REPORTS NOT RELATED TO THE JURISDICTION OF ANY COMMITTEE

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF THE

SUB-COMMITTEE ON RULES

On motion of Councillor Wade, the Report of the Sub-Committee on Rules, dated January 8th, 1992, was considered clause by clause.

Mayor's Dining Room,
Administration Building, Winnipeg.
January 8th, 1992,

His Worship the Mayor and Councillors:

Your Sub-Committee of Council to Review The Procedure By-law submits the following Report and recommends:

Request for Amendments to the Procedure By-law - Question Period.
File GK-4

479 - 1. On March 7th, 1990, Council adopted By-law 5400/90 being The Procedure By-law. Pursuant to Section 4 of the By-law, no rule or procedure shall be adopted by Council, nor shall provisions of the By-law be added to, varied or appealed, without having first been submitted to your Sub-Committee of Council for review and report.

On December 18th, 1991, Council referred the following motion to your Committee, namely:-

> "That Procedure By-law No. 5400/90 be amended to change the order of business at each meeting of Council, to provide for a 'Question Period' following consideration of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee and each of the Standing Committees, as was the practice of Council under its former Procedure By-law, By-law 3200/82."

On February 15th, 1990 when the first draft procedure by-law was referred to all members of Council for comment, the recommendations included a provision for a single Question Period to be limited to 30 minutes. However, there was no support from Members of Council for any time limits to be imposed on Question Period. Council subsequently approved the draft by-law incorporating a single Question Period following the Committee reports.

At the meeting of Council on March 7th, 1990, to consider the draft Procedure By-law, an amendment which proposed to provide a Question Period after each Standing Committee Report (with a 20-minute time limit) was defeated by Council. Another amendment proposing to conduct the Question Period after hearing delegations near the beginning of the meeting, was also defeated by Council.

On November 21st, 1990, Council referred to your Sub-Committee an amendment proposing that the Order of Business be changed so that Question Period be held after the Executive Policy Committee Report. Concern had been expressed that on occasion Committee Chairpersons had been obliged to leave the Council meeting before the Question Period. Your Sub-Committee reported at that time that during the period April 4th, 1990 to February 15th, 1991 there were only two instances (not including Council approved Leave of Absence for the entire meeting) where one of the Committee Chairpersons had been obliged to leave the Council meeting before the Question Period. In addition, Members of Council were reminded of the provisions under Section 14 of the Procedure By-law, which read as follows:-

> "14.1 Questions may be directed to the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, Standing Committee Chairpersons (or their alternates), and to Councillors on the various boards and commissions and sub-committees not related to the Standing Committees."

Report of the Rules Committee, dated January 8th, 1992.

Council on March 6th, 1991, reconfirmed the existing practice of Question Period being the last Order of Business on the Council agenda.

Your Sub-Committee has further reviewed this matter and is of the opinion that the status quo with respect to agenda format should be maintained and that Question Period should continue to be the last Order f Business, without a time limit, following consideration of all Committee reports.

Your Sub-Committee also recommends that the motion as referred by Council on December 18th, 1991, be filed.

Moved by Councillor Wade,
Adoption of the clause.

The motion for the adoption of the clause was put.

The Speaker called for the yeas and nays, which were as follows:-

Yea: Councillors Wade, Boychuk, Brown, Douglas, Duguid, Gilroy, Prystanski, Selinger, Thomas, Timmers, Young, Yuen, Mayor Norrie and Councillor Eadie. 14

Nay: Councillors Clement, Demare, Diamant, Fleisher, Fraser, Golden, Hyman, Kaufmann, Lazarenko, Lorenc, Mendelson, Mitchelson, Murray and Reese. 14

and the motion for the adoption of the clause was declared lost, in accordance with Section 58 of the Procedure By-law.

Request for Amendment to the Procedure By-law - Notice of Motion. File GK-4

480 - 2. On October 16th, 1991, Council referred the following motion to your Committee, namely:-

"WHEREAS City Council deals with many important matters and these matters require careful consideration;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that all motions not received by Members of Council within 24 hours of a Council meeting be automatically referred to the next regular meeting of Council. Exceptions will be made only for amendments to motions on the regular agenda."

Your Sub-Committee wishes to advise that the provisions of Section 17 of Procedure By-law 5400/90 provide assurance that due notice is given for a substantive motion and that Members of Council are provided time to consider and prepare for the discussion of the question. Sections 17.1 and 17.4 read as follows:-

NOTICE OF MOTIONS REQUIRED

"17.1 No motion introducing new matters shall be discussed unless same has been given in writing at a previous regular meeting of Council. Proper notice of a motion shall consist of filing with the Clerk while Council is in session a copy of the actual motion to be considered under the title Notice of Motion.

17.4 Where notice of motion has been given under Rule 17.1 and 17.3 the motion shall be circulated by the Clerk to each member of Council within three days after the meeting."

In light of the existing by-law provisions which provide that any member of Council can call "Notice", your Sub-Committee recommends that the motion as referred by Council be filed.

Moved by Councillor Wade,
Adoption of the clause.

Carried.

QUESTION PERIOD

481 - Councillor Reese asked why the document entitled "Preliminary 1992 Annual Capital Estimates and the 1993 - 1997 Five-Year Capital Forecast" was not released until the first meeting of the Executive Policy Committee held in 1992. She informed Council of advice she had received from the Chief Commissioner that while the document was ready sometime in October, it had been a decision of the Executive Policy Committee not to distribute the budget at that time.

Mayor Norrie confirmed that although the draft budget had been reviewed by the Executive Policy Committee at a special meeting held in October, the Committee made a decision not to release the document before Council's annual organizational meeting in November. He added that following the new Committee appointments in November, the Committee had been unable to schedule a meeting to review the estimates until the January 8th, 1992 date.

Councillor Reese expressed her concerns regarding this process and asked His Worship to explain how this process would be rectified to provide Councillors adequate time to review the estimates.

His Worship responded that the budget is currently being reviewed by Standing Committees and Community Committees. He added that originally the Executive Policy Committee had hoped to be able to have its review completed much sooner and even have the budget adopted before December 31st, 1991.

Councillor Clement referred to correspondence he had received several months ago from Councillor Gilroy, past Chairman of the Committee on Planning and Community Services regarding the process for reviewing the Plan Winnipeg document. The letter had invited his participation into the planning process. He stated that through correspondence to Councillor Gilroy, he had confirmed his interest and asked for an opportunity to appear, yet has not been afforded the opportunity to make his views known.

Councillor Douglas responded that he will be releasing the interim Plan Winnipeg document on February 13th, 1992, and Councillor Clement could make representation when the document is being considered by Executive Policy Committee.

Councillor Gilroy confirmed that Councillor Clement's request had been received and subsequently referred to the Urban Development Sectoral Committee. The sectoral committee is in the process of completing its report to Executive Policy Committee. Councillor Gilroy suggested that Councillor Clement make his representation when the report is being reviewed by the Executive Policy Committee, prior to drafting the by-law. Councillor Gilroy extended an apology to Councillor Clement and agreed to investigate why Councillor Clement's request was not acknowledged by the sectoral committee.

Moved by Councillor Lorenc,
That Council do now adjourn.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: The Speaker Councillor Eadie, Councillors Wade, Boychuk, Clement, Demare, Diamant, Douglas, Duguid, Fleisher, Fraser, Gilroy, Golden, Hyman, Kaufmann, Lazarenko, Lorenc, Mendelson, Mitchelson, Murray, Prystanski, Reese, Selinger, Thomas, Timmers, Young, Yuen and His Worship Mayor Norrie.

The motion to adjourn was put and carried and Council adjourned at 12:50 a.m., Thursday, January 23rd, 1992.

APPROVED AND CONFIRMED

Acting City Clerk. Speaker.