. Are you aware that FIPPA requests for such fines is being blocked and continues to be blocked and doesn't seem to be getting anywhere in terms of fines to Emterra?

Councillor Vandal: No I am not.

Mr. Speaker: Second round anybody? Seeing none. We'll conclude the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and move on to, what's next? Finance? Yes. We have no report. No motions. No consideration of by-laws. We do have a question period. Question period for Finance.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck to Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Havixbeck: I understand that the Chair was the creative mastermind behind the Responsible Winnipeg ad campaign. How can the Chair justify spending this \$90,000, perhaps even more, of taxpayers' money?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: You know, I want to thank Councillor Havixbeck for that question. If I could provide her with an answer. There was definitely a need to communicate in terms of the report coming forward. There is no doubt that there were errors made in terms of the advertising campaign. I've said that publicly in terms of the fact it did not have the logo. Was this part of a conspiracy to create a group that would be somehow mysteriously out there, Responsible Winnipeg? Absolutely not. The logo should have been there and upon finding that out, it was corrected quickly and rightfully so. In terms of the button you pushed to send an email off to a City Councillor, I think probably the best thing there could have been, had there been a negative and a positive, you know. You're in favour or you're against, you know, to give people a chance to vote and to send that message out, but some folks felt that getting the message is not appropriate so that was removed as well, but it was definitely not intentioned to bully Councillors as some had suggested that be the case, similar to what I would argue is bullying going on now by one of the major trade unions mailing brochures in a certain Councillor's ward and targeting them and getting residents to phone them. That's bullying Mr. Speaker. This was more informational. This was an opportunity to put the side of the story which I think was not being heard. If we, Mr. Speaker, spend 90,000, I think it's probably going to be less, but if it was 90,000 that ultimately got approved by the Mayor's Office, then...to save potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars, you have a debate about whether how much that is. If it's an SOA it's technically a million according to our Auditors. Not an SOA it's maybe half that. You know, that's a permanent savings Mr. Speaker. That's a permanent savings. And 90,000 one

time to permanently save, you know I think there's an argument to support that. The Provincial Government does advertising when it comes to their budget. I was watching a hockey game the other night and saw four ads by the Province of Manitoba talking about their budget. The Federal Government does it. You could argue they shouldn't be doing or they should be doing. One thing though that the ads did do Mr. Speaker, is it did raise...I think a lot of folks out there who were not following this discussion all of a sudden...and the so called "silent majority" started seeing and hearing and engaging, and I think that's a great thing. In fact, the fact that the Canadian Taxpayers Association got involved, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the Chamber of Commerce. You know, I think that was a positive part of it. But there was no doubt there was mistakes made but you know what Mr. Speaker? You know, you try nothing in life you will never make mistakes, but you will never succeed either no matter what you do, so you know you have to be able to communicate the message that we wanted to communicate and I think it created some discussion which I think has been very healthy. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Havixbeck: I think the Chair misunderstood what I was referring to when I was referring to mistakes and the sham of a process. I don't care that the logo wasn't on the advertisements. What I care about is that that excessive amount of money was used towards this advertising campaign. My next question is, will the Chair support a full accounting of that money spent? It's a "yes" or "no".

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: You know, to answer the first question, I believe it was worthwhile, to answer your first question, and second is that is an expense from the Mayor's Office and that would be the Mayor's (inaudible), no different if you had an expense from your Ward Allowance, Councillor and you wanted to give the details, that is your decision as well as required by our CRA rules.

Mr. Speaker: Last question?

Councillor Havixbeck: A couple of weeks ago, the CentreVenture Board held their AGM, and they provided their annual financial statement, and I'd like to ask the Chair, in 2012 they show a loss of \$937,000. In 2011 they show a loss of \$571,000. So my question for the Chair is, given that we're focusing so much of our administration's time and our time on an audit report and on a Golf Services report, which at the end of the day I'm not convinced will have that much savings, how does the Chair expect to sustain these losses that the CentreVenture Board is showing on their financial statements?

Councillor Wyatt: This is the first I've heard. The Councillor hasn't raised this with me before. I'd be pleased to look into this and have a detailed response to her in terms of the CentreVenture's annual report that comes every year with their annual general meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Smith followed by Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Smith: Mayor Wyatt. If Responsible Winnipeg was a City of Winnipeg initiative, why was there no mention of it on the City of Winnipeg website?

Councillor Wyatt: Again, that was a point well taken, which was caught and addressed, so you know, the campaign was to get the information out as quickly as possible in terms of the report before us and in terms of the losses and you know, that was something that was addressed so...

Mr. Speaker: Second question? No? Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Chair, I'd just like to ask if he'd be kind enough to get sort of a return on investment perspective when he's getting the answers on CentreVenture when it comes to their operating losses and some of the gains that have been made in our downtown. I know from my time on Downtown Development there was a great deal of value attributed to the monies that were put in, and I think we've got to be very careful if we're trying to grandstand on something by cherry-picking a number out of somewhere, not to get lost in that when the true result of CentreVenture's amazing return on investment, and I would hope that when the information comes forward, that the Chair would be kind enough to give the full picture.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you Councillor Swandel. I think, you know, we as a Council made it a priority a number of years ago to make downtown a priority in terms of re-development and renewal, and that is why I'll be interested to see really what those numbers represent. The fact is, we did give options that actually ceded our land in the downtown

to CentreVenture to facilitate development, creating a land bank, and you know, CentreVenture has done some amazing things, I mean, you look at North Main, what it was ten years ago compared to today. You look at Market Avenue, what it was just a couple of years ago compared to today. You look at the developments around the Metropolitan Theatre across from the...and the whole idea of the SHED District coming alive. A lot of that I give credit to Councillor Swandel when he was Chair of Downtown Development and the Chair now of Downtown Development has pursued those policies, of bringing a real emphasis to renewal, and it's tough because when you're a Ward Councillor, I remember when I was Chair of Downtown Development, you know, my constituents were saying, you know, what about our downtown. Forget about that downtown. We want Downtown Transcona. So you know you're working hard for the good of the City to renew the downtown and CentreVenture has done some great work with...actually when you think about it, we increased the grant recently, but actually the amount of resources on an annual basis is pretty minimal in terms of the actual return that we get for the activity that they do, so anyway, the point well taken and I'll keep that in mind. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Swandel: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you to the Chair, I just want to make sure the Chair...is he aware that by the end of this summer we'll probably see between six and eight overhead cranes working on new developments in downtown Winnipeg?

Councillor Wyatt: I was not aware of that. So thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Swandel: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you Mr. Speaker for allowing me this opportunity to point out the great facts of what go on in Winnipeg as opposed to dwelling in the negative. Does the Chair have any opinion on how these characterizations of these wonderful mechanisms that we use to develop our City in the negative, how destructive they are to our City?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I'm not too sure what the Chair is referring to, but anyway.

Councillor Swandel: The characterization of these organizations (inaudible).

Councillor Wyatt: Oh yeah, yeah, I'm not too sure what he's referring to but if he's referring to the question from Councillor Havixbeck, I think it's a good point.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Finance? Seeing none. We'll move on to Councillor Pagtakhan, Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED MAY 27, 2013**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to move suspension of the rules and move Items 1 and 2 as consent of May 27th.

Mr. Speaker: Motion to suspend the rules, all those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Would you like to move the...make the motion?

Councillor Pagtakhan: And I...yeah, I'd be pleased to move the Downtown Development of May 27th, Item 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker: Any comments? Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
QUESTION PERIOD**

Mr. Speaker: We have no motions, we have no by-laws. We do have a question period for Councillor Pagtakhan. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Mr. Chair. To the Chair, can you enlighten us today or at maybe a future meeting, the status regarding The Bay?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank Councillor Orlikow for that question. As early as this past Monday, we asked the Chair of...pardon me, we asked the CEO of CentreVenture who came down for his monthly update, a question relative to The Bay and the good news is that The Bay, it's a national retailer, and they are going to be staying in business here in our City for the next foreseeable future and if there is going to be a transition from The Bay to another retailer, we'll be making that transition as seamless as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions for Downtown, Heritage, Riverbank? Seeing none? We'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development. Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED MAY 7, 2013**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of May 7th and move Items 2 and 4 through 16.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no other, we'll vote on Item 2 and 4 to 12, 14, 15 and 16. All those in favour? Yes.

Councillor Gerbasi: I would like to be declared in opposition to Item 15, please.

Councillor Eadie: Likewise for Councillor Eadie.

Mr. Speaker: Eadie and Gerbasi, negative on 15, and Smith. All those in favour? Opposed? Motions carried. No. 13, oh, I'm sorry, No. 1 and 2, we still have to do 1, 2...

Councillor Browaty: One and three.

Mr. Speaker: One, three and thirteen.

Item 1 – Taylor Redevelopment Master Plan – SP 1/2013

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Councillor Fielding is going to, right, move one and three on my behalf.

Councillor Fielding: Sure, I'd like move item no. 1 and 3 on Councillor Browaty's behalf.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Any further comments on item 1? Seeing none, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Okay.

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to be recorded in opposition, please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty in opposition. Motion carried, two.

Councillor Browaty: No, three.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, three.

**Item 3 – Subdivision and Rezoning – Land located South Side of Taylor Avenue between
Wilton Street and 1260 Taylor Avenue DASZ 4/2013**

Mr. Speaker: And...similarly, Councillor Fielding is moving. Moved, all those in favour? Opposed?

Councillor Browaty: Nay, can I be recorded in opposition, please.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty, recorded in opposition. Motion carried. Councillor...No. 13.

Item 13 - Lease of a Portion of Kildonan Park Peguis Pavilion to WOW Hospitality Concepts Inc.

Councillor Browaty: I think this is a great news story, but I'll certainly respond after Councillor Sharma and any others make their comments.

Mr. Speaker: It does require two-thirds. Okay, Councillor Sharma would like to speak. All right.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm personally very excited to see WOW Hospitality as a proponent of this new restaurant and cafe. We all know this restaurant...we haven't had a restaurant actually for the last four and a half years and park users have really felt that emptiness. Kildonan Park is a jewel of the city and over the last several years, the City of Winnipeg has invested in many redevelopments there such as the new playground, upgraded swimming pool and a new spray pad as well. This proposal, Mr. Speaker, is a good one and we all know WOW Hospitality brings a wealth of experience and expertise. Their plan is to create a Canadian regional cuisine concept of pavilion that will focus on fresh, simple and pure food. The vision is for it to be a neighbourhood restaurant where people can gather to enjoy meals and memories together. I have advocated for service Mr. Speaker, at all meal times, when this item first had appeared on the Property and Development agenda, it was more of a later start, 4:00 or 5:00 p.m. and I didn't feel that it was sufficient. I've had much dialogue with my constituents and also feel full service hours which are being proposed today, is something that park visitors in general would like. Who wants to take a stroll in the early morning hours and not be able to buy a cup of coffee? So I'm really pleased to see this proposal in front of us includes the extended hours and this restaurant, Mr. Speaker is long overdue and I'm sure WOW Hospitality is assured to wow its patrons. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any other comments? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman, and I, too, was quite happy to hear that a restaurant was going to open up and it is a long term lease agreement and I believe that that's very important. The people who attend this restaurant will be delighted with the newly renovated Peguis Pavilion, in which even people who use wheelchairs, walkers, strollers, everybody will find it easy to access the facility and utilize it and I think that's a really great thing. And I would just express...I really want to see them make a go of this in the long term future in which the neighbourhood and the bigger community of north Winnipeg, I know that Kildonan Park is used by people from North Kildonan and from both sides of the river. The north, it is a jewel just like its golf course. It is a very important part of that community up there. But...and I would note and I'm hoping...I understand there is a huge sign out at the front of Kildonan Park and I'm hoping that they'll be able to advertise their restaurant on that sign and that...so that people know and can identify that there is a good quality restaurant available for service to people who want to visit the park. Thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Seeing no further comments, Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I just like to thank my colleagues for their comments and encouraged of course, to see Councillor Eadie supporting private operation in a civic facility. That's very encouraging.

Councillor Eadie: We're not in the restaurant business.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we get to this vote. All those in favour? Opposed? Motion carried. Thank you very much. We now have no motions. We do have one by-law. Councillor Browaty.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – FIRST READING ONLY**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that By-law No. 62/2013 be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour?

Clerk: By-law No. 62/2013.

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

Councillor Browaty: I'd like to move that the following by-laws numbered be read a first time, By-law 56/2013, 70/2013, 71/2013, 72/2013, 73/2013, 74/2013, 75/2013, 76/2013, 77/2013 79/2013.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 56/2013, 70/2013, 71/2013, 72/2013, 73/2013, 74/2013, 75/2013, 76/2013, 77/2013 and 79/2013.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Browaty: I move that by-laws numbered 56/2013, 70/2013 to 77/2013 both inclusive and By-law No. 79/2013 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 56/2013, 70/2013 to 77/2013, both inclusive, and By-law No. 79/2013.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and by-laws numbered 56/2013, 70/2013 to 77/2013 both inclusive, and By-law 79/2013 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Question period for Property and Development. Councillor Smith, Havixbeck, Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Smith: Through you Mr. Speaker to the Chairman...Chairperson. What is the Winnipeg Parking Authority need to advertise at Goldeye Games?

Councillor Browaty: I thank the Councillor for the question. The Winnipeg Parking Authority is a Special Operating Agency that operates at arms length. It would actually report to the Alternative Service Delivery Committee. While I'm a member of that Committee, I haven't asked that question. It could certainly be passed on through the Chair, which is Councillor Wyatt, but I don't have the information on that.

Mr. Speaker: Second question?

Councillor Smith: Yes. Councillor Browaty, I asked you at the last Council meeting when the report from the engineer's inspection of the Sherbrook Pool, which was closed six months ago for safety reasons, would be made public. You responded with "I don't have that information for you right here. I will endeavor to get you a response today. I understand, soon." Can you give me your definition of "soon"?

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: It is my understanding that it will be on the agenda for the June 11th meeting of the Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck?

Councillor Havixbeck: Approximately a year ago, Councillor Orlikow attended, and I held one. It was a celebration about the fire halls that were built. One on Taylor, one in Charleswood. Can the Chair tell us, are we any closer to owning the land that Station 12 on Taylor is built and what is the status of that?

Councillor Browaty: I thank the Councillor for the question. It's still a sore spot in my mind. The Standing Policy Committee, back in...I believe Councillor Wyatt was still on the Committee so it would probably have been October, November. Councillor Wyatt asked the question "Can the Department start going to...attempt at least to negotiate". We discussed, I think, quite broadly that the best way to find a value is to have two appraisals without going through a full expropriation, because we were considering, I think, at that point an expropriation. The departments were supposed to...Shindico and the City were both supposed to have appraisals done. I understand the department got a mixed message and that information was supposed to come back, I think, by mid-April at the latest. Here we are days away from June. We don't have it. I find it very disappointing and if we do need to file an expropriation, we're wasting time. Again, our internal City appraisals show the value of that Taylor land initially between 672 and 750 thousand dollars. The fact that this isn't settled yet is quite disturbing.

Mr. Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Havixbeck: I wasn't going to ask another question related to it, but it strikes me that the cost is going up now as time goes on, and these prices don't stay fixed for very long. When do we expect, or when does the Chair expect for something to be resolved on this?

Councillor Browaty: We were advised back in the fall of last year that the best approach would be to try to negotiate something rather than an expropriation. I hope that wasn't bad advice because at this point, you're absolutely right. If we do need to file an expropriation, I think...I'm not a real estate expert anymore but I could venture that the value of that has gone up and if you file an expropriation it may cost taxpayers more.

Mr. Speaker: Last question.

Councillor Havixbeck: Different topic. It seems to me that I've been patient. You asked me to be...the Chair asked me to be patient with regard to permits, and a new process was adopted and implemented last year March. I'm wondering if the Chair could give us a status update on how effective that has been in improving response times for those seeking permits.

Councillor Browaty: I understand if you're participating in the process where you have pre-stamped plans and you go through all the due diligence to become expedited through the process, I understand that process is working well. As has always been the case, at certain times of the year, things get very, very busy and wait times are going to be a lot longer during the summer months just due to the nature of construction cycles and construction seasons. Is it acceptable where we're at yet? I don't think so and there's definitely further room for improvement. In terms of getting a status update, I will ask the Director of the Department to have something either for the Committee meeting or for the next Council meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks Speaker Nordman. I believe it's Bill 43 of the Manitoba Legislature right now is being debated and moved forward on liquor and lotteries; changes to legislation, and it's also my understanding that there was a consultation about some of the changes with our Permits Department to determine how the City felt about the changes, and I'm wondering if the Chairperson of PP&D could tell us if he knows anything about what our position was or if he can get us information as licensing of alcohol establishments in our wards is usually a contested issue.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Browaty: I will check with the Department if they made an application...or a submission on that particular Bill. I'm not aware at this point but I will find that out. Again, I know they have a separate hearing process for liquor permits and where would be most hotly contested, you know, the type of liquor permits should be at the liquor board hearings not at Community Committees or zoning type of meetings.

Councillor Eadie: Speaker Nordman, as I understand some of the new changes involve whether or not...and again it's very complex actually when it comes to establishments starting up and getting liquor licenses...but it's my understanding through this process that somehow the City will be able to have some sort of feedback as to whether or not to allow such licensed establishments.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: I'm not aware but I will ask the department for some additional information for Councillor Eadie.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: My question has been answered. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Alright any further questions for Property and Development? Seeing none, we will move on to the last Committee of the day.

**REPORT OF THE ALTERNATE SERVICE DELIVERY
DATED MAY 17, 2013**

Mr. Speaker: Alternate Service Delivery Committee, report of May, the 17th. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm prepared to move item 1 for consent and adoption and have a bus ready outside for all of us to go play a round of golf at Kildonan if it's all voted on consent, right now. So it's not happening? Okay, just thought I'd...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Steen.

Councillor Steen: Mr. Speaker, I will excuse myself.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: All right, Councillor Mayes has his hand up. All right.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: So it's been stood down so now you can open. Councillor Mayes.

Item 1 - Business Plan for the Private Management of Golf Courses, Proposed Leasing of City Operated Golf Courses (Expression of Interest #497-2011 for Selected City-Owned Golf Courses) and Declaration as Surplus of John Blumberg Golf Course Land

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Are we voting on this thing all together or are we separating the vote on?

Mr. Speaker: What is the will of Council?

Councillor Eadie: Separate.

Councillor Gerbasi: All together.

Councillor Eadie: Separate.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Okay, I'll entertain a motion, Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'd be please to move that we'll vote separately on items 4, 5 and 6, be voted separately from Items 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Speaker: All right. All those in favour? All those opposed? All right. So we will separate the two issues, four...the four leases as opposed to the declaration of surplus for John Blumberg. So...

Councillor Wyatt: Mr. Speaker, thanks. I rise, happy to move this proposal to bring it forward. The Alternate Service Delivery Committee was set up, Mr. Speaker to look at finding savings on how we do operations as a city. It's a concept which goes back a number of years and we, in the last operating budget, made a commitment for what we call accelerated ASD to bring forward more options for finding efficiencies and savings. There's no doubt Mr. Speaker, that there's been a great debate about this issue, and I think it's very passionate and speaks well of Winnipeggers' passion about parks and open spaces. But I want to stress a couple of things here, Mr. Speaker in terms of what we're proposing

today. And that is the fact that a year or so ago, there was an initiative after the last general election to look at selling off certain courses potentially, declaring the surplus and selling them off, based on the public response to that, Mr. Speaker, it was clear there was the public support was not there or there was a strong element of opposition maybe is the way to put it and that proposal was not pursued even though it was one of the recommendations in the Auditor's report in terms of moving towards the long term. The short-term option though in terms of getting professional management of these courses, contracting them out if you like, was recommended and really is the second option that is being brought forward to Council today to consider in light of the fact that there was concern with regards to the parks and open space. I want to stress Mr. Speaker, a couple of things. There's been a lot of misinformation out there and we've been getting e-mails and you know, it is what it is but the misinformation regarding the fact that we are losing park space is absolutely false. We are keeping park space within the City of Winnipeg. Blumberg is in the RM of Headingley. Why are we operating a golf course for the benefit of the RM of Headingley and the citizens in the RM of Headingley, I'm not sure and it goes back to I know before Headingley seceded from the City of Winnipeg. That's the history but they seceded and they left Winnipeg and they're now their own RM. So you know, I think it's worth revisiting that. The courses inside the city though, Mr. Speaker, are remaining park green space. And you know and operating as golf courses. So you know, it's really important. I mean, one of the individuals who I believe is going to be voting against this, he spoke against it, versus he has a different argument coming from this is Councillor Browaty, is the fact that he doesn't like the 20 year lease because it locks the city down and keeps these courses, we can't sell them earlier and isn't that amazing, Mr. Speaker, that a lease agreement would actually secure and keep green space. Absolutely. A twenty year lease. We get out of it but we would have to pay to get out of it. There would be a cost so there would be a cost so there would be a real disincentive to future Council to doing that. This actually secures publicly owned land, publicly owned green space for 20 years longer Mr. Speaker, than anybody else can guarantee with a future Council down the road. That's the amazing thing of having a lease like this. We went to a public RFP, Mr. Speaker. We went out to the market and we had a very qualified firm bid and was selected. Number of firms bid and this one was selected, qualified experienced operator of golf courses, and you know Mr. Speaker, they've put forward a proposal that is actually going to reinvest in the courses in terms of capital funding which we haven't done for years and bring our losses down. Absolutely, not eliminate the losses, we know that, but bring them down dramatically, Mr. Speaker, and that's even an option for product sharing. So I mean, we, I think have a very good agreement here Mr. Speaker, to go forward. Ultimately, when you look at it, this comes down to a former member of Council, he was here in May to speech many times. Now, I'm going to make it. He is not here. This comes down to a philosophical debate; a philosophical debate about government and about services. Do you believe that golf is a core service that the municipality should deliver? And if you believe that, then yes, you believe we should be subsidizing courses and operating them losses and all. But if you don't believe that, if you believe, and you know, it's interesting, Mr. Speaker. I believe that there's been a big change that's happened the last number of months here in this province with regards to the provincial budget that came out, that the fact that all the work we've been doing lobbying for alternative revenues is gone in terms of growth revenues to fund our infrastructure, crumbling infrastructure, I think there is a shift happening and that is we...whether we like it or not as a Council today or future Councils in the future are going to have to make some tough choices with regards to what those core services are. To me, a child learning how to swim in a province that has a hundred thousand lakes that's a core service, yet we haven't built a pool in how many decades in the city and children cannot get into learn to swim programs in this city? Mr. Speaker, that's a core service. Seven hundred thousand dollars a year, half a million a year, a million dollars a year depending on the year at a loss would be enough to subsidize the construction of a new...finance a new swimming pool in the city of Winnipeg, believe it or not. That's the choices we are coming down to here, Mr. Speaker. You know, if you want to head back to Sherbrook Pool, these are the choices that we're going to be coming down to. And you know what, nobody likes to make these choices. This is a fact, but we only have so many, so much revenue and so many levers in terms of gaining new revenue as a city, in terms of our budget and then we have other options with regards to reducing our expenses and then we have things which folks have called you know, the sacred cow, police and fire and ambulance. You can't do anything there. Can't lay off police officers, can't lay off firefighters, can't lay off ambulance, okay? So really, what levers do we have really to pull there in terms of reducing our expenses? This is one, Mr. Speaker. If Council today chooses through a two-thirds vote to eliminate this option, we are going to bring other options forward, but Mr. Speaker, if Council keeps choosing to say no to other options, then we only have one other lever and that is the lever to raise taxes and I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, based on what's happened in this province in the last month or so and the provincial government's decision to suck tens of millions of dollars out of the economy of this province and put in nothing back into the infrastructure of the city, seven million dollars out of 152 that should've been invested in the infrastructure in the city, Mr. Speaker, the appetite of raising taxes in this province is falling quickly if it hasn't dropped off the map already. So we only have so many choices. Again, it's a philosophical debate. If you believe that this is a core service, we have to fund this or you don't, you believe that this is another option, there's been a great debate whether these are the real numbers based on our SOA that we created 11 years ago and the Auditor says these are the numbers based on an SOA operation. If we eliminated the S...as a business trying to operate as a business. If we eliminate the SOA, there's no doubt, we would be absorbing and subsidizing like we do other government depart...other departments within the City and it would be less transparent and it would be less accountable which is why the SOA was set up in the first place. I'm saying to this Council that we can ensure that the losses here, whatever the debate around the number, come down that there's money reinvested into these courses, and Mr.

Speaker, that the courses are remaining publicly owned. The land, the land is ours and that, Mr. Speaker, is something that I think we heard over and over again today, but again, it's a philosophical debate. You either believe that or you won't. You believe that once the government is in a business, there are some who believe that they should never leave that business. There are some who actually believe that the word 'profit' and I heard it from one of the delegations today, is an evil word. I don't believe that, Mr. Speaker. You know, I mean, it was entrepreneurial spirit and those who came here on the prairies, you know, harsh climate at times, to make a living, to make a go of it. It was the profit motive that drove a lot of that development and growth of the city early on and it will drive the development in the future. And if there's a way here to have a win/win where we can reduce our losses and yes, a private company input makes potential profit, but we also know that with the fact that the market has golf courses all over the place, far more actually than what was estimated here because they only went thirty minutes from the corner of Portage and Main. You drive beyond that folks. There's even more golf courses and people do drive, all right? The fact is the pressure in terms of prices is there to keep prices down and modest in terms of what will be offered in the future in these courses and the sustainability will be there for the future for golf. The question was raised the other day by the Mayor, I believe it was, that you know, if this doesn't go forward then other options have to be considered. Whether you...however you want to cut it, Mr. Speaker, Harbour View before the City deduction...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: Before the City deductions, lost \$215,000 in 2011, approximately in 2010, it was \$284,000 so it goes up and down depending on the year, the weather, I'm sure. Crescent Drive in 2011, 43,000 loss. In 2010, 82,000. Windsor Park in 2010, \$129,000 loss. In 2011, it was 174. I understand they were closed for a little while because of the Seine River flooding. So you know, these are losses Mr. and I know it's argued...it was argued in the paper that actually when you factor in the external leases, they are actually making money, they're 106,000 in 2011. Well, I hate to tell you this folks, but when you factor in the external leases in 2010 the City lost \$100,000, okay. So it goes up and down. There is no predictability. Largely, it's a weather-driven business to a large extent. It has a great year, it's great. If it doesn't, it doesn't and Mr. Speaker, if we can find a way to reduce these losses and keep it as park space which is what the Mayor alluded to, maybe that's the other option in the event that the two-thirds vote is not here. At least, there will be park, the option we would have to get...cut the grass or maybe you lease it out to a farmer and plant a wheat field. You know, I mean, Mr. Speaker, there's options, but the cost would definitely be less, the losses would be a heck a lot less so...and it would be preserved as park. Of course, you would lose all the jobs that are there now but it would be preserved as parks. Some of them would keep it because you have to cut the grass but nonetheless, you know, and when I ask the Auditor which courses would be the...you know, he surmised Windsor Park and Harbour View. I don't know if it would be that or Harbour View and Crescent, I'm not sure. You know, and then, hopefully other golfers would go to the other two courses that remain and drive the revenues up there and maybe that would be a win for the golf SOA at the end of the day. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that's a real scenario coming forward, so those are my comments and I look forward to the discussion and will be looking forward to wrapping up afterwards. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Firstly, I'd like to start off by thanking a couple of City staff, Al Shane and Mike McGinn have been tirelessly working on this and responding to my e-mails about arcane stuff like depreciation of Tuxedo Golf Course, that kind of things so I want to thank them. But, you may ask yourself how did we get here to this point of debating the golf courses and the future of the golf courses and really the main document is one that isn't even in this report. The main document is one from a couple of years ago, that shows the arc of time. It shows from the peak, 180,000 rounds a year in 98. Now we're down to about 85,000 rounds a year. So in that sense, this...this EPC, this Council, this Mayor didn't start the fire here. We've had this decline over time that's system wide. It hasn't been each year steadily down but they certainly over the arc it's been down from 180,000 to 85,000. What are we going to do about that is a fair question so that's part of why I am supporting the Blumberg part of this resolution is I think that's...that's a way of reducing the supply somewhat. Twenty-seven holes out at Blumberg maybe we'll get a proposal to develop nine. We can still have a full on golf course at 18. We still have the soccer fields. We still have the other facilities out there, but I want to talk mostly about the leasing of the other four courses. So the proposed solution here is to lease them out and the main rational that's driving this from the City report is well, the average percentage of direct revenues at private courses, it's 62 percent and the City courses, it's 37 percent. Thus it's the Union's fault and if we just privatize these, we won't have these losses anymore and that's, that's just bad math quite frankly in terms of what's causing the problem and I've said it before and I'll say it again. Kildonan makes money, it makes money even after you put in the depreciation of long term interest so not really the Union's fault there. Secondly, Harbour View, as has been alluded if everybody worked for free at Harbour View, it would still lose money. Everybody works for free, it still loses money, not really something you can blame the Union on there. So, if...once you get some of that rhetoric out of the way. Let's take a look at some of the numbers then. You're going to hear a lot of numbers today. You're going to hear the golf courses losing million dollars. Well, a lot of people used a lot of numbers and most people aren't using inaccurate numbers. They're just telling half the story and I'm going to try and tell as much the story as I can. Golf courses did lose a million in 2009, which is a question

to the Auditor the other day. That's not the number we're dealing with though. We're dealing with 2011 numbers, the loss is 850,000. I must be right in that because that's what Responsible Winnipeg website says. It's 850,000, so I'm going with 850,000 not a million. But the...what the Responsible Winnipeg website says though, that mixes apples and oranges is this, so they say, well, we're going to bring it up to profitability. That's apples and oranges. The apple's comparison is you lose 800,000 a year, 850 if you include the 300,000 of depreciation. What happens after we privatize under this model? You're still going to lose \$268,000 a year. I'm not making that up. That's an Appendix 3. So the other, McGinn numbers, I call it, the oranges, take depreciation out, the courses lose about \$500,000 a year now after privatizing, they'd be slightly profitable. If you can make an apples to apples or oranges to oranges, you can't do what the website of Responsible Winnipeg is saying is we're at negative 850 and we're going to make them profitable. You've got to if you're going to include depreciation on one calculation, you've got to do it on the other side as well. So, rolling forward from that, so to me, the...that they're not going to return to profitability and I think Councillor Wyatt has said that. So the number then is according to this is the loss is going to be...the saving's going to be \$568,000 a year according to Appendix 3. And this is where I think Councillor Vandal and I have raised some issues. I don't think we've said the losses are exaggerated at least. That's my take. I think we both said the savings, the purported savings are exaggerated. Okay, we're not auditors. Where are we getting that? The facts are here in Appendix 3. We collect the City of Winnipeg from the SOA collects property tax equivalence, 311 charges, collects accommodation expenses. We simply aren't going to save 568,000. I side with Mike Ruta who said, "We have to make some adjustments on the expenditure side." It was his way of putting it and I agree with that. So it's not a savings of 568,000. To try and draw this analogy if, Mr. Speaker, you ran a business, said to me, "Here, I'll pay you 300 grand a year for rents and property taxes. You cover my losses." At the end of the first year, you pay me 300,000, I get that in and but then you've lost 586 and I pay the 586,000. Then you come to me and say, "I'm shutting down and you're going to save \$586,000 a year." I think great and then just before you leave, I'd say, "No, no, wait a minute. I'm not saving all 586,000 because you paid me \$300,000. That's the analogy here that I think Councillor Vandal and I have been trying to raise. The savings aren't 586,000, they're at somewhere around 250-300,000. And so we get to probably where this debate should've been all along and this is the debate I would say I had with Councillor Fielding and our battle of the polite men debate on CBC Radio which was okay, and Councillor Fielding eminently capable of making his own argument here but you guys, you said even if I accept your numbers, that's real money, that's savings. I want to put it towards something else, defend in essence putting it toward golf and that's a good debate, I think. And I don't think it's philosophical necessarily as much as it is what do we want to put our money towards? So, I said, yeah I can live with subsidizing the golf courses. It's about 125,000 a course if you look at the hockey, the arenas report from 2010, that's about we subsidized each arena. No mention of depreciation in that 2010 arenas report. We seem to get into depreciation on golf and not our other recreational services. So I'm okay with the subsidy at that level for a couple of courses. I'm also wanting to keep control of the green fees because we would surrender that if we contract this out for the next 20 years. So I do think it's...it is acceptable, it is in line with some of the other services we offer to maintain that. I think in some ways the stronger argument is on the capital side if you...because people have been saying, "Well, look, Golf North is going to put in 4.2 million, much more than the 56,000 a year we're putting in. Well, to get the full picture, we're putting in more than 56,000 in our budget, so we're putting in about \$100,000, \$130,000 if you look at the numbers from more recent budgets so okay how do you square that thing?" Golf North is going to put in over 20 years, 2 million more than what we put in. Well, the Auditors actually supplied the answer yesterday which was an odd moment, the Auditors and CUPE. agreed on something which was the Auditors say, "Look there was majority support from the golf and public for a user fee. If you put a user fee of a buck or a buck fifty on, 90,000 rounds a year, you can get a 100,000, you can get 130,000. We can start reinvesting that in our courses. That's going to make up whatever capital difference, whatever shortfall we were looking at. It's not going to come from the general taxpayer as part of the next budget certainly I'm going to be proposing, we put that use fee on, something both CUPE and Auditors seemed to agree on so the other aspect of capital that I wanted to talk about as I looked at this was Councillor Vandal at a recent Riel Community Committee put 25,000 in from Land Dedication towards St. Boniface which is a semi-private club. I would certainly be a...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Mayes: It's my intention to put \$75,000 in to help Windsor Park. The federal government put in 75,000, Cross-Country Ski Manitoba put in 75,000 and I'm certainly prepared to match that from Land Dedication to try and get to work on that bridge that links, I always wanted a bridge between... over the Seine as part of what I wanted to do. Here is a bridge that's needs some work. It's between St. Boniface Ward, my ward, it's on the 9th hole and gets flooded out. We lose days of golf and so I'm certainly willing to put in 75,000, it is the number two capital priority identified in this document so I'm happy to support Windsor Park Golf Course in that way. I guess, the other, in terms of other capital improvements as Councillor Gerbasi I think has pointed out in the past, we've got a new building going at Crescent Drive. Even the Auditor said yesterday that's going to generate some more cash flow for the courses so I look forward to getting that so I think the...some ways this debate's become unfortunate because we are doing responsible things in the City of Winnipeg. We're doing the community centres. We're investing for the future in the roads. We're investing in rapid transit. We're doing river bank erosion work. This is stuff we should be celebrating so I hope today marks the end of some of our debates over the golf courses. I was saying...so I was saying to Al Shane yesterday, half-jokingly, "What

am I going to do once this issue is over? What am I going to do with all my free time?" to which he said, "You could go golfing." So I'm going to take him up on that. I'm going to go golfing at Windsor Park for the first time in a number of years, I hope others are. We're doing some good work at our courses. The sun is shining here. I'm proud of our public courses, proud to keep them accessible. Part of the web site said well, the contracting out will keep them accessible. Actually keeping them in our public hands will control over the green fields, that's going to keep them accessible. So I will not be supporting the part of this motion today: the cost for contracting out the courses but I am certainly prepared to invest some money in Windsor and maybe we can go golfing together there some time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to touch in my comments today on three aspects of what this debate is about. It is about philosophy and vision and how people see our city. It is about process and planning and trust in those processes and it is about the merits of the actual proposal in front of us and the specifics and details of what we're voting on today. The idea of the...the philosophy of the City of Winnipeg getting out of the golf course business has been around for a long time. It's a favourite platform of the Taxpayers Federation, it's a part of the Scott Fielding or EOC report Scott's proud of, from several years ago. The lingo of talking about core services has been tossed around for years. The mantra is that cities are about pipes, police and pavement and most other things ought to be done away with or given over to the control of the private sector. We would be in paradise if only we could stop the waste of public dollars on non-core services such public art, recreation, rapid transit, housing, culture and pretty much anything that makes our city unique and interesting, but this view has pretty much been ditched by all the successful and vibrant cities in Canada as they've learned that investing in the creative sector; improving quality of life, create safer, happier citizens and actually better economies. While look, well, some cities are look at the issue of repurposing green space, the ones that do it successfully take a very different approach than we have seen in this process here. There's a better way than grouping together a bunch of green properties and giving them away to a private interest with little planning or consultation. Issuing the initial request for proposals to sell the golf courses on mass without meaningful public consultation was a failure and now instead of learning from that mistake and other mistakes, such as the water park debacle, the powers that be on this Council continue to make the same mistakes over and over again expecting different results. There is a strong ideological belief that private control and management by some...that private control and management is always better yet the irony is that the true facts of this deal show that the savings are minimal to non-existent. The devil is in the details and the private sector is not here to provide charity, but to make a profit. There's a belief that having a well-paid workforce with rights afforded from fair labour contracts is some sort of luxury that somehow should be done away with. Moving to a low wage economy is somehow supposed to improve the economy. Increasing the number of unemployed people or low wage employees would tell a very different economic and social story than that philosophy. There are very different visions on what direction this Council should go and that's partly why this Council has been unable to do a strategic plan and whether it's been an epic fail on a number of files that I've mentioned some of. but I believe that the ideological differences on this Council could be overcome and a lot of good things could happen and we could work through some of these issues if the way that these issues were dealt with was fair, inclusive, democratic and truly motivated by looking at the bigger picture and our city's future. If we could take a thoughtful look together and properly plan initiatives and consult with people in an honest way, looking at each individual property we're talking about with the area councillors and the public, we might have found a way to repurpose some of this green space to better use if that was the right answer. Instead, what do we have? Another initiative by Responsible Winnipeg. You know, a fake community group created by the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor to which was to bully Councillors and dupe citizens which was very unethical and a waste of public funds. The irony is that that \$90,000 could've hired an expert policy adviser for a year to do some of the policy work and planning that is missing. And regarding the specific discussion in front of us today we are being asked to declare Blumberg Golf Course surplus before there were any discussions with the Municipality of Headingley, before there or citizens of Winnipeg who use the golf course. Why would there be no plan brought forward that could be reviewed and discussed and thought about? The cart is clearly before the horse. If this property is declared surplus, the decision has therefore been made to sell it, a valuable city asset and again, it's just a lesson that doesn't seem to be learned. It's the same mistake over and over. You know, the suggestion...and back to the devil that's in the details. The suggested disposition of the funds of the golf course are that it goes into recreation but that's all it says. It's incredibly general and non-specific. It's not part of a plan of reinvestment that can be determined to be fair or appropriate. Selling valuable, irreplaceable assets where one time money is something that should never be done without a clear plan in place, proper consultation and better justification and I expect to hear that it will be argued that Blumberg isn't being sold today and that we are only declaring it surplus today but we all know that once you declare something surplus you've made the decision to put it up for sale. And a lot of times, these assets go up in value. You know, we have none of that analysis. Crescent Park is in my ward and is one of the four golf courses on the block for the private management from the Ontario company and only a few years ago I supported a private spa development on that golf course property as you remember, which was intended to be a means to have a new clubhouse built. The idea was to make this public golf course more viable. It was a tough sell in the neighbourhood in Fort Garry but it seemed to me like a balanced way to improve the success of our golf agency and to keep it under public control. The clubhouse isn't even open yet and I'm sure the golf numbers of the last few years

reflect the fact that the site has been under construction, hardly a fair assessment of profitability. With a brand new clubhouse and a new spa, wouldn't this golf course now be a source of profit to the City? That argument...that's the argument I was given; that was the argument I was given to justify allowing a private business on City land surrounded by a peaceful public park. The initial proposal to sell this course and now to lease it is a real betrayal of the co-operative effort on this Council among us that went into getting that clubhouse built. The willingness to be flexible and creative and work to improve the financial viability of a city asset was ignored very quickly. The ink was barely dry on that agreement when the whole thing was up for sale and now leasing these courses and lumping the four courses together without looking at the individual situation is just unbelievable. It's a real slap in the face to the people of Fort Garry. Another issue is that the report clearly states the pricing...that the pricing of golf in these leased out courses will completely be under the control of a private company. The City will have no say for the next 20 years so that point has been raised by Councillor Mayes. That raises very real questions about the accessibility and affordability of this recreational activity. The City is involved in recreational services such as pools, arenas and golf courses and fields and much more. And so in that sense, it is a core service and the golf courses could have been profitable as we've heard from many speakers today, if the City hadn't failed to invest in capital, if they hadn't skimmed off profits to go into general revenue over the years and we found, heard some solutions today of how we could reinvest with the simple golf fee going forward. One thing I found, I think I'll skip this because I'm not going to have part of this, because I'm not going to have enough time. We've heard the argument...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: We've heard the argument that the losses that are being talked about are losses, are really only losses because it's framed in the terms of the SOA itself. And all the things they have to pay back and the model makes it appear to be a much greater losses than it is and even the Mayor when he talked about the Responsible Winnipeg Campaign, he said some of the money didn't really count as an expense because it went back to Winnipeg Transit. So you know, you can argue if you're paying yourself, it's not really an expense in some ways so the numbers we're dealing with are much lower than the numbers that were presented in the Responsible Winnipeg ads. And as several Councillors have said over the years, including Councillor Swandel I believe, I'm curious to see, hear what he's going to say today but the so-called debt of the golf agency isn't really a debt either. It's really just the way things were attributed in the creation of the SOA and the idea of having it presented as a business model is all fine but we have to recognize that that's how it's presented when we're looking at whether it's profitable or not. Another thing I found kind odd is that the report goes on at length about how little money there is to be made on golf courses and how there are too many golf courses. I guess this is left over from when the courses report was written to argue that the courses should all be sold which Council didn't support but if there's really, truly, no money in golf and they're not profitable at all, why would a private operator sign on? Like they're not exactly a charitable organization, they're obviously going to make some money. So obviously with proper management, there could be money that could be money that's made. It's just that it will be made by a company from the Province of Ontario rather than within Manitoba. The real issue here today is how can we best use our resources and assets to serve our citizens and provide the quality of life that people deserve? I'll just be a second here. We know the City needs more sources of revenue but the answers to our financial woes are not in this proposal and the case has really not been made that leasing the courses will bring in significant savings and furthermore selling an asset like Blumberg which we're going to do if we declare it surplus without knowing the value and knowing that the value of that asset increases over time is a very poor decision. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding.

Councillor Fielding: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...you know, there's quite a history on this file and I was a part of it. It originally started out, even before I had an opportunity to chair something called the Economic Opportunity Commission, which identified the golf courses as an area where there was a lot of funding issues. If you look back on that, actually we implemented, although at the time it was kind of seen as this forward looking document, some people thought it was for good, some people thought it was for bad. I was in for good. We've actually implemented a lot of these things that are actually were in the report which I'm very happy about. You go back to this and that was something we identified to it. So really, we've been looking at this issue for at least six and a half years because I've been on Council since six and a half years. We know that an Auditor came out, identified this isn't driven by politicians who...you know, someone argue it's an ideological stance one way or the other on the issue. Auditor came out and said this is a major issue, it's a risk for the City of Winnipeg and there's a better way to do it. So quite clearly, this isn't just the City Hall making these decisions on it. We came from a point about a year and a half ago which I liked where we looked at Expression of Interests saying selling off a portion of the golf courses, maybe you make some golf courses nine holes. You have some development upon it as it happens, all over the country, all over the world, really. And they're fantastic properties and fantastic golf courses that are part of that to help to pay for some of it, but you are quite right. There is a movement from our citizens that possibly some of the people that lived around these courses didn't like this per se so we moved away from that. So I would suggest where we are right now is it's really a compromise from where we started in terms of this process so it's kind of we start at one end and we kind of move to the middle and over, really over six years and specifically on when

we are since the Auditor came out, probably two and a half years, so to suggest we're rushing into these things. I don't think is a valid case. So that's where we are. The problem? Well, we know quite clearly that the courses are losing \$850,000 a year. I know that because the Auditor came yesterday and also came before and identified this and the questions were clearly asked to the Auditor, how much are the courses losing on an annual basis, the SOA. And clearly, the answer was \$850,000. I do want to remind people that also there's external Auditors that are part of these things when they bring financials in that are signed off that are agreed to, that are there and so dollars and cents, there's an argument and it probably gets lost for the politicians back and forth, but at the end of the day, an Auditor has come in and verifies that there's \$85,000, that's a real problem for the City of Winnipeg here. We also know that there's a variety, a spider web of how we're operating some of these courses. As we mentioned, CUPE operates the four courses through our city employees. There's management agreements, there's management contracts. You know, in terms of how we're operating. Now, the difference between something like Tuxedo which is kind of a model we're looking to go towards, something to that effect, has run very effectively for the City of Winnipeg, Assiniboine which is actually in my area, run effectively for a long period of time. So moving the four courses, we think it can save some substantial amount of money. In terms of the debt, we talked about the debt, we know it's a \$8.2 million. There has been some talk of politicians in the past well before I was elected, I think in 2002 or 2003 suggested that they raided this one went into general revenue when it became SOA. Maybe that's the case, maybe it's not. I wasn't part of any of those discussions. All I know is there is a problem that we have and it's \$8.2 million problem in terms of the loan every year. We have to increase the loan guarantee that's a part of it. I don't think anyone would argue that point. We also know that golfing is at our courses, it's been split in half, in the late 90s or mid to late 90s when what was kind of the focal point where you had the most round of golfers that are courses. You had about 180,000 rounds. It's gone down below 90,000 in the course of about 15 years. Probably a variety of reasons, there's a whole lot of courses there in the City, in City of Winnipeg or the surrounding area around the City of Winnipeg, lots of choice. If you look at all of the courses, there's a lot of private sector courses, Glendale, for instance, is one that's looking for members. I know St. Charles has changed their process of getting involved. Now whether everyone can afford to go with Glendale or St. Charles is another matter but I'm saying everyone is scrunching around to get more members, more people playing their courses. So my point with that is there's a lot of golf in the City of Winnipeg and right around there. We also know that our current courses have some deficiencies and a lot of it has to do with what Councillor Wyatt had said in terms of the labour cost differences and that was clearly laid out in the Auditor's report identified yesterday where they talk about the labour component or how much of the actual expenditures are made up of labour on a national basis, what a normal course runs at is around 38 percent of labour makes up the total expenditures. At our courses, it's right around 63 percent. So you can see there's a big difference in terms of what the labour cost is there. Is it all CUPE's fault? I don't think it is. I think, for the most part, they're doing a relatively good job in terms of our courses, but the fact of the matter is the labour costs are driving higher. There's some examples as Councillor Wyatt also had said, some workers were making upwards over \$60 an hour on the long weekend for some of the courses that are there. So, it's hard to compete, I guess is what we're saying when we're in these areas. So look at the proposal. I think the proposal once again is a very moderate compromised proposal that allows us to save money and allows us to invest in other areas. Councillor Mayes indicated what my opinion on these things is, whether argue Brian's numbers or my numbers, the fact of the matter, the courses are losing money and this is money that could be put in a community club, it could be put in a road, be put in to public safety in some capacity or another. You hear these debates and it's all the politicians always arguing back and forth, who is responsible for the infrastructure deficit and I get tired of listening to myself and being a part of it as well. We all know and I think all citizens know that there is infrastructure deficit that's here. We're scrounging around for dollars. I don't think that's different from other levels of government. We need more money to address the issues that we have. At the end of the day, there isn't a money tree that we can come and plant and pick and pick all the money and do things. So we need to make choices and in my personal choices, we can deliver these services in a more effective way, I think makes a lot of sense. So we know that there's numbers of options that are out there. I have mentioned kind of the different types of courses; you've got Tuxedo; you've got Assiniboine; you've got courses like that. People can enjoy. The fact of the matter is the only difference that people are going to see because they'll still be able to go to Kildonan, you'll still be able to go to Windsor, you'll still be able to go to a number of these courses that are City run is a logo. The logo of when you go up and pay your greens fees, whether it's a City-employed person or someone that works for Tuxedo Golf Course. The fact of the matter is the courses are there, people are going to be able to enjoy them from now for the next twenty years, which I think makes a lot of sense. In terms of some of the cost, that's also been brought up, there's been some suggestion that's somehow fees are going to go through the roof. Well, I've got some good examples here because I called around in terms of some of the fees and for things like Blumberg, for instance, you have for 18 hole courses anywhere between 38, 30 I think 33, 33 dollars an hour, Assiniboine Golf Course, that's a nine hole course you can double back. It runs around 28 to \$34 an hour, Tuxedo, same thing around \$33 an hour, Windsor Park, the City run course, \$32 hour, Kildonan, \$32 for the round, I'm sorry. So as you can see, there is no much difference in terms of what the costs are to go to these private managed courses versus the public courses. So my point with this is if you introduce that model, the reality is if you increase the rates, let's say we let a private management company go and they do Kildonan. The reality is if they increase the rates by \$20, what are you going to do? You're just going to decide to go to another course. You might go to Shooters, you might go somewhere else. So there's a limited amount of increase that even a private corporation can do because you're going to lose market share so I think that's important part of it.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Fielding: Another very important part is in terms of the invest in these courses. We've talked about whether there should've been a dollar fee to invest in these courses, there hasn't been. This proposal puts \$4.2 million of capital investments in these courses. In the short term, I think it's about 2.5 million over the first 3 years of the proposal, which makes sense. So, suppose the bottom falls out in this corporation that runs 20 courses in Ontario can't go ahead with them. Somehow, they hand back us, hand back the keys to the carts that's there. At the end of the day, you've got over \$2.5 million invested, investments in the courses they're going to have in the immediate term and you're not going to notice any difference overall. So, I think the proposal does make sense. Just talking a little bit about the proponent as mentioned, they ran over 20 courses in the Ontario area. I believe one is a championship type of course so we know there're people that can do things in a proper way. The sale of Blumberg, well, you know I have had, I have had a lot of calls and this is something that obviously closer to my area and as yours as well, Mr. Speaker. A part of this, as mentioned, we're having a hard enough time to do infrastructure in the City of Winnipeg. Blumberg Golf Course is outside of the City of Winnipeg, one point it might've been, but with Headingley seceding obviously that's a part of it. So it's hard to justify making investments in infrastructures that's there in locations that are outside the City of Winnipeg that's part of it. I think that there's a lot of opportunity for golf for people to go to a whole number of courses that are around. I think there's been some talk of the...for sale sign if we do declare it surplus, we'll get a whole bunch of offers that do come in here and we can take a look to see what offers are there. If you could still have golf operating, maybe you sell off nine holes, it would be some development on there were you'd still have 18, you know could be a proposal that's there, but at the end of the day, that would be Headingley that would make those decisions in terms of the zoning portion of it. So just to conclude Mr. Speaker, this is a very good compromised proposal. It's a common sense proposal, it's proposal that's going to help us address the issues we all know with golf is there. It does a little bit in terms of the real estate side of the equation of selling off a course that's outside the City of Winnipeg, but also addresses a major issue that's there that the Auditor identified in terms of the numbers. So, I encourage all of Council to support it. It's a good proposal going forward. In fact, this is the easiest vote that we have all year because it makes so much good common sense. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I always love the word, common sense. So I'll try to give my common sense. This golf file has been completely mismanaged and I would say for six and a half years. Council has spent an astronomical amount of time on this. It is a failure for Council. We're spending way too much time on this issue. We have so many huge issues in this city. Again, we keep trying the same approach, and we keep getting the same result. Maybe we need to change the approach. This process continuously reflects poorly on Council's ability to work of the public and all stake holders to be stewards of the land, and in which, we are in trusted to be. A trust that is required to, lease four golf courses, totaling over 322 acres of public land for \$100,000 or \$25,000 per lease, per course, per year for the next 20 years. We're also going to hand over the clubhouses and all our public investment to a private Ontario firm. We're going to relinquish control over the cart fees, green fees, merchandise, concessions and other revenues again for the next 20 years. We're going to lose control of access to the land of the 322 acres of land. And this is excluding the 198 acres of land associated with John Blumberg. We're going to lose control of this land for 20 years. So therefore, I think it's very fair to say that there are many people out there in the Winnipeg community that are quite concerned and what we do need again if we want to try a different approach rather than this failure, we need to have a long term plan of what we are doing with our green spaces as Winnipeg is growing. The motion was passed by the City Centre Committee to do such this in January 2012, but again it was rejected, February 14, by the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Again I think it's still a great opportunity to engage a community about what is our future of our green spaces and then we can move forward. However, this proposal...however, today, we're going to first talk about the leases and then I'm talking about Blumberg. The proposal, I believe, and I'm very clear, and I'll say why, the lease proposal is not in the best interest of the City no matter how we try to spin it. And I'll provide two reasons why. Access, we talked about, we had a glory moment of how we're going to retain public green space for 20 years. Well, only if you pay the fee to get on. Does that mean it's public green space? Not so much. A private firm is going to own this land, not own it, manage it, i.e. unless we let you on our property, oops, City property, you're not allowed on. Again, that is what we're saying, 322-acres of land will be restricted for a "buy for profit" company. So again, it's apples and oranges. The past public investments and the future private investments to the golf courses will be restricted exclusively to those that play golf but not for the public at large. It's only for those that can afford to play golf with this private company. So those again, our assets, we already paid for are being sent over to this Golf North company, and they will reinvest, but again, reinvest to make a profit for themselves, not for the City of Winnipeg. Oh, we'll have these assets, when this 20 year lease is over. Well, our discussion apparently talking about depreciation. Guess what, 20 years, all those investments are done. They've depreciated themselves out, so we're going to get nothing when we get done if you want to talk about the way that the accounting principle has been working so far. We also have rates, will increase. There's not...there's a reason why in the reports, there's a line that says that the City of Winnipeg won't interfere with rates. Why Golf North needs that? Well, because they want to maintain at the same rate, no. That's because they want to have the free rein to

raise it. Then that will also further increase the lack...the barrier to access to these 322 acres of private public land. So, that's...that's that. But how about the money part? There's been a lot of talk about how this golf is losing money. Again, we have to have a better process in talking about accounting principles, depreciation, fees that are on the books but aren't actually paid monetary because they're all internal. So what I had to do because it wasn't done, was to try to figure out the impact that this lease, not all the verbiage about would it be in golf or not be in golf. I had to figure it. On the impact of the budget, for the City of Winnipeg and what definitely, I'd be more than happy to show it to anybody that our expenses including direct salaries will go down about under \$200 million. I mean, \$2 million. But our revenue also will go down just over \$2 million. So we have less revenue, in the end of the day, my figures show very clearly...now, this is the impact, not on golf services but on the City of Winnipeg that we actually, we'll lose money on the direct costs and this doesn't take into the extra \$250,000 of revenue allocated to the City for Winnipeg Golf Services for such things as \$81,000 to help cover the cost of 311 verses zero from the Golf North lease. A \$170,000 loss resulted from the difference in property tax and business tax between Winnipeg Golf Services. It's presently paying and what Golf North will pay. The \$129,000 in debt payments to the City of Winnipeg verses zero from the Golf North lease. The numbers for these just don't lie. So and finally, so that's just...I have not been convinced that the numbers that are presented are actually going to work and that's what I need to be done today and I left it all the way up to the last moment hoping somehow that someone can show me that this just doesn't spin, its actual merit in what they are talking about. And in the accounting principles, there is some merit, but in actual dollars of impact, there isn't. So, I will be supporting...I'll talk about that. So finally, I'll be supporting the public accessibility, fiscal responsibility by voting no to this lease proposal. I do hope a better proposal will come forward in the future. Now regarding Blumberg, I hope everybody realizes Blumberg is considered a major open space in OurWinnipeg, a major open space in OurWinnipeg. And we are now going to decide without any plan, without anything to change OurWinnipeg arbitrarily and see what proposals come through. OurWinnipeg states though on major open spaces that the City of Winnipeg recognizes and protects the land designated as major open space. I don't see this doing that. Also, have we ever done...have we ever presented, can we redo this? How about the ecological significant land strategy and policy? Was that done? This is on a river bank. This is part of our land inventory. We should be checking about the inventory. Has it been done? No, because we're rushing into this off the left hip. Let's just see what happens. Again, that doesn't show true stewardship of the land. So therefore, since there are no proposals pending. We haven't talked to any of the other partners,. There's no ecological assessments being done and there are no conditions being put on this option, i.e. if we actually allow some huge infill residential development to happen in Blumberg or say, Headingley, you decide what you want to do with it and they go we know it would be great because everybody who lives in Winnipeg. If they just live out here, they're going to pay a lot less taxes, so let's do that. Let's have a huge residential development here, and they'll pay half the tax they would pay inside the City of Winnipeg which is a about hundred meters away. Again, I don't see that being in the City's best interest. So again, until I have some more ideas of what we're thinking about and we have some more discussions about Blumberg, I'll also not be supporting that one.

Mr. Speaker: Thanks, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's been some good discussion and debate around here. For the leasing Mr. Speaker, of the golf courses, I read the report from our administration. There's a solid business case Mr. Speaker, that I feel that they put together, and is something that I can get behind and support. Mr. Speaker, we're not, here are no public sector jobs being lost here. There is no developing occurring. No development, real estate development occurring on the golf courses. The golf courses, Mr. Speaker are remaining publicly owned, they are within the City of Winnipeg. We still own them and I just checked with our staff and all winter activities, Mr. Speaker, at the courses will be accommodated throughout the lease. Incidentally, I just wanted to, as I segway into John Blumberg, John Blumberg, Mr. Speaker, is a very good example of a privately managed course and as I transition to that particular topic, for me, for starters, you know, I've heard the question why would the City of Winnipeg want to operate a golf course outside of the city limits? Well, you have to historically understand you know, Headingley was part of the City of Winnipeg, they receded and you know, they are no longer part of the City of Winnipeg but Mr. Speaker, that is still our asset and what's lacking in the report, Mr. Speaker, there are no financials. There isn't a business case to support the sale other than the fact to say, you know, these monies will be held in trust once we declare and sell it, and to be used for recreational amenities. Well, Mr. Speaker, the John Blumberg land is a recreational land and you know, I just did some general high level inquiries. Is this Council aware Mr. Speaker, that John Blumberg actually makes a very healthy lease payment back to the City of Winnipeg? It is a profitable course, like I said, it is very well-run. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the vendor invests 10s upon thousands of dollars every year for tree replacements and landscaping improvements on that course. Also Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the vendor has also invested hundreds of thousands of dollars into capital improvements for drainage and irrigation at the John Blumberg site so the City of Winnipeg isn't investing in this site Mr. Speaker, it's actually the private operator and they're still able to maintain a lease payment, a very healthy lease payment, it's my understanding, well over a hundred thousand dollars back to the City of Winnipeg. And Mr. Speaker, I checked with RM of Headingley yesterday, while this course does pay an amusement tax, a very low one, they don't pay taxes to the RM of Headingley, which is a very unique operating advantage for John Blumberg. So considering the first question, the question I posed you know, why would the City want

to operate outside of the city limits, well Mr. Speaker, given those things that I just talked about, will those supporting the sale or declaration of surplus lands of John Blumberg and eventual sale also support Mr. Speaker, the adjoining land that is actually part of John Blumberg, which is also recreational lands, a softball complex, the baseball fields and the soccer pitches all very well utilized, recreational amenities, that are City owned used by thousands and thousands of Winnipeggers. And also, John Blumberg Mr. Speaker, the majority, over 90 percent of the golfers for John Blumberg are citizens of the City of Winnipeg. I just want to make that clear. So it doesn't make any sense why we would want to retain the fields or if that's the case, if we're looking to sell them, I wouldn't support that but Mr. Speaker, today the John Blumberg Golf is recreational land. It is City owned, it is profitable, it's making money. It's utilized by our citizens of Winnipeg. Today, I won't be supporting the sale, the declaration of surplus of that land and our eventual sale of the John Blumberg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel.

Councillor Swandel: Mr. Speaker, you have to excuse me, I'm having a bit of problem with my back so I'm in some significant pain here so I'm going to struggle through this as best I can. I just want to start by reminding everyone why we're here. We are not to serve any special interest whether it be CUPE, the Labour Council, or the Taxpayers Federation, Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses or any of the other specialists that came forward here. We're not here to be led by any single ideology whether it be an extreme left ideology or extreme right ideology or something that may fall in between. And we are not here to put our own self-interests ahead of the best interest of the City and I've seen quite bit of that and this is sort of, as we get closer to upcoming election, we see a lot of that. You know, one of the former Councillors used to characterize it as the craziness of election season. Certainly when you get within two years of an election, you can see, you know, the behaviours and some of the way people deal with important issues becoming more on the crazy side and less on the pragmatic side. We've got to clear the air on a bit of a goofy misdirects that are being put forward here. We always hear the term you know, what about full public consultation and we need more public consultation, public consultation. I think those of us in this chamber, a lot agree that in a great deal of cases, that's really sort of a red herring and it's code for our special interest didn't get its way. So, you know, let's put that where it needs to be put. You know, we get the usual demonization of individuals. We see that here, the characterization, demonization of people, let's not wallow on that gutter. You know, some of the people who will come here and speak, they're perhaps not familiar with the way we choose to conduct ourselves here, but let's not wallow in that gutter. I want to talk a bit about the advertising stuff that was done, you know, really it's not the issue here, but I think it's important in my opinion. I think there was some communication done on both sides of this that were, you know, perhaps well intended but greatly exaggerated, misguided. The messages might have been somewhat good. The methods might have been bad. I don't want to get caught up on that. I don't want to make that the issue of the day. Whether somebody had a logo on somewhere or something or who paid for what out of what account, we've all stood here in this chamber and said we've got to a better job of communicating from the City Council perspective and I know certainly from the EPC perspective on my time there, somebody at least attempted to do that. And I don't think it was the best effort, but I don't want that to be the decision that we're making today. And speaking to some of the advertisements I've heard on the radio from the labour side of this, you know, certainly great exaggerations you know, I find it a bit offensive that you know hard working civic employees who are paying their dues or union dues and they seem to be using more as a political campaign than working in the interests of those workers. So I'm troubled a bit by that. I think it's important to frame that in the same way that that side of this equation has framed what the Mayor's office chose to do and how they chose to communicate but I don't want that to be the issue that we're...dwelling on here today. Really, what it is if we go in this direction, will it be better than the place that we are in today? I've done a great deal of work on this. I've torn apart these numbers, Councillor Gerbasi made reference to some of the stuff I've said in the past about creation of debt and creation of things that were probably already fully depreciated and we gave them a value when we created the SOA. And I've looked at that and I've looked at these...through these numbers and you look at the asset values that have sat there and they've been depreciated over the years and knowing as Councillor Orlikow talked about, you know we don't really have in this report is an income statement. The financial, true financial position, is not fully put out in this report, but there will be an increase in the asset value when those investments are done and so for me the question is really simple. If we make a decision to lease out, will we be providing a better product for the citizens of Winnipeg and will we be doing it in something that I can stand up and defend as better value for the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg? I believe that golf is just another form of recreation like any other form of recreation that we subsidize. You know, somebody made a reference to having to pay to get on to a golf course. If you want to go swim at the Pan Am Pool, you pay to go swim at the Pan Am Pool. You know, there's a pool that I know in the City of Winnipeg, we subsidize per swim over \$40 per swim, not per user who's there 100 times a year, but per visit, \$40 per swim. We do that. We participate in funding recreation. Is this going to make us completely whole? I can't say that this will make us completely whole or it will make us completely profitable, but what I can say is it will be a better financial place for us to be in and the product will be better for all the citizens of Winnipeg. That's the decision that we need to be making here. I want to just comment quickly on John Blumberg. There was a comment made here about the deplorable condition of John Blumberg Golf Course. I play at John Blumberg Golf Course fairly regularly. I could tell you that one of the biggest problems with John Blumberg is it doesn't have an irrigation system as Tuxedo Golf Course didn't have many years ago.

The current deal on the John Blumberg Golf Course is that the contract operator of the golf course is installing this irrigation system so that sort of hard packed deplorable condition as the warm summer breezes blow across that course and there's no winds in the middle of the summer, those conditions are no longer there. There are huge retention ponds being built underground piping going in. All the sprinkler heads and the amenities that go with that. So, the contract operation out there has been successful. As far as selling John Blumberg Golf Course, I don't have a huge problem with selling it or at least declaring it surplus. I don't think when it comes back to this Council and we have to vote as to whether or not we would accept an offer on it, that we would like the offer we're going to get. Because I can tell you as a golf course operation, it might be worth two million, two and a half million dollars, maybe a bit more. As developable land, when you look at the development plan for the RM of Headingley, their residential development is half acre lots but in overall development, you can have no more density than one lot per acre. You've got 200 acres out there most residential development you can have is 200 lots. When you consider, you know, what that means in value if you think it's 30 to 50,000 to service those lots, you're going to sell them, let's say, at 150,000, you know, it's not going to bring you much more than two to three million dollars as a straight up offer or maybe more than that because there is bit of an upper value of the frontage on Portage. Councillor Pagtakhan will be pleased to know that the sports fields aren't included in the schedule that's put forward in the report. That's actually in the report on one of the back pages. I want to also say that there's just a little bit of stuff on the labour stuff here and you know, I think it was Mike Davidson. I've a great deal of respect for him. Mike's got a difficult job and he does a good job of advocating for the people that he represents but he made the statement that we've agreed. We have an agreement already, that's what we agreed to, that's what our collective agreement says. So when it comes to the role of CUPE, our collective agreement already guarantees job protection for all those permanent workers and when you look at the money that we can bring back into working, whether we're going to keep, making this debt and bringing that money forward that can be ploughed back into our city. In the summer time, perhaps you've driven on any of the image routes right now, look at the deplorable condition of our boulevards. You know, getting some workers out there, you know, those part time positions, those seasonal workers that we have working on our golf course right now, if we could put those bodies out on our boulevards. You know, come into our city, down Pembina Highway right now. There's not a live piece of grass anywhere along there that we've done it...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Fielding moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Swandel: We've done experiments with salt resistant grasses in a new section of road that we did on Pembina Highway. Well, it might be salt resistant but it isn't resistant to whatever else is going on out there because it's all dead. And so, there's other places that we could keep those workers going, together we can work with CUPE, and we can find a way to keep all those people employed at the City of Winnipeg at the same level going forward. And we could have these golf courses operating, we could be growing the asset value and yeah, you're right Councillor Orlikow over 20, 25 years, it will depreciate out what that 4.5 million dollars is starting there, it's coming from somewhere else because it won't come out of the increase in rates. That increase in rates will drive as many people away out to the...a little further out of the city, the other cheaper golf courses are just around us, and the other side is there is only so much capacity. If you go to the peak times for golf right now, the golf courses are in those best hours, those peak hours, they still run pretty well at capacity. It's the off hours stuff where you used to get a bit of pickup and you start pushing the rates up. That's...you know, that's the youth, the seniors, the novices, that are looking just to go out and hack and slash, they'll go to where the price is. And so you're not really going to get that out of that \$1.50. At least, in my belief so, you know, I'm supporting both the clauses here today because one has just declared surplus. I think when the offers come back, if they do actually getting offers back, they're not going to be greatly attractive offers on Blumberg and I do believe that leasing out the other operations will bring a better product and better value for all of the citizens of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to start off with a little bit of a reality check and a little bit of review of where we've been, where we're going from. First of all, it's very frustrating that we've gone all this way, all this time and this is where we've landed. The Auditor's report, I think is, you know the most key document in the key piece to this whole discussion. The number of rounds of golf being played in the macro City of Winnipeg environment are going down. The last number of years, the supply of courses has gone up. Take a look at it. People's time and people's days nowadays. A fast round of golf is four hours for 18 holes. On a city municipal course, I played Kildonan last summer, I think it was probably five and a half, six hours. How many people have that kind of time in today's world, in this type of life style that you know, we're all living where we're all constantly connected to everybody to put your phone down for four and a half hours, five hours? I predict that golf is going to continue to be a declining sport, the industry experts say the same thing. I'm a little concerned that 20 years of committing city assets to golf is problematic. I'm not saying you have to go and build mini malls on all of it right up to every square inch of green space that's there, but perhaps with proper public discussion, public consultation, some development on golf courses is prudent. What about other areas where there isn't competition with the private sector? There aren't a lot of people operating. There are some exceptions

but there aren't a lot of instances where there are soccer fields, baseball diamonds, ultimate Frisbee fields, dog parks that are privately owned? Those are the services that I think we should be involved in because we're not competing as the private sector. There are private sector golf courses out there. One of my colleagues made the comment, I think it was Councillor Orlikow, recently, just today, private courses only benefit those who pay. It's the same thing with public courses, it's just what is the exact price, what is the exact, you know. There's still so much supply on the market. I'd argue you know, all these courses, all the City owned and operated courses were off the market. You wouldn't see a huge spike in golf prices, and as Councillor Fielding pointed out, there are a lot of private sector options out there, and I've done my research, too. I mean, we've got Meadows just outside the city limits in East St. Paul, very close to city rates. Shooters Golf Course, probably not as nice as Kildonan, very competitive, but I mean, there are options out there if you want to golf, there are options out there in the private sector that aren't, in my mind, that astronomically expensive and again, we don't give away golf either. Again, if we decide that some of our courses are better than some of the private ones out there and there's you know, in the case of Kildonan for example, an argument that it should stay a golf course whether it's for five, ten, fifteen, twenty years. I'm not opposed to allowing some private sector involvement for the one that are the best but bundling them with courses that are dogs, like Harbour View, don't necessarily make sense. I mean, if we can get a real good business case and a good operator that wants to run Kildonan Golf Course, we're probably going to do better than if we give, force them to run out other courses that don't make a lot of sense. Again, you know, in the short-term, I think the proposal we have before us today is better than the status quo that's why I have trouble not voting for the proposal to do the lease-out today, but again, in the long term, I think we are just being a little bit...we're saddling the future with what was being proposed here before us today. Again, we heard Mike Davidson this morning confirm some of the rates that our employees are making on these holidays even if we follow Councillor Swandel's suggestion where we redeploy them to go do boulevards, they're not going to be working on Victoria Day or other days where you're paying three, four, five times the regular compensation. I mean our CUPE, some of our CUPE. employees work very hard, they do a lot of jobs that I wouldn't want to do. In the middle of winter, I wouldn't want to be the guy dealing with a water main break when it's -40 below. Nothing is enough money that they can pay me to do that job for example. So I do appreciate a lot of the hard work, a lot of our city employees do and they do deserve, some you know, very suitable and substantial salaries for that work but when you're competing against the private sector or another model of delivery, whether it's life guards at the YMCA, we do need to look at every option to provide the best value for taxpayers. I've said that all along and I'm going to say that again now. You can just vilify me but I can justify this to any taxpayer that wants to come and have a sit down and have a chat with me. I'll buy the coffee. So again, in terms of the actual numbers, there's people all debating over the numbers. You know, is it \$200,000, is it \$800,000, I mean the notion of a special operating agency is you're trying to...is trying to fully load all the legitimate costs into an operation, so we can actually decide it, you know, it does make sense if it were a private entity. We're not competitive when it comes to salaries, we know that but I mean, they should be loaded with relevant and appropriate property taxes and you know, overhead costs for 311, for accounting, for HR and that. I'm not sure how they arrived at those numbers. The numbers for Harbour View are I think inappropriately loaded and why does it cost more for some of the back ends stuff on Harbour View than it does on Kildonan Golf Course, for example. I'm not sure I completely buy those numbers but again, that's splitting hairs. What I think is really important here is there are better models that we can either, A. run golf courses or B. not lock ourselves into a 20 year commitment for something that I don't think is appropriate. I mean, I'm a golfer. Okay, that's very generous. I go around on a course, I've got clubs, I hit a ball, I hit a ball quite a few more times and still a little bit more and eventually it'll land in a hole. If you want to call that golf, we'll call it golf. But I think there is a place for it in our market. It's not going to go away and I think market forces can do it. So again, locking in for the City assets, when again, we have a fine amount of green space, our cities are growing. You know, who'd thought we would have dedicated off leash dog parks. They are phenomenally popular. Maybe there's other places where we can, you know, move other types of things into creating golf courses and do dog parks, and there's whole multitude of options so again, Blumberg again, completely separate, it's outside the City of Winnipeg. It's still zoned for park, discussions with the RM, discussions with whomever, we're not talking about selling it today. I think we can explore that option, I'm supportive of that portion, but I will not be supporting the notion of the 20 year lock down. Again, there are opt out clauses, but again I think they are kind of rich and not fair to the operator. That's where I am today.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Speaker, I do support the sale of the Blumberg course. Through the sale I believe we can use these funds to upgrade other recreational amenities within the City which is desperately needed. My ward is growing, Mr. Speaker, as are others across the city especially through the immigration we've seen over the last number of years. And with that diversity, Mr. Speaker, comes interest in a variety of different sports such as cricket. We have a lot of work ahead of us in terms of upgrading our existing recreational facilities and many new projects that are waiting in the queue to get started to meet the demands of our youth and our families. The other courses in question Mr. Speaker, have been losing money for decades, and the City doesn't have the funds to maintain and improve them. In our current situation, a large percentage of Winnipeggers are subsidizing the relative few who golf on public courses. There are plenty of other courses in the city and for this new group to be competitive in the golf business, they will need to be cognizant of that. The proponent Mr. Speaker, is ready to invest in these properties, pay the City leasing fees and also will be paying taxes

on the golf course properties. The new operators will be upgrading the courses which the City has not been able to do for many years. The clubhouses at Kildonan Park and Windsor Park, Mr. Speaker, are in drastic need of repair. The City has no money to do the repairs or the upgrades. Most important of all, Mr. Speaker, is that the City will retain a 100 percent of the ownership of all the courses it leases out and also, it is important to note that no permanent City employee will be laid off. Also Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that when Tuxedo Golf Course was operated by the City, it was a disaster. It had no irrigation, a crumbling clubhouse and it lost a lot of money each year. The City leased it out and now it has taxes it pays to the City, pays an annual lease, has a new club house, it has an irrigation system, it has a miniature golf course and offers lessons to young beginner golfers and is still owned 100 percent by the City of Winnipeg. I am supportive of this plan Mr. Speaker, and I do take the City Auditor and CFO's reports very seriously. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Nordman. Well we've been actually dealing with this issue I think from 2011 and I wanted to, I guess, first I should make, I wanted to thank all sides that presented today. I think that there's a lot of important information presented to us and I think that enlightened me a little bit more about...the financial goings and the issues around reports that have been given to us. And I especially thank Mr. Sanders, for helping me out, a highly qualified person who's examined this to a great length. And he goes back to the report, I believe it was...wasn't 2011, I believe, well outside of the two years from the election and people's decisions on how we should proceed in terms of our golf courses and at that time I voted against the plan to move ahead and look at the leasing options as well as looking at selling off any of those green spaces so I just like to start from that premise because today we're at a position where somehow I'm supposed to change my mind because we've got some great offer. Throughout this debate I've...it became apparent to me that a lot of people have dissed our city workers on our City owned and operated golf courses and I can't imagine what it would be like to try to work and be motivated to actually do your job when you have politicians beating up on them, you have residents beating up on them, you have you know, these...just totally dissing them and yeah, you know, making on a stat holiday making a lot of money, yeah that's something but how many of those stat holidays are there a year and was it open and somebody tried to say that we keep our courses open and people working on rainy days which I believe would be just silly, I don't think we do that. The...and I would like to point out though, so if we're going to pick on these people who are making let's say, the lower 150, whatever dollars an hour on a stat holiday, I noticed that this leasing agreement we're going in to with a huge corporation from Ontario. Is it Mr. Balsillie who owns this company? How much does he get paid annually? Ninety million dollars a year? Is that what he makes every year, as a CAO of a corporation? How's that going to be factored into the price? How much profit do you need to make so that a person can make those kind of...that kind of living? Let's be serious about this, why are we picking on employees? All we want to do is operate the courses and the Auditor made it clear to me yesterday that one of the main reasons that we have labour inefficiencies on our City owned and run golf courses is our equipment. It's not state of the art equipment. It needs to be repaired all the time. How can you get some efficiencies and do the job that you need to keep our golf courses up and that demonstrates to me that you know, we...what we should've been doing if you want to establish a business and run it like a business, let them run the thing and actually make the proper investments. You don't need the private sector to make the kind of investments you're talking about. We could've made those investments to make our golf courses better. You know, for me, it is ideology, yes. I'm sorry, Councillor Swandel, there is ideology being thrown around on all sides. The City can operate a golf course. You have to give the parameters and allow them operate the way they want and they can do it. I know they can do it. And I just want to also make a final note about making some money. You know, people working for a living which is the reason we established golf courses in the city many years ago, is that the working people in Winnipeg couldn't afford to participate and yeah, I know the golf industry has changed but we were put it there for people who are working and well our city workers are making a decent wage and they can afford to do more things and they can. There are a lot of working people in our city who are only making 18 or 22 dollars and I'm sure they'd love to be able to play golf and that's only equivalent to about \$40,000 a year, making \$20 an hour and some people would have the people working on our golf courses, work for \$12 an hour, so how are they affording to play golf? So, it was very troubling to hear that most of the golfers who were surveyed by the consultant back when, when the report came out, that they were earning over \$50,000. I would say maybe we are not following the mandate that was given by the people who came before us that said we need to make this affordable, so that the people who are real working, like hard working people, like the majority of people who actually live in my ward and many wards around the city, who aren't making those big dollars so I think maybe we might be failing in that so how are we doing on that mandate? I know we moved at some point, not when I was a City Councillor, to move this in to being a special operating agency to make it run like a business, which I truly don't believe but it should be treated like a business. It's just like any other recreation service we provide in the city. Anyway, what I'd like to say is I'm hoping, in terms of that survey and all this attention we brought to golf courses, I'm hoping, and I know that for a fact, a lot of people are afraid we're going to lose our publicly run and operated golf courses, and I'm sure golfing will go up if the weather provides. It sounds to me, and I would encourage the seniors, we heard an announcement from the Mayor today about an Intergenerational Day or whatever or week or month, and you know, the seniors, there's tons of seniors who golf on the Kildonan Golf Course, John Blumberg and all over, bring your kids and your family out there, get them involved in golf because if we want to

keep this golf recreation service going, we need to be able to do that, providing services that the people of Winnipeg want to have. Privatizing the operation of golf courses is not the answer. I know, I hear they are putting in the sprinkling system, but in this debate I heard somebody say how disappointed they were in the John Blumberg Golf Course. So it's been under private management for what, 10 years? A very long time as I understand it. I don't know if they had a lease agreement renewed or anything. But why has it taken it so long to get to the point where we have as Councillor Swandel had said it's a successful private lease. I don't know that it is. Why did it take so long? Obviously, I know there's rounds of golf and problems with that, but I know that those kind of investments need to be made to get people to inspire them to come out to our golf courses. So we have heard...I wanted to talk about private sector. Councillor Browaty is talking about the private sector. I need to point this out. The City of Winnipeg has been in the golf services for a very long time and there weren't that many golf courses around, and the private sector got involved. As a matter of fact, when I was a kid, Shooters was a driving range. There was no golf courses there, yeah, you know, through the 80s and 90s, golf kept going up, rounds of golf and they took a risk and they built a golf course and actually the other golf course that Councillor Browaty mentioned, Meadows or whatever, I think that's the one that Larters built over, towards the Perimeter Highway near Birds Hill, East St. Paul, you know, they took a risk and...

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Swandel moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: I don't feel sorry for them. They took the risk and the City has been in golf services and we're not getting out of golf services. Forget it. We're providing something that we always provided. On the John Blumberg, I cannot support any idea that says because John Blumberg is in Headingley that somehow we need to sell this off. I will remind everyone that the Kildonan Park and Kildonan Golf Course were owned by the City of Winnipeg and existed in West Kildonan for many, many years and we never treated it that way. I'm concerned that when you start talking like this, we're going to get rid of Little Mountain Park which we happen to own, that's crazy. Those are important green spaces that this city and the people of this city have appreciated for a very long time. So I have to...all what I want to say is to...in this whole thing, just get responsible, we're pitting golfing fixing road you know what, they're not connected. They're not connected, the amount of money that we supposedly are losing is nowhere near enough to fix any streets so, to try to say that there's somehow some trade-off between fixing our roads like the CFIB is trying to say and us running golf is ridiculous. So, you know what, the reality is they're not really connected, we need to deal with those roads in another way. Both our local roads and our regional roads that we need and so today, I really can't understand any arguments for this so I will be voting against both of...to declare John Blumberg surplus and I will be voting against a private lease because you know what, we can as a city, run it properly if we invest it properly. Let's get them some equipment so that they can do their job, really.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Havixbeck.

Councillor Havixbeck: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to see that Councillor Wyatt is remaining in the room for my presentation on this one. No, no, please, stay. I absolutely don't know what to believe out of the Deputy Mayor and the Mayor on this file. Their behaviour in running a \$90,000 ad campaign to convince each of us to support this, it's really desperate and it's shameful to taxpayers and the Deputy has laughed it off and I think it's very seriously. I believe that this has tainted this report and it throws it into disrepute. Comments made that this was a best effort as some Councillors are talking it up to. It's dismissing it and \$90,000 is a lot of money to a lot of people in this city. This is indicative of deeper problems we have at City Hall: the lack of accountability, the lack of transparency and a lack of communication with each other, and especially with those who elect us and the lack of dialogue. I don't recall the consultation that occurred in each of our wards to hear what people had to say. Some are reported as saying that this was never expected to pass because it required two-thirds Council majority so again why would we waste that money? How ironic that these are the same elected officials who cut funding to inner city groups, who cut kids programs, the arts and museums, yet see the need to run up large advertising bills. I have now heard from two other bidders in this process. They happen to be local. I have questions. I have questions about why an Ontario firm has been selected. When I asked the Mayor for a Council seminar to have these questions and the questions that were raised at EPC last Wednesday, I couldn't even get a response to my e-mail. May 23rd, I wrote an e-mail, asking the Mayor for a Council seminar on Monday or Tuesday, no reply. I have to ask what is to hide? I have questions about the Ontario firm selected to lease the four courses. How many Councillors know that they charge membership fees, \$2,000 for individuals and \$500 for juniors? Will our golf courses continue to be municipal courses or are they now private? Will they be accessible to everyone as everyone has stated so far? Not one of us would leave a car at...our car at the garage and not get a quote before we got the work done. So I'm not convinced that we're in a better financial position and that we retain accessibility. I'm certain of this, the goal posts appear to be moved and I would like those questions answered. Things are not shared throughout the process with each of the bidders and this is really unfair. This does not help our reputation at City Hall. It does nothing to allay fear or restore trust and confidence. And I ask, what is the rush to judgment? We aren't doing this tomorrow. Why would we not lay it over, hold some consultation, hold some Council seminars on this and do something meaningful? Since the Deputy Mayor appears to be pushing this so hard, I would be remiss if I didn't mention his track record for supporting contracting out services over the years. And for this, I turn to our friend, Hansard

who does not lie. In 2004, he opposed a possibility of private companies overseeing Winnipeg's trash services arguing that, "municipal employers are more reliable." In 2007, he was the only cabinet member of EPC, to oppose the creation of the Assiniboine Park Conservancy, arguing that, "He could not support more private sector control of the City's park lands." and went further to say, "Save the park and the riverbank and our bridges." This is a board he later served on. In 2009, he voted against his colleagues on EPC including the Mayor, to replace Winnipeg's water and waste department with a new city owned corporation. I find it ironic and unsettling to think that he was the creative director behind this ad campaign and he missed the City's logo. I also find it disturbing that just four weeks ago, he announced numerous cuts, frightening citizens into thinking they might lose the Arlington Street Bridge, they might lose the Jets, they might... a host of other of services as well, all the efficiencies that I brought forward during the budget process, he could now see doing without, although he refuted them at the time. For example, the increase to Councillor's ward allowances of \$600,000 would have solved this problem. The Chair mistakenly contends that Headingley uses this course and are the main people using it, and I can tell you I have heard from people from Charleswood, St. Charles, St. James, Westwood, mostly seniors, mostly fearing that it will become unattainable to golf there anymore. I'm not for a second saying there isn't a problem with how our municipal courses are doing financially. I'm not saying there isn't a worthwhile debate that needs to occur. We saw during our strategic planning process last year, which has been abandoned for a year, that there was no consensus on this. We discussed it, we debated it. There was no consensus, but when I look at what could be done to make this a solid process, this is what I see. We need to get these bids on story boards, we need to go to the...to extensive consultation in each Councillor's ward talking about what we've learned in this process. Very importantly, I don't think that by sending CUPE, a memo, they will feel engaged in this process. Let's hear their ideas, let's work with front line workers at each of these golf courses because they know where the savings are, they know what improvements could be made and they simply want to be part of the conversation. I believe the outcome would've been better and we would've had Mike Davidson here speaking in support of a report. I really do believe that. How many councillors recalled it there is a golf course being developed in our city right now? The Southwood Lands, the University of Manitoba is a city's biggest developer right now. Forty acres of some riverbank development and green space has been established as a priority, functionality, words like international design competition. This will be a spectacular place, something that everyone can be proud of and that's not to say that there won't be some naysayers along the way, but people feel engaged in the process. Yesterday's EPC meeting that I attended of course did not see one of my questions answered or considered like whether recommendations 1 through 8 have been considered or attempted of the Auditor's report. Yet we're jumping to 9 or 10 with supporting this report. Feasibility studies were suggested. Hiring a turf management specialist, a CPGA professional, someone who specializes in golf course accounting and a POS system. These are all common sense business things that most business owners would agree with are essential. More answers than questions or more questions than answers, sorry, cause me concern that once audits are completed, who controls whether the recommendations are implemented or not and in what order? I believe that citizens will remember this waste and they will remember the disregard for process and they will remember to vote in 2014. Nothing personifies what has gone wrong here than Councillor Wyatt, Deputy Mayor Wyatt's refusals to suspend rules to hear delegations since day one when he chaired the Property and Development Committee meeting and 50 people at least came out to be heard and the rules were suspended, were not suspended and not allowed to be heard.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Vandal moves extension. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Councillor Havixbeck: My question is what are you hiding and what are you afraid to be asked about each and every time this occurs? Events at City Hall are dynamic. They're not static. They don't wait a week or have a 24 hour limit. They happen the night before. It would appear there are two Mayors, Councillor Smith jokingly referred to you as Councillor or as Mayor Wyatt. Yet, there is this distinct lack of leadership on this and I have to say that the bullying tactics are reprehensible. Bullying is unacceptable on school grounds, the work place and on Council. Not answering my e-mails, shutting me out from meetings, these are all tactics and I will not back down from asking questions that people expect asked. In every field, there's a standard to which all others are measured. Unfortunately, the bar at City Hall is going lower and lower and citizens do not trust us. We heard many of them here today say so. It is completely shameful, so I won't be supporting either of the reports.

Mr. Speaker: Mayor Katz.

Mayor Katz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I think the dialogue has been extremely positive, hearing people's different views. What I think I'd like to do Mr. Speaker, is just try to put a few facts on the table. I'll start off with the SOA that we call Winnipeg Golf Services. It's broken, Mr. Speaker. It needs fixing. Now, unfortunately, for the majority of us, we weren't here when that SOA was created. If my calculations are right, I believe there's only three Councillors here today that were present at that time and that would've been Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Vandal and Councillor Smith. But I believe everybody accepts the fact that the SOA known as Winnipeg Golf Services is broken and needs some attention. And unfortunately, it's interesting how people have been talking about rush. One person says rush, another person says we've been talking about this for six and a half years, so I guess everybody has a different opinion but I think we do know that something has to be done, Mr. Speaker. The one thing that it appears everyone can agree with,

I've heard it from several Councillors and I'll take a Councillor Mayes' comments about the number of rounds of golf that have been played. I believe it was approximately 180,000 and dropped to about 80,000, 180,000 to 80,000. Now, we all can see that the number of rounds of golf have dropped. That's a signal, that's a sign and anybody who's astute will see, you have to address that situation. And unfortunately, nothing has happened. I've heard several comments about what people think, you know, they like or dislike, but I don't think I've heard any real constructive scenarios on what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker. If this isn't what we should be doing, then what should we be doing? Then what should we be doing? Isn't that what's important? And that's why this dialogue's extremely important. So we know the number of rounds of golf has decreased drastically. I'll just leave it at that, use whatever numbers you want. And we also know, Mr. Speaker, that we need to put significant investment, capital investment, in these golf courses. It was mentioned by a few councillors about raising the golf fees, a buck, a buck and a half, whatever the case may be. It was also suggested by CUPE, and investing that money in capital improvements. That's a great strategy, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately wasn't mentioned was the other side of the equation that 42 percent of the golfers who use those golf courses said no way. If you do that, I'm going somewhere else, interesting, but that's a fact and that was actually came out. We've heard on several occasions from the Auditor, from the CFO and from the Auditor that do our audit to verify these numbers that the SOA is losing money. Mr. Speaker, debate what you want, \$840,000, \$582,000, it's a loss. A loss is a loss. And if anybody thinks you take those losses and multiply them over 10 or 20 years, it isn't a significant amount of money. It is, Mr. Speaker. That's just the reality. There was lot of dialogue that was going out there Mr. Speaker, and there were all sorts of campaigns out there selling, number one, we're basically selling our assets. Well, we're not selling our assets, Mr. Speaker. It's a lease. Okay, no different than Councillor Eadie just touted, what's happening in Kildonan Park with the restaurant. It's no more than a lease, Mr. Speaker. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, we don't control the price as they said on the menu, either. They talked about the loss of green space. There is no loss of green space, Mr. Speaker. None whatsoever. The green space will be maintained. As a matter of fact, the winter activities will be maintained. Yesterday, when one of the representatives of Now Winnipeg was there, I asked the question because they were talking about green space. You know, if green space is a priority, would you prefer seeing maybe some of these golf courses turned into green space? I think Jeff...Councillor Browaty has also mentioned dog parks, et cetera, et cetera. That certainly would guarantee green space. I had to push it a few times, it was very difficult to get a commitment whether they did or they didn't. But they're certainly open to the idea but this isn't about green space, Mr. Speaker, this lease, they will pay rent and they will pay taxes as well as, as was mentioned, they will invest \$4.2 million, okay, in capital improvements, which we all know that's the one thing I think everybody agrees with is necessary to be done. My understanding is they're also putting up a letter of credit. So those are the facts we've heard from the auditor, the conversions reports, the CFO, if there are members of Council who prefer not to believe what they're saying. That's their prerogative, okay? It wasn't any member of Council who asked for this report, Mr. Speaker, okay? This came forward, the Auditor did it and here are the answers. The other thing that I think is extremely important when they talk about rates, we all know we have to be in a competitive environment, otherwise you won't survive. Statistically speaking factual you know, from I believe it's the 2002 to 2013, green fees at our municipal courses have gone up just under 50 percent, Mr. Speaker. Everything goes up. We all pay our bills, we know everything goes up, nothing stays static. So you know, what's really amazing is that when we talked about the sale of Blumberg, we talked about investing that money in recreation, which I think many of us believe is a priority for Winnipeggers, for families, for children, I think we made significant investment over the past eight years in recreation and I think everyone would agree we need to continue to do that. Where is the money going to come from, Mr. Speaker? That's really what it's all about. And in the end, that golf course will still be there. All these golf courses are still going to be there. Anybody will have that opportunity to go there. They're not going anywhere and it's rather ironic that just recently, Mr. Speaker, the City of Calgary, they just recently sold what they call the McCall Lake Golf Course. Just sold it off. What are they doing with the money? They're putting it into recreation, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to read some of the quotes here, "The officials are saying interests in the sport is waning and the golf course is losing more than \$200,000 a year, imposing significant operating and capital cost." Very, very similar to what we discussed here, the Mayor, Mayor Nenshi, said the course needed \$8 million in capital improvements. Our courses need that as well and the Mayor Nenshi, "Fewer people are golfing on public courses. When we have such desperate need for so many different recreation facilities, should we actually better match what we have to the demand? Exactly a lot of people were talking today. I was mentioned how long golf takes, it's time consuming. A lot of other citizens may prefer soccer, they may prefer cricket, whatever the case may be, there are many other choices out there. And then once again, Mr. Speaker, from the administration, golf course operations across Canada and North America are experiencing challenges, said the City's Golf Course Manager, Terry Bolt. People are just too busy to golf as in the past and we're also seeing an increase in ethnic diversity in our communities and golf is not necessarily.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Browaty moves extension of time. All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Katz: The game of choice any more. Mr. Speaker, you can certainly see similar analogies here. The realities here, all we're trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is save monies, and put them elsewhere and if that's not what Council wants to do, then Council should come up with a solution how we're going to deal with an SOA that has significant problems, and more than likely, will continue to have the problems. You can't maintain the status quo, something has to give, Mr. Speaker. And from my point of view, the administration has come up with suggestions. The experts have come up with

suggestions, what this is, their recommendations, their suggestions. We certainly have the option to ignore them if we so desire. And the other thing I will add for Councillor Browaty is that when it comes to Harbour View, we can opt out and probably it won't cost us any money, Mr. Speaker. We should be getting more money because that is one of the losing golf courses that they're taking. And that was specifically put in there. So there is an opportunity to move forward on these two issues, the sale and the lease. and if neither moves forward, this Council better figure out a way to deal with a problem that's not going to go away. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much, Mayor Katz. Next up, we have Councillor Smith.

Councillor Smith: Yes. Let me tell you, when I picked up the newspaper and I saw that Responsible Winnipeg ad, I was really then concerned. I didn't see a logo. I saw no indication so I immediately contacted Jenny to see if she knew who it was. I contacted the Free Press reporter, I contacted the Chief Financial Officer, who told me to talk to Russ Wyatt, of all people. The future Mayor, now the fact is, that ad and that whole campaign should be a warning sign to us that they are trying to put something over on us. Now, the fact is...the fact is there was no...Russ Wyatt didn't talk with his committee, didn't talk with EPC, there was no consultation taking place with the citizens. It was out of nowhere and then when it was caught, they suddenly started to put the logo on things even though they didn't stop the ad campaign from happening. You know, as I said, should've been a warning sign to us. I think we should go, I think the Mayor is right, we can't continue the way we're going. But why don't we go back, and not have a SOA? I mean, the fact is, you know we are charging taxes, I talked to the Auditor after the meeting yesterday. I said, "Why are we paying taxes?" He said, "The private courses pay taxes." The fact is if you look at this as a business, you expect them to pay taxes, but you know, we don't charge taxes for the Millennium Library or the Cindy Klassen Centre. We don't charge taxes for our parks. In fact, I got an e-mail that I thought was very short, but to the point, "as a taxpayer I did not expect parks, swimming pools, public golf courses and other green spaces to make a profit or even break even. They should provide affordable outdoor experiences for everyone and so it should be. New green spaces cannot be created". I'll repeat that. "New green spaces cannot be created. Please maintain that green assets that we have, do not sell or privatize our golf courses". You know, as I said, the Mayor is right. We can't continue with this SOA, we should go back to when we didn't have the SOA. When we didn't have the courses paying taxes, when they didn't have to pay 311, when they didn't have to pay for rent and we made it so they would fail. We gave them so many expenses that they didn't have before, that they're bound to fail. So I...you know, I don't look...I can't support either of these things. The fact is the golf courses can make a profit. If they're operated by the City and we don't...we shouldn't be having this SOA for this whole direction. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much, Councillor Smith. Next up, we have Councillor Vandal.

Councillor Vandal: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be brief. This has been a good discussion. Lots of good comments put on the table. I've talked to dozens of people over the last few weeks. Most of them against the leasing of our public courses but a few of them that...think it's a good idea and when I talk to them I say, "The City of Winnipeg owns 12 golf courses." And they say, "Really?" I say, yes we own 12 golf courses. Nine of which are privately operated. Three of which are publicly operated. One of them in my ward, I share with Councillor Mayes, Windsor Park. And I think that's a balanced policy on our golf courses and that's something that I can support. The public golf courses are more geared towards people that are novices. They're generally more affordable. They're...they have great twilight packages for seniors in my ward that are very much appreciated and up until last year, and maybe we are even doing it this year. We used to run a learn to golf program out of the Windsor Park Golf Course which was very much appreciated, Mr. Speaker. As you gain some skill and some...you want more challenges in the golf business or leisure activity, you move on to the St. Boniface Golf Course and that's where I often golf with some of my friends, which is a semi-private course, it's generally more challenging, a little more expensive. It's more limited in terms of public access and that serves my constituents perfectly. We have nine courses...twelve courses, nine of which are private, three of which are public. It's a balanced approach and I think Winnipeggers, when I certainly know my constituents appreciate a balanced approach to our policy making. So I'm not going to be supporting the leasing of the public golf courses. Someone mentioned an audit report and that was the impetus for this whole initiative some time ago. The audit report says many things. There were ten recommendations. We're moving on No. 11 as Councillor Havixbeck has said, the audit report said that we have too much public green space. I'm not sure if that was only the consultant's opinion or the Auditor's. I couldn't determine that yesterday, and the Auditor report said that we lose...the City of Winnipeg loses a million bucks on golf courses. So we have to do something and that's been the line. In fact, that was a line that was printed in Maclean's magazine. Last year. The City of Winnipeg, million dollars, they lose a million dollars on golf courses so when I look at the business plan in front of us this morning, this afternoon, sorry, 2011, a net loss, Special Operating Agency, \$836,000 net loss of the SOA, that's a big number. It's not good news if you are...if you're concerned about City services, but four lines above that I see allocated to the City, a property tax equivalence, \$248,990. Departmental support costs 52,000. Office accommodation 16,700, this is allocated to the City from the SOA, all told there's about eight items, all told \$636,000 allocated to the City from the Special Operating Agency. I brought that up with the Auditor yesterday, he said, "Well, that's a cost." I said, "Well, that's a cost to the SOA, but it's money, revenue coming to the City of Winnipeg. So it's...you

can't actually stand up and say the City of Winnipeg loses in this case, \$836,000 every year on golf courses because it's not true. We have twelve golf courses and nine of them are private, three of them are public, and I've already explained the benefits of the public and private. It's a balanced policy. People appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there is a subsidy. I've always said there is a subsidy to our public golf courses and in my dictionary, Mr. Speaker; subsidy is not a bad thing for a public service. Profit is not a bad word in my dictionary either. In fact, I hope the St. Boniface Golf Course is very profitable. We have a deal with them until 2025, a dollar a year. They pay taxes. I'm investing \$25,000 to help with their irrigation this year. And I'm going to do everything I can as a Councillor to work with the St. Boniface Golf Course to make it even more profitable, Mr. Speaker. The federal government has just announced an investment of \$75,000 in the Windsor Golf Course for cross-country skiing, for lighting in cross-country skiing. I see Councillor Mayes has announced, he is ready to invest 75,000 into Windsor and I'm certainly going to look at that very seriously to make it an even better golf course, Mr. Speaker. In my mind, Mr. Speaker, it's all about balance. The audit report's clearly identified too much green space. That's a big debate we can have and we will have into the future. You can't say we have too many golf courses, which is why I'm going to support the sale of Blumberg Golf. I shouldn't even say I'm supporting the declaration of Blumberg as surplus. It's 27 holes. It's not in the City of Winnipeg, it's in Headingley and that gives the administration the authority to go forward, to talk with the RM of Headingley, to talk to the manager, to talk with some of the privates out there to see what the opportunities are and everything comes back to committee, to this Council, and we're going to have an opportunity to actually see what the opportunities are for Blumberg. So I will support it to the surplus stage and I know it's likely going back to Property. I'm not sure if it's going to come all the way back to committee but that's where I'm coming from, Mr. Speaker. The SOA does need help. If somebody, that's a discussion for another day but generally, the constituents that I've talked to appreciate the balanced approach to our golf policy in the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Vandal. Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Councillor Nordman: Thank you, Councillor Pagtakhan. I won't extend this day any further than we have to. I have eight minutes. I'll try to be much briefer than that. I really did like Councillor Vandal's close on Blumberg, said many of the things that I was about to say. Being the Councillor that has closest to Blumberg, I would suggest I probably have the most residents, voters, that use it on a regular basis. It is the only public golf course that services the real west end of the city, the far west end of Portage Avenue and I was the Councillor that played there on May the 11th, and was really, words I use, I was embarrassed by the condition that was in. Yes, it was the first week of, week or so, May, but the condition that it was in was not relative to the time of year, it was the time that has not been put into the course over the last few years. The reality is for those who are concerned about the recreation complex as a whole, because that's what John Blumberg is, it's not only a 27-hole golf course on the Assiniboine River, but it's also 10 soccer pitches and 5 softball diamonds that were created actually for the Pan Am Games in 1999. The sale of the golf course at some point in the future would allow the soccer pitches in particular to be irrigated. The funding that could go right back into recreational facilities that are desperately needed. The land out there is very alkaline and it's very difficult for the local water to be taken advantage of from beneath the soil. It's really important that the water be drawn from the river to take full advantage of putting the appropriate chemicals and top dressings to allow the fields to flourish, particularly for soccer. On the other side of the equation is the lease, and I would share with you that when I did have that round of golf on May the 11th, that was the 50th consecutive year that I played golf. I started playing golf in 1963 when I was 13 years old. Now, I still have a ways to catch up to Councillor Smith, but the reality is, I've been around the golf game a long time. My father was a country club manager from the age of 13 to 20. I was a golf club brat so I understand golf. Today, my backyard is Glendale Country Club. I am surrounded by golf and have not missed one year in the last 50 where I actually have played. So with the greatest of respect to all my colleagues here, I probably have a closer relationship with the game than many of you, and for the folks that have spoken to me loud and clear from my ward that are not happy, I am...I have to share with them that I don't make my decisions on the basis of whether or not I'm going to achieve a vote at the next election, and I'm sorry to say that, yeah, I've lost some support over this, but I believe that the lease is the absolute right thing to do. The reality is, as so many of you have already stated, the game is shrinking. I guess I could use a winter comparison here and ask out loud, outside of the occasional grant that we may share with the curling club. How many public curling clubs do we have? It's the corresponding winter sport to golf in many respects and the curling clubs seem to make it on their own no matter which way they have to and I would suggest that we have to retain the ownership of the land and make sure that our agreement is rock solid with the vendor that's going to be put forward and hope that they will do all the things that are prescribed within the contract to spend the money to bring the clubhouses as Councillor Sharma said, of both Windsor and Kildonan up to today's standard. The urban myth that Bob Hope played his first round of golf in Kildonan Golf Course, you know, a hundred years ago almost, you know, the clubhouse looks the same as Bob Hope saw it. So, it's you know, something I expect that the private sector will be able to do. So, I will be supporting both measures that are recommended in the report today and I will just, to my colleague on the Finance Committee and my colleague on the Alternate Service Committee, I just like to say to Councillor Wyatt, hi neighbour. Thank you.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman. We're finally up to close, Deputy Mayor Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker or Deputy Speaker. It's been an interesting debate. The...I think the report is a solid report. It definitely will help address us with regards to our losses that we've experiencing, whether you debate what that loss is, this will definitely do that. These are professionals they bid. They're committing and we have an opportunity to ensure that golf will stay that these fields, these actual golf courses will stay publicly owned and be privately operated through a lease through the City of Winnipeg. And it's...I think common sense in terms of what's before us today, it's an opportunity, I think for the City to reduce its losses and at the same time, offer a service which many enjoy. It's unfortunate that it's gotten into I think Councillor Swandel made the point of in terms of, it should stay on the issue, it should on the issue of...with regards to the actual pros and cons rather than this interest group or that interest group but as he's also said it's kind of the beginning of the funny season. You know, with regards to the upcoming municipal election, I appreciate the kind words from my colleague from Charleswood-Tuxedo honouring me today on the floor of Council. I know she's running for Mayor and obviously, she thinks I'm running for Mayor too. But the reality is you know, when it comes to our standing committee, I'm more than happy to entertain her motions. All I ask is she read the motion ahead of time before asking for the suspension of rules, but when I asked about your motion, suspend the rules. Well, you know, but can't you just share the motion and then we can vote on suspending the rules, not even that, but when I talked to the reporters after the meeting, they have a copy of the motion, a motion which I had never seen. So you know, when we walk reports into a committee, Mr. Speaker, you know, when we walk reports into a committee, walk on, well, there you go. And when you walk reports into a meeting, you know, we're criticized, and rightfully. You know, Councillors don't have the time to consider it, don't have...I think the same goes,, You know, we did it the first time, we suspend the rules, if we recall on these and we actually work to help the Councillor with her motion, made some changes, some of...one we didn't support, one we did with changes. And you know, we're open to that discussion. All we ask is either be some transparency and I think that's fair. You know, on the part of the Council, I'm asking some transparency. So, you know, well, if you're on the committee, maybe you will see it. But anyway, the reality is Councillor, you know, we have an opportunity now, Mr. Deputy Speaker to do something here that makes sense. What we've been dragged into and I said it at EPC is a partisan debate, not really about the pros and cons of the proposal before us, but rather the fact that the Labour Council through their main member, CUPE. has...due to a large effect gained control of approximately six positions on this council, one way or the other, and directly or indirectly and their goal is in the next general election is to win control of this council and so you know, and that is what it's all about, and I wish it weren't. I wish it weren't. I wish it weren't about that. I wish it was about the issue, but the reality is that's what's going on and the citizens of Winnipeg should be aware of that that this is about the fact that right now, Kildonan Park Golf Course, \$537,000 is the pay roll for Kildonan...for Windsor, it's \$557,000, that was in 2010. The losses, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you add...when you take out...if we were to eliminate the SOA, which some people I've heard say, eliminate the SOA, which means you're not counting the lease money coming from the other courses, these are now operating like a department. Your loss would actually be close to \$300,000 a year, just on that alone, not, Mr. Speaker, talking about allocating anything to the City, it's just the strict loss on those four operations, so we are subsidizing it, and we...you know, and I thank Mr. Davidson for bringing forward the fact that we...he said we agreed to the contract, thank you for bringing that to our attention. That's something we clearly have to address. Thank you. I mean, I recall when we were doing the last contract negotiations, I wasn't on EPC at the time and bumping into the Mayor in the parkade, and the Mayor saying ...I asked the Mayor, "Are you putting on the table?" We can talk about it now because the contract negotiation, this is all the previous one. Are you putting on the table, the issue with regards to job security? How many employers, how many employers actually offer job security to their employees, no matter how bad the economy, you've got a job? We do. We've been doing it since the days of Bill Norrie, Ed Blackman, when they were buddies down here and we negotiated it and we...and it was a deal. How many employers do it? We do. You know the Mayor's response to me? No. I want to assure we have good will. Look at the good will it's bought us. Six, nine months advertising campaign against this Council, against the City, malicious, hard hitting, false and misleading. And that is the good will that that has...this Council has gotten with that leadership and that's unfortunate and for the Councillors who've been targeted by CUPE., it's not going to be over. I'm sure they're going to target me as well because that's their style and that's their leadership style coming out of Ottawa and that's what this issue is about, ladies and gentlemen. It's about, the issue here is about...yeah, you can laugh but the issue is about that. It's not about efficiency, that's why the fight has been made, the fight that it is today. And if we're considering and we're thinking about the ratepayer out there, the person out there who's subsidizing, that's what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker, not about the power of CUPE, and the power of the Labour Council and the power that they're going to push in the next general election. That is what this is about, ladies and gentlemen, and you know, they are reacting because it's the truth. They're reacting because it's the truth. And yeah, it is unfortunately, that's...it should be about common sense, but it's not. Anyway, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I realize that to get two-thirds vote, we won't have it because the other guys said they've got their guaranteed six for sure, and the reality is that is a lost opportunity to the ratepayers of our city. You know, it's disappointing, but nevertheless we as I said, have only so many levers available to us with regards to reducing our cost in terms of our operation and I was one of the strongest advocates to start increasing taxes long before everybody else, when other members of this Council started the tax freeze, and we are literally still suffering and living under the 14

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
May 29, 2013

years of tax freezes and some year's cuts started under Glen Murray, and we're still struggling with that with regards to balancing our operating budget, Mr. Speaker. The challenge, Mr. Speaker, is that and you know, we have to start looking at efficiencies in terms of our operation on top of new revenues and unless we want to make and put sacred cows on to the table which nobody here, nobody here has any appetite to do, I would argue, especially, just in December, we voted on the contract for the fire fighters above the rate of inflation unanimously passed through this chamber. So those are the challenges we face and I look forward to the recorded vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Deputy Mayor Wyatt. Okay, Mayor and Councillors, the way we're going to do it, we're going to vote on Clauses 4, 5, 6 and 7 first. It's a recorded vote and then the Clauses 1, 2, 3, also recorded vote. So, on Clauses 4, 5, 6 and 7, all those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Fielding, Mayes, Sharma, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Orlikow, Smith, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker Pagtakhan.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 6.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: Okay, and so we just needed a simple majority for that so the clause passes. That's for the sale of John Blumberg. Now on the lease for Clauses 1, 2 and 3, all those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Fielding, Sharma, Swandel, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker Councillor Pagtakhan.

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Orlikow, Smith, Vandal.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 8.

Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker: So we needed a two-thirds for that, and the vote is lost.

Mr. Speaker: Councillor Mayes moves adjournment. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker Councillor Pagtakhan, His Worship Mayor Katz, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Fielding, Gerbasi, Havixbeck, Mayes, Orlikow, Sharma, Smith, Steen, Swandel, Vandal, Wyatt, Mr. Speaker Councillor Nordman.

Council adjourned at 4:20 p.m.