



Second Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

STANDING COMMITTEE

on

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

40 Elizabeth II

Chairman
Mrs. Louise Dacquay
Constituency of Seine River



VOL. XL No. 4 - 7 p.m., THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

LIB - Liberal; ND - New Democrat; PC - Progressive Conservative

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIB
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	ND
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	ND
CARR, James	Crescentwood	LIB
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIB
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	ND
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	LIB
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	ND
CONNERY, Edward	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	ND
DOER, Gary	Concordia	ND
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIB
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	ND
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	ND
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	ND
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIB
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	ND
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	ND
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	LIB
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	ND
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	ND
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	ND
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	ND
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	ND
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	ND
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	ND
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	ND
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	ND

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS
Thursday, July 18, 1991

TIME — 7 p.m.

* * *

LOCATION — Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRMAN — Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Seine River)

ATTENDANCE - 11 — QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Enns, Ernst, Hon. Mrs. Mitchelson

Mr. Carr, Mrs. Dacquay, Ms. Friesen, Messrs. Gaudry, Maloway, McAlpine, Rose, Mrs. Vodrey

WITNESSES:

Doug McGiffin, Winnipeg In the Nineties

Ken Guilford, Private Citizen

Roger Young, Pembina-Riverview Ward, City of Winnipeg

George Fraser, Private Citizen

Peter Diamont, University Ward, City of Winnipeg

Shirley Lord, Private Citizen

Glen Murray, River-Osborne Ward, City of Winnipeg

John Harrison, Private Citizen

David Brown, Private Citizen

Mike O'Shaughnessy, Private Citizen

Glen Hewitt, St. Boniface-St. Vital Residents Advisory Group

Jim Shapiro, St. Germain Residents Association

Kenneth Emberley, Private Citizen

Shirley Timm-Rudolph, Springfield Heights Ward, City of Winnipeg

Al Golden, Glenward Ward, City of Winnipeg

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill 68—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2)

Madam Chairman: Order, please. Would the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs please come to order. This committee is to hear the public representation on Bill 68, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2).

I will first read the list of all presenters. If there is anyone in the audience who wishes to make a presentation whose name I do not read, would you please indicate to the clerk your intention to make representation?

* (1905)

Number 1, Mr. Doug McGiffin, Winnipeg In the Nineties; 2, Mr. Ken Guilford, Private Citizen; 3, Councillor Roger Young, Pembina-Riverview Ward; 4, Councillor George Fraser, Private Citizen; 5, Councillor Terry Duguid, Miles MacDonnell Ward; 6, Councillor Peter Diamont, University Ward; 7, Ms. Shirley Lord, Private Citizen; 8, Councillor Glen Murray, River-Osborne Ward; 9, Mr. George Lapp, Private Citizen; 10, Mr. Jim Mandryk, Private Citizen; 11, Mr. Gary Coopland, Private Citizen; 12, Mr. Grant Nordman, Private Citizen; 13, Mr. John Harrison, Private Citizen; 14, Mr. David Brown, Private Citizen; 15, Mr. Mike O'Shaughnessy, Private Citizen; 16, Mr. Gordon Mackie, Private Citizen; 17, Mr. Bernie Wolfe, Private Citizen; 18, Mr. Glen Hewitt, St. Boniface-St. Vital Resident Advisory Group; 19, Dr. Jim Shapiro, St. Germain Residents Association; 20, Mr. Kenneth Emberley, Private Citizen; 21, Mr. Frank Goldspink, Manitoba Communist Party; 22, Ms. Jean Miller-Usiskin, Private Citizen; and 23, Councillor Greg Selinger, Tache Ward.

Number 1, Mr. Doug McGiffin, Winnipeg In the Nineties. Welcome, Mr. McGiffin, if you would just wait 30 seconds while the clerk distributes the copies of your presentation to the members of the committee, please? I am sorry, it has just been handed in, and the clerk is in the process of making copies, so with the will of the committee we will proceed. Is that the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Madam Chairman: Okay. Please proceed, Mr. McGiffin.

Mr. Doug McGiffin (Winnipeg In the Nineties): Madam Chairman, does the committee have copies of the brief now?

Madam Chairman: No, but we will momentarily. It is being photocopied at this point in time, but you may proceed.

Mr. McGiffin: What I wanted to do, Madam Chairman, this evening is go through the brief that I am presenting to you and entertain questions afterwards, if you have any questions on the brief.

Winnipeg In the Nineties or WIN, if you are not familiar with, is a grassroots, nonpartisan, volunteer organization working for a better Winnipeg. WIN promotes open civic government which facilitates citizens' access to information and to the decision makers and encourages their participation in the political life of the city.

WIN believes that Winnipeg's ward structure and number should be a concrete working expression of that viewpoint. WIN does not support Bill 68 which proposes to reduce Winnipeg City Council from 29 seats to 15 seats. WIN does not know the right number of council seats, nor do we have the research resources to establish it. We maintain, however, that the number of council seats should be such that it would ensure adequate citizen access to councillors, recognize the importance of our neighbourhoods and communities, promote local control in neighbourhood issues and planning, and encourage political and cultural diversity on council itself.

In the meantime, our membership supports the retention of 29 council seats. WIN believes that the provincial government's council related amendments, The City of Winnipeg Act, will work against our citizens' best interests.

WIN has challenged the provincial government to disclose the criteria by which it determined that a 12- to 15-seat council is appropriate. Winnipeggers have yet to be informed of their substantive reasoning on this count. Certainly, failure to disclose suggests that the reasons for reducing the size of council are different than those stated.

We would also be interested in seeing better support for the Winnipeg Wards Review Committee's opinion that a 15-member City Council is ideal. Frankly, the report of the Winnipeg Wards

Review Committee is not compelling in its argument.

WIN must express its grave concern for the process which the provincial government initiated to change Winnipeg's electoral boundaries. Combining the public policy consultation and the wards boundary revision, two very distinct activities in the mandate of the partisan Winnipeg Wards Review Committee was improper. Although the minister was forced by public opinion to reassign boundary redistribution to the Wards Review Commission, we believe that the minister's initial error and his blatantly political approach to the council reduction has permanently tainted the outcome of the entire council reduction process.

The provincial government's entire approach to council reduction has been backwards. They have been negligent by failing to determine the public's expectations of councillors and the duties they are expected to perform. Cutting council to 15 seats and then leaving councillors to fudge the real world roles and responsibilities after the fact is irresponsible.

*(1910)

WIN also believes that the provincial government has been negligent in its failure to involve Winnipeg City Council in the ward reduction consultation. Recent political experience has taught us that a senior government should not impose structural or institutional changes on a lower government without the latter's involvement. City Council should have been invited to participate in the consultation from the very first day.

Indeed, what is the problem? The Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) has vaguely talked about the need for efficiency and his concern about too much discussion at City Hall, but his prejudices are hardly grounds for unilaterally and arbitrarily cutting City Council seats. For WIN, the first problem is the failure of the provincial government to state clearly and decisively why it wants to reduce the size of council at all. Secondly, the provincial government should have informed Winnipeggers of the principles and criteria guiding the reduction and redistribution of council seats. Does the minister even have guidelines? Apparently not.

What efficiency? This point has been well discussed by other interveners. On the main discussion, WIN repeats the same question—how? Where are the inefficiencies? Where is the

research? How is efficiency defined? What are the standards by which efficiency is being ascertained? Winnipegers already know the answers. The provincial government simply has not done its homework and cannot answer these questions in economic terms even though that is the main ground for justification.

WIN believes that the minister is talking about political efficiency which is completely different. Log rolling, back scratching and back-room dealing have been normal practices at City Hall for years. WIN and several independent councillors take exception to this way of conducting civic politics. The current close balance between the Gang and the WIN-Independent councillors no longer guarantees that deals hammered out in closed caucus will pass without significant opposition. Hence, from a purely political point of view, the inefficiencies at City Hall result from changing political ethics and the failure of the Gang to successfully co-opt a majority of council.

Of course, the answer to this inefficiency is clear. If the Gang is to regain its control of council, two things must occur. First, the electoral consequences of council reduction will increase the likelihood that the Gang councillors will be elected in the first place. Second, fewer players at City Hall will concentrate political power in fewer hands, making the job of rewarding some councillors and punishing others much easier. Since both the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) are former Gang or ICEC members themselves, it is not hard to determine where the provincial government's loyalties lie.

Under Questions of Democracy—Accessibility: Accountability is a cornerstone of democratic political practice, but it cannot exist apart from accessibility. Citizens must be able to have regular and worthwhile contact with their councillor if they so choose. Based on comments from the WIN councillors, several of whom already work full time, we can confidently state that they are already stretched to the limit servicing their constituents. They simply cannot handle larger wards. Made no mistake about it, doubling the number of constituents per councillor would simply reduce citizens' access to their representative and achieve nothing else.

Responsiveness: Other commentators have noted in some detail already that full-time councillors will be needed if the number of seats is reduced to

15. They have also noted that research and clerical help will be required for each councillor, thereby wiping out any economic efficiencies imagined by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst). Therefore, we will not pursue that topic at any length except to indicate our general agreement. However, WIN believes that there is an additional dimension to councillors' work that deserves attention.

Councillors fulfill important community relations and ombudsman-like functions as part of their jobs. They put a human face on the arcane and remote business of politics. In this regard, they resemble provincial backbenchers. The provision of researchers and secretaries cannot replace those councillors who not only debate on the council floor, but give guidance and assurances to constituents, explain how and why City Hall works as it does, cut through the civic bureaucracy and expedite service delivery. Chopping council in half will put councillors on a footing comparable to that of MPs whose visibility is much less and certainly more distant.

* (1915)

Natural Communities: WIN supports measures which encourage community consciousness, including the promotion of neighbourhood identification and citizen empowerment through participation in planning and development. Ward size, number and shape can complement these goals. As a result, WIN largely agrees with the City of Winnipeg Act Review Committee's opinion that wards should be established on the basis of probable mutuality of interest and likelihood of intraward co-operation. WIN adds, however, that traditional identifications, alliances and similarities between neighbourhoods should figure in the ward definition process.

For Electoral Implications: The proposed reorganization of the City of Winnipeg's electoral boundaries will radically alter civic campaign practices and methods for the worse, we believe. WIN's electoral approach to the proposed boundary redistribution is simple. Ward sizes should be small enough to permit local, worthy candidates with modest financial and organizational resources a fair chance of winning elections. When WIN states that City Hall should be accessible, this not only means direct councillor accessibility, it also means that City Hall should be open to the citizens who want to be councillors. New wards of 40,000 to 50,000 people each, compared to today's roughly 21,000 per ward,

or from 18,000 to 21,000, will clearly deter many potential candidates from entering civic politics simply because it will be too rich for them and will prevent others from mounting credible campaigns if they nevertheless decide to run.

Political Party Involvement: Let us state the obvious first: 15 "superwards" will be bigger political prizes than today's 29 smaller ones. Councillors will have proportionately greater power at City Hall than now, a feature that is sure to be irresistible to some office seekers. Council seats will become more valued as springboards to the provincial Legislature or to Parliament itself, attracting people more interested in establishing their political careers than serving the citizens of Winnipeg.

Council candidates will require far richer, better organized campaigns than now to achieve electoral success. Superward campaigns will easily exceed the scope of provincial constituency races in terms of spending, workers and activities, rivalling federal election campaigns. Members of three major political parties already participate in civic campaigns, although without the sanction of their provincial party executives. However, the resources required to elect councillors in the superwards will require considerably more involvement of the parties. Only they possess the needed organizational skills, the human resources and the campaign expertise.

The relative mobility and profile of candidates will be inevitably reduced in the larger wards. Doubling the number of households will certainly diminish the chances that voters will ever meet and talk with their candidates. As a result, ward residents will have little or no direct knowledge about their alternatives when making their choice on election day. Therefore, WIN expects that strong, central and likely partisan campaigns will be developed by the parties to compensate, introducing an entirely new dimension to Winnipeg's elections. Federal and provincial campaign features and practices, not commonly found in civic campaigns now would surely be imported. Among those features could be professional opinion polling and shaping, slick advertising, image engineering and the evolution of official civic leaders.

The parties will not, cannot, pass up the opportunity to develop a cadre of future MLAs and M.P.s at City Council. To do otherwise would amount to political negligence, risking the wrath of membership and supporters. Nor can any political

party allow the others to gain the upper hand on council without a challenge. The parties will be compelled to enter civic politics on a larger scale because they cannot trust the others to stay out.

* (1920)

Not surprisingly, the involvement of the three major political parties may well squeeze independent citizens' coalitions such as WIN out of civic electoral politics. Some have argued that this is precisely the point of the province's initiative. WIN has frustrated the Filmon government's ambition of a compliant City Council, and it intends to remedy that problem.

A Different Candidate: The superwards will be real political plums, and much will be at stake for any group or party fielding candidates. Campaign budgets and organizations will need to be doubled and risks reduced correspondingly. Therefore, the outright electability of candidates will be a much bigger consideration in the selection processes. Nominees may well be chosen on the basis of their political connections, name recognition, media skills and financial support, while such factors as experience in civic affairs, knowledge of the city's problems, practical political skills and commitment to Winnipeggers would be downgraded. Furthermore, in the past, candidates have been picked to suit the needs of the political party's leadership, not the constituents.

The local grassroots councillor could well become a relic of the past. Even under the present 29-seat arrangement, many candidates cannot make electoral headway because the campaign costs and organizational demands are beyond their reach. Winnipeg will lose a valuable political dynamic with their elimination.

One other thing that WIN has been wondering is why just in the last sitting of the Legislature, they changed the members of the Legislature for the City of Winnipeg to 31. The Legislature wants to be represented by 31, yet wants to reduce the City Council representation to 15.

Spending and Financing: A credible civic campaign now costs about \$8,000 and needs at least 100 or 150 committed workers. These figures will rise proportionately with the number of voters in the new larger wards. Since many campaign supplies have a fixed, or nearly so, per-unit cost, few economies of scale are likely to be achieved when the wards are enlarged. Savings which can be

made, such as office rental, insurance and incidental supplies, are minor compared with the high-cost items such as pamphlets, signs and telephones. As a result, the expected \$15,000 or \$20,000-per-ward cost of a civic campaign will clearly mean only candidates backed by wealthy patrons will have a hope for success. When elected, councillors would have to seriously consider their chances of re-election if they subsequently failed to please their sponsors. Withdrawal of financial support would be disastrous.

In conclusion, the reduction of City Council to 15 seats and the abolition of community committees and the resident advisory groups also would simply concentrate power in fewer hands and distance citizens from decision making. WIN believes that the average Winnipegger has too little influence at City Hall already. The size of council should be based on the needs of the city and its residents and not on an arbitrary figure that has been set by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst).

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. McGiffin. I believe there will probably be questions from the committee. Are you prepared to entertain questions?

Mr. McGiffin: Yes, I am prepared to entertain any of them.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. McGiffin, your last statement, the conclusion, says, the abolition of community committees, and then you added the abolition of resident advisory groups. Where in the bill do you see that community committees and resident advisory groups are to be abolished?

Madam Chairman: Excuse me, but I am just going to ask the co-operation of all members of the audience. If you would come through the Chair so I can recognize you for the purposes of simultaneous translation, our Hansard facility. Thank you. Please proceed.

Mr. McGiffin: To the honourable minister through the Chair, I unfortunately do not have a copy of the bill. I asked for a copy of the bill this evening, and I could not be provided with one by the Clerk as she told me that the committee does not even have enough—she did not have enough copies for the committee.

What we have based our comments on Bill 68 from are the report of the Citizens' Commission on Municipal Representation and also the report of the

Winnipeg Wards Review Committee. The Citizens' Commission on Municipal Representation is the one that has put forth the abolition of resident advisory groups.

Mr. Ernst: Mr. McGiffin, we are dealing with a bill tabled in the Manitoba Legislature on about the 17th or 18th of June. Presumably if you are making representations here, you would want to have read the bill at some point before preparing your presentation. Let me not get into an argument with you, but suggest to you this, there is no section of this bill dealing with the abolition of community committees, and there is no section of this bill dealing with the abolition of resident advisory groups.

* (1925)

Mr. McGiffin: Thank you for pointing that out to me, Mr. Minister, but I will also likely be making presentations to the second part of this bill. There is a second phase I understand to Bill 68 going through, a second phase on the size of community committees and the wards boundaries. That was the original plan for the hearings, was it not?

Mr. Ernst: Mr. McGiffin, the Winnipeg Ward Boundaries Commission, which is a statutory body and to which you referred in the early part of your brief, will be conducting the exercise of drawing boundaries of community committees and drawing boundaries of wards. They will conduct public hearings, but that has nothing to do with our actions here this evening, this bill or any second phase of this bill. That is a separate process.

Mr. McGiffin: The bill presently, Mr. Minister, is open to amendment, is it not, at this table?

Mr. Ernst: The committee is dealing with the bill. We are hearing public representations. There may or may not be amendments put forward with respect to this bill, and the committee will consider them at the appropriate time.

Mr. McGiffin: If the amendments are brought forward to dissolve resident advisory groups, WIN's position on resident advisory groups is that they are a valuable part to this city.

Mr. Ernst: I may also suggest to you, Mr. McGiffin, in terms of the process, in case you are not aware, that when a government introduces a bill, it states its intentions by tabling the bill. Now, as a result of public hearings, as a result of technical or other kinds of amendments, it may bring in amendments to change the bill. By and large, a matter of principle

such as the abolition of community committees, if it was intended by the government to do it, it would have put that in the bill in the first place.

Mr. McGiffin: That is fine, no response.

Madam Chairman: Are there further questions from the committee? If not, I would like to thank you for your presentation.

Mr. McGiffin: Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Number 2, Mr. Ken Guilford. I believe all members of the committee have received a copy of Mr. Guilford's presentation. Please proceed, Mr. Guilford.

Mr. Ken Gullford (Private Citizen): Madam Chairperson, members of the Legislative Assembly dealing with Bill 68, ladies and gentlemen of the audience, my name is Ken Guilford. I would like to say that I am speaking to you not only as a private citizen, but also as a concerned person. I am a working person who will be affected by these government actions.

It angers me first of all to see such a bill to reduce the number of city councillors. I do not know where these city councillors find the time to do their own jobs plus be a city councillor. One city councillor spoke last night on Bill 35 and said that he did not find it very taxing. I have spoken to a lot of city councillors who say just the opposite. Who is doing the job properly?

* (1930)

If the size of City Council is reduced to 15, it will take only eight people to run the city. I disagree totally with this arrangement. I feel it should be kept at 29 where it takes 15 people to pass motions.

I realize why the government is so anxious to pass this bill. Remember the good old days, Mr. Ernst? You were there and others beside you. Mr. Laurendeau was here this afternoon. I was hoping to be able to ask him about it, but he has gone. He has disappeared. He has gone this evening. Good night.

In the good old days, the city councillors used to meet behind closed doors and make special deals. They then came to City Council and helped each other. The budget in 1989 was a good example when all of the photocopiers broke down and no one could obtain a copy of the budget. Too bad. That was sure too bad.

A few concerned people got together and formed an organization called Winnipeg Into the Nineties.

Eight city councillors who had received endorsement from WIN and the Winnipeg Labour Council were fortunate in becoming elected. In 1990, we changed our name to Winnipeg In the Nineties. I would like you to be sure that when I speak, I speak as a private citizen.

Last fall, after Mr. Laurendeau became elected as an MLA and they had a byelection in the University Ward, Peter Diamont, who received the endorsement from WIN, was elected. On May 14, this year, Sandy Hyman, also a member of WIN, was elected. This is great. Gradually, the working people like myself are having a say at City Hall. I realize you must help your friends, but to reduce the size of City Council is sure putting the risk of having people being elected who are not on the working people's side. It will take a lot of money, or a person will need to have a lot of friends in order to be elected. I do not have much money. I do not know about friends. In fact, at the present time, I am laid off Versatile until December 2. I should be out there pounding the pavement looking for a job right now. I am so mad at this Bill 68 that I had to come and speak as a concerned person.

I am also against the name of Tyndall Park as reported on the report of the Citizens' Commission on Municipal Representation dated June 28, 1991. I like the name Sisler. In Sisler Ward as it now exists, we have two community clubs, Tyndall Park and Northwood who are working together fairly well assisting each other due to the lack of citizen participation. I come from Garden Grove and have known this ward as Sisler for a long time. I like it as do other people. We have a Sisler-Rosser Community Association. I am sure I can speak on behalf of a lot of people when I say keep the name Sisler and keep everything else the same.

I want good accountability with a spending cap during elections with reported donations. I want an all-around good citizen participation. I want to make the city councillors full-time jobs so it will not interfere with other jobs that they have and so that the citizens in Winnipeg may receive good representation. I want the amount of pension reduced and also this money only obtainable at age 65. This to me is a pension. I believe at the present time, if a person is elected for two terms, he receives a continuation of his salary. This is crazy. If you are good enough to run and become elected, you deserve your money. If not, forget it. This should also apply at other levels of government as well.

I detest Bill 70. My remarks on that are found in Hansard last Wednesday. Imagine a wage freeze while the price of everything else goes up. I did not notice a wage freeze to the Conservatives' friends. If they can suspend other people with pay like they have in the latest scandal, why can they not suspend a few of these Conservative MLAs who are right in there along beside them.

I would also like to include with my report a copy of articles in today's paper regarding councillors vote against cutting wards as well as the PC scandal. With your permission, I would like to read it so other people can see what happened today. We have a lot of busy people. May I read it?

Madam Chairman: Is it the will of the committee to permit Mr. Guilford to read the article? What is the will of the committee?

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): I think if that is part of his presentation, then he should read it.

Madam Chairman: Agreed?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Madam Chairman: Agreed, Mr. Guilford. Please proceed.

Mr. Guilford: This article in today's paper deals with the meeting they had yesterday, a special meeting in order to deal with Bill 68. "Councillors vote against cutting wards" is the headline; "All 29 council seats essential, members decide to tell province."

"A slim majority of Winnipeg's city councillors voted yesterday to ask the provincial government not to change the size of the 29-member council.

"After almost three hours of debate, councillors voted 10-6 against a motion to recommend reducing council to 23 members.

"I thought it was a complete waste of time," Coun. Gloria Mendelson (Kildonan Park) said as she emerged from the meeting.

"Had I known what the result would be, I would have left the meeting earlier because it's a lot of hot air for nothing," Mendelson said, adding she supports trimming council to 23, as a civic commission recommended last week.

"The provincial government will just say we have a vested interest in the status quo.

"A plague on both their houses—the province with its 15-seat recommendation and us with our 29-seat recommendation."

"Last week, the city's Citizens' Commission on Municipal Representation unveiled its recommendations, which included reducing council to 23, eliminating resident advisory groups and redrawing ward boundaries.

"The three-member volunteer commission, headed by former Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce president Herb Middlestead, was created by city council to counter the recommendations of the province's ward boundaries review committee.

"Last month, Urban Affairs Minister Jim Ernst unveiled plans to cut city council from 29 to 15, keep community committees and increase the mayor's powers.

"Ernst said the Winnipeg Ward Boundaries Commission will release a final map of the new riding outlines and names by November.

"Coun. Terry Duguid (Miles Macdonell), who voted for the reduction, said he also cannot understand why so many councillors voted in favor of keeping the status quo.

"Everyone said the (civic commission) report was reasonable and done by an independent committee, and then we essentially ripped the guts out of the essential parts of the report," Duguid said.

"The three-hour meeting teetered close to losing its quorum several times, especially when Councillor Doreen Demare (Riel House) and Councillor Mike O'Shaughnessy (Jefferson) walked out—"I am glad we elected him—"leaving the bare minimum of 16 councillors needed for a quorum.

"Both councillors said staying was a waste of their time, as they knew they would be outvoted by those in attendance, the majority of whom were members of Winnipeg In the Nineties.

"Do a poll, listen to people. The people want city council reduced," O'Shaughnessy said.

"This is just an attempt to embarrass our provincial government, but in the end we will embarrass ourselves," Demare said.

Several councillors criticized Mayor Bill Norrie for not appearing at the special council meeting. He was chairing a meeting of civic executive policy committee.

"But Norrie said he knew the council meeting was totally a waste of time. The course is already set. The government has made its decision."

* (1940)

Thank you. What I would like to say is, what are we doing here tonight if all this is a waste of time. If I may go on now. There is another article here. I am not going to read it, but what it is in regard to is this, "Doer fears public will never know if PC aide tied to scandal."

Another article in the Winnipeg Sun, which is my favourite paper, because it concerns with local issues, shows a picture of our Premier (Mr. Filmon) smiling and nestled in between two articles, the first one heading: Family tragedy, son kills self, then parents follow; and the other article: Scandal, two more officials named. I am not going to read that; I think it is a you know what. I could use a lot of words but I will not. I will spare you them.

Got to get back. I firmly believe we should have an act in place that we may recall people in municipal, provincial and federal positions. If I am working at my job and not performing, I will get fired. What is the difference between you and me? What makes you so special?

We, the people, want an honest government and one who believes in working people, not one who gives large salary increases in salary to the upper class while choosing to ignore the middle and lower classes.

I have an article here—I read the paper at odd times when I have time. If I may read it? The headline reads, Wage Freeze, Judges Face Meltdown, Pensions for Provincial Judges Should be More Than Doubled.

A report released yesterday recommends: The judicial compensation committee recommends a judge retiring at 65, after 20 years of service, get an annual pension of \$56,400 compared with the current \$28,181. The committee also recommended immediate salary increases to \$95,570 from the current \$88,607. This 7.8 percent increase would be retroactive to January 1 and would include retroactive pay hikes to 1990 when there was no increase. The committee rejected proposals from the provincial judges association last January that their salaries be increased immediately by more than \$50,000 a year to match the federal judges, but the committee's proposals which must be voted on by a Legislature committee were promptly rejected by all three parties.

This is totally unjustifiable at this time, said an indignant Dave Chomiak, NDP Justice critic. I have far more constituents unemployed and in more

serious trouble than judges. I do not see how we can increase pensions for people who build up their pensions as lawyers before they are appointed.

Liberal Justice critic, Paul Edwards, also called the proposed increases tough to justify however warranted they may be in comparison to other jurisdictions. The Liberal support the Tory proposals for a wage freeze for public servants so cannot support any increase in salaries or pensions for judges, he said, but politicians should not be making those decisions through a Legislature committee jeopardizing the independence of judges, Edward said, suggesting that judges instead should get binding arbitration.

Justice minister Jim McCrae said the issues relating to judicial compensation need to be addressed. Whatever is finally decided on should respect the spirit of Bill 70, the Provincial Wage Freeze bill McCrae said. The committee defended the proposed increases as essential to keeping Manitoba provincial judges in line with their counterparts in other provinces. The pay increases would not bring them up to the same level as Alberta, \$114,000, or federally appointed judges who get \$148,000, the report said. Instead, the committee reached its \$95,000 proposal based on an average of three provinces—Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

I hope you are listening, Mr. Ernst. The pension proposal is also based—

Madam Chairman: Excuse me, Mr. Guilford, on a point of order. The honourable minister on a point of order.

Point of Order

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Guilford, the committee has been patient in listening to your presentation, and we want to hear the rest of your presentation but the part dealing with Bill 68. I understand you have a lot of frustrations and a lot of things you want to get off your chest, and that is fine; but there are a number of other people waiting to also make presentations on Bill 68, and I think it is reasonable and fair that we should give them an opportunity as well.

Mr. Guilford: All right, I only have two paragraphs here, and then I will continue with my own presentation if that is okay.

Madam Chairman: Excuse me. I am making a ruling on the minister's point of order. It indeed is a point of order, Mr. Guilford. We do have rules that

we are governed by in the Legislature, and relevance in debate is definitely supposed to be a rule that we adhere to. We do allow a lot of latitude to the public, but to be fair to all people present in the room this evening, I think I should request that you try to keep your remarks as relevant as possible to the bill, to Bill 68, which basically the intent is the reduction on the size of the council. Thank you. Please proceed.

* * *

Mr. Gullford: As I said before, I only have two paragraphs left and then I will continue. I apologize, in the heat of the moment, I just did not realize what I was doing.

The pension proposal is also based on an average of those provinces. The current formula for calculating judges' pensions gives the worst of both worlds, the committee argued. First, they are the lowest paid judges in the country, giving them a low base on which to calculate the pensions; second, the formula used to calculate the pensions is based on civil service pensions. It ignores that fact that civil servants often spend a lifetime in government service while judges are generally not appointed until about age 43, the report said.

I firmly believe we should have an act in place, that we may recall people in municipal, provincial and federal positions. If I am working at my job and not performing, I will get fired. What is the difference between you and me? What makes you so special?

We, the people, want an honest government and one who believes in working people, not one who gives large increases in salary to the upper class while choosing to ignore the middle and lower classes.

I am totally against The Pines project, giving it a \$350,000 loan—not a loan, a grant of \$350,000—plus a \$4.4 million loan, low-interest fee, for a home for senior citizens whose rents will be approximately \$750 a month. I wish I could afford to live there. I am working at Versatile, where the average wage is approximately \$16 per hour, and none of us can afford to rent at such high costs.

Another project I am dead against is moving the Weston city yards, at a cost of \$39 million, to a site two blocks further west. This movement is in order to make room for a virology lab. I want a lab, but not at such an expense. I understand the site to which the city yards are being moved to has just had a

major reconstruction at a cost of \$5 million, approximately. What a total waste of money.

I also understand that there is a water aqueduct under the site where the lab will go. What is going to happen to the water? Will it be contaminated or has anyone taken this into account? What happened to the environment study?

Another project I dislike is the delay of the St. James-Charleswood bridge. Let us get on with it. What is the hold up? I also would like to keep the Winnipeg Jets. I do not feel we need to spend an enormous lot of money on a new arena, especially in times of the restraint we have today.

I spoke on Bill 70 and listened to many speakers on the wage freeze. The Conservative government wants to have no collective bargaining. This is ridiculous. I have to bargain with many people every day. This bill is total dictatorship. We have lost a lot of ground and money in the last few years, discussing different topics. I will say that I would hope that there is more openness within the legislation and good accountability.

On May 30, I attended a town hall meeting where Jim Ernst, Jean Friesen and Jim Carr were speakers with Bill Neville, the moderator. I am a community producer with Videon Channel 11. I held a town hall meeting at Sisler High School June 26, 1991. I invited the same panelists to come and speak on the topic, "The City and the Province—Who Runs the Shop?"

Jim Ernst would not make a commitment until the last minute, and then the answer was no. I was very disappointed. I could not advertise this town hall meeting to the public. Thanks a lot. Because he did not come, Jim Carr would not come and Bill Neville would not come.

* (1950)

We continued with the meeting, and I would publicly like to thank Jean Friesen, NDP MLA, critic for Urban Affairs, and my MLA, Kevin Lamoureux from Inkster who, incidentally, while I was speaking on Bill 70, said that the Liberals are against the wage freeze. They want to open it up; they want to be able to have collective bargaining.

The West Kildonan-Lord Selkirk resident advisors sponsored a meeting and Mrs. Jean Miller-Usiskin, acting chairperson for West Kildonan-Lord Selkirk resident advisors, spoke and told the public who we are and what we do. Paul Neilson was the moderator. I would like to also thank these people.

Prior to the meeting, Jean Friesen and Ajay Deol went to the studio and discussed how the multicultural people could become more active in the political scene. Everyone did a great job. I am really looking forward to seeing this town hall meeting on Videon, Channel 11, Saturday, July 27, 10:30 in the morning.

I am a resident advisor in the Sisler Ward, and I believe we in West Kildonan-Lord Selkirk have the best community councils in Winnipeg. I attended a miniconference in June of all the resident advisors in the city. We have the right to discuss with the city councillors and raise problems in our ward, as well as other concerns we have in our District No. 3. We also have the right to receive agendas prior to the meeting. We can discuss with the public their different proposals and assist them in presenting them. We may ask questions of the presenters, speak of the subject, et cetera. This is great.

I would really hope that not only can we continue in our district, but that other districts may do the same. They are very anxious to do this. We need assistance from the provincial government. We do not want this offloading of the different monies from the federal and provincial governments. We are very mad about this.

I am also a little upset on this report of the Citizens' Commission on Municipal Representation dated June 28, 1991, where one of the recommendations is to delete resident advisors. I would hope the provincial government would continue with these community councils because I feel that this is one of the best ways to become educated on the different things that are happening in our city, not only in our city, but also in the province and federally.

I have just returned to Winnipeg after visiting my mother, family and friends in Clearwater and Crystal City. I discussed the difference between the councillors in the country and my job as a resident advisor in Sisler. We realize that our roles are very similar, and our problems are very similar.

The provincial government must be more accountable. They must do a lot more to assist the working people. More and more, as time goes on, I see more and more erosion. I am sure my views are very much the same as other people. I talk to a lot of people. I am laid off Versatile now so I have a lot of time to do things that I want to do. I look forward to talking with you more. I hope that we will

receive a review of the different proceedings and your final report.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to me. I hope that you will take some of my concerns to heart. Remember an election is not that far away. You will be held accountable, I am sure.

We have lost a lot of ground and money in the last few years discussing different topics. I would hope that there is more openness within the Legislature and good accountability. I do not want to be held accountable for taking up too much time. I apologize for getting carried away in the heat of the moment. It just happened. I will close now and invite any questions. Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Guilford. Seeing no questions, no hands, I would like to thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Guilford: Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Councillor Roger Young. Please proceed, Councillor Young.

Mr. Roger Young (Councillor, Pembina-Riverview Ward, City of Winnipeg): Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Good evening to you and committee members and thank you for the opportunity of making a presentation to your committee this evening.

I am Roger Young. I am what I define as a truly independent city councillor, not a member of any political organization or party. I was elected on that platform, and I have maintained my independent status at City Hall. It is my own opinions, not the opinions of any political party or group, that I am presenting to you tonight, my opinions as the city councillor for Pembina-Riverview Ward.

I just wanted to comment, Madam Chairperson, that I apologize for not having a written submission prepared for you. I only received less than a day's notice to be here this evening, and it is quite difficult to prepare material in that short a time. I notified the Clerk some months ago, one month ago, that I wanted to make a presentation, but I was told at that time it would not likely be until August some time that you would be sitting to hear presentations, so I apologize to you for not having a written submission. It is entirely verbal.

Reference has been made to a special City Council meeting that was held yesterday, and I would just like to refer to that for a moment because I was at that special council meeting, and I wanted

to point out a couple of aspects of that meeting to you, if I may.

I think it is significant to notice that the councillors who attended that special meeting consisted primarily of the most recently elected councillors at City Hall, and by that, I mean there were 13 newly elected councillors in the last civic election. Eleven of those 13 councillors were at that special meeting yesterday to discuss the Middlestead report and the question of the proposed reduction in the size of City Council.

I think that is significant to note because those councillors, and I am among those 11 councillors who were newly elected, represent, I believe, the most current public support that is present at City Hall. Many of us were elected for the first time, and we were elected, I think, because a number of people wanted to see some change take place at City Hall from what has occurred up until 1989.

I think it is also significant to note that two of the other councillors who were there forming the quorum at City Hall yesterday are the longest-sitting members at City Hall, and I very much respect their opinion. I do not always agree with their opinion. I very much respect their opinion, though, because they are the most experienced councillors. They have sat through several reductions in the size of City Council, from the 120-odd members that composed the 13 municipalities under Metro Winnipeg to the 50 councillors that formed the original City Council under Unicity, to 29, and their views on further reductions I think were most important and most enlightening.

The decision that came out of our meeting yesterday was to not make any change to the present size of City Council. I do not agree entirely with that, and I am going to qualify that statement with my comments as I go on, but I would like to give you some reasons why. The reasons that I am referring to are reasons which I included in my presentation to the Eldon Ross Commission hearings, and most of those reasons were included in the discussion that we had yesterday.

A reduction in the size of council will mean an increase in the size of wards. If our council were only 12 to 15 members, or in this case 15 members, each councillor would represent a ward twice the present size, with a 40,000 to 50,000 population to represent, instead of 20,000. This would inevitably mean a significant reduction in accessibility to his or

her councillor for each individual member of the public. It would bring about a reduction in access to our City Council when the public has been demanding more access to their public institutions.

The effect of larger wards upon civic elections would be to reduce participation. A smaller council would mean the cost of funding civic election campaigns would increase so dramatically that most independent candidates would be unable to afford it. Only wealthy candidates or those with the support of wealthy developers or those supported by political parties could afford to run, and clearly Winnipeggers have consistently, overwhelmingly rejected political parties and rejected any candidate backed by a vested interest group to represent them at City Hall.

* (2000)

In essence, a smaller council would all but eliminate the presence of independent councillors such as myself and create a partisan and highly vulnerable City Council. A City Council of 12 members would be less able to take charge of the business at City Hall. There would be too few members, hence less capacity to develop adequate policy initiatives, man committees and control the bureaucracy.

A smaller council would be more disadvantaged when dealing with the ever-broadening scope and complexity of agenda items, therefore would be far less effective in directing essential policy matters at City Hall. A smaller council would regrettably reach decisions by consensus in all likelihood, rather than debate, and if the range of representation is narrowed, the quality of debate will also be narrowed, and if the quality of debate is sacrificed, so will the quality and wisdom of council's decisions. When the quality of council's decisions are compromised, that equates to a reduction in efficiency, not an increase; just as two heads are better than one, not because it decreases the amount of debate, but because it does lead to better quality and more efficient decisions through providing a wider perspective.

The simplistic statistical comparisons that have been offered in defence of a smaller council I think are entirely false, and taking the information that was sent out in advance of the Ross Commission hearings, I analyzed that information and put together this analysis. Montreal City Council has a council of 57 members. Toronto has several

councils in its entire urban area plus Metro Council, a second level of civic government that totals 83 members. Vancouver is only one of several city councils in that urban area as well, and one can go on.

The upshot of all the statistical comparisons are that average population ratios per council in urban Canada confirm that 20,000 residents per councillor, just what Winnipeg now has, not 40,000 or 50,000, is the norm. To imply that a smaller council will have fewer problems is not accurate because even cities that do have smaller councils still have big problems. The two just are not connected in any logical way.

In our current economic recession when all governments ought to be seeking ways to cut costs, our provincial government seems to have found a way to increase costs by planning to reduce City Council, and you do not have to be a rocket scientist to figure that out. It is really quite simple. Half the number of councillors, each with a ward twice the size, will require twice the current pay, because for \$24,000 a year no one is going to undertake the demands of being a city councillor on a full-time basis. It is unrealistic entirely. Fifteen councillors times twice the salary will cost the same as 29 councillors at the present level, and if you add to that the additional cost of support staff and assistants to handle the larger wards with more residents and increased workloads, not only have you not cut costs, but the total cost increase will be substantially more as a result.

If you add all of this up, you have less accessibility, less participation, less effectiveness, less quality in the debate and decision-making processes, and all at more cost. That is not a definition of efficiency in my understanding, in my logic.

I think if the provincial government is really sincere about correcting inefficiencies in our political institutions, one cannot fail to recognize that 29 councillors representing two-thirds of Manitoba's population in Winnipeg, how can that be too many when there are 1,202 elected municipal officials in Manitoba representing the remaining one-third of Manitobans that live outside Winnipeg?

Why on earth do we need 57 school divisions in this province, with over 500 elected school trustees? We have 13 school divisions in Winnipeg alone, with a proliferation of 78 school trustees.

Why do we need 31 MLAs to represent Winnipeggers in our Legislature, and yet 29 councillors is too many for the people of Winnipeg? It does not make sense. Given all these good reasons why it is not good to cut our council, why on earth would the provincial government want to cut it in the first place? Let us not forget about the fact that school taxes have been allowed to skyrocket, and yet the City of Winnipeg and other municipalities have been saddled with the responsibility of collecting those taxes and take all the heat from the public for it as well.

Let us not forget the fact that the province introduced a property tax reassessment bill that in Winnipeg caused many city property taxpayers to experience huge increases in their property taxes, and the city received the blame for that, too. Let us not forget about the fact that the province has not indexed or increased property tax rebates since they were introduced which has caused an ever-increasing climb in the remaining portion of property taxes to be paid by property taxpayers. Let us not forget about the fact that the province has continually cut back in increases in grants to the city, leaving an ever-increasing portion of the city's budget to be absorbed by the city property taxpayer.

I would just like to draw your attention to some differences that I noticed between the Ross Commission report and the Middlestead commission report because I think they are worth noting. The Ross Commission really undertook a deductive reasoning process in arriving at their recommendations. They started with the premise that council should be reduced to 15. In stark contrast to that, the Middlestead commission employed an inductive reasoning process.

They started by looking at the fabric of Winnipeg's composition, Winnipeg's neighbourhoods, the diversity, the communities that Winnipeg is composed of, and out of that developed some recommendations that were consistent with their findings, rather than starting with a preconceived conclusion. That is a major difference. The recommendation that the Middlestead commission came up with was for 23 councillors at City Hall, rather than 15.

I think there are a number of false premises that underlie the preconceived conclusion that council should be reduced to 15. There are two that I would like to point out to you.

Firstly, the size of City Council is somehow—and this is a preconceived false premise—a determining factor regarding efficiency at City Hall. It has never really been clearly explained to the public or anyone else how a smaller council of 15 councillors will be more efficient than a council of 29. The reason is because the size of council has absolutely nothing to do with the actual inefficiencies that exist at City Hall. The actual inefficiencies that exist are a function of management structure and the geographic matrix that creates redundancies through duplication and hierarchy in the management structure. That is where the fundamental problem lies insofar as the inefficiencies that exist at City Hall—not the size of council.

A second false premise that I would like to draw to your attention, and I realize that many of you may not like to hear this, but I am going to draw it to your attention anyway, and that is that the provincial government of the day has a clear mandate to reduce council. I would like to remind committee members that the present majority of seats held by the present provincial government are not in Winnipeg. The majority of Winnipeggers did not vote for the present government or their platform in the last provincial election. To suggest that there is any clear indication that the majority of Winnipeggers support a reduction in City Council is a distortion, because it is not factually correct.

Madam Chairperson, I would like to draw your attention to three recommendations that I would like to make to you. In recognition that the fundamental components of our democratic process are the quality of our representation, participation in the representation process, and access to our representative institutions, I would like to recommend the following three recommendations.

Firstly, council should be full time. The endeavour of being a city councillor must be a full-time endeavour. Secondly, in the interest of recognizing the preservation of our natural integrity, of Winnipeg's diversity and the traditional communities that exist in Winnipeg, it is fundamentally necessary that this committee consider maintaining—and I am pleased to see some of the following recommendations in Bill 68 recognize this to some extent, but I would like to clarify it: community committees should be retained, but I think that there is a need to take a look at revising the role of community committees

so that the community committees have less routine issues to deal with, and perhaps more authority to deal with regional issues. I think that is fundamentally important in this city. There should be a distinct inner-city community committee, recognizing the central part of the city and the special interests that concern the inner city or the core area of Winnipeg.

Thirdly, community committees really cannot function properly unless there are four councillors on each community committee, each from a distinctive ward. If one can imagine a community committee of three members, with one absent and one chairing the meeting, how on earth can two people reach any kind of an agreement? It is utterly ridiculous. A community committee must of necessity have at least four members in order to be able to function.

* (2010)

I am pleased to see that Bill 68 does not recommend the dispensing of resident advisory groups, and I disagree with the Middlestead commission report on that point. I think the resident advisory groups are a fundamental part of our grassroots democratic process. It is the one means by which the ordinary citizen can become involved in an advisory capacity with their council. I think, however, there are two changes that should occur. There needs to be some measure of financial support recognized for the resident advisory groups, and, secondly, I think there must be some safeguards against interference in the composition of resident advisory groups by councillors or any other politicians.

One final recommendation I would like to make, and that is based on the result that one must recognize a council of 15 is simply not feasible or desirable, other than for purely political reasons. I would like to suggest to you that council should be, insofar as size, anywhere from 20 to 25 members in size. I base that upon the information I have presented to you. If you are to have five community committees, one distinctly recognizing the inner city, with four councillors in each community committee so that it can function, you must have a minimum of 20 city councillors in order for City Council to be able to function properly.

If you chose to maintain six community committees, with four councillors in each, that would mean 24 councillors. If, for some reason, you

decided to have five councillors in each ward and five distinct wards, a council of the size of 25 would be in order, but clearly no less than 20 councillors. A council of less than 20 simply cannot function properly.

I thank you for listening to my presentation, Madam Chairperson and committee members, and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have for me. Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Councillor Young, for your presentation.

Councillor George Fraser. Councillor Fraser, do you have a copy of your presentation for members of the committee?

Mr. George Fraser (Private Citizen): No, I have the same problems that Councillor Young has. In fact, we only have one secretary for 29 people at City Hall, and it is sometimes difficult to get your thoughts down in written form.

Madam Chairperson, members of the committee, I too would like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to appear here. I think, as all of you know, this is a special privilege that we as citizens have, in the province of Manitoba, that others across our country do not experience, in terms of being able in this democratic process to come forward and speak on bills in this manner. I think it is something we should cherish.

I, as I think you know, also am a new councillor, similar to the status of Roger Young. I do not want to comment on my independence; I will say here, though, that I am here to express the opinions of my constituents, and also to give you some of my own personal opinions.

We are very disciplined at City Hall. I have been trained to speak for five minutes, and if I go beyond five minutes, and someone will move extension, I am also trained to go to eight. I stop automatically at eight minutes. I will try to adhere to that.

In principle, I want to say from square one that the issue of the reduction of the size of City Council is something that I dealt with on a door-to-door basis, as I know every other councillor must have in the last election. There were, I think, those of us, who were part of that elective process the last time, who realized that it was a major issue. Indeed, the general opinion of everyone—in fact, in my ward, a very high percentage, in excess of 85 percent of the residents in that ward—was in favour of a reduced

City Council. So there is no question in my mind that this bill heads itself in the right direction.

I think the reduction principle has been further endorsed by surveys that have been done. I do not want to say that The Winnipeg Sun survey was something that a pure researcher would fully support, but I think, again, public opinion was there, and certainly it supported the statistics that I had received from my own constituents. I went further and most recently, when we were heading towards this discussion, did a further survey in my ward and I came up with the same high percentage of support for reduction. Again, I think my last polling that I did was most important, because people were more aware of some of the conditions that would be associated with the reduction process. So I think reduction is very valid.

I want to deal in comments particularly about the effective and the efficient aspect of a grouping close to the numbers that are indicated in the bill. My own personal viewpoint is that we are really looking at group dynamics here, and we are looking at, from a management perspective, a group that can be effective and efficient in decision making, and especially in the effective use of time. I do not have the same fear that many others do in terms of the loss of democracy.

I feel that, as is indicated here, in settings like this—indeed, what I experience at community committee, at standing committee or wherever I go in the community—we have a very sophisticated citizenship out there that is represented very adequately by associations and by groups with special interests, and by individuals who are well educated and knowledgeable in the issues that come before us. So there is no elected official—and I add to that, of course, the dialogue that we have in the media—I think, who can say that democracy is not well served in today's modern environment.

I would like to focus on some very particular points within the proposals within the bill and try to be short and to the point in that respect. Councillor Young had made some references to the numbers and the practical side of trying to come to some number that the Legislature can place before the community in terms of—every change of this nature, in terms of structure, is really an experiment that we deal with for a period of time, and we always have a tendency to revisit.

I do not favour the odd number of 15; I favour the even number, in my case, of 16, plus the principle of the mayor being elected at large. I do not support five community committees. I do support four community committees, and with four councillors from each of the community committees. I do not want to get into the dynamics of how you divide things up, but obviously this would be four community committees that have equality in terms of the numbers of residents they represent, and indeed, on a quadrant basis, get at some of the issues that the controversial pie-shaped configuration represented; because if we are staying with the principle of community committees, I think there is some value in having, as you would within a quadrant concept, some contact on a community basis, community committee basis in particular, with the inner city.

That, on the basis of ward structures with a councillor representing one ward, would be achieved. When the council returns to such things as standing committees or special committees or debate within council collectively, I think that there would be an appropriate preparation by that structure.

I belong to a community committee right now that, by division, has three councillors, and I can tell you, from a practical standpoint, there are some problems. I just came out of a meeting this past Tuesday where, by circumstance, one of our members was not available, so indeed, yes, we can do business, but I guess the question is: Is it "perceived" to be democratic, and is it understood still to be democratic? Are you really achieving what you want to achieve in terms of community debate?

The other areas that I would like to deal with are things that I feel are missing from the bill. I would like to see the mayor and, in fact, I would even go so far as to say, the committee Chairs, recognizing that they have some executive accountability through the mayor's office because of their preselection, would have a tie-breaking vote. I think that it builds in, as was mentioned in the comments from the minister's release, this aspect of accountability and, with the reduction, certainly, the visibility. I think, when you come down to a situation where you have a vote that is a tie vote for whatever circumstance, numbers, there are many factors, absenteeism from a councillor or particular

councillors, that I think we have to get on with business.

* (2020)

I have experienced in the 15 months that I have been a city councillor, there have been a number of major issues that indeed have ended up in a tie, and they go back into the mill.

I think the reason I would give the mayor the extra vote and I would consider giving the Chairmen of Standing Committees an extra vote is that indeed it begins to build a foundation of accountability in terms of policy development that is presented at the time of an election, i.e., a platform in which the citizens have some confidence in and support. Indeed, that should be delivered, and there should not be a breakdown within the structure to stop that just on the basis of rules. In the case of City Council, if it is a tie vote, it is a lost vote, and it either goes back into the mill, or it is not acted upon.

I also have under reduced the size of City Council. I have some difficulty with continuing the presiding officer position. I think, as is even the case right now, within St. James-Assiniboia—and this is no reflection on the present presiding officer—that indeed there is some disenfranchising of the citizens as a result of a councillor, particularly a municipal official playing that presiding officer role. I think that from time to time there has been debate within the Legislature. Even the role of Speaker, there are some difficulties in that respect, but if we are talking about the model of a smaller council, then indeed I think that you have to support the fact, as we see in most other municipal authorities, that the mayor plays the leadership role in terms of conducting the affairs of the Assembly.

Therefore, I think it would be important that I just put my comments on the record, that I would see it: there is no advantage under reduction to have a presiding officer as part of the structure. There were other comments made by my colleague Councillor Young in terms of additional reductions: school divisions, reductions in the numbers of MLAs. I suppose, too, that, in general, society is looking at overall reductions in our federal government also. In that respect, I think we are somewhat on the cutting edge of what we will see as a pendulum swing towards reducing representation. I would just like to end by again saying that I think, for a municipal government, in these times and in this place, where we find ourselves, that a reduction has

the effectiveness and the efficiency that I would like to see from my experience recently as an elected official but certainly as a taxpayer.

I do not believe that we will lose any of the elements of democracy that others have spoken to in the past as being a weakness of this process. I guess I would end by saying and emphasizing again that, as legislation has changed and structures are changed, they are indeed leaps of faith in some respects based on experience but also based on a little bit of risk taking. I am certainly supportive of the risk taking that has occurred here, and if the experiment does not work, ladies and gentlemen, of course, we can always return and increase the numbers if representation does not work out to the satisfaction of the citizens.

It is my opinion, from the citizens whom I represent, that a reduction in the size of City Council is something that they desire and they are prepared to support. That is all I am here to deliver, in terms of that message. Thank you very much.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Councillor Fraser. Ms. Friesen has a question.

Ms. Friesen: I also have been door to door and talked to people about the reduction in City Council. I think the initial reaction—this was during the provincial election—was that it might not be a bad idea, but when people find out that it is going to not cut costs and that it may in fact, with the addition of secretaries, such as you need, assistants, that kind of thing, that it may indeed, in the long run, cost them more, I do not find the same kind of enthusiasm. I am wonder if you have had that experience.

Mr. Fraser: Well, I would agree with you, there is not going to be a cost saving, but I guess, if you look at the approximate cost of the 29 councillors at the present time as 1/650 of the budget, and I have also had that same discussion with constituents, the general response of the constituents is, as Councillor Young said—and I did not emphasize because he had said it—they are looking for full-time representation.

My opinion is, and I think their opinion is, too, that they are prepared to pay the stipend and the support that is required to deliver that, because they recognize that the city councillor at the municipal level plays a very important front-line role. Indeed, they would feel that they are shortchanged at the present time, in my opinion, because they have

part-time representation. I am glad you raised that because that is a very important point that Councillor Young had addressed.

Ms. Friesen: You obviously set high store by representation. You spoke of the fact that we would not be losing democracy because there are highly organized interest groups out there that are ready to make their presentations to you and that you are dealing with a well-educated population.

I just wanted to have some of your reflections on city councillors and elected officials who are not dealing in that kind of situation. Part of my riding, for example, is in an area where there is a high level of illiteracy, where there are not well-organized interest groups, and in fact, an increasing number of people do not even have phones, so that I am finding that, to get back to them, quite often, as I did tonight, I am out delivering messages on foot, by hand. You drive through parts of my constituency any time of the night or day, and you can find people lining up for phone booths.

Now I know that is not true to the same extent in your area, but I wonder if you have reflected on the conditions for the inner city councillors who are having to face the same kind of conditions.

Mr. Fraser: I would respond by saying, just to clarify, that I am an association manager by profession. If you speak to the professionals who work within association management in this country, and there have been many documents presented on that basis, the associations are really the leaders in terms of policy debate and policy setting within the country. It is not the political structure.

I would say that, if you are talking about anything to deal with socioeconomic factors, my point would be that there is strong representation. I am not saying it is necessarily directly from the particular taxpayer, the resident themselves, but there is very strong representation in terms of the spectrums of ideology and on whatever the issue is within the public debate. That was my key point. I do not think there is a lack of information; I do not think there is lack of representation. You can go to the structures we have set up to support individuals who have concerns. I personally do not feel that there is that lack.

In fact, I think it is very refreshing. Just on an individual basis, I spent today at Variance and Conditional Use and License Appeal Committee which all of us have an opportunity to serve on, and

we really move across the entire city in dealing with issues. I have done that on several occasions now, as other councillors have, and again I would emphasize, under those circumstances which are ominous for some people who are experienced with that, very good strong representation and knowledge of the situation, either collectively with people coming together or individually someone representing a group, I do not see it as a particular weakness. I think it is a positive thing that we should cherish as a community and as Canadians.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Councillor Fraser. Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Fraser: Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Councillor Terry Duguid. Councillor Peter Diamont.

* (2030)

Mr. Peter Diamont (Councillor, University Ward, City of Winnipeg): Good evening, Madam Chairman.

Madam Chairman: Good evening. Please proceed, Councillor Diamont.

Mr. Diamont: Members of the committee—I thank the committee for this opportunity to make a presentation.

It is my view that the size of council is not the issue, and any substantive reduction in the number of councillors, as proposed in Bill 68, will only complicate the functioning of council and cloud the real difficulties that exist. It is premature and unproductive to make changes in the size of the council without first dealing with the issue of what type of council and what type of decision making is most appropriate for Winnipeg.

Before getting into that, I would like to say first that I am pleased Bill 68 anticipates a retention of the community committees. They serve an important role in bringing city council closer to the residents who are most affected. However, a smaller council with larger wards will only weaken the access of residents to their local government, including in the community committees. I believe Councillor Fleisher's example of the three members in the community committee as legitimate, if you were watching television last night and watched the situation in where you only had two councillors.

It is too high a price to pay for some ethereal concept of efficiency, imagined in a smaller council whose logical extension is that, if there were only

one councillor, decision making would be even more efficient.

In dealing with the community committees, I think a more responsive way to deal with the problem is to strengthen the role of the community committees. I would suggest that you decentralize and devolve areas of responsibility which do not have an impact on city-wide matters to the community committees.

The type of changes being proposed in Bill 68 have far-reaching implications, and these need to be addressed. Decreasing the size of council without putting in place a political and administrative structure to deal with the changes can only impair City Council's ability to function. Major amendments in the past have been the result of extensive reviews of not just the size of council but the implications of the changes on the administrative and political structure. Governments of both political stripes reviewed, analyzed and discussed these complex issues before they would bring in legislation. Unfortunately, this is not the case in this particular legislation.

In dealing with Bill 68, I would like to focus my remarks on why I do not see the size of council as the issue. The fundamental question is really: What type of council will best serve the citizens of Winnipeg? Is it to be a council that is quasi-judicial and reacts to concepts and issues put before it by individuals, groups and the administration or, two, is it to be a council that develops policy and takes a leadership role in determining the future direction of the city? Governments over the past 20 years in Manitoba have been struggling with this question, and I have been a part of much of that struggle.

From 1971 on, successive provincial governments have been trying to find a way for city councillors to demonstrate more leadership.

The complex urban problems that affect all major urban municipalities in Canada are not easily handled by a municipal structure that was designed to build streets and collect garbage but was not designed to deal with the social, economic and physical realities of the nineties.

There is nothing in the examples of other cities of similar size that suggest for a moment that a larger or smaller council has dealt with these urban problems in a more effective and efficient way. In fact Calgary, with its council of 14, has the same, if not more, of a bias to parochial decision making.

New initiatives are at least as difficult to implement in Calgary as they are in Winnipeg.

The amendments to the act in 1989 went a long way to providing a structure of municipal government that allows for the mayor and his appointees to take on more of a leadership role. Contrary to what Councillor Fraser was saying, I believe the speaker has played an important part in that. With the speaker rather than the mayor in the chair, opposing groups on council have a more balanced and open forum to express their views.

The budget process over the past two years has demonstrated two realities of the substantial changes that were made to The City of Winnipeg Act in 1989. One, that when changes are made to the act, no matter what they are, it takes time for council to adjust and adapt to those changes—that was just as true in 1977 as it was in 1989—and two, that given time, the amendments of 1989 introduced by this government are showing real signs that they have the potential to create a council that can show leadership and deal with the difficult issues of the day in a responsible fashion.

Leadership can only be accomplished at the municipal level if there is a structure in place that allows groups on council to form, develop policy, take initiatives, and where necessary, act as an opposition. I want to make it clear that what I am describing is not a parliamentary model, although some aspects of it are evident. Municipal issues are not always dealt with through party discipline as they are at the provincial and federal government, and there is ample evidence at this point in time that the groups on council do not always vote as a block, but that should not be seen as a weakness in the argument for a more legislative form of government at the municipal level.

The American situation, where Republicans, Democrats cross party lines to vote on specific or on regional issues, is an example of what seems to be occurring now at City Hall. That is positive. Citizens have the chance to relate policies to groups on council and the councillors become increasingly accountable for their decisions.

A small town council tends to work against this type of open debate and the development of policy. With the smaller council, decisions are less likely to be made in the open. It is easier to make deals in secret when fewer people are involved. With a smaller council, the councillors' roles become

increasingly reactive and quasijudicial in nature. It is very much like the corporate model which this particular legislation seems to be focused on.

Items are brought forward—in a situation of a corporation, by the chief executive officer—or they are brought forward by standing committees, by two standing committees in council, by individuals, developers, citizen groups, vested interests, the administration and council adjudicates the competing interests. The smaller the council, the more that will tend to be the case. It is difficult in a small council for policy leadership to evolve and for new initiatives to be brought forward.

When there is not the potential for like-minded councillors who work together, it is unlikely that informed and well-thought-out positions will be developed. As in the situation with the corporation where the chief executive officer becomes the person who develops the policy which is ratified by the board, that will become the situation at City Council.

In the absence of councillors providing that initiative, others, such as the administration and outside vested interests, will fill the vacuum. Councillors will only be able to react after the fact. In my view, a smaller council will only perpetuate the difficulties that are perceived to exist.

It is my view that the amendments put in place in 1989 by this government are working well. The evolving budget process at City Council shows that change is possible under the existing structure. My conclusions are simple. This is not the time for radical changes to The City of Winnipeg Act, and I think some of you know and have gone through other radical changes and know the difficulties. The recent amendments in the act should be given the time to work. There is every indication that the councillors can provide the citizens of Winnipeg with clear policy choices.

Groups such as WIN or the other groups on council have publicly-articulated positions, and some of the other groups on council who previously had hidden agendas can no longer make decisions in secret. The act does provide the beginning of a structure where groups on council can provide leadership and initiative, and if the mayor does not choose to take on the leadership role in a council of 29, I believe that others can take on that role for him.

The present act also gives council wide-ranging powers to change its administrative structure,

budget process and procedures, and what I would like to emphasize is that these are the types of changes that are needed now. Council is just beginning to look at these. The proposal before you to reduce the size of City Council will only delay any action in these important areas and set back reform at City Hall. I think that is the significant point that I wanted to make—that there is a move afoot to make changes, and the budget process is one of them that has gone on in the last year and a half.

* (2040)

When you have the disruptive aspects of changing a council from 29 to 15 and having councillors scrambling to try to figure out where they fit in, what these new procedures are, what the new games—as Councillor Fraser suggested—group dynamics are, you end up with a situation in which those important issues get delayed for a year or two while everything else scrambles out.

This change will set reform back at City Hall. It may be unexciting. To recommend change for the sake of change will accomplish little in dealing with the complex problems that face Winnipeg. In my view, it can only make things worse. This is not to say that the act is perfect, or that the number 29 is the ideal number of councillors. In fact, yesterday morning I voted for a decrease to 23, but I accept without difficulty a council's position which was previous and reaffirmed yesterday on the size of council, that it remain at 29. That is not the issue. By focusing on the size of council, Bill 68 has failed to meet the needs of Winnipeggers.

There have been enough changes over the past 20 years and I have to take some of the responsibility for them in my previous life, but what is needed at this time are some changes that can fine tune the amendments of 1989. It is time to let Winnipeg City Council get on with its own work, and it is time to let the citizens of Winnipeg decide at the next municipal election whether or not they approve of how the majority of the present councillors are dealing with the issues about which they feel most strongly.

I would like to make one or two minor specific comments to the bill. If it is going ahead the way it is, I think it is important that the recommendations in the city's report that was published last week regarding the mayor having the power to remove his appointees and fill the positions on EPC at any time during the year, be included. I think if you are going

to deal with a small council you have to give somebody the power to do those kinds of things, although I am still against a small council.

The other things is, I think you have talked in the French language section about French language services for St. Boniface and St. Vital. I think there should be some consideration about St. Norbert, but the difficulty there is that it has traditionally been part of Fort Garry since 1935. Any proposals as put into place in the Ross report, I think, are ones that would have to be thought about very, very carefully because you are basically moving most of what is a lot of Fort Garry into St. Boniface, St. Vital, and I think you would find that would not be acceptable at all. On the other hand, I think that small area of St. Norbert, which is really a very small group of people, needs to have French language services. I did not see that in the act itself.

That is my presentation. If you have any questions, I would be pleased to answer them.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Councillor Diamont, for your presentation.

Ms. Friesen: You have had experience at both the provincial and the municipal level, and obviously one of the consequences of this act is that it is going to create MLAs who represent 20,000 people and city councillors who represent 40,000 people, so that one way of describing it is that the people who have the closer contact with their constituents in Winnipeg, in fact are going to be the MLAs.

If you are looking at it in the sense of who speaks for Winnipeggers, I am wondering where this leaves city councillors who are going to be much more distant from their constituents than the MLAs. I wonder what reflections you might have on that for the relationship perhaps between the province and the municipality.

Mr. Diamont: I think there are two approaches to that. One is that from just a practical level, there is no question as many of you know, that the kind of calls that a councillor gets are quite different. Even in a ward such as mine, which is suburban in nature, I still get a lot of calls that are similar to the ones in the inner city.

Obviously, there is the time and resources required to deal with that. What I have found is that it is impossible to be a part-time councillor and look after what I consider to be the two important roles of a councillor. One is to deal with the constituency difficulties, and the second is to deal with the broad,

overall policy issues. I think it is impossible without being full time, which I am, to deal with both of those. The constituency issues become paramount and those councillors who are just dealing with part time, because they do not have the time for it—I think that is a significant problem.

The larger the ward, the more those become issues that focus a councillor's attention. Let us face it, it is what keeps them elected to some extent. That brings it to the other aspect of the question and that is the political situation that results when you have councillors who are elected from twice the size of wards where you have competing political interests in a city which is 60 percent of the province, where you have a media centered in here, where you have decision making centered in here. That is a political question that the provincial government has to deal with in the sense that is it prepared to deal with councillors who will have a mandate and an authority at the political side which is more powerful than most of the MLAs?

The example that is best is to the extent that a mayor of the City of Winnipeg who knows how to play the media and the politics of the city, such as Steve Juba, was able to have more influence than probably most of the politicians at any level of government at that particular point in time.

That is strictly a political question which this government, the province, has to deal with. That is their decision to make. I am just pointing it out. I have made the case at a conference in Minneapolis that politically it was a stupid move to amalgamate 13 municipalities into one because it strengthened the role of the mayor and City Council over the province. Again, as I say, that is not the way it is related to parties.

Ms. Friesen: I was interested in your comments on St. Norbert, as well. Is there any other advice you could give us there? You are assuming that in a larger constituency there is going to have to be St. Boniface, St. Vital, old St. Boniface and St. Norbert. I know that that has been talked about generally. Could you give me some further background on the density of French population in St. Norbert and how you might see those?

Mr. Diamont: I am not sure of the statistics, but it is quite small now. It is a population which has decided for one reason or not, not to live in St. Boniface, but it is a tradition in a sense. I have talked to them briefly about this issue because of the

recommendations of the Ross committee, but I think the difficulty would be not so much moving that small component into St. Boniface-St. Vital as it would be taking 30,000 or 40,000 people from Fort Richmond and Fort Garry and other parts of the community and moving in St. Boniface-St. Vital which I would suspect would be a very difficult thing to do in setting up the community committees.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Councillor Diamont.

Ms. Shirley Lord: I believe all committee members have a copy of Ms. Lord's presentation. Please proceed.

Ms. Shirley Lord (Private Citizen): I am pleased to be making this presentation today as someone who has taken an active part for over 20 years in a multitude of facets of our city and our council. The size of our City Council is an issue that I have dealt with over the years because I am seriously concerned with the effectiveness of our city government. I have made presentations to various groups and committees outlining my position on an effective, accountable City Council. There are a number of issues I wish to deal with in this present exercise. They include:

The process: Your committee is dealing with recommendations as a result of an election promise made by the Conservative Party in the last provincial election. It did not come about as a result of serious concerns raised by the Winnipeg electorate and, in fact, is a result of the decision made by a government whose majority does not come from inside the boundaries of Winnipeg. This is in spite of the fact that through countless hearings in which the majority have not indicated a preference for reduced City Council. Contrary to the remarks of Councillor Fraser, in my various experiences working in municipal election campaigns and having worked, designed and implemented polling that was totally impartial, trying to get a reflection of what the citizens of the city of Winnipeg wanted, and in fact the ultimate poll being taken in the last civic election and in the University Ward by-election and again in the River Heights by-election; the citizens want good, open, accountable city government that they have some power to influence. It is clear that the present provincial government intends to reduce the size of council whether Winnipeggers want such a reduction or not. This raises several questions.

Would rural Conservative MLAs support unilateral changes to town or municipal councils which are in their constituencies? Are urban Conservative MLAs, the majority of whom were members of the ruling caucus at City Hall, concerned about the shift in power at the city over the last two years and prepared to do anything to destroy a City Council that is much more reflective of the needs of the citizens of Winnipeg? Should subsequent City Councils exist at the whim of provincial governments whatever the desires of the citizens of Winnipeg?

* (2050)

I support the principle that amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act should come about as a result of pressure from Winnipeggers and its City Council. Such changes should enhance the operation of the city, not be at the political whim of provincial politicians.

Size of council: City Council is the level of government closest to the people it serves. Citizens can and should be able to contact their councillors at any time to ensure the decisions that they make reflect the kind of council the citizens want. At the present time city wards roughly reflect the size of any provincial constituency. This structure and the community committee structure allows an opportunity for individuals and community groups to influence decision making.

This was evidenced in the last budget process when many community committees had to schedule second meetings to accommodate citizen participation. In the final analysis the current Estimates that were passed on March 20 reflected the needs and desires of the community. In a reduced City Council the opportunity to shape the capital and current budgets would be greatly reduced. The question that has to be asked is: Who would benefit from such a reduction? I believe the danger is that we could return to a city that is operated in the interests of developers and not the citizens.

I do not believe the size of council should be reduced. I do believe that the community committee structure should be strengthened through empowering resident advisory groups to facilitate and encourage citizen participation.

The ward system: Wards should reflect neighbourhood boundaries and community of interest. Any suggestion of increasing the size of

wards could facilitate systemic racism and disenfranchise many who live in poverty. There is no question that inner city neighbourhoods have the highest level of aboriginal people, new Canadians and people living in poverty. The proposed enlarged wards would make it almost impossible for inner city residents to elect someone who would put the needs of their community first and be in a position to articulate that with any sense of power in a reduced council.

In the light of recent court challenges to questions of gerrymandering to support partisan ends, your task will be to ensure that the decisions you arrive at do not serve any other political agenda other than the best type of structure for the city of Winnipeg.

Funding: Elections run on issues that cross such divergent neighbourhood boundaries would be costly and would end up being glossy media events that would have little substance. The proposal to eliminate funding from political parties could seriously hamper many who wish to run for elected office unless they were independently wealthy or could rely on friends and acquaintances who could make significant contributions to their campaigns. Even at the provincial and federal levels there is a recognition in the relevant Election Finances Act to tax credits for donations to campaigns to ensure equal opportunity for all.

Therefore, it would seem logical, particularly with seats the equivalent to the size of federal ridings, that the process should include the opportunity for tax credits for contributors to campaigns if it is necessary to eliminate the exclusion of political party contributions. There is absolutely no way that any government has been able to outlaw third party intervention in political campaigns both at the provincial and federal level. They would not be able to eliminate that at the municipal level with any more success, and it would largely depend on third party intervention and who could mount the most effective political campaigns.

In conclusion, I trust that this provincial government will not implement the provisions of Bill 68. I would ask that the caucus members who were former City of Winnipeg councillors to act in the best interests of the citizens of Winnipeg. Ensure that we have a city government that each and anyone of us can participate in whether as concerned citizens or elected representatives.

Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Ms. Lord.

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Thank you very much, Ms. Lord, for your presentation. I want to focus in on just one sentence which I think is quite significant, and the sentence is, that the decision to reduce the size of council was made by a government whose majority does not come from inside the boundaries of Winnipeg. Do you believe that a government of Manitoba whose majority comes from inside the boundaries of the city of Winnipeg ought to have the authority to make agricultural policy?

Ms. Lord: I think if in the event that they take into consideration what the interests in the agricultural community and what they are saying, then that should be so, but all the public hearings under the Cherniack commission—I sat through numerous hearings in the Eldon Ross commission. Very few people talked about the reduction in the size of council. This government—I do not think any government would go ahead and pass significant agricultural policy if all the farming community was extremely upset with it.

Mr. Carr: I guess we could have a debate about who is upset and who is not, but both the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party—and I do not take any great joy in siding with the government on an issue but, you know, you have to call it the way you see it—ran on a platform in the last provincial election to reduce the size of City Council between 12 and 15. The majority of citizens in Winnipeg voted for either one party or another.

Let me ask you another question. Do you think that the councillor who represents Transcona has the authority or the mandate to talk about issues that affect downtown Winnipeg?

Ms. Lord: I think in taking the consideration of what the rest of the city of Winnipeg or the downtown does, yes, ultimately they have the authority.

Mr. Carr: I guess I am just a wee bit sensitive on the point, and I do not want to prolong the time available for other members who want to express their views to the committee, but I think it is important to make the point that I am elected by the people of Crescentwood constituency. My responsibility is to those voters and they will judge at the end of the mandate whether or not to express their confidence in me by giving me re-election. I am a legislator. I am responsible to deal with legislation that affects northern Manitoba, that affects Manitoba Hydro, that

affects rural communities to whom I am not responsible as a member of the Legislature.

If we were all to sit around this table and talk about our own constituents in isolation of everybody else, then it would be chaos; it would be a fiasco. One of the reasons that there is a motivation and incentive to reduce the size of City Council is that precise reason that we want all city councillors to care about the city in its entirety. We do not want to be able to say or to be able to assume that because a government has a majority of its members from outside of Winnipeg, or a government has a majority of its members from inside, that they ought to have no interest or jurisdiction over the entire province. Exactly the same point is true for the governance of the City of Winnipeg, and I think that point has to be made.

Ms. Lord: In response to those remarks, I agree that ultimately legislators have the responsibility to act in the interests of what they believe to be the interests of all Manitobans. I qualified my remarks in saying that any move to change The City of Winnipeg Act, I believe, should come from City Council looking for change in direction as well as some reflection of opinion of the citizens of Winnipeg. I have been extensively involved in market research, looking at what the citizens of Winnipeg want and the kind of government they want. When you ask them the simple question, will it make the city more efficient and more cost effective by reducing the size?—of course, everybody wants things more efficient and more effective—but when you start to detail some other mechanisms to make it more efficient and make it more effective, the reduction in council is not what they want. It is efficient, effective government. I am just asking that the legislators take that into consideration.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Lord. Councillor Glen Murray.

* (2100)

Mr. Glen Murray (Councillor, River-Osborne Ward, City of Winnipeg): Thank you, Madam Chair. It is nice to see you 24 hours later, and I look forward to discussing this with you this evening. I want to tell you, quite frankly, having appeared now before the Eldon Ross committee and the Middlestead committee, this has become a worn and tired phrase. I feel like I am on a proverbial treadmill in the sense that I have a feeling that the

decision on this has been made and very little is going to persuade the government at this point to do anything but deal with 15.

I want to start off by talking about democracy. In my right hand I have the Herb Middlestead report. In my left hand I have the Eldon Ross report, as they are popularly known. Here is a report that was established by a committee chaired by the Speaker with members of all political parties and persuasions, with people with different views on the size of council. They selected three outstanding citizens, the past chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, and the past chair of the Chamber of Commerce Civic Affairs Committee of the chamber, no more a hotbed of socialism, as my dear friend and former Councillor Marshall would have said, than probably the Winkler Chamber of Commerce.

In my left hand I have a report written by a former Conservative candidate, the spouse of a former candidate and a campaign worker and friend of another former Conservative candidate. One had a predetermined mandate between 12 and 15. Yet one said, you go out and determine what the right size is. As a matter of fact, when writing the motion, I removed myself because of my own biases on the size of council to determine it.

Mr. Middlestead and Mr. Trachtenberg, a professor at the Faculty of Administration, and Mr. Fergusson, a long-serving and respected clerk, came back and said, 15 will not work. You will deny people representation. Losing the intensive ward system will deny major parts of the city of Winnipeg from being represented. It said that Calgary and Edmonton, which are really the only two that will have smaller city councils, are not good models. It could be observed that Calgary is the only city with a higher per capita debt.

He had some conversations with colleagues and friends in Edmonton. When they have six wards and two members per ward, not too many people there are very happy, and I think you may be seeing that city going in the opposite direction from what we are going. Where in Edmonton you only have two councillors from the inner city, because of the financing situations of municipal politics, ten come from the suburbs. This is hardly fair or representative democracy.

This process that led up to this report was nothing but a sham, and I use the words of a former Conservative candidate and the speaker of the City

Council, that this is something driven by polls, not by reason, not by what is right, not by responsible leadership.

It was done in a political scream of hysteria that preceeded the most untimed and ill-prepared assessment act ever brought forward, and I can quote the minister who said way back in 1983 as an opposition critic and shortly after that who criticized the government of the day severely for the lack of preparation when we had a formula that was brought in that not one property was tested, from Winkler to Thompson, from Brandon and Virden, all the way to eastern Manitoba, and that we had no preparation.

The impact was devastating. It shifted assessment burden dramatically in the city in a way that was carefully stage-managed to blame on a city that an 8 percent mill rate increase, property tax increases in real dollars of 100 percent, 150 percent, and 70 percent were somehow stage-managed into being something of a municipal mill rate issue, which it was not, and the public has slowly figured that out as they have looked at their assessment bills, and they have understood that.

To me it was nothing but cheap, sleazy politics, and I was most offended by it. I think you would be equally offended if the integrity of your Legislature was so compromised, if the federal government set up a committee of partisan people to decide that the Legislature of Manitoba should be 70 or 20 or 10. You would consider that gross interference in your own internal affairs. If you have any respect for the constitutionality of a government your size, you would not be proceeding with this.

As I said yesterday on Bill 35, which in my view—and I have gone back and I have talked to councillors of long service—nothing has been railroaded through on such a timetable. Never before have we had 27 amendments presented five minutes before a committee. I think that speaks volumes of the interest in sincere representation.

I also remember, and I guess what is most disturbing is that it is not just this legislation, it is the underpinning philosophy of this government, where the city and your ministry, under the Honourable Gerry Ducharme, worked very hard to restore tenants' representation in regional housing. A year and a half was spent to give tenants representation in regional housing in an area where there was some overlapping jurisdiction, and that was

snatched away from those people who had fought long and hard to get some control over their shelter. The former member of a Child and Family Services board, that same—

Madam Chairman: Councillor Murray, excuse me, but I have allowed an awful lot of latitude and I do—an earlier presenter to the point of relevancy. I would appreciate it if you would address your comments to Bill 68. We have an awful lot of presenters here who want to be afforded the same opportunity with representation this evening.

Mr. Murray: I appreciate that, Madam Chair.

It is a pattern. I would like to start my formal part of my presentation by starting where the 1988 Ward Boundaries Commission ended, the last truly independent inquiry. It said the major concern expressed by each of the public meetings was that the revised boundaries should address local and community interests on an equal basis with population density.

The citizens of Winnipeg, as well as the elected representatives, with one exception, were unanimous in expressing their view that the 29-ward proposal be retained and that the wards identify more closely with comparable socioeconomic characteristics and history of interest of ward residents. This is almost identically the result of the conclusion of the Middlestead committee. This is also the official position of the City Council of Winnipeg, twice represented, twice voted on, both by the previous council and by this council and by majority vote—do not want to change, do not find it helpful, in our collective wisdom, do not view this as helpful legislation.

This sounds like a summation of what you have already heard in your 1991 consultation. Public opinion has been consistent on this matter. Winnipeg is currently represented by 29 councillors, each representing a community of 21,000 people, 14,000 of whom are voters in most cases. One-third of us on council approximately right now are full-time or have given up the majority or all of our other employment time.

The population in my ward alone, 21,000 people, is a population approaching two-thirds the size of Brandon and twice the size almost of any other city in the province. The economy and gross domestic product of my ward alone is larger than almost any other municipality in the province. It includes an industrial park and two business zones. The

average municipal ward represented by a municipal representative outside of Winnipeg is approximately 325 people, population at the current ward size of 1.5 percent of the current ward size. In other words, you can fit over 60 average-sized Manitoba municipal wards from outside of Winnipeg into the city's average-sized ward.

In the 15-ward scenario, the average ward outside of Winnipeg would be less than 3/4 of 1 percent of the size of a Winnipeg ward, and you could fit over 125 of them in the average ward. If there is any equity at all in representation, the diversity of language, of culture, of age, of socioeconomic group, of traditional communities within Winnipeg, is at least if not more complex than those communities that lie outside the city. Where it is important enough to have wards of 325 people, it certainly seems wards of 40,000 to 44,000 can hardly account when each ward would be larger than even the second largest city in the province of Manitoba.

The Province of Manitoba, in its 1988 Ward Boundaries Commission report, defines my ward, River-Osborne, as six distinct neighbourhoods. It is comprised of a diverse community containing the second highest- and third lowest-income neighbourhoods in the city. It is held together by the commonality of high-density neighbourhoods and older housing stock. There are neighbourhoods that share a common identity, common problems and shared strengths. These twenty-odd thousand people are served by two community centres, share a common local newspaper, identify themselves as a united community. They see themselves as Winnipeggers with the interests of the city as their overriding priority of their councillor, but confident that their participation in city-wide issues is not without someone being accountable for insuring the concerns of their neighbourhoods are addressed.

* (2110)

As with every level of government, a specific person is accountable for addressing local concerns within a consistent and homogenous neighbourhood—very important—very important for the provincial representatives in areas to have areas that make sense, that are coherent, so that you are dealing with some commonality of issues, some commonality of people.

The city of Winnipeg has been restructured more than any other major municipality in Canada in the

last 25 years. It was done when the province has financial or other problems and wants to deflect it from public attention. You cannot find a major city in Canada—I do not know what it is about this province, maybe it is because we only have one big city to play with, but we go through more restructurings—Unicity, 13 councils, metro government, one government.

It is particularly strange right now that here we are in Winnipeg, one of the few large municipalities without suburban councils, no suburban councils in the city of Winnipeg. In Ontario and Quebec, every single major urban area has a regional government. The average ward size is larger for that reason. There is no other municipality, very few. Even in the Eldon Ross report, they failed to take in regional municipal government, which just actually amazed me. There is no municipality in Canada right now that incorporates such a diverse community and does not have a regional government that deals with regional services. We are truly unique and we are now going to end up with really the largest wards in the country because we do not have a two-tier system of government and we do not have councils.

This whole issue started, as I have said, when the province's assessment bill created unnecessary hardships on taxpayers and a revolt in the reaction to the dramatic increases in the taxable value of properties. This occurred purely as a result of provincial legislation. The province's situation and agenda to blame the city—which had no legislative authority to do anything about the mess—reducing the size of council seemed to be a simple response to anger with taxes, politicians. It also avoided any action to control provincial borrowing, city spending, or examine the province's efficiency and spending itself.

The City of Winnipeg is a government with more direct service responsibilities than any other level of government. We are responsible for ensuring electricity, fire protection, policing, building inspections, public health, a huge share of social services, parks and recreation, heritage buildings, solid and water wastes, all land use and zoning regulations, community centres, arts and culture funding, street construction and repair, traffic regulation, water and hydro utilities, Tourism Winnipeg, economic development strategies, housing, libraries, the bus services, and on and on and on. No level of government is as service-intensive as municipal government. There

is no level of government that has so much locked up, so much staff and resources into the direct delivery of services.

We are three-quarters the size of the provincial government, and with the most restricted revenue sources of any level of government. We maintain a balanced budget each year with a total per capita debt of less than \$1,300 per person, the envy of most governments. The province has not seen a balanced budget in decades and maintains a growing cumulative debt of just under \$10,000 per citizen, more than seven times the city's declining debt. When the sinking fund is deducted, the per capita debt of the City of Winnipeg is \$740 per person, or 7.5 percent of the province's per capita debt.

Financial efficiency is a foreign word to provincial government, when compared to the city with seven times the per capita debt load of the city. If the reason was efficiency and rationale for bringing this in, the province's debt is absolutely uncontrolled. The city's comparatively small debt load will be reduced through the policy that I and my WIN colleagues have brought forward to try and cap borrowing at lower levels.

It is particularly ironic to me, Madam Chair, that, given the major argument when I listen to the debate about this, was that somehow fiscal responsibility was going to result from a council. This came from people who should know better, who should know that when you triple the annual capital debt from \$33 million a year to \$101 million a year and put Winnipeg as a second highest capital-in-debt city in the country, you have huge problems, and direct and indirect service costs \$21 million debt growth for the next six years as a result of the financial policies of the majority of city councillors who now sit on the government side of the House.

This is the problem. This would require a 7 percent annual property tax increase, and what we are having to do, if you want to deal with efficiency, and what I would ask you to do, if you want to include something in this bill, bring in fiscal reform. Amend Bill 68 to bring in fiscal reform.

You created the debt problem; you are now doing something that absolutely does nothing to help with fiscal responsibility or more efficient management. If you want to do something, if you want to bring something in that is helpful, give us the authority to give tax exemptions; give us the authority to have

our grants known the year before our budget is decided. Do not wait until one quarter into the current year to announce our grants, because when you wait until March, as you do now, to bring in grants and tell us how much money we have, those decisions cannot be changed until June, and we play "How much is the province going to give us?"

One of our major funding sources, one of the major things that is holding up fiscal reform and is a 15 point budget reform process to deal with the kinds of authorities that we would need from the province to shift our budget control so that our budget, like other larger municipalities in Canada, is finished before the final quarter of the year prior, and that mill rates are projected as they are in other cities.

Point of Order

Mr. Ernst: Madam Chairman while this is all very interesting and encompasses large and other extensive civic reforms that may or may not require legislation to accomplish, we are dealing with Bill 68. There are a number of people present this evening who wish to be heard, and I would encourage the delegation to try and restrain himself with regard to all of the matters of civic reform that he would like to see and try and deal with the bill that we have before us.

Madam Chairman: For the record, I have to determine whether indeed the honourable minister had a point of order. Indeed the honourable minister does have a point of order. It once again is relevancy and I would please request your co-operation in keeping your debate relevant to the bill, Bill 68. We have allowed an awful lot of latitude. I appreciate that you have a vast knowledge of civic affairs, and at some time I am sure the minister would be more than pleased to listen to some of your civic reform ideas that could be addressed in a bill comparable to changes that are being proposed in this bill. Thank you. Please proceed.

Mr. Murray: My apologies, my point was quite simply that—

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Madam Chairperson, I think we have a practice in this House of allowing presenters the widest range of opportunity to present their views on any subject. I do not think we should go around restraining them or badgering them or suggesting that they are not relevant to the case. I see it as obstructionist.

Madam Chairman: The honourable member does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over facts. Please continue with your presentation, Councillor Murray.

* * *

Mr. Murray: My point was simply, Madam Chair, that I think it would be very helpful if sections could be included in Bill 68 that would deal with taxation authorization of the City of Winnipeg and the ability to be able to do our budget planning the year before because I think, in my understanding of what the minister wanted to achieve, that would be the way to go, not—the size of council is really a red herring.

City council meets once every three weeks for an average of about eight hours and deals effectively with complex agendas, this year again bringing in a below inflation tax level. The city has maintained the lowest tax level increases in Canada for the better part of the last decade, to the credit of many people around this table, a much more efficient process than a host of small councils or the Metro Winnipeg regional government models which preceded it, and much lower, quite frankly, than any of the smaller councils in other western Canadian cities which have experienced average tax rates of 50 percent to 100 percent more than the City Council and have dealt with more uncontrolled spending and less political responsiveness and accountability than has been evident in the last few years on City Council.

It would be miraculous if the province, quite frankly, could handle its business with brief, infrequent and efficient meetings as the council does. The provincial legislature meets for days for every hour that we meet. Council has seen greater co-operations, divisions are rarely along party lines and usually based on legitimate concerns of diverse neighbourhoods, hardly the kinds of things that would lead to a call for a reduction. How can the government that has three times the city's real debt and meets one day for every hour the City Council meets claim to be a moral authority insofar as predetermining the outcome of a public process on constituency size and the shape of wards.

The province ironically did this by prejudging the efficiency of council and suggesting an optimal size of 12 to 15. This is contrary to the principles of The City of Winnipeg Act. The City of Winnipeg Act outlines these principles fundamental to the assurance of equitable, democratic representation,

not only in the shape of wards or the configuration of them, but in the number and in selecting the number, according to the original City of Winnipeg Act, the following criteria should apply:

In determining the boundaries of wards and communities the commission shall consider the community or diversity of interest of the population, the means of communications between the various parts thereof, the fiscal features thereof and all or other similar and relevant factors that relate to those;

To me that is not done in this. This does not pass that litmus test.

Accessibility is fundamental to democracy. Our council represents one of the most culturally and ethnically diverse cities in Canada.

In my neighbourhood, few people can afford to run for elected office as it is now structured. I would not have considered running simply because the financial burdens right now of the current system would be overwhelming. Even if post-election tax credits existed, which they do not, few of my neighbours could raise the funds required for a reasonable campaign. A successful election campaign requires an initial investment of about \$5,000 under the current system and subsequent funding amounting to more than twice that much.

* (2120)

One of the things, and I hope I am not wandering out of order, one of the things I think, and I hope out of fairness that some of you who may support a smaller council would consider as fundamental and a companion approach to this is to deal with the real difficulty in 44,000 member wards of the problem of financing.

It is unlikely that I can seek re-election for the following reasons: Right now if you are a provincial candidate and you get more than 10 percent of the vote, you get I believe it is 50 percent of your campaign costs recovered. If you try to raise money you can use tax credits, very, very helpful. If you think you are going to do well or you think you are going to be a competitive candidate and you judge yourself to be that, if you have to absorb a personal debt of \$15,000, which is hard to raise without tax credits, and if you know you are going to spend \$15,000 or \$20,000, which is what our City Clerk's office in my discussions estimates, based on previous expenditure patterns, would be required, that is personal liability.

I cannot go to anyone and get a tax credit. If I spend \$20,000 it is personal liability. Unfortunately, after the election is over, we only have 120 days under the current legislation to cover that money. I tried to raise \$4,000 in that period of time and could only raise \$2,000. I am much more affluent than many of the people that I represent. If this system that is now being imposed is beyond the financial pale for me, it certainly will be for others.

There are some other situations that exist and the weaknesses that this legislation does not address. One is parties, political parties carry debt. They can do campaign fund raising 12 months a year. They carry debt and usually have centrally organized campaigns, tax credits. Most political parties, the three represented here, have lists of some long-standing, where they can raise money. They can go after those people. Most individuals cannot go to a large printing company and say, give me a line of credit of \$10,000 for printing, please, and most of us do not have long party lists or organizations that we can subscribe to, so that creates some very serious difficulties.

It also creates some distortion because, in smaller wards of 44,000, volunteers are very important. I had 250 volunteers on my campaign. It was very possible, quite frankly, Madam Chair, under that system where that made a difference.

In a larger ward, money becomes more valuable. We are in the business of regulating a very large industry, the land development industry. The land development industry makes most of its money through rezonings. If you rezone something from agricultural to residential, or from residential to commercial, millions of dollars change hands. It is not much of an investment since the corporations and unions both can make donations. It is not much of an investment to make a considerable donation and raise through a number of \$750 donations, which is the limit, an amount of money.

I am not likely to be the recipient of that kind of money. Many of my friends cannot write that kind of cheque. So without the tax credit system, without a recoverable amount of money, those people who tend to benefit, who are regulated who tend to benefit by having sympathetic people on, they are generally going to make much more generous donations. No one else has the financial interest or the means to compete in that way.

So with the short recovery period of time, very little money to raise money, you are at a huge disadvantage because only those people proceed by those interests, the same people who have contracts with the City of Winnipeg, who stand to gain from largesse of garbage contracts and snow contracts also have a major interest to make sure that, for example, those people sympathetic to contracting-out policies are elected. Local community leaders with modest means are not going to have much of a running chance.

I cannot see myself raising that kind of money, and I cannot see myself as a candidate in the next election, and I think it is very unfortunate that people like myself, who are, relative to most other inner city residents, affluent, have to sit down and be able to say to you now, as many of my colleagues have said privately, and some publicly, if you have been following the papers, the decision on whether I run or not is going to be based on how much money I have and how much money I can raise.

If that is not fundamentally defeating the intent and purpose of financing, Councillor Duguid and many others have said that publicly now: We do not see our way clear to doing it, and I would like the decision on whether I get a second term as a councillor or not, not to be made on financial matters, but to be made on the worthiness of my candidacy and my record as a councillor.

I want to move from that, Madam Chair, to two other large communities that currently are underrepresented or have not been represented at all. That is the aboriginal community in the city and the new Canadian community, lower economic income strata who, through conflicts with the police department and many city services, already see civic government as something quite foreign to them. Already the existing system has not been a friendly system for them, has not been encouraging them.

I have had the benefit to sit on the board of the Aboriginal Cultural Society for the last year, to be involved with that community. I have had the chance to talk to many, many friends of mine, some of whom have been actively interested in seeking City Council, who have said, quite frankly, where are we in all of this?

They have pointed to American cities where large, visible minorities and lower income strata are not represented on city councils, where the rapid growth

in those populations and their underrepresentativeness in civic government is not being addressed.

One of the things that I clearly hoped would be addressed was, given that by the end of this decade, 20 percent, one in five citizens in this city, is going to be of aboriginal descent, it would only make common sense that one of the first objectives we would be looking at is how civic democracy can work to include that population.

With our growing Asian and new Canadian community, how can civic administration work to represent those people? In an administration where there are 64 senior representatives—62 of whom are white, middle-aged men, 1 woman and 1 person of colour in the entire senior administration—we have not sent a very positive message about inclusion.

I see, quite frankly, nothing in this bill that addresses that, nothing that is going to lend itself—quite contrary, these large wards where most of those communities disappear within a much larger ward really, really disturbs me.

Another issue that concerns me that I would like to see addressed in this legislation, which I do not feel is yet addressed, c'est qu'il est absolument nécessaire pour le futur de la communauté francophone de Winnipeg que sa présence soit préservée dans la structure municipale. La législation qui protège le droit aux services pour la communauté et la population francophones est très faible.

La représentation de cette communauté francophone sera réduite à un quartier et à un siège sur le Conseil municipal en vertu des dispositions du Projet de loi 68. Je pense que la réduction de l'ancienne ville de Saint-Boniface, avec son conseil indépendant qui représente l'intérêt des communautés francophones de Winnipeg, à un siège, est épouvantable.

Le référendum d'il y a quelques années sur la question des services en français pour la communauté française est un exemple de la réduction des droits des francophones, de la population francophone de Winnipeg et de l'isolement de cette communauté.

(Translation)

Another issue that concerns me that I would like to see addressed in this legislation, which I do not feel is yet addressed, is that for the future of the

Francophone community in Winnipeg, it is absolutely essential that its place be preserved in the municipal structure. The legislation that protects the language rights of the Francophone community and population is very weak.

With Bill 68, representation of the Francophone community will be reduced to one ward and to one seat on the municipal council. I feel that the reduction of the old City of St. Boniface, with an independent council that represents the interests of the Francophone communities in Winnipeg, to one seat, is appalling.

The referendum of several years ago on the question of French-language services for the French community is an example of the reduction of the rights of Francophones, of the Francophone population of Winnipeg, and the isolation of this community.

(English)

I think it is extremely sad that a community that once hosted the largest, and still does, Francophone community in Western Canada that had its own council is being forced in a system to try and seek representation through one member. To me that is totally unacceptable. Given the weakness and the failure of the City of Winnipeg to implement even the most basic components under the existing City of Winnipeg Act guaranteeing French language services, to proceed now and reduce that community's representation when we cannot even get enforcement of the existing language laws under The City of Winnipeg Act, to me, is absolutely a travesty and a tragedy.

Again, if we were seriously trying to deal with representation, one of the things that we would be seriously looking at would be the preservation and representation of the Francophone community, or at least the size and scale of council, as I gave the example and the criteria that were in there and guaranteed in The City of Winnipeg Act, which guaranteed sufficient size of council to make sure that there was at least someone who could second a motion in that language from that large community, a community under somewhat threatened circumstances. That extremely disturbs me; it extremely disturbs me.

I was quite interested in listening to the Middlestead committee to the presentations of the Franco-Manitoban Society, and I am hoping that we will be hearing more from them.

These are communities, Madam Chair, that I cannot see being represented. How do we design a council structure that ensures that communities from St. Vital to Point Douglas all feel some ownership of city government? How do we start to ensure that social conflict between communities and communities and government is resolved inside the Council Chamber and not through disharmony and distress resulting from incidents of violence on our streets?

* (2130)

It will be a long time before the J.J. Harper shooting is behind us. It is hard to imagine that aboriginal people will feel some sense of ownership of city government when there remains such significant barriers to their participation. This will worsen in the larger election with greater campaign expenses.

Again, how will the Francophone community reasonably maintain a presence at City Hall, when St. Boniface is swallowed up in a huge constituency? A ward of 40,000, 44,000 or five wards of 220,000 or two or three councillors will ensure the stage is set for further excluding linguistic and racial communities from City Hall.

Many of my constituents, as I have said, cannot afford to run in the current system, and fewer still in wards of two or three times the city of Brandon. If you recommend a ward system as proposed, only those interested in civic government who can pass an unwritten but obvious financial litmus test could contest elections.

The traditional major funders of financially well-endowed civic campaigns are land development companies. Land values are often increased by millions of dollars when a reasonable chunk of agricultural land is rezoned or when urban lots of land are rezoned commercial. The rewards are large and obvious for campaign largesse and the financial interest being protected substantial.

City Council regulates the land development industry; not many other groups have such a vested interest in the decisions of this level of government. Councillors, unlike other elected officials, play a quasi-judicial or adjudicating role through their involvement in ruling on land use applications, the sensitivity of which we discussed only last night in this room.

We have a judicial role. It would be more than dangerous to create scenarios where money,

specifically from land development companies and their friends, could become a more significant factor in the election of people whom the public trust to regulate this industry.

I have attempted to put this action by the provincial government in the context of real emotions. I want to conclude with my last remarks by addressing the comments made by Councillor Fraser earlier on.

He made reference to a meeting, and I remember in a hall where Ms. Friesen and Mr. Carr and the honourable minister were present at Trinity Church, the minister asked me, he said: Were you aware of what you thought was sort of—not illegal—but kind of unnecessarily familiar or cozy kinds of deals? We talked about parochialism, and one of the things that was a concern is that we wanted to get out of parochialism, that we wanted to get out of cronyism, that we wanted to get out of deal making.

Today I sat through that experience, and I want to talk to you about as an example of how it works, and I then want to conclude by suggesting what the solution to it may be. I sat through a variance committee that Councillor Fraser described as a friendly discussion that ranged through the spectrum of political opinion. I thought that was a particularly interesting description of it, and I respect that because there are different points of view and I would like to give you mine.

What we sat through was a hotel development on St. Mary's Road, overturning the recommendation of the Planning Department, the Streets and Transportation Department; it was a unanimous rejection of the community committee—(interjection)—pardon me?

Madam Chairman: Councillor Murray, please proceed and try to ignore the committee members.

Mr. Murray: Okay. Thank you. As long it is not you, too, Madam Chairperson, I will be glad to do that.

It was a unanimous rejection by the large residential community that surrounded it. I mean the petition was extensive, the representations were large. This was to put in a seven-storey hotel, a beer parlour and comedy club, a dentist and doctor office, a mini-mall, a convenience store, a drugstore, a drive-through beer vendor, a chapel, on-site banking, fitness centre, . . . licenced restaurant. So many land uses that I have never seen in what was a commercial hotel being sold as a seniors complex

that only the most incompetent fool could not make a small fortune operating a facility that had that many uses in it.

I think this is what we talked about. I was quite amazed because it was a four to one vote; and, obviously, by my tone and my reaction to this, you can tell I was the one person out. This was done and we talked about variance the other day, and here is another law to protect this kind of thing from happening.

There is, as you know—and some of you are former councillors—that there is no C3 or C4 zoning, which this would fall into, allowed in that entire area, under that entire zoning bylaw, and this definitely falls within a much higher zoning density. It also defeats through variance the intent of the zoning bylaw. It was also an application that was put forward by the ward council for the area.

A deal or arrangement granted that was never given to anybody else who had ever applied. As a matter of fact, no one was ever allowed. The highest building on the street is three storeys, and no one is aware that I could see of any equivalent uses.

This was done by some members of the governing party of this Legislature. It was particularly what I saw when I talked to the residents, who walked away from that discouraged, upset and feeling that the bylaws did not mean anything. I do not think that there was anything illegal done here, and I do not think that there were deals made, but I think there are just some common understandings, as it is often politely said, amongst like-minded councillors who have a philosophical view that really can totally rob a community of its representation and grant to some people in the city certain rights in lands and privileges with great ease that others have not been able to.

It has set a precedent that any other high-density development would now have to be granted in that area out of simple fairness. Four decades of well-managed local land use management for that area was reversed by a decision that went way beyond what had ever been granted there before.

Unspoken understandings are immediately on the table between like-minded councillors to be remembered when one of the grantors is in a position of equivalent need. No fix, nothing technically illegal, quiet but understood. I also understand that it is highly likely there will be some

retaliation at some point in the future for me making these points. -(Interjection)- Yes, I know I am right. -(Interjection)- I know that. I do not pull punches. -(Interjection)- Pardon me?

This to me is what frustrates me. This to me is what I often hear criticized. This is what I hear members of the Legislature criticize when they say that. That fundamentally disturbs me. There is nothing in this bill that is going to stop that from happening. As a matter of fact, I would say that getting consensus to do those kinds of things or to try and get that kind of agreement or like-mindedness on a larger council is much more difficult. It is much more difficult. It is a very difficult issue.

In a small council and in smaller committees like this, those kinds of understandings happen. Often it simply happens, quite frankly, because of the luck of the draw. Quite frankly, had other councillors been there from other parts of the city or if other people had been represented, the decision could have gone very much the other way. That is the luck of the draw.

So those kinds of things have existed; they do exist. I do not agree with them, but that is the way it works. If that is truly what is meant, then I think that I would to hear an explanation of how anything in this bill is going to change any of that.

Thank you, Madam Chairperson, I will conclude my comments with that.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Councillor Murray. Mr. Gaudry?

M. Neil Gaudry (St. Boniface): Vous avez parlé de Saint-Boniface. Puis je suis le député de Saint-Boniface et je demeure à Saint-Boniface depuis plus de trente ans. J'ai toujours eu à cœur l'intérêt de la communauté de Saint-Boniface.

Puis lorsqu'on a amalgamé Saint-Boniface avec la grande ville de Winnipeg, il y a eu certainement de la controverse et, encore aujourd'hui, je pense que l'on voudrait garder l'aspect francophone de Saint-Boniface puisque c'est la plus grande communauté francophone de l'Ouest canadien. On dessert beaucoup de communautés francophones dans le Manitoba puis dans l'Ouest canadien. Est-ce que vous avez lu le Projet de loi au complet?

M. Murray: Oui, je pense que je l'ai lu au complet. J'ai eu des discussions avec mes collègues, M. Selinger qui représente le quartier de

Saint-Boniface et Mme Reese qui est une conseillère de Saint-Vital et qui a la même opinion que moi sur cette question. Elle a peur que les changements apportés à la loi placent la communauté francophone dans une position plus faible en ce qui concerne la constitution de la ville de Winnipeg.

M. Gaudry: Vous avez lu la clause 85.1 visant la prorogation des services linguistiques? Quelles sont vos impressions de cette clause du Projet de loi?

M. Murray: Excusez-moi, répétez un peu plus lentement, s'il vous plaît. Je n'ai pas la loi—

M. Gaudry: Quelles sont vos impressions de la prorogation des services linguistiques? Malgré toute modification des limites ou des noms des comités municipaux, les limites du district de Saint-Boniface - Saint-Vital, telles qu'elles sont au moment de l'entrée en vigueur du présent article, sont réputées demeurer en vigueur aux fins de la prestation, à l'intérieur des limites en question, des services prévus à la présente partie. Quelles sont vos impressions au point de vue—

M. Murray: Je pense que c'est possiblement une amélioration de la situation qui existe présentement à la ville de Winnipeg. Je pense qu'il est plus important qu'il y ait des membres francophones sur le Conseil de Winnipeg. S'il n'y a pas de membres francophones sur le Conseil de Winnipeg, il n'y aura pas une personne, ou deux ou trois personnes, qui seraient—je ne sais pas le mot en français "advocates"—pour les communautés francophones.

S'il n'y avait qu'une seule personne, elle se trouverait dans une situation très isolée.

M. Gaudry: Vous avez aussi mentionné que depuis plusieurs années maintenant la ville de Winnipeg doit donner des services en français sur demande. A quel niveau est-ce que vous voyez à ce moment-ci le progrès qui a été fait depuis cette résolution que le français soit disponible à la ville de Winnipeg.

M. Murray: Je pense qu'il n'y a pas eu beaucoup de progrès jusqu'ici. Je ne suis pas au courant de tous les détails de la loi maintenant, mais je crois comprendre que la plupart des services n'ont pas été mis en œuvre jusqu'ici. Ça fait longtemps que j'ai eu une conversation avec la Société franco-manitobaine et j'espère qu'elle a présenté tous les détails de ses revendications.

(Translation)

Mr. Gaudry: You spoke about St. Boniface. I was elected in St. Boniface and have lived there for over 30 years. I have always been concerned about the interests of the St. Boniface community.

When St. Boniface was amalgamated with the bigger City of Winnipeg, there was certainly a lot of controversy around the issue. Still today, I believe that we would like to keep the Francophone aspect of St. Boniface because it is the largest Francophone community in western Canada. It serves many Francophone communities within Manitoba and throughout western Canada. Have you read the bill in its entirety?

Mr. Murray: Yes, I think I have read the whole thing. I have had discussions with my colleagues Mr. Selinger, who represents the St. Boniface community, and Ms. Reese, who is a councillor for St. Vital and who shares my view on this issue. She fears that the change in legislation will weaken the position of the Francophone community at City Hall.

Mr. Gaudry: You have read Clause 85.1 concerning the continuation of language services? What are your views regarding this clause of the bill?

Mr. Murray: Pardon me? Could you please repeat that a little slower? I have not got the bill—

Mr. Gaudry: What are your views regarding the continuation of language services? Notwithstanding any change to the boundaries or names of community committees, the boundaries of the St. Boniface-St. Vital community, as they are immediately before this section comes into force, are deemed to remain in force for the purpose of providing, within those boundaries, the services set out under this part. What are your thoughts from the point of view—

Mr. Murray: I feel that it is perhaps an improvement on the present situation in the City of Winnipeg. I think that it is more important to have Francophone councillors sit on City Council. If there are no Francophone councillors, there will not be one person, or two or three people, who would be—I am not sure of the word in French—"advocates" for the Francophone communities.

If there were only one person, he or she would be in a very isolated situation.

* (2140)

Mr. Gaudry: You also mentioned that for several years now the City of Winnipeg has had to provide

services in French upon request. Up to now, how much progress do you think has been made since this resolution was put into effect?

Mr. Murray: I do not feel that much progress has been made up to now. I am not at this point familiar with all the details of the bill, but I understand that most of the services have yet to be implemented. It has been a while since I spoke to the Société Franco-Manitobaine, and I hope that they have presented all the details of their demands.

(English)

Mr. Ernst: Councillor Murray, last evening we dealt with Bill 35. In Bill 35 is an amendment that would require use changes to be considered as rezonings. Last night you opposed that; after this morning's experience, have you changed your mind?

Mr. Murray: I enjoy the question, I think. Thank you very much Mr. Minister for that question.

No, I was very clear yesterday. I said there were two issues of which I was of two minds on, and it was very difficult. I have said my preference was that it remain as a decision of the community committee. I cannot remember the member who asked me, and I said, what would you propose as an alternative? I suggested an appeal from a district commissioner's decision or a reference to a committee.

I think when an appeal committee can so easily overturn a community consensus and a community committee's unanimous decision and the recommendations of the department, so easily from people who have no accountability to those people. If we cannot have a local decision, I would certainly see the idea of a citizens' appeal committee being that.

As far as rezonings go, yes, I am leaning much more in that direction. After my experience today, Mr. Minister, I am leaning much more on the idea of expanding rezonings and being much more restrictive on variances. So, if you want to concede a point on that, I would certainly concede that to you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Councillor Murray. Thank you for your presentation.

Mr. Murray: I just want to conclude. I want to tell you I apologize for some of my anger tonight. I found this an extremely frustrating situation, and I guess, in my heart of hearts, I really felt that I was speaking to a hung jury tonight, somewhat, that it was quite clear the government is committed to a

course of action. I feel better having vented my frustration with you, and I hope it was not too difficult to listen to. Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you. It has been suggested that the committee take a ten-minute recess. Is that the will of the committee? Is that the will of the committee to take a ten-minute recess then reconvene the committee at five to 10? Agreed and so ordered. The committee will reconvene at 9:55.

* * *

The committee took recess at 9:44 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 9:56 p.m.

Madam Chairman: Order please. Will the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs please come to order. I will now read the next names until we are made aware that a presenter is in the room—Mr. George Lapp; No. 10, Mr. Jim Mandryk; No. 11, Mr. Gary Coopland; No. 12, Mr. Grant Nordman; No. 13, Mr. John Harrison. Would you please come forward, Mr. Harrison. Do you have copies of your written presentation?

Mr. John Harrison (Private Citizen): It is not a written presentation, just from notes—I do not.

Madam Chairman: Thank you. Please proceed.

Mr. Harrison: Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson, and members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to be here as a private citizen speaking on behalf of Bill 68. I come, I think, with a bit of a different perspective than many of the people who I have heard speak this evening, just someone in an area of Winnipeg who has a few comments with respect to what he has seen go on, not so much involved with the process.

In particular, I want to take one point out of order because it is something that has bothered me to a certain extent, something that I heard this evening that I do not agree with and I think needs to be put on the record in some fashion. That is that Mr. Murray has made the comment that, for example, if the federal government was to come to the province on a matter and then try and meddle with the number of MLAs involved, that would be something that the MLAs would get very excited about and, of course, that is the case.

You cannot make the comparison between what is happening here with a potential change with the

number of city councillors because we are talking about two very different things. We are talking about two supreme governments by nature of the Constitution act in this country. We are then talking about, in this particular case, delegated powers from a provincial government, and they are not the same thing. They cannot be discussed on the same terms, and I find it rather upsetting to take a look at it in that situation.

It is more of a case, in my opinion, of a situation where powers have been delegated much the same as you do to an employee, and the employee does not have the right to turn around when you want to change the job somewhat as long as it is under fair and obvious circumstances. I just wanted to make that one point out of order, because it is something that concerns me. There are two major governments and, not to take away from the very important job that the city councillors have, they do have to understand that those powers are delegated and changes can occur.

Now with that off my chest, there are a few other points that I would like to make, and I will be brief. First of all, a number of people have made the comment that by virtue of having less councillors, there is going to be less service, less availability to the public of the given councillor. In my opinion, I do not think that is the case because there is the added change of the fact that we are now going to have people who are working full time.

* (2200)

There are, granted, some councillors, by no means the majority, who are doing it as a full-time job, but most are not. The thing is right now I can tell you that I know a number of people from across this city who have difficulty getting a hold of their councillor. I do not think it is the councillor's fault. I think it is by virtue of the fact that they have a very important other job that is their primary job which is taking up a major portion of their day and of their week, and then they are trying to get done a bunch of very important business in what amounts to their spare time. I do not think that is the way to run a city.

I agree with the fact that there have to be full-time councillors doing the job and, by virtue of the fact that there will be a small group but now working full time, I think they will be as accessible if not more accessible. Tied to that, something that I have not heard mentioned this evening is the fact that for

those people who have another job—and, of course, there are some very significant jobs held by some people on council. There is absolutely no question of that either, some very significant onerous jobs that require a great deal of their time both inside normal business hours and outside, by virtue of the fact that their income from being a city councillor is not the key thing in life. To me it is not the best way to run things. When it is your primary job, then you are going to be much more concerned if that potential income can disappear and, of course, that means you have to be responsive to the people out there, your constituents.

It concerns me that someone is doing it sort of on the side because it is an interest area, and albeit that may be someone who is a very good person, a very concerned person, but they do not have to be as responsive, and just that concept concerns me. So I really like the idea of having the full-time councillor, and it is a point that has not been made to this point.

There have also been the comments about whether or not—another advantage that will involve less councillors, one that I agree with, is this comment about being less parochial and have concerns that are caring more about the city. We have something called Unicity now. I do not agree that it is fully in place, although it should be, and I think part of making Unicity work is having a situation where there is less parochialism and more concern about issues across the city. I think that will happen when there are less people involved and looking after larger constituencies with diverse groups of people. I think you get a sense of what is going on in more than one income bracket when you are dealing with the larger areas, and I think that is important as well.

Another thing that I can honestly say concerns me, and it relates back to the first point I made, is that an example of what I feel is wrong right now with City Council is what went on last night. You had a situation where we had a bare quorum to make a final decision on something that was supposedly very important. I thought, at a minimum, the people should have turned up.

There have been a lot of people making representations, of course, many from City Council, although it appears the majority who have spoken are people who were there. I have a concern again about how involved are these people if they will not even come and get involved on something where they have spent the time and money to have a

decision made. I think all of them should have been there or a majority of them should have been there.

I think that kind of thing occurs at times because they are not—again, it is not their primary job. They have other things in life, and oftentimes the situation is one where they may very well want to be there but they cannot be there, and that concerns me.

The one final point that I would like to make—a number have been made this evening that do not need to be reiterated—but one final point that concerned me was one again made by Councillor Murray, and that was one where somewhere toward the beginning of his presentation there was a comment about the fact that there have been 25 years of massive change with City Council and it has been too much, it has been too long, there have too many changes.

However, toward the end of that presentation he made another good point in that the council as it exists now is doing a better job than it did when there were multiple little groups looking after things than when there was a Metro. There has been improvement it seems each time that there have been changes made, and again those changes have been made by the province. I have the confidence that the changes the province are putting forth right now are the right changes, and those are my comments.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Harrison. Thank you for your presentation. Councillor David Brown.

Mr. David Brown (Private Citizen): Madam Chairperson, thank you. I am not here as councillor, I am here as a private citizen.

Madam Chairman: Thank you. You wish the record to show Mr. David Brown, private citizen. Please proceed, Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown: Just a point of clarification from the last speaker who made a presentation. I was in the council building yesterday and unfortunately was unable to attend the special council meeting, because I was at our regularly scheduled Executive Policy Committee meeting right next door.

When the councillors decided to call a special meeting and had their petition signed, they spoke with the mayor and he suggested to them that Wednesday morning was not a very appropriate time, this morning or Friday would have been a better time, and they declined to follow his advice. We were unable to change our schedule and make

this most important special meeting. I would just like to point that out.

I hope with my presentation—I want to be very brief but sincere and maybe demonstrate to you what the smaller council would do in terms of time consumption. My presentation relative to Councillor Murray's will demonstrate that, I believe.

I am here to put my support for the legislation on the record. We are a city that operates approaching a billion-dollar-a-year budget, 10,000 employees. Certainly to run that kind of an organization and be responsible for that kind of an organization, the job must be full time. I put about 40 hours a week in now, and I am looking forward to a full-time position. I try and put those kind of hours in at my other job as well.

I want to make one comment, though. Councillor Fraser was here earlier and talked about a four-by-four concept—four quadrants in the city and four councillors in each quadrant for a total of 16. I personally support that and think that you might even want to look at making it running the four candidates at large in each quadrant. I think that has some merit, and I would respectfully ask that would be reviewed.

I am not going to go into long detail and rhetoric. I think you have had enough of that today and this evening. I do have one problem with the legislation, however, and there is no clause that I have seen that makes it retroactive. Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Councillor Mike O'Shaughnessy. Do you wish the record to show as councillor or Mr. Mike O'Shaughnessy, private citizen?

Mr. Mike O'Shaughnessy (Councillor, Jefferson Ward, City of Winnipeg): I think because of one of the remarks I will make, Madam Chair, I would prefer Councillor Mike O'Shaughnessy, Jefferson Ward.

Madam Chairman: Thank you very much. Councillor Mike O'Shaughnessy, please proceed.

Mr. O'Shaughnessy: I should not follow animals, small children or Dave Brown, I do not think—anticlimatic. If I might begin with, to the committee but a partial aside to the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), last night I was against citizen panels for variance and conditional use appeals having sat through a number of appeals, especially the one Councillor Murray

mentioned earlier today. I think I have changed my mind.

I am here to congratulate the minister and the government and the good sense of particularly one of the other parties in the Legislature here tonight on what I think is a fine piece of legislation.

* (2210)

I did not support 15 to be the number of councillors, but it is very close to 12 and I knew one did not have a chance. So I would like to support the numbers and, like Councillor Brown before me, comment that the special City Council meeting which had a bare quorum of 16—that came from a group of 15 people who had signed a petition because they supported the citizens' panel, or whatever it was council had appointed, and only had 16 people show up; and they came to support a report that recommended 23 councillors, which this Legislature is rather familiar with—that number I believe; and then changed their mind and voted 10-6 to keep the status quo, I do not really think that represents council. I bet those 16 people—none of those—I do not think they think it represents what they think today either. They must be wondering what the heck they did.

A smaller council—I am not sure of the benefits. I was part of the 50-member council that went to 29. I noticed a great change. I returned to council after leaving for six years. I came back in 1986, and found it bogged down again. Actually, I found the 29 acting more like the 50 than the 50 did in its day, and so I really welcome this change. I think it is due.

More important than the numbers I think will be the expectation of the electorate that councillors be full time. I really think the full-time aspect of a job is what will lead to dramatic improvements at City Hall: political leadership rather than bureaucratic leadership at City Hall; opportunities for greater imagination in the financing of the city; councillors who will set their own agenda rather than reacting to preset agendas of the bureaucracy, which is the case now.

Just being together, the opportunity for all councillors—I do not mean by party—in a loose term, to caucus, to get together to share ideas and build ideas with each other, which is not there now in a part-time council, I think will be one of the greatest benefits that will come out of this. I thank you for this impending opportunity for us.

As for those who do not agree, and there have been a number of presentations, both here and to the Ross commission on this, I would just like to say that it appears to me that it is only those on the fringe of electability who support the status quo. It seems that the councillors I have seen who seem secure in their position, who seem to be doing the job and get the accolades from their electorate, seem to be the ones, for the most part—perhaps I should exclude myself here—who support the reduction in the size of council.

I would just like to comment, if I might, on a couple of small points within the bill. One of them is under Section 5(4), which is to have the Ward Boundaries Commission convene in 1991 and as may be required, but not less often than every nine years. With the term of council being three years, I realize what I am about to say would be difficult, but I have not taken the time to research this and I am wondering if there is anything in it—the nine is a multiple of the term of three years, but every 10 years we have a census. We have accurate information out every 10 years. I am wondering if there is any way to tie in the Boundaries Commission review with the census.

Our wards are dramatically different in size right now. If some of the ward boundaries taken by the Ross commission would have followed with the population trends we have before us, even if you equalized the wards today—or let us go back five years and use 1986 figures—before the next review, by the year 2000, some wards, if they were totally equal then, would be more than twice the size of others.

What happens is, in keeping neighbourhoods together, it seems to me that the areas that are suffering a population drain end up, every time we have a Boundaries Commission, starting off with the smallest wards, and they are losing population. Those in the suburban areas, that tend to have the most growth, start out as the largest ward, and by the time there is another review, three elections down the road in many cases—and this happened to me last time and Councillor Demare from St. Vital—our wards were more than twice the size of a number of inner city wards.

Now, maybe there is more to do and maybe more attention should be paid to these inner city areas, and I do not dispute that, but representation by population is not just an Americanism, it is a cornerstone of democracy.

I would like to see that—this comes up under 6(2)—the population figures not be given, as they were last time there was a boundaries commission, an extra leeway, but they be tightened. That if anything, the leanings, the instructions for any leaning, should be that the areas with the most obvious potential for future growth be made the smallest wards, and those which have demonstrated a population pattern of exodus, if I can say that, if anything, be slightly larger.

Because the boundaries will probably not be reviewed more often than once every nine years, it will keep some form of balance. There will still be an imbalance with growth and shrinkage in certain areas, but when you have wards representing 18,000 people, another with 42,000-43,000, something is wrong somewhere. Believe me, new areas do have a lot of problems as well.

One final point—and it is not mentioned in Bill 68 but it has been thought of; it was mentioned in the Ross report—I must say that I am a strong, strong supporter of a four-year term for City Council. I realize this causes a conflict with the present election system with school boards, and that school division boundaries are not yet being examined at this point, but the full-time council is going to mean that people are going to have to give up their jobs. I am in the process of selling my company at the moment in preparation for this. Four years is no guarantee—a person is taking a chance with their personal career, their family's life and security for the future; but three—it is not going to go beyond four and should not anyway—is a little bit much.

What I am afraid of is that people who have a good career, or who have built a good business but are still in the building stage, still have growing families, just will not be able to give it up for a chance at—what?—one three-year term. We know there are no certainties in politics but a lot of us, who do not have the privilege of working for government or a few other unionized positions, are not having positions held for us to go back.

It might be inconvenient. It might cost a little bit of money to go to a four-year term before the school divisions are done, but the calibre of candidate and the amount we are asking of each of these candidates for a civic election, I believe make it worthwhile. Of all the things I have said today, both the maybe important and a few minor things for sure, this is the thing I wish to leave you with most strongly. A longer term will give you better

candidates, will be fairer to the candidates in the future council. If it requires a little work and manipulation, I think it is worth it.

The success of this legislation will be largely judged one way or the other on the success of the first council. Inviting the most and best qualified people to run is the best thing you can do to show off your legislation as having been a success. The four-year term, I believe more than anything else, would help ensure a better quality of candidate. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Councillor O'Shaughnessy; thank you for your presentation. Mr. Gordon Mackie. Mr. Bernie Wolfe. Mr. Glen Hewitt. I would just remind committee members that Mr. Hewitt's presentation has been distributed. Please proceed, Mr. Hewitt.

Mr. Glen Hewitt (St. Boniface-St. Vital Resident Advisory Group): Good evening, Madam Chairman. I appear tonight on behalf of the St. Boniface-St. Vital Resident Advisory Group.

The St. Boniface-St. Vital Resident Advisory Group can agree with some of the conclusions reached by the minister as presented in this bill, that being: the pie-shaped wards are not the way to go; and the need for more citizen participation at City Hall.

We will limit our comments tonight to three issues that we believe are smoke screens that are being presented to the citizens of Winnipeg:

1. the citizens of Winnipeg will save money by reducing the size of City Council;
2. reducing the size of the City of Winnipeg Council would make it more efficient in the delivery of services to the public; and
3. the provincial Conservatives have a mandate to reduce the size of City Council.

* (2220)

Number 1, Ms. Chairperson, we take the liberty to include certain pages of the 1991 Working Papers of the City of Winnipeg Current Estimates, which are included at the back of your package.

The pages titled Tax Supported, Summary and Comparison, show the total budget as being approximately \$615 million, and of this amount the General Government section shows a cost of approximately \$35.5 million. Of this amount, the Council department, account No. 01-020201, shows a cost of approximately \$1 million, and of this

amount, approximately \$500,000 are for Salaries-Permanent for the city councillors.

The General Government section is approximately 5.8 percent of the total Tax Supported budget; the Council department is approximately 0.2 percent of the total Tax Supported budget. The councillors salary is only approximately 0.08 percent of the total Tax Supported budget.

This information shows the salaries of councillors and all the support services associated with council as being approximately \$1 million. From this amount only approximately \$500,000 are for salaries of council. This is arrived at by multiplying 24 councillors times \$16,000, for a total of \$396,000, and adding to that total \$105,000 for four standing committee chairpersons and a deputy mayor at \$21,000.

The committee should be aware that council is not only responsible for Tax Supported budget but also the Utility budget and the Capital budget, and by adding these amounts into the equation, the cost of council, or the councillors' salary, is very small.

Should this committee recommend the size of council be reduced to 12 to 15 councillors, we would assume that the councillors would have to become full time and their salaries must be changed accordingly. Using 15 councillors and assuming the amount of salaries would not be increased—that being \$500,000—each councillor would receive approximately \$30,000. Committee chairpersons and the deputy mayor would receive approximately \$40,000.

We feel this amount is not enough to entice people to give up their jobs. So we have suggested that the salaries be changed to reflect the new duties and responsibilities of the councillors. We suggest each committee chairperson and a deputy mayor receive at least \$45,000 and that the other councillors receive at least \$35,000, for a total, approximately, of \$600,000. Furthermore, we would recommend all councillors' tax-free allowance be increased. We would also recommend that the mayor's salary be adjusted to reflect the historical difference between the salaries.

The support staff must also be increased to service full-time councillors. We would recommend each committee chairperson and the deputy mayor be assigned a clerk B and the remaining councillors be assigned a clerk A.

We would also suggest that each person running for council should receive a return on the election cost, since we believe this must be factored in since the cost of running an election campaign would be similar to that of a person running in a federal or provincial election. So, as the committee can see, the cost of council must be increased in the belief that the citizens of Winnipeg will save money by reducing the size of City Council is only a smoke screen.

This committee should be reminded that council does not deliver services to the citizens of Winnipeg. Services are delivered by the administration. Council should be making policy statements and directing the administration to implement these policies. Thus, reducing the size of City Council will have no effect on the day-to-day running of the city.

Maybe the problem with the present council system of government within the city of Winnipeg is that they do not understand the function of government compared to the function of the administration. We would think reducing the size of council from 29 to 12-15 will not improve the services delivered to the citizens of Winnipeg.

Would reducing the size of council improve policy making decisions? We would point out that for the last number of years, we had the Gang of 18 running the city. We only have to look at the financial mess we are in today to understand that a smaller size of number of councillors makes no difference, but if this committee could guarantee to the citizens of Winnipeg that between 12 and 15 councillors would only make correct policy statements, then we would agree with the recommendation. We know that the committee could not guarantee this.

The committee has been using Calgary and Edmonton as examples of an efficient form of government, but we would remind you that these cities have a completely different system of delivering services to the public. These two cities have a standard of living that is higher than Winnipeg, and they also pay higher taxes. We would like to point out that they have only one school division. Is this committee going to recommend that the present system of delivering services to the citizens of Winnipeg change to reflect that of Calgary and Edmonton? We would suggest that the answer would be no.

Therefore, to suggest that reducing the size of City Council would make the delivery of services to the public more efficient is only a smoke screen.

The Conservatives and the Liberals had the same plank in their election campaign, that of reducing the size of City Council. So, the question should be, why did the Liberals end up in third place in the recent election? The response is that other issues were more important than this particular plank.

We would point out to the committee that during the provincial election a major change in the tax process was taking place, that being reassessment. This affected the outer areas of the city, where most of the Liberals' and Conservatives' support is. So we would assume that it would be in the interest of both parties to present a plank that included a change in the city structure, and the only one the provincial government could change was to reduce the size of City Council. If these two parties were that interested in reducing the cost to the city of Winnipeg taxpayers, they would look at the school boards and maybe look at their own house.

We would like to take some time to reference the Report of the Winnipeg Wards Review Committee dated May of 1991. In its report, the committee recommended in Section 1.2 that the statutory requirement for maintaining the community committees and resident advisory groups be repealed from The City of Winnipeg Act. Section 1.3 states that in the alternative, in the event that the statutory requirement for the community committees is retained, their number be reduced by one from six to five, and Section 2.1 states that the reduced number of Winnipeg city councillors be set at 15.

We will point out to the committee that Section 2.1 states 15 councillors and Section 1.3 states five community committees. This would mean three councillors per community committee.

We would point out on page 15 of the report, the committee wrote, as evidenced by the problems of three councillors, St. James-Assiniboia community committee, the community committee system requires a minimum of four councillors to be effective. It would seem the committee is saying, if the government is to retain the community committees as the minister has stated recently then, using common sense, at least the number of councillors should be 20.

In conclusion, Madam Chairperson, the St. Boniface Resident Advisory Group can see no logical reason to change the size of City Council.

What scares the group is the reasons we believe the Conservatives are doing this: 1) to eliminate the poor from running for council; 2) to eliminate public access to their elected officials; 3) to eliminate the opposition on council.

We would ask that this committee review the overall picture that this recommendation would have on the citizens of Winnipeg. We would also remind you that this system has been in place for a number of years and to rush to make changes for some misguided reason is stupid.

We would ask the committee to delay making a recommendation till after the 1992 election and then form a committee made up of citizens of Winnipeg recommended by concerned groups and that their mandate not be limited to any recommendation, as was the case with the Winnipeg Wards Review Committee. We thank the committee for allowing us the time to make this presentation.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt.

Mr. Ernst: Thank you, Madam Chairman, and thank you for your presentation, sir, on behalf of your resident advisory group.

In the calculations, and I do not dispute the conclusion, but I do dispute the fact in your calculations regarding the cost of City Council, if you look at the pages attached to your brief, you will see on what is numbered as page 17, that is the second page of the city budget pages you provided, that you have left out a quarter of a million dollars of costs for City Council not included in your calculations.

* (2230)

The salary calculations in City Council are divided into two parts, taxable and nontaxable. There are two different sections in the budget dealing with it. Your calculations has it listed in the content, or the text of your brief appears to have left out a quarter of a million dollars of cost to the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Hewitt: I am not going to debate with you.

Mr. Ernst: I do not want to debate the conclusion, because I happen to support the general conclusion that you came to. I have done so right from the start of this process, but you are in error there and left a significant part out, and I do not want you to be caught by somebody else who may not be as forgiving.

Mr. Hewitt: If I might, what you are suggesting is that the councillors actually get that money, but they do not actually get the money, the city pays that money, not to the councillors, but out of the city cut. The money does not actually go to the councillors.

Mr. Ernst: Yes, it does go to the councillors. It is just not taxed.

Mr. Hewitt: In the budget it is listed under a service for that particular department. It is not listed as a salary or a benefit. If it was a salary, it would be a benefit or—

Mr. Ernst: The category again, if the delegation again refers to page 17, it says nontaxable indemnity. Indemnity is in fact an amount of money paid to someone. I again do not want to debate the issue. I think if you do review this afterwards, you will see that in fact they do get that money and, if you ask a councillor what his salary is, it will be more than the amount that you stated in your proposal. That is the only comment I have, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Hewitt: Could I make one more comment that is not included in my remarks that in the Winnipeg Wards Review boundary, the particular ward that I have for the scenario of 15 wards, which is ward one, has me living in a ward with 52,000 people, which I think is a little bit over and above what anybody ever estimated as the size of a ward.

Mr. Ernst: I might suggest first of all that those are not the boundaries that will be determined ultimately. Those were done for planning purposes, I believe, although I cannot formally say that, because I was not present at the time that it was considered.

What is going to happen though is that the Winnipeg Ward Boundaries Commission will be sitting, assuming the bill passes, over the next period of time between now and November to actually draw ward boundaries that are formalized with appropriate population adjustments to meet requirements.

Mr. Hewitt: Just a further question then to the Chair. Is it the intent of this committee then that the wards will be limited to a number and then it would be up to ward boundaries to suggest a line?

Mr. Ernst: Yes.

Mr. Hewitt: Is there a recommendation as to the number?

Mr. Ernst: The bill contains a clause that would limit the number of wards in the city of Winnipeg to

15. That is the purpose of the meeting here tonight. That is why we are meeting, to discuss this bill which says 15 councillors.

Mr. Hewitt: I do not think that was my question. I asked you if there was a number for each ward. Would you say that the number is going to be based on an existing number from time to time, or is it going to be at 20,000 and then it is going to be increased till we get more?

Mr. Ernst: The question of the number of representatives or the number of people represented in each ward will be determined by the Ward Boundaries Commission. They will simply take the total population and divide it by the number of wards. They have to give you an approximation, and then they have the right, I think, to adjust 10 percent in either direction to try and fit the pieces together. There will be public hearings on the question of the size and the configuration of wards, and you will have an opportunity to make representation before that commission when it meets later this year.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Hewitt. Dr. Jim Shapiro? Please proceed, Dr. Shapiro.

Dr. Jim Shapiro (St. Germain Residents Association): Madam Chairperson and members of the committee, my name is Dr. Shapiro. I am the president of the St. Germain Community Association. I am also the vice-chairperson of the St. Boniface-St. Vital Resident Advisory Group and the vice-chairperson of the IntraCity Resident Advisory Group. I am not affiliated with any political party.

I tell you these things not because I am representing these groups, but so that you will know something about me and my background.

Madam Chairperson, nothing is more dangerous than an idea, especially when it is the only idea that one has. Your government seems to be obsessed with the idea of reducing the size of Winnipeg City Council. The Minister of Urban Affairs, the Honourable Jim Ernst, is quoted as saying that his government is committed to reduce the size of City Council. In other words, City Council is going to be reduced—period, end of discussion.

Mr. Ernst's decision has been made. There is nothing left to talk about. I must say that I find this attitude repulsive in a democracy, abhorrent in a free society, and condescending to the voters of this

province in general and to the residents of Winnipeg in particular. What Mr. Ernst is saying, Madam Chairperson, is that all previous committees investigating this issue have been sacrificial lambs on the altar of the Minister of Urban Affairs and that the views of Winnipeg voters mean nothing to him.

Mr. Ernst has also said that reducing the size of City Council was an election promise, and I would ask this committee, to whom? Your government, Madam Chairperson, only won 13 of 31 seats in Winnipeg, hardly a majority. It only won 30 of 57 seats in the province, a very narrow majority. The 13 seats your government won in Winnipeg represent only 22 percent of the seats available in the last election. If your government was instituting a policy of reducing the size of City Council in all provincial ridings, then your provincial majority would mean something. Then you would have a mandate.

A mandate carries with it the implication that a majority of the people agree with a particular issue, but that is not what your government is saying, Madam Chairperson. Your government is saying that the people of the province of Manitoba are concerned about the size of City Council in Winnipeg. Now, Madam Chairperson, I may be bald, but I am not stupid. Your government does not really expect me to believe that the people in the riding of Rupertsland or Turtle Mountain or Emerson or Thompson or wherever give one hoot about the size of City Council in Winnipeg. So when Mr. Ernst says that his government has a mandate to reduce the size of City Council, that statement is simply false.

While we are on the topic, Madam Chairperson, I would like to point out that your government's statements seem to indicate that the only plank in their platform was one of reducing the size of City Council in Winnipeg. Since they won the election they seem to think that they must implement this aspect of their campaign. But, Madam Chairperson, the Liberals ran on the same issue and they came in third. The NDP ran against such a proposal, and they came in second. If reducing the size of City Council was the only plank on which the PC government platform rested, then how do you account for the fact that the other parties did as well, or not as well, with the same issue?

Obviously, Madam Chairperson, there is more to a campaign than one issue. Indeed, political campaigns are deliberately made into emotional

orgies designed to distract attention from the real issues involved. They are designed to paralyze the powers of thinking the electorate can normally muster. So how can the PC government repeatedly tell the public that they have a mandate to reduce the size of City Council, as if there was just one issue at stake?

Furthermore, Madam Chairperson, I would like to know which policy your government is referring to when they say they have a mandate—all campaign promises, or just selected ones that have some advantage for the government now in power? If your government says that they have a mandate, then they will have to address all campaign promises as if that is their mandate. But your government never said that in its campaign, never said that any one policy was any more important than any other policy. So why is reducing the size of City Council so important to your government when they have already rejected other campaign promises—for example, to decentralize civil service jobs from Winnipeg to rural Manitoba? They have also rejected the plan to cut the educational funding burden on property taxpayers. These campaign promises have already been broken.

* (2240)

So again I ask: Why is it so important for your government to reduce the size of City Council in Winnipeg? Your government did not get a majority of the people in Winnipeg to agree to reduce the size of their City Council. You cannot reasonably tell residents of Winnipeg that the residents of towns and villages outside of Winnipeg care about the size of Winnipeg's City Council. Even if they did, Madam Chairperson, they are not empowered by The City of Winnipeg Act to vote in any municipal matters inside the borders of the city of Winnipeg.

If the majority of the residents within the city of Winnipeg did not vote for a reduction in the size of their City Council, and the residents in the rest of the province do not care, then who is fostering this condition onto the residents of Winnipeg? The answer, Madam Chairperson, is your government. The question is—why? We do not know. We do know, however, that your government's provincial majority does not mean that they can impose conditions on Winnipeg residents that Winnipeg residents do not want.

The situation would be vastly different, Madam Chairperson, if your government had a position that

it was representing. Normally, a government puts out a white paper or a position paper on a particular topic that is available to the public to peruse and study. Your government's white paper, Madam Chairperson, is blank paper. Your government has not given the people of Winnipeg one shred of evidence that a reduced City Council would be advantageous to the residents of Winnipeg. Your government has given the solution to an unvoiced problem. It has given the answer to an unasked question. Again I ask, why should we reduce the size of City Council?

The PC government has not given the electorate of Winnipeg one reason why they should believe the PC government's claim that a reduced City Council would be more advantageous than our current City Council. The lack of any terms of reference is insulting to the intelligence of Winnipeg residents. With no stated rationale for changing the size and shape of wards, your government can be accused of gerrymandering for their own political objectives. Unfortunately, I do believe that many residents of Winnipeg believe that a reduced City Council would save the city some money, but we know that is not true. Even Mr. Ernst admits that.

It has been stated that a smaller City Council would be more efficient. Well, efficient for whom and in what way? There is no guarantee that a smaller council would be a more efficient council. If you want efficiency, install a dictator as your form of municipal government; if you want democracy, stay with the current system. Democracy, by its very nature, is not efficient, but there is nothing written that says that a large council cannot be efficient. To be concerned with efficiency is reasonable; to be obsessed with efficiency at the expense of democracy is unreasonable.

If there is no good reason for reducing the size of City Council, Madam Chairperson, if there is no logical or sane reason for doing so, then your government is encouraging the public to come up with illogical reasons, bad reasons, false reasons, insane reasons. The number of possible bad reasons that could be generated is only limited by the ingenuity of the originator. The point is that your government, for whatever undisclosed reason, is fostering upon the residents of Winnipeg a policy that has not been aired. It has not been debated, it has not been discussed or even open to a public forum. Your government is exercising the raw power of a majority. Power politics is the diplomatic

name for the law of the jungle, and the people of Winnipeg deserve a better fate than to be fed as meat to the PC Party. If legitimacy and integrity of process are the cornerstone of governments, then your government is violating both, and in the end, I believe it will suffer.

There are consequences to reducing the size of City Council and I would like to discuss those with you for a few moments. The first possible consequence may very well be a court challenge. If that occurs, your government's desire to implement such a change by the municipal election of 1992 may be held up, and the entire exercise will have been counterproductive. The process of deciding whether City Council should be reduced in size should be impartial, but it should also be seen to be impartial. If that is not the case, your government is inviting charges of gerrymandering, encouraging a court challenge, and damaging its own reputation.

Second, each councillor would represent two-thirds the population of federal ridings and twice that of provincial constituencies.

Third, the cost to run a campaign in such a large riding would just be too rich for most local, independent candidates.

Fourth, only the well-heeled, the well-connected, the well-placed would be able to run for office. This simply is not democratic. Furthermore, larger wards would encourage blocks of candidates to band together to share campaign expenses such as brochures, mailing costs, advertisements and so forth. It would encourage corporate donations to individual candidates marking the end of the democratic process and, given this situation, who will represent those segments of society that the corporations are not interested in, such as various citizens groups, minorities, the disadvantaged, the poor, aboriginal people, inner-city residents and so forth?

Fifth, there will be more provincial representation for the same number of people than there is municipally.

Sixth, in all probability hired officials will have to decide on zoning matters which are currently handled by local councillors who are familiar with the neighbourhood.

Seventh, reducing the size of City Council would double the workload and would mean that local issues were decided by councillors who were not.

Finally, No. 8. If such a course of action was pursued successfully, then Winnipeg residents would be denied their fair share of democracy. If liberty and equality are the by-products of a democracy, they are best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost. Your government's idea would prevent that.

One reason why democracy would suffer would be because the concept of community committees would be altered, either in number or function or both. The community committee, Madam Chairperson, is simply the best show in town. There is no admission charge. There is no cover charge. It has fantastic comedy. I cannot remember when I have laughed as hard as I have when I heard some of the gaffes, the jokes and faux pas that have occurred at community committee meetings, but community committee meetings also have great drama. Think of 100 residents crowded into a council chamber, half of them want a project approved and half of them are opposed to it. What is the area councillor going to do and on what basis is he or she going to render a verdict? Will he or she go for the votes or strive to retain some degree of humanity in municipal politics? You think, what would I do under similar circumstances? You wait for the decision. High drama, because it involves something very intimate to the area residents and because this is a democracy where we can still discuss these issues without exchanging bullets or blows.

* (2250)

The community committee also involves pathos when neighbourhoods begin to change, when old values begin to give way to modern technology, when lofty ideals and honoured objectives are defeated and the best of intentions with the greatest of efforts come crashing to the ground, leaving those involved feeling defeated and frustrated and abused and defenceless. Madam Chairperson, there is a vein of poetry that seems to exist in the hearts of many people. Listening to them at community committees makes one want to hear a lot more of that poetry.

At the community committee meetings one can see great courage when an individual stands before a potentially imposing and intimidating group of individuals and struggles to do that which is so difficult for most people, that is give a presentation, act as a delegation or present a point of view. You have to admire the fortitude and the strength of

these individuals, Madam Chairperson, and you can ask, what makes them do it? I believe it is a sincere and honest desire to preserve or enhance or facilitate some aspect of their community. It is that important to them.

The community committee is grassroots involvement par excellence. Yet, I do not see community committees listed as one of the 100 reasons to love Winnipeg, but they should be. Community committees are open, democratic forums which are sensitive to the needs of the communities and the people within them.

Community committees deal with the quality-of-life questions in one's neighbourhood. It concerns one's child, one's desire to have a park nearby or a set of swings or a wading pool or the frequency of garbage pickup or no garbage pickup. It is the informal atmosphere of one's local community committee in which one can discuss local issues with local councillors. The community committee is the political gymnasium where area residents can exercise their political muscles. Just as one finds newfound enjoyment in discovering muscles that you never knew you had before, in a similar fashion residents find that they can participate in decisions affecting them, their neighbours, and indeed their community, and perhaps just maybe some of these individuals will continue to be involved with their resident associations and neighbourhood groups because they now know that they can.

That is important, Madam Chairperson, because if democracy is going to die, it is not likely to be by assassination from ambush. It will be a slow extinction from apathy, indifference and undernourishment, and this is why the concept of community committees must not be tampered with. We want to encourage our residents to participate in the political process. This is why, one could argue, that the number of community committees should be increased, not just allowed to remain the same and certainly not to decrease in number.

I say that last statement, Madam Chairperson, knowing full well that most of the implications which would follow from such a concept, such as increasing the size of City Council. Community committees were initially established to facilitate citizen participation and involvement with local government. They were based on the assumption that the elected representative must always be as

responsive and accountable to the people he or she represents as is humanly possible.

In 1970, Metro Winnipeg corporation's political structure consisted of 10 elected members for some 500,000 people. It was felt that the situation afforded greater Winnipeg citizens extremely limited access to their representatives on Metro Council. It was felt that there were far too few councillors to permit a high degree of contact between councillors and constituents.

Your government's desire to reduce the size of City Council, Madam Chairperson, would take us back to the former situation instead of improving the current one. Your government's objective should be to reduce the number of citizens per elected representative or at least to guarantee that it will remain at the current level.

Community committees are composed of wards. In most cases, these wards are based on local, historical or traditional boundaries. In other words, the wards are ideally based on natural and familiar community groupings. The purpose of such groupings is to strengthen local character and identity. Your government's former proposal to introduce pie-shaped wards would defeat this objective. Instead of providing a structure in format to encourage citizen involvement in the affairs of the community, your government would be discouraging, not encouraging, citizen involvement. There would be no community from which citizens would be involved. This reasoning extends to any other ward which would cut across the local, historical and traditional boundaries of the communities.

Why would an individual want to become involved in an issue that is remote from his neighbourhood, but which technically is in a politically defined area which includes this individual's community? If you close avenues of political access, citizens certainly will not participate in local government. If you provide avenues of political access, citizens may respond. That is why it is important to obtain community committees and to strengthen them with resident advisory groups.

The community committees must provide ready access by the people to the local government system. Democracy is government by the people, Madam Chairperson. By doing anything that will reduce the ability of the people to govern, the PC government is only serving its own objectives and

not those of the people who elected you. A people's government is made for the people, it is made by the people, and it is answerable to the people. If your government is going to threaten our democracy, then it will be making Winnipeg a place where the candle of hope no longer shines with the result that we may become a city cloaked in the darkness of the damned. That will be your government's legacy to our city.

That situation is not likely to make the list of 100 reasons to love Winnipeg. Democracy is direct self-government over all the people, by all the people, and for all the people. Your government's proposed actions will redefine democracy to mean the bludgeoning of the people, by the people, and for the people. In a democratic society like ours, relief from objectionable actions or proposals must come through an aroused popular conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives.

I hope this hearing senses the still mostly unspoken will of the people to the members of your government and sears your collective conscience so that you react as if someone touched a raw exposed collective nerve. I hope that Mr. Ernst takes notice and asks himself, is this really the right way to go?

I hope that some of the members of your government's majority ask themselves if this issue is one which they can live with, if they choose to suppress democracy in our city. I hope they ask themselves if they must vote with your government or if this is an issue so important that they must vote with their consciences even if it brings down your government.

I also hope that this issue educates the residents of Winnipeg, Madam Chairperson. I hope the residents of Winnipeg realize that they are about to be deprived of something that in other countries people are willing to die for. I hope the residents of Winnipeg become educated, because education makes people easy to govern but impossible to enslave. No government is good enough to govern other people without the consent of those people. I truly believe in the current form of municipal government. I believe it is a government of the people, and by the people, and for the people. I do not believe that it should be a government acting in place of the people or instead of the people.

Madam Chairperson, the most frightening thing about your government to me is the fact that they have given no reasons for their decision to reduce the size of City Council. They have not indicated whether it would be better or worse for the residents of Winnipeg. Most importantly, they have not indicated the evidence on which they based their arguments and the criteria by which that evidence was evaluated. Other commissions formed to do the same exact thing have done that. I believe that if the PC government has a good idea, let us talk about it, let us hear what you have to say. If it is a good idea, let us air it, let us debate it, let us discuss it.

* (2300)

On the other hand, I must frankly tell you, I am equally frightened by the attitude of the residents of Winnipeg. In the last municipal election, 67 percent of them did not vote. Very few of them have appeared at any of the hearings convened to discuss this issue. I am afraid that the residents of Winnipeg have become apathetic, uninterested and, most frighteningly of all, uninformed. Perhaps what we need is a Spicer Commission for Winnipeg residents, a forum to give ordinary average Winnipeggers a chance to talk about their city. Too often we hear the refrain, you cannot fight City Hall. This attitude is unfortunate since our current mode of municipal government was set up to encourage decision making at a level as accessible as possible for the citizens directly affected by it.

Community committees were set up to represent City Council at the local level. Their primary responsibility was to develop communication between the city and the residents of the community. Resident advisory groups were established to represent the people to the community committee. These two groups acting in parallel, one on the government side and one on the citizen side, were to be the means by which the people and the government would communicate. It is a unique system in Canada, and it encourages participatory democracy. Unfortunately, there is a built-in antagonism between elected public officials and politically active citizens' groups. So, although they were mandated by The City of Winnipeg Act, City Council never gave the RAG groups any significant policy making or administrative functions to perform, and they never allocated them any financial resources to carry out their functions.

The shortage of funds restricted their ability to conduct research and publicized their actions. You cannot expect residents to participate for long if there is little or no point in their participating. So, over the years, we have had a public that has been less and less informed about a more important issue in their lives, that is, public representation of their concerns to their local government. Any conclusion that the RAG's contributions to the effectiveness of community committees have not been noteworthy is to put the cart before the horse. You cannot destroy a system and then say, it has not been effective.

The community committees were to provide local services and to facilitate communication between the city government and local residents. The resident advisory groups were to provide input to the community committee concerning such items as city finances, programs, planning and development decisions. Today our residents do not know what the functions of the community committee are, and they do not know what the functions of the resident advisory groups are supposed to be. When Winnipeg residents complained about not having a say in local government or a say on financial matters, they do not realize that they do have a say in such matters. They simply do not understand how they can avail themselves of such services and how they can participate.

Instead of even suggesting that the number of councillors be reduced, the provincial government should be educating its citizens about the processes available to them. We need more informed residents participating in the RAG groups and co-operating with the community committees to enhance local control over local matters with local councillors concerning local issues and affecting local residents.

Education is the first part of politics. It is also the second part and the third part. Your government should be concentrating its efforts on educating the electorate and freeing them from a yoke of ignorance that they are currently wearing. The problem facing your government, as I see it, is not in reducing the size of City Council or in changing the shape of existing wards but in educating the residents of Winnipeg concerning their local government and showing them how they can participate in it.

Using ignorance of the rules to take advantage of local residents for the government's own sake is

simply something I cannot condone. The changes that the PC government is proposing in local government should facilitate participatory democracy, encourage resident involvement and educate the residents about the form of their local government. You should centralize the delivery of services and politically decentralize public representation. You should be making accessibility to elected representatives easier and more frequent instead of suggesting changes that would have the opposite effect. You should be recommending changes that would make delivery of services more efficient and less costly to the citizens of Winnipeg. In that vein, Madam Chairperson, I do have some specific recommendations to make that might just accomplish these objectives. They are as follows. I will be giving you copies of this after my presentation, so you will have copies of these recommendations.

Number 1, do not reduce the number of councillors. To do so would just centralize the political process and reduce the accessibility of local councillors to those they are supposed to be representing. The six community committees have really worked quite successfully in Winnipeg. Given a minimum of three councillors per community committee as an absolutely irreducible number, and allowing for various population densities, 29 councillors then represent the smallest council that we should have to preserve democracy in Winnipeg.

Number 2, the number of wards, their shape and their names should remain the same. Any changes to the existing wards can be handled by the Winnipeg Wards Boundaries Commission which is mandated under The City of Winnipeg Act.

Number 3, have the mayor elected by and from the elected councillors. In other words, the mayor would not be elected at large. He would represent a ward like all other councillors but would be elected by the largest block of elected councillors. The result of this process would be that councillors representing a majority of the electorate's concerns, on at least one issue, would be able to elect the mayor. They would also formally introduce party politics to municipal government.

Number 4, eliminate the Board of Commissioners and the bureaucracy that they control.

Number 5, give the community committees the power to make local decisions and give them a budget to implement these decisions.

Number 6, refine the responsibilities of the resident advisors groups to supervise the provision of these services, as they were originally intended to do.

Number 7, councillors should be elected for six-year terms.

Number 8, one-third of council would be elected every two years. In each of four community committee areas two councillors would be elected every two years with a single councillor being elected in the next election year. In one community committee one councillor will be elected every two years, while in a third area two councillors will be elected every two years.

Number 9, municipal candidates obtaining 10 percent of the vote cast should be compensated for their election expenses.

Number 10, councillors should be full-time employees of the city.

Number 11, councillors should be paid around \$70,000 per year. They would have secretaries, research staff and offices equipped with those machines necessary to effectively and efficiently deal with the public and with city councillors. If you want to know why the salary, councillors under your proposed scheme would be doing roughly twice the work of an MLA in terms of the people they would be representing, so they should be paid accordingly. In addition, when you add on the perks of the MLAs the salaries become almost equal.

Number 12, councillors in positions of authority would take over the positions currently held by the Board of Commissioners. The problem with the Winnipeg city government is the size of our bureaucracy and the amount of influence and control they exert over elected representatives.

* (2310)

Number 13, such councillors would be responsible to council for proposing policy but responsible for the delivery of services to the public at the same time.

This system, Madam Chairperson, has several advantages to it over the policy proposed by your government. First, it maintains the possibility of enhancing participatory democracy in Winnipeg. It does not reduce the number of wards and provides the possibility of educating the public about its role in local government. It at least maintains

democracy as it currently can be, not necessarily as it actually exists today.

Second, it gives councillors a long term of office to learn how the city actually runs and to learn how to operate a particular aspect of the city. Councillors in administrative positions would have department heads that would oversee the business of the day. Over a period of time those councillors who are predisposed to such administrative duties will fill those posts, and those who are not will not do so, or they will be voted out of office if they are incompetent.

The electorate will have direct control over the administration of city services in that they can voice their concerns about the performance of a particular service at the ballot box. The budget process is a case in point. Currently, the budget is prepared by the city administration and reflects what they think is required to financially run the city and what they think the politicians will accept. Why not let the politicians make up the budget to reflect what they think is required to financially run the city? With the voter's finger on the re-election trigger, I venture to say that what is required to financially run the city will take on a different appearance.

By electing some councillors every two years, the electorate will have more control over the direction in which they want City Council to go. Not all wards would elect a councillor every two years, but in each community committee area there would be an opportunity for the electorate to work for a candidate they feel will do the most good for their community committee area every two years. Eventually, if such candidates were elected for a majority of the time, the electorate would be in a position to control City Council much more than they can at the present time. At the same time, it would be in the best interest of the community if concerned residents participated in local government through the RAG groups to achieve local objectives with their local councillors through their community committee.

By not duplicating the costs of operating a City Council and a Board of Commissioners, the costs of operating the city will be reduced. By centralizing the delivery of city services and reducing the six-district concept, the cost of running the city will be reduced and probably be more efficient. By decentralizing the political process, accessibility of councillors to local residents would be enhanced.

These, Madam Chairperson, are my suggestions. I do not claim that they are the best suggestions that can be offered to your committee at this time or at any time in the foreseeable future. Indeed, there are some problems associated with my suggestions. For example, how do you elect a mayor from a revolving council? I do not know. What do you mean by a full-time councillor? I cannot offer you a satisfactory definition at this time, but one thing that I am suggesting to you is that your government's proposed actions are counterproductive and unwarranted. Nothing is more terrible than ignorance in action, and unfortunately your government is giving every indication that is exactly what it is doing.

Nothing is more damaging to a new truth than an old error. If the new truth is an enhanced municipal government that is more accessible and more efficient and less costly to its residents than, Madam Chairperson, your government is potentially about to wreak great damage on the citizens of Winnipeg by committing an old error.

In the 1960s, in the Metropolitan Winnipeg Council, voter turnout was extremely low. It was thought to be because the wards were too large. Before we repeat our failures of the past, let us determine how to remedy them so that we do not repeat them again.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my presentation, Madam Chairperson and members of the committee. I know that it was longer than most, but I do appreciate your courtesy while listening to me.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Dr. Shapiro.

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Dr. Shapiro, I am intrigued with your presentation. I want to acknowledge that very much of what you have told us today is very excellent—thoughts on local government—and certainly worthy of consideration by this or any other committee, or indeed city administration. But I am troubled with many other parts of your presentation.

You caught my attention immediately in your opening sentence, when you suggested nothing—if I am paraphrasing you right—is more dangerous than an idea. Surely you are not suggesting that those of us, who from time to time get elected to office, should be nothing but a collection of vacuous airheads, bereft of any idea. That cannot be what you meant, sir.

Mr. Shapiro: No, Mr. Enns, that is not what I meant. What I meant was the Progressive Conservative government is not giving the residents of Winnipeg one shred of evidence about why this single idea of reducing City Council is advantageous. If it is advantageous, I want to know why, and if it is not advantageous, I also want to know why. So by being obsessed with one idea, that is, repeatedly telling us through the press that this city government is going to be reduced—end of discussion—I would like to know why.

Mr. Enns: Obviously, Dr. Shapiro, it is the idea of reduction, in this case, that is upsetting you. Again, you refer to it as repulsive, abhorrent, anti-democratic. I mean, this is not the first time reform has come to the City of Winnipeg and surrounding area of government. You are well aware of it. You refer to it in your brief. If I were to describe to you a raw exercise of the power of a majority, then you would have to recall the actions of an NDP Urban Affairs minister, under the then Schreyer NDP administration, that wiped out 13, 14 municipal governments, including the City of St. Boniface in its totality.

We heard an eloquent appeal by a presenter just previous to you, Councillor Murray, who chastised the government for reducing the representation from the city of St. Boniface. In an NDP administration, Mr. Saul Cherniack, wiped out the mayor and entire council of the city of St. Boniface, along with 13, 14 other mayors and reeves, along with some 100 councillors and aldermen, as they were then called. Was that action on the part of a majority government repulsive, abhorrent and anti-democratic to you, sir?

Mr. Shapiro: I cannot comment on that specific aspect of your question, Mr. Enns, but I want to point out it is not the reduction in City Council which is repulsive, abhorrent and anti-democratic, but the procedure by which I perceive the Progressive Conservative government going about trying to achieve that objective. That objective may be laudable and advantageous to the residents of Winnipeg. Tell us why. Where is your white paper? What is your position? Let me know. I am willing to discuss it with you, but you are not allowing me to. It is the procedure, not the objective which is repulsive.

Mr. Enns: Dr. Shapiro, you know, it has really concerned me, in fact, saddened me that over the last period of time in these committees I and members of my government are being consistently

charged with being anti-democratic in some way or other.

We had, on another bill the other evening, a presenter telling us how undemocratic we were in a particular bill, and he was asked—was he giving up on democracy? He described that, well, you could not have a democratic situation while he was living in Ontario because his member was a Conservative member. He did not have a democratic situation when he moved to Winnipeg, in Wolseley, because at that time it was represented by a Liberal member, but now that he has a New Democratic Party member everything is fine, everything is democratic. Surely that is not the kind of simplistic approach to democracy, as I think you and I both understand it, that you are presenting to us.

* (2320)

Mr. Shapiro: It is not, and I said in my opening comments I am not a member of any political party. I am not saying that the Liberals or the NDP or the PC Party has not done things which were advantageous for both the province and the city of Winnipeg. I am addressing this particular issue, and I am saying that the procedure by which your government is going about trying to accomplish this objective is anti-democratic, and I say that, sir, because it is anti-democratic.

Mr. Enns: Let us deal with that democracy question once and for all. The Liberal Party and the Conservative Party ran on the last election with this as a major part of their platform, and they garnered in excess of 60 percent of the vote—a clear majority of all the residents of Winnipeg. What can be more democratic than that, and the fulfillment of that promise? Surely part of the cynicism that people rightfully have of politicians is when they say something to their electorate prior to election and then refuse to carry it out.

I mean, I am a little country boy from Woodlands. I raise cattle for a living, but I am troubled when intelligent people—and I respect your capacity and your understanding and your obvious interest in community and public affairs—will say to us in a committee that a leader of a Liberal Party, which garnered some 27 percent of the vote—more than the New Democrats, by the way, in the city of Winnipeg, yes; and the Conservative Party that garnered 37 percent or 38 percent of the votes here in the city of Winnipeg, for a combined total of some 60-65 percent, as high a majority as you can in an

open and free society where we do not have laws that charge a penalty for people if they do not vote—that is a pretty clear democratic expression of will on the part of the citizens of Winnipeg.

I do not take offence if you tell me it is a lousy bill. I do not take offence if you think it is a foolish and stupid idea, but it does offend me when you tell me that it is undemocratic of this government to do that. It does offend me when you accuse my colleague, the minister, of exercising raw power. He is a purring little pussycat compared to what Saul Cherniack did to the citizens of Winnipeg when he wiped out 14 municipal councils, mayors, reeves, and over 114 or 150 councillors and aldermen.

If your proposition is, the closer people are to their elected representatives, then, sir, you should have been making the same presentation to this same committee in 1973 when The Unicity Bill was brought forward, because it was wiping out the kind of local representation that you have been—and I think that there is some merit to it, I am not taking issue. But the issue that I am taking with you, sir, is the description of the action on the part of the minister and the part of this government as being anything less than fully democratic in every and the fullest meaning of the word. Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Dr. Shapiro.

Mr. Shapiro: May I respond? I would like to say, Mr. Enns, that I am a country boy myself. I work with ducks for a living. I would also like to say that had I been—in 1972 I had just come to Winnipeg and I wish I was more aware at that time of the concept of Unicity, because I most certainly would have spoken out against the consolidation.

It seems to me that the city of Winnipeg is encountering now the very problems that the people back then said they would encounter when they gave up all their equipment, all of their independence, all of their services to a central government. Now, some individuals are asking for their charters back, and I think that is going to continue in the weeks ahead, and I suspect that there may be more municipalities, that were formerly part of Unicity, that are going to ask for those charters back.

I would like to conclude by saying that all of my comments stand, even in light of your comments.

Mr. Enns: Madam Chairperson, I can accept that kind of a presentation and that argument being put

forward. It is an argument that, quite frankly, was shared by a number of us in 1972, although certain members of the then opposition voted for The Unicity Bill. As my memory recalls, the majority of them voted against it. But that is a legitimate difference of opinion about how we order our affairs from time to time, and that is fair game.

I suggest to you, as sincerely as I can, it is not fair game, however, to suggest that the action being undertaken by the minister and by this government as being anything than in the fullest light of the public and in a very democratic way. Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you, Dr. Shapiro, for your presentation. Mr. Kenneth Emberley. Mr. Emberley, please proceed.

Mr. Kenneth Emberley (Private Citizen): Madam Chairman, my name is Kenneth Emberley. I am not thirsty now, thanks to an angel of mercy, and the efficiency of this committee. I am grateful for that small mercy.

Chairman and members of council, the reorganization of the City of Winnipeg Council, without city councillor participation, without any balanced report on the reasons for doing so, without any supporting research, and without an opportunity to question the research and reasons, is really not an acceptable process in a democracy.

The fact that these meetings, like this meeting tonight and the meeting on Bill 70—the public is excluded. There is room for 16 or 25 and a half, or 39 people to sit in this room, but these should be broadcast on cable television.

I do not know whether you heard Mr. Shapiro's beautiful talk on democracy. He talked about educating the public. The thing most of all most of our governments do not want is for the public to be educated on the issues. They want them to hear their political campaign; they want them to hear a biased story, if a little bit of a story gets in the media. The last thing they want is to have 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 or 200 people get up here and tell the truth about proposed legislation, or what people see as the truth, and then to hear your questions and to hear answers and get educated. So when I look at government hearings, city, provincial and federal, and they deliberately exclude the public by not allowing cable television broadcasts of the whole of the hearings, I say it is an undemocratic process, deliberately limiting the public's participation.

I am a little bit of an expert on that because for 38 years in the city of Winnipeg I have been taking part in government as a small outsider tiptoeing up and trying to get a foot in the door. As a citizen member of WIN and as a citizen member of CHOICES, I am very proud of the briefs presented by Shirley Lord, and I am very thrilled with the council presentation by Councillor Glen Murray.

The possible destruction of viable community committees is almost a sure goal. By reducing the number of councillors to a trivial number in each community committee, you are destroying the effectiveness of community committees, which were one of the few salvaging principles in the NDP government's great restructuring of Unicity that took place in the early 1970s. Many of us appeared at hearings and fought with them just as hard as we are fighting with you. Do not think you are the only one that gets that honour of being angered at and disputed with. But the community committee structure was created. The resident advisory groups were created. City Council chose deliberately the old Gang of 19 to keep the community committees under their control, and to keep the RAG groups absolutely powerless. We fought about that but we knew that is the way it is.

You really do not want citizen representation; you want citizens to come and talk at a meeting but you do not want citizen empowerment. If you did, there would be a whole different structure of government. Many of us here today—I heard some of the briefs this morning. I have talked about citizen empowerment, not very much, but citizen empowerment is the last thing you want. I believe the bill should be named the restructuring of City Council to reassert the ascendance of the Gang of 19 and retain the control that has existed for such a long period of time, since 1919, I guess.

I would just like to read a brief little introduction here, a wonderful comment on another great parliamentarian. It is about a Mr. Mackenzie King and a book called the Great Depression by Pierre Burton, beginning on page 58, just a brief paragraph.

* (2330)

He had convinced himself during a visit to India a few years before, the great Mackenzie King, in 1929 that in every way desirable Canada should be kept for the white races and India for the black races, as nature appears to have decreed. He was far more

at home with men like Senor Mussolini, then the darling of the Canadian right wing, whom he visited in Rome in the fall of 1928.

I have been enthused, he wrote, about the manner in which this country has been brought together and is going ahead, the order of it all, the fine discipline, the evident regard for authority and for M. Mussolini, himself. It filled him with admiration the way in which Mussolini had offered to clean up in Italy filled with communists. He cleared the streets of beggars, like Bill Norrie, and cleared the houses of the harlots, which men liked very much.

Mussolini was a truly remarkable man of force, of genius, fine purpose, a great patriot. This was the grandson of one of Canada's great heroes. It just gives you an idea of the thoughts of people which come out a little bit later.

I wonder how many people notice the city is going bankrupt, completely going bankrupt? The Province of Manitoba is going bankrupt. Mr. Manness has the solution. He says we double our debt and double our interest payments by buying a Hydro project. We will be better off and that kind of management they say they are going to apply to the City Council, make the City Council more efficient. I would not trust them to run a bicycle factory with that kind of management ability.

I want to refer to a brief presented to you by Local 500 of CUPE, where it mentions some of the things the city is shouldering. On page 6, they mention the city shouldered much of the public's frustration and anger because of its inability to focus its collective attention on the Legislature and to get proper funding to run the city. There are graphs in here on the criminal neglect of the funding for the City of Winnipeg that has occurred since 1980, something that can be jointly shared by the provincial, NDP and the Conservative government, and I am sure the Liberals would have done as well if they had been in power. That is on page 3—there is a very important graph on the cutting of funding.

The bar graph shows the dramatic increases in school taxes compared to city tax over the last five years. It shows the effect that these increases have had and the cumulative increases and a large fraction of that is because of deliberate underfunding of the schools by the provincial government.

You just have to look at the amount of information that has been brought to us by these hearings today to show the deliberate design of the bankruptcy of our province and of our city and of our federal government by deliberate policies chosen, and the most delightful one is the illustration of taxes, the illustration of the taxes not charged to corporations.

I would like to mention this point just very briefly. Great West Life raised a great fuss about having their taxes raised after 18 years of constant tax figure. You know we would have another \$24 million in the City of Winnipeg budget if they had raised their taxes just at the rate of inflation on the giant corporations. We have a darling little leaflet here that shows the Premier's senior staff received a 15 percent increase in wages last year; the Treasury Board, the ministry of cutbacks, received an increase of 34 percent on their budget; \$50 million was given away to corporations to help them stand on their own feet independently since 1989; generous tax credits to Manitoba's large corporations of \$7 million. Power Corporation, owner of Great West Life, had profits of \$217 million, paid no income taxes in 1988. Cadillac-Fairview, who was subsidized to build Portage Place to suck money out of Winnipeg, paid no taxes in 1987 on \$37 million of profits and got a credit of \$12 million. It is all there, and you tell us you want to create efficiency and fairness and bring democracy to the city by cutting City Council?

I have been involved with community committees and I believe Mr. Ernst has been involved in community committee in the long olden days. At that time we had six members on our community committee, and the other night we had a meeting and the chairman said, you will notice that I pass the motions pretty quickly but there is one other member here tonight and the other one is away on holidays. So when the other member speaks, I will just agree with him and we will pass the motions between the two of us.

I think that is the kind of committee they plan to have in 12 community committees of six, but they are going to rearrange the city and have five community committees and that is just exactly what the NDP did to us in the early 1970s and another government did in the late 1970s. They came to us, how do you want your city chopped up? Do you want 20,000 people or 22,000 people or 24,000 or 26,000 to be represented in a group? Where do you want the boundary for your city? We will put it

anywhere you want. We will chop the city up. It is like taking twin babies and telling the mother we will give you divided up in three, and chopping off an arm or a leg or chopping it off at the neck.

Do you not know anything about cities and people and communities? They are living organisms, a group, a committee, the Wolseley area, east St. James, Westwood, St. Vital, St. Boniface. The people in St. Boniface think they have a community in downtown St. Boniface. The people in Windsor Park think they have a community. You are just going to chop them up and rearrange them. That has nothing to do with democracy. I beg to differ. I have been studying a little bit about government and I have been involved in it a little bit and I did not know anything until 1979 or 1980 when I began reading alternative sources of news, dreadful socialist literature, trade union literature, peace literature, literature by ex-capitalists, and by capitalists, all kinds of people. You find out what is really going on in the world.

We have a managed, controlled, imitation democracy, managed—what? Ninety percent of the policies of government are chosen by the 100 richest men in the country and the 12 richest families. That has nothing to do with democracy. Do you think you are fooling us? All these people talk to you today—Mr. Shapiro talking a dream world of empowering the citizens. That is not what this is about.

I went down and sat in Eldon Ross's committee and I listened to the people making presentations. There is the same rage against your government. It is the same rage we had against the great—what was his name? Howard Pawley—the same rage by the working people against Howard Pawley, the same rage that is against Brian Mulroney. They appointed the Spicer Commission to run around in circles and chitchat and they did not tell any of the rage. The rage is because the people are powerless to have any democratic power. That is the thing that makes us so angry. I am not going to be as long as Mr. Shapiro, Madam Chairman, I promise you. Either with your wishes or my wishes, I will not be as long.

I want to give you two very important things that are related to the policies you are trying to develop for the government. You are not addressing any of the real issues. You are addressing the issue of the needs for the political party in control to control and manage the City Council to their advantage so the

old Gang of 19 would be back in power and there would be a steady recruitment of new city councillors in to keep the government in power here in the province for years to come.

* (2340)

What are you really doing to our city? Do you ever look at cable television from Detroit? I have got two excerpts here: Seymour Melman's Profits Without Production. The story of the destruction of every single city in the United States because the government puts all of their emphasis and all of their budget on the military. New York City is collapsing.

My friends, Walter and Phyllis Robbins, who lived in Wolseley for many, many years, took a six-week trip all down the east coast of the United States and right across the southern states and back again. He was born in Washington, D.C. I will read you a brief excerpt from his letter.

Phyllis and I spent seven weeks and were back on May 2, 1989. Travelling in our camper van during February and March, we did a lot of sightseeing in the south and southwest. During that trip, we were struck by the enormity of the social problems in the country. The division between the haves and the have-nots has become worse and complicated by multiracial tensions, drugs, gang warfare, downright anarchy in many of the decaying inner cities. It is quite frightening. The place of my birth, Washington, D.C., has become the murder capital of the nation. I worked with the experimental federal anti-poverty agency in the capacity of deputy director for civil rights, said Walter.

Above, I am quoting from a letter I received last week from Walter Robbins now living near Montreal. In the 17 years Walter and his wife, Phyllis, a schoolteacher, lived in Manitoba, they were exemplary citizens active in the affairs of our province.

On February 15, '89, the Senate office building of Washington, D.C., Sargent Shriver, the first director of the Federal Anti-Poverty Organization, addressed 200 former members of the group during their reunion with this message: The rate of poverty in the U.S.A. in 1987 is higher than at any time since 1970. It has risen since steadily, and the rate is higher than that of any other modern industrial nation. The U.S.A. divides its economic wealth between rich and poor now more unfairly than any one of the 13 OECD countries, including Spain

which used to be the leader in unfairness, a 40-year military dictatorship.

The United States divides their income between rich and poor more unfairly and because they are starving their cities, every city is collapsing. You are doing deliberately the same thing since 1980. It is documented in this brief from CUPE 500. You are doing exactly the same thing to the city of Winnipeg, and you tell me that you are trying to help the city of Winnipeg by restructuring City Council and rearranging it so there will be 40,000 people in each city councillor's ward and each city councillor would be twice as important as an MLA as far as population goes.

Have you studied cities? The city has a greater need. They perform more vital functions in the country for the people than either other level of government. To most people, the city and the City Council and the city government is far more important and far closer than any distant provincial government or more distant federal government. What you are doing, you are depriving them of the funds that they need to look after the people in the city, and because of their own stupidity and the fact that they are dominated by the same kind of people up until a few years ago that we have right here in this Legislature, they do not give a damn about balancing their budget and taxing the corporations fairly and honestly.

We have the extreme right-wing agenda of cutting taxes. It began with that extreme right winger, Pierre—what was his last name?—some Montreal millionaire. Pierre Trudeau, that was it. In 1975, he started the 6 and 5 program to attack the labouring classes and cut the wages and the trade union rights of working people—a great right-wing Liberal. He carried on and he carried on and they kept setting taxes. The last three or four or five years on \$70 billion to \$100 billion of profits in Canada, all the federal government got in net taxes was between \$1 million and \$6 billion. One to \$6 billion was all the federal government got in net income taxes from corporations, and you people are playing the same game provincially, and the City Council is playing the same game locally.

You are destroying my country. You are making my federal government bankrupt. You are making my provincial government bankrupt. You are making my city government bankrupt. I think, and I bet you there were two other people who were in this room today who think that the people who are

carrying out this program thoughtfully, carefully under the guidance of Tom d'Aquino and David Somerville and the Chamber of Commerce are not very decent people. You were not hired—because you are hired, you are employees of the people of Manitoba. You were hired not to destroy Manitoba and not to sell Manitoba to the Americans. You have done that under free trade. This is all part of the same program of taking our country apart. Do you think we do not know what is going on?

Maude Barlow talked to us for 45 minutes in St. Norbert. She and a gang of people were down in Montreal looking at the maquiladoras. It is exactly what the gang of the Chamber of Commerce had their big meeting a year and a half ago February, exactly what they planned for the working people in Winnipeg. They said the first thing they have to do is cut the wages of the labouring classes. We have to cut taxes on the rich executives. We have to cut taxes on corporations. That was the first three goals of that gang, that new imitation committee that has been set up. They hired a guy from Mississauga to run it. I sat in the Spicer Commission hearing beside him.

This legislation is not right. It is not decent. There is nothing good about it. There is nothing democratic about it, and it is not going to improve things in the city of Winnipeg. It is deliberately done to destroy the democratic process. I beg of you to heed Mr. Shapiro's brief. He made a far more intellectual brief than I can read. You heard the councillors get up here and speak and they spoke with knowledge, wisdom and skill. I bet you there is one other one waiting. Maybe he will turn out to be the same kind of a person. We never know. I beg of you -(interjection)- Oh, my God, like the Golden Boy standing on one foot. I just beg of you, do not pass this legislation as it is. You are not going to fool the people of Winnipeg. If this hearing had been broadcast and the people of Winnipeg knew what all the knowledgeable people who came in here with their exquisitely written briefs, if they knew what they had said, you would not have a chance of passing this bill. You would not get elected the next election.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Mr. Emberley. Councillor Shirley Timm-Rudolph. Excuse me just one moment. I better just check and ascertain that indeed the other individuals listed prior to you are not in attendance. Ms. Jean Miller-Usiskin, Councillor Greg Selinger. I

am sorry, I missed one—Mr. Frank Goldspink. Councillor Shirley Timm-Rudolph.

Ms. Shirley Timm-Rudolph (Councillor, Springfield Heights Ward, City of Winnipeg): Madam Chairman and committee members, it is nice to see you again this evening. The hour is late and I will keep my comments as brief as possible. I hope to repeat a lot of the things that were said before the Eldon Ross commission. I made representation. I am sure that information is able to be provided to committee members in terms of the briefs as well as, I guess, the verbal presentations, but I did want to point out a couple of things.

I found it interesting, first off, Mr. Enns' comments about democracy. While he raised one point in terms of one of the former NDP governments taking municipalities and forming them into one unicity government, of which I happen to be a second cousin to the former Premier, I would also like to point out that in 1977 he commissioned the Taraska Committee to prepare a report on another reduction to City Council. The recommendation from the Taraska report was to reduce council to some degree, but the provincial government decided to go even further and deeper than those cuts that were recommended by Taraska and went from 51 to 30.

The history of that is contained within the Cherniack report, the review of The City of Winnipeg Act, so I thought that was rather interesting and something that also should be pointed out at this level and included within the minutes of this meeting. So it is not once that he did it but in fact twice and even went further and deeper than his own commission had looked at at that particular time.

I sincerely believe, in my own opinion and some of the discussions I have had with my cousin, that I think even today he would agree that council must be reduced. I wanted, I guess, basically just to raise a couple of points with you and maybe provide some information that had not been provided at the commission hearings.

* (2350)

Back on March 7 of this year, when the Eldon Ross Committee was meeting in the West Kildonan area, the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee office, to be specific, I happened to have been chairing a community residential meeting in Councillor O'Shaughnessy's ward. At that time, there were approximately 103 people who attended

that meeting and basically were there to discuss the city's financial situation.

At that meeting, we passed around a questionnaire to the people who were in attendance, and there were a number of questions on it, one dealing with the arena, one dealing with the budget process. There also happened to be one specifically—and what had generated the question was the fact that Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan office was being host of the Eldon Ross committee. In that questionnaire, we asked a question about whether or not those in attendance supported the reduction in City Council. Of those 103 who attended, 100 responded: 94 percent of those in attendance at that meeting were in favour of a dramatic cut in the size of council and indicated 15 or less; 6 percent went for the status quo; zero percent for an increase in the size of council. It was a very interesting exercise.

Just recently, as a result of some of the discussion centred around the issue of pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Portage and Main, I, in my ward, had a phone poll done that basically was conducted in the Morse Place area, the East Elmwood district, part of Transcona, which I represent, Lakeside Meadows, Kildonan Meadows and Mission Gardens area. Of the 100 people who were phoned—I am just looking for my numbers here—they were also asked a further question on the size of City Council, whether it should be reduced or remain status quo.

Of those who were polled, 95 percent in my constituency supported a reduction in City Council. We did not get into the details of how expansive that reduction should be, but there was the answer to the question. I want to point out to the committee, for those of you who may not be familiar with, for example, the East Elmwood area, this area in my community happens to form part of what used to be the old city of Winnipeg, which is fairly old in age in terms of the housing stock, has a large portion of senior citizens and, as well, people who are living in poverty. The reaction from that area was just the same as it was in the real suburban part of my constituency.

I think my area, being largely different from that of Councillor O'Shaughnessy, which is strictly a suburban area, has a combination residential inner city, what I would classify as inner city, because those people surely believe they are inner city. They form part of the old city of Winnipeg. They are

on Winnipeg Hydro, not Manitoba Hydro. They are part of Winnipeg School Division No. 1—is a different group of people, and they, too, share that same opinion. So it was an interesting exercise.

On the feeling that some expressed here this evening that it is impossible for somebody, anybody, for that matter, to represent 40,000 people. Well, Madam Chairman, you will know, as somebody who formerly sat on City Council, that I, along with another few members of City Council, represented some 42,000 people. For somebody to say that you cannot effectively represent those people, I think it is a complete fallacy. It is totally unquestionable that somebody would say just that it is impossible to represent those people.

My constituency, at that time, as compared to others within my own community district, were, as an example, some approximately 18,000 that ranged in a variety of different numbers in terms of population. So you would have one councillor representing 18,000 and somebody like myself representing 40,000 or 42,000. Quite frankly, I was able to do it. I work at this job full time. I am not compensated full time for the hours that I put in, but I ran on that level. I told the citizens that I was running to represent that I would do so. I have lived up to that commitment.

I at least believe that I have been a proactive councillor in establishing citizens' groups in my community, as I did in the Harbour View South area, a brand-new subdivision. The neighbours did not even know who lived next door to them, never mind who was across the street. We were able to establish what probably would normally take in excess of some maybe 10 years. We were able to accomplish that, I will point out at this time, with the minister's help of recreation, who helped with a community project which really put a group of residents together to work towards a cause and, as a result of that cause, have formulated a real community environment, a wholesome environment, a holistic community of people who know who their neighbours are today. All of that was done within less than six months as I represented 40,000 or more people, I might point out.

Madam Chairman, I quite frankly heard the conversations of some members of council saying, oh, well, we are not going to be able to afford to run. I have seen some of the numbers that were presented by other presenters today who said what

the costs are going to be. I guess, if you want to spend money, you can go from here to China and do it, but I can tell you, members of council—and I will use as an example, former Councillor Jorowski in Miles MacDonell who spent no more than \$1,000 on an election and continued to get elected term after term. She did it with volunteers. She did it because she did her community work; she did her homework in her community; she worked for the people.

So it is a question of how much time you are going to put in to run. Are you going to go out and solicit the support of the citizens or are you going to just plaster them with brochures and signs? You take your choice and if you want to make an effort, it does not have to cost you the kind of money that some are saying today. As a matter of fact, I think I read in one report there was something to the effect of \$8,000 to \$10,000 to run an election to represent 42,000. I did not even spend probably about \$4,500 when I represented the 42,000, but I will tell you, I wore out two pairs of shoes. I did not include that as an election expense.

I worked hard, and I am proud of how hard I worked, because I happened to have started campaigning in June and went through to October, so if somebody wants to come here and say to you that they cannot do it, I think that only exists in the minds of people who have no optimism of what they can accomplish and maybe they just do not have the willpower.

* (0000)

I wanted to say that I am supportive of the four-year term in office, and I say that because of the experience I have had in representing 42,000. There is a lot of work to do if you want to be the kind of councillor who goes out and does that kind of work for his or her community. You need time, because it is a lot of work. There is a lot of legwork to do. There are a lot of things that you have to do in terms of discussion with your community, meetings to attend, and in order to do that, it would help. It would help make you a better councillor. I know it would make our city ultimately a better place for the people who live here.

I wanted to make some reference to one of the comments that was made earlier by a member of council who spoke about a variance committee and said that the whole thing had gone out the window and a lot of unfair things had happened today. I,

quite frankly, found some of the comments very interesting from that member because today for a very short time I stepped into that committee meeting. I will just give you an example of how short of a time I spent there. It was exactly four and a half minutes because I timed it; I was late for a meeting. In the four and a half minutes I was there, and I stopped by that meeting to drop a note off to a colleague about an event that was taking place this evening. That note, it was in a brown envelope, a small, normal, letter-size envelope and sealed.

As I was waiting for that particular member to finish speaking so as not to interrupt them, a member of the media passed me a note and asked me if I would be so kind as to pass it to one of the other members of the committee which contained, as I asked, a request for that member of council to phone that person in the media after they had a break.

After the individual whom I wanted to pass the brown envelope to had completed, I walked around the table, which is not uncommon at any committee meeting, and passed the two individuals, one, the note from the media and the other, my brown envelope. The brown envelope was put in the person's pocket because they knew what it contained. The other individual, I understand, opened it up, the little note from the media, and I had left the room.

Within approximately three and a half minutes of that process taking place, I understand I had raised a kaffuffle in the committee, and I guess I would go as far as to say there are some very paranoid people who are elected to office in that committee. So much so they demanded that that individual open that note up to divulge what the contents of that note were. I am a member of council. I am not a developer. I never walked around the table. I think I know The City of Winnipeg Act, and I know where I would place myself if I or any member was to do something so silly as that.

I just want to point out to you there are some very paranoid people on City Council and think that this is some kind of plot to destroy our city, some kind of plot to destroy council and, quite frankly, I think it is absolute insanity, absolute paranoia. I have never heard of anything so ridiculous in my life, that a member of council would think that another member of council was passing notes and letters from developers—absolutely unbelievable.

I want to say that in the context that some of those members who appear before you today, I think are coming completely off the deep end, and that is my own personal feeling.

As to some of the comments that were made earlier about why some members of council did not attend that special meeting of council. I, too, happen to be a member of Executive Policy Committee who were scheduled to meet with a whole host of delegations that particular morning, people who took time from their work, all types of people, both from business, from industry, workers, housewives, you name it. They come to those meetings to make representation and when they take the time off work, I think they are owed the due consideration to be heard at those meetings, and when members of council go off on a tangent and do their own thing, then that is when those kinds of situations occur where they have bare quorum meetings.

I think that was rather unfortunate, and it was not a boycott of members of Executive Policy Committee. It was because we were busy doing the work of the committee that had been scheduled for weeks and weeks and weeks in advance.

Anyway, I guess I wanted to finally say that, as an individual, I am prepared to work with whatever number of council is ultimately decided and determined, because I believe that I can work, I can learn to work with what I am given to work with, and I will learn to adapt because I think that is where we have to come together to start to make the changes that are necessary to make the government of the city of Winnipeg start to work effectively and efficiently in the city. It is a billion-dollar corporation that is going nowhere fast.

As a matter of fact, I would go as far as to say it is like standing on the Titanic, and some very substantial changes really do have to be made and made quickly, and if some people are worried about gangs, whatever gang it is right now—I could go on and give you an example of a WIN gang tactic. I probably should, but I will not. I will be as kind as not to.

An Honourable Member: Go ahead.

Ms. Timm-Rudolph: An example? Okay, I will give you an example. For example, on a number of occasions, a former WIN member councillor, and I will name that individual, Christine McKee, was going to be out of town on a couple of occasions on

holidays and there were a number of decisions that were to be before council, for which she would not have been present, and because they had the numbers, they were able to defer those decisions to dates and times when she would be back. That same courtesy was not extended to members of council for this upcoming council meeting on July 31, who, I understand, will also be away on holidays. They do not happen to be members of the WIN group, and the WIN group was not prepared to stand down an issue, a very important issue in the city, and an issue before City Council, and extend that same courtesy to those individuals who will be away as a result of their vacations.

I am saying that they are exercising muscle, they have the right to do so, but so does any other group. I think you can cast stones all you want, wherever they be. The Winnipeg School Division No. 1 has recently been anointed the NDP gang dealing with the issue of Argyle School. I guess that, when individuals do not like the decisions that are being made, you can line people up in whatever way you want and make points that way.

Quite frankly, I feel that if members of council are going to conduct themselves in those kinds of fashion, be unfair to other members of council, it will not take long before the general public feel them out. A number of those kinds of councillors were defeated in the last election for the way they conducted themselves, and I think that it is the electorate that will be watching. They are not stupid; they know what they are doing; and they will ultimately make that final decision as they are vested with the power to do so.

I guess, aside from some other points that were not addressed in terms of the rationalization of city boundaries, which I wish would have been addressed, within the context of some of the amendments that are being dealt with and also with respect to the review of the school divisions and school trustees. I think they are a couple of issues that need to be addressed in the city because they are impacting communities and the citizens of the city, and I would hope, at least to the future, that this government would start to look at some of those issues. Thank you.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation, Councillor Timm-Rudolph. And our final presenter this evening, I believe, is Councillor Al Golden from Glenlawn Ward.

Mr. Al Golden (Councillor, Glenlawn Ward, City of Winnipeg): Madam Chairman, I would ask you to please allow me the leeway to enter into the record a very brief response to a manner in which Councillor Murray misled this committee earlier this evening.

It was an attempt on his part, in my opinion, on character assassination of myself and others on City Council. The fact of the matter is this morning the hearing that he referred to was dealing with the matter, not of uses of land—was dealing with the matter of the bulk and size of a particular building that would be built and the amount of parking that would be required for it. There was no matter dealing with uses of land today, and the community committee and the resident advisory committee in their vote were unanimous in supporting the use of the land in question, and there was no matter of use of land handled at City Council this morning, and he misled the committee when he read off all the uses that were approved. But I will be dealing with that in another form at another time; I just wanted to enter that into the record so this committee knew that in fact the information received was untrue, and I would appreciate those of you who have an interest in determining the truth to enquire of City Council as to what was dealt with this morning. I thank you for the opportunity to enter that into the record.

* (0010)

I think one of the things that this committee was able to see today is the value of community committees, and I think that ours, which was represented here tonight by Glen Hewitt and Jim Shapiro, displayed excellence. In many ways, this group in St. Boniface-St. Vital have been of invaluable assistance. They go to great lengths in organizing the community and getting information for us, doing various things such as polling and door-to-door gathering information and assisting at special meetings and town hall meetings and all sorts of things, and I do not think we would be an effective elected representation if it was not for the resident advisory groups.

I hear bad things about resident advisory groups in other areas, and I suppose, just like councillors, there are some good ones and there are some bad ones. We happen to have an excellent one, and it would be a real loss to our community committee if we lost our resident advisory group. So I would hope that you would leave the resident advisory group in the act. For those who have a bad one,

maybe next time they will get a better one; but, for those who have a good one, it is a tool that we would hate to lose.

I believe there are two kinds of city councillors at City Hall. There is the city councillor who believes that he was elected to represent the will of the people who elected him/her, and they come to City Hall to represent the view of the people who elected them. Those people do not want to see council reduced because they feel they are representing enough people already and they have got a full-time job just keeping in communication with them.

The other kind of city councillor is one who believes that he/she was elected because of their particular skills, their good looks, or whatever other attributes they had to carry forward, and they were elected to represent their view and their platform and carry out their own mandate at City Hall. They lose touch and do not care to keep in touch with the community who elected them, and the result is that, over a period of time, when the community whom they lost touch with finally get tired of them, they throw them out.

I believe that the city is best served by the former kind of city councillor who is allowed the opportunity to be in good quality touch with his constituents; and, if you lessen the size of City Council, you definitely lessen the communication between the city councillors and the people who elected them.

I urge you not to reduce the size of City Council. There is nothing to be benefited by reducing the size of City Council, except to justify statements that were made to deflect criticism at the government over the tax reform uprising that happened last year. When the tax revolt started, people really thought they were involved in a tax revolt because they were misinformed. They now realize that what they were really involved in was an assessment revolt. The assessment act is so inequitable, so poorly drawn, and was so desperately in need of change because it was based on reproduction costs of 1950 levels of value that people were assessed in newer homes at about half of what people were assessed in older homes because the depreciation schedules did not work, and the other facts as applied to the formula did not work.

You have now got a piece of legislation that provides for the opportunity for equitable assessment. It has not yet been achieved because it takes a long time for the legislation to actually take

effect in practice, but we are headed in the right direction. We have got a good piece of legislation with which to work now in assessment, and I believe we are very close to a situation where everyone is paying their fair share, no more and no less. But at the time when these people were paying less than their fair share, they were getting tax bills which they believed were fair. They believed they were paying their fair share; and, when they found out they were not, they got very mad at City Hall. Rather than standing up and having this government admit that it was not City Hall's fault that they got those huge increases, it was the provincial government's fault that those increases came into effect, because the legislation was bad, the assessments were bad. People would have been less mad at City Hall. But what was done instead was the provincial government said: You are right. Those councillors are bad guys; they are inefficient; they are doing a bad job. We will reduce the size of City Council, make them full-time, so they can do a better job.

This entire issue you are dealing with here today is as a result of the inequitable assessments. That is why we are here today; that is why the public want a change. The change they want was to correct the inequities in the system, and they were misled to believe that would be brought about by the reduction of City Council. I do not expect anyone to admit that; I sincerely believe that is the case.

I want to also inform you here today that the official council policy—and I am not just talking about the meeting that was held Wednesday morning where the official council policy was reconfirmed—but the official council policy when the vast majority of councillors were present, and I believe the vote was something in the range of 21 to 7, was that council not be reduced in size. This was a vote taken well over a year ago; there has not been another vote on the floor of council to change that view; and the vote that was held a couple of days ago upheld that view.

City Council's policy is that council should not be reduced in size, that it would be counterproductive to reduce the size of City Council. The people who took that vote on the floor of City Council were representing people who elected them, and I believe they were in touch with the views of their constituents and the interests of their constituents in large measure. However, I do believe that the decision is cast in stone. There will be very little, if any, tinkering with the legislation. We are going to

come in with 15 members whether we like it or not, whether the citizens of Winnipeg are best served or not. Your view may be different, I am not suggesting your view is not legitimate. It is, and you are entitled to your view. I do not believe it will be best serving the citizens of Winnipeg.

The subject of lengthening the term of council from four to six years, perhaps—there is merit to the idea of increasing the term of City Council in terms of saving costs of elections, in terms of protecting people who are going to give up their careers to run for public office. There is a danger involved as well, and I would hope that if you are going to increase the length of term of City Council, you would also put in a provision for recall. There has to be some way for the citizens, in cases where they feel they have made an error, do not have to wait until the next election or wait too long to correct their error. I do not know what the formula might be, a certain number of signatures, perhaps, on a petition from the ward, but if you are going to lengthen the term of council, give the citizens of Winnipeg a chance to throw the scoundrel out if they believe that the person they elected is not representing their best interest.

Another concern that I have with the proposed legislation is the powers that this legislation is going to give to the mayor. If the mayor has the power to appoint executive policy committee, that would make the mayor far too powerful. With this power, the mayor could dictate his will to council. The most the citizens could hope for in the mayor would be a benevolent dictatorship. This is the opposite of having council elect the mayor. The citizens of Winnipeg have rejected the idea of council electing the mayor. I would suggest that they would also reject the prospect of dictatorship, benevolent or otherwise. Historically, the mayor of the City of Winnipeg obtains his power by popular support and not by legislation. I am begging you, do not legislate power to the mayor. Leave it in the hands of the people to give the mayor the power that he holds.

I personally represent 21,000 people. The majority of those who voted in the last election decided I had done a decent enough job to allow me the honour of continuing to represent them. I am a full-time councillor who puts in over 80 hours a week. I do not believe that I would do as good a job if I had to represent twice as many local issues and that is the bottom line. Worse, I would be forced to become parochial because I would not have the

time to deal with city-wide issues if I had twice as many local issues to deal with. I certainly would not have the time to be proactive on any issues.

As I said, the citizens shall have less contact with their elected representatives. They shall have their calls answered instead of by a city councillor, by a bureaucrat, because the councillor would obviously be too busy to take the calls. Of course, because bureaucrats will now be required to answer a councillor's telephone calls, you are going to have to hire more bureaucrats. I want to quote Steve Juba here for you tonight. He is my political hero and he has often said to me that bureaucracy is the enemy of democracy. If you are going to decrease the amount of political representation and increase the size of bureaucracy to offset the reduction in political representation, you are moving away from democracy and towards dictatorship.

* (0020)

I believe that I get more calls than the average city councillor. In fact, I believe I get more calls than any other city councillor on a city-wide basis. I can tell you that the citizens of Winnipeg are not calling me telling me they want the size of City Council reduced. They are calling me telling me they want the size of the city budget reduced. That is what they want, and reducing the size of the council is going to increase the size of the city budget, no question about it.

The bureaucracy is going to be running the city and they do not have a goal of reducing the budget. They have a goal of building empires. We get told, as we were last week by Commissioner Frost, that the idea of raising the pay of the highest paid civil employees 12 percent and lowering the pay of the entry positions 12 percent will be expense neutral. I asked the question, what about the effect it will have on the pension plan? Surely people are collecting 70 percent of their best five years and if their best five years are 12 percent higher, the cost of the pensions will be 12 percent higher. I got a oh, yeah.

People do not tell me their opinion about reducing the size of the City Council. They ask me. I share my opinion with them and I have not had anyone tell me they thought that I was wrong, of all the people talking on this subject. Perhaps I overbearing and convinced them, but I can tell you, nobody ever got off the telephone with me telling me they thought council should be reduced.

If you need changes at City Hall, let the people do it at election time. I would simply ask you, in closing, that I do not believe that you are being told to reduce the size of City Council. I believe you have had problems identified to you that the citizens of Winnipeg want addressed and I would ask you to address them through proper reform in the manner that council operates. There are changes that can be made but the change of reducing the size of the City Council is going to be negative.

To end on a joke, if you want to cut the size of City Council, Councillor O'Shaughnessy and myself

have both donated our services—we will both go on a diet.

Madam Chairman: Thank you for your presentation.

This concludes public representation on Bill 68. This committee will reconvene tomorrow, Friday, at 1:30 p.m. to consider Bills 35 and 68 clause by clause.

Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 12:23 a.m.