COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Wednesday, December 10, 2014

The Council met at 9:39 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Browaty.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer and Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, I understand you have a few announcements today.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good morning to everyone on the floor and in the gallery and watching online. As we commence our very first Council meeting to consider regular business today, the 14th sitting of Winnipeg Council, I wish to begin by noting that today is Human Rights Day. Human Rights Day was first proclaimed in 1950 by the UN General Assembly and has a theme every year. This year's slogan is Human Rights 365 to represent the idea that every day should be a day of human rights. I'd like to note that in honour of Human Rights Day, the Canadian Museum for Human Rights is extending their hours today from…until 9 p.m. and offering free admission from 10 a.m. until close. I encourage everyone, not right now for those of you here, to go down and visit the museum today. And if they can, and use this opportunity to reflect on the importance of the issues that really have shaped all of us. With the brand new Canadian Museum for Human Rights located right here in central Canada in Winnipeg. I believe that Winnipeggers are more ready, willing and eager than ever before to discuss the difficult issues facing our community and really our society. It's also poignant that the Human Rights Day should occur this week because as I think all of you know the Assembly of First Nations has gathered here in Winnipeg this week to select a new National leader, a very important event for our nation. At the Special Chiefs' Assembly yesterday morning, a very brave and strong young woman who occupies a special place in Winnipeggers' hearts, Rinelle Harper, addressed her supporters in our community for the very first time. Rinelle called on the Assembly to remember love, kindness, respect and forgiveness. Rinelle's words and in particular her inspirational forgiving spirit embodies human rights and sets really a shiny example of how we should treat everyone as our neighbours, as our community, as human kind and as one Winnipeg. On that note, it's my hope that as we move forward together as Council and as we serve Winnipeggers, we're all working collaboratively to have the hard discussions; to make the right choices even when they're difficult or unpopular and we set a positive example for our community and really for the entire nation. The holiday season is fast approaching as well and I want to take this opportunity, Madam Speaker, to extend holiday greetings to all of our valued City of Winnipeg employees, my esteemed colleagues on City Council and Winnipeggers everywhere and I ask and encourage everyone to have a safe and a happy holiday season with your family, with your loved ones and your friends. Please remember to plan ahead and drive safely and on behalf of all of us, I'd like to thank our Winnipeg Police Service for once again helping to keep all of us and our loved ones, our families and friends safe during this festive period especially with their CheckStop Program that they'll be doing again this year. And above all, I'd like to extend to everyone best wishes for a healthy and successful New Year. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MINUTES

Councillor Schreyer moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on September 24, November 4 and November 12, 2014 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move onto delegations. First up is Mr. David Sanders. Are you here today, sir? Is Mr. Sanders here today? No? Okay. We will move on to Mr. Colin Craig who is here today. Mr. Craig is in support of Item No. 8 of the report of EPC dated December 3rd regarding severance for members of Council. Welcome, Mr. Craig.

Colin Craig: Well, good morning and thank you for the chance to speak here today. I'd like to begin by congratulating all members of Council on your recent election. On behalf of the Canadian Taxpayers Federation, we wish you all the best as you look to serve the citizens of Winnipeg over the next term. Today, I will be only speaking to the severance item, but I would note that we do support the two other items that have come forward concerning Council expenses as well as pay for EPC, the Mayor and other positions. I'll keep my comments brief today, but what I would like to start off is talking about how this motion is a good example of Council looking to lead by example and in the last election, Mayor Bowman committed to looking to the administration to find more efficiencies and we believe that if you're going to go to the administrative side and say it's time for you guys to tighten your belts a little bit more that it's good for Council to first tighten its own. And really, that's what Items 8, 9 and 10 do. They're certainly nothing outrageous when you look at what's being proposed. On the…one of the rationale that has been put forward for having this severance package in place that people claim that it's a way of compensating those that are let go and I think there's really sort of two aspects to the current way that the admin…the severance package is handled and that is…on the hand, you have individuals who choose not to run again and in that case, I think it's pretty clear that someone who's decided to essentially quit their job and outside in the private sector when someone quits their job, typically you don't get a severance package on the way out. So I think most members of Council can see that that element of this particular perk is really not reasonable considering what people outside of government receive. The other element of course concerns those that who choose to run again and are defeated by the electorate. The argument has been made that severance packages in that case are justifiable. However, we would suggest that that's an indication that someone has been released with just cause. Obviously, over the next four years, you're going to be doing your best to try and earn the…or represent your citizens and if you choose to run again, and they choose to elect someone else and replace, then that's an indication that you don't feel that you've been doing enough, a good enough job. I think the Mayor raised a good point during the last election that he said that, you know, it's…you have four years to plan for the event that potentially the elector chooses not to hire you once again, and over the next four years, it's quite reasonable to be able to put aside a little bit of saving each year in the event that you're not selected for re-election. The other thing that I would note is that some people suggested that the perk is reasonable given that members of Council are not eligible for employment insurance, but that actually just puts them in line with a small business owner who are not able to collect EI. At the same time, members of Council do have a perk that almost no one else has and that is the unprecedented job security that you have over the next four years. Very few people have a guarantee that they will not be laid off for four years as well as having a good steady income at the same time. So there certainly is the need for give and take there. One of the other things that I would raise today is something that Tom Brodbeck from the Winnipeg Sun has done a good job raising over the years and that is that the savings from eliminating this perk for Council is actually quite small when you look at the amount of savings that are at stake on the administrative side of the equation because of…members of the administration are able to receive a bit of a golden good-bye package on top of their pension payments when they decide to leave and Tom in a column earlier this year, he described the formula I believe it's a day for each year up to 15 years and two days per each year served after that, so we certainly don't begrudge anyone on the administrative side who retires and accepts that. That's something that's negotiated by their unions and their representatives, but it's certainly a perk that people in the private sector typically don't have and we think it's one that should be phased out or grandfathered out. So by eliminating this perk for Council, you then again have the moral authority to walk over to the administration and say, you know what, it's time to end that perk there as well. Finally, I would just touch on the fact that this perk is in place due to the Michael Werier Report. We certainly respect the work that he does. We know that he puts a lot of time and effort into his reports when he reviews Council, pardon me, elected officials compensations as well as expenses, but I would note that one preferred model that we think would be a better approach would be if Council actually went out and had a grass roots committee actually determine what they felt was appropriate, so go out and find every day Winnipeggers, someone who's stocking the shelves at a local grocery stores, perhaps a dentist and an accountant, maybe a lawyer, some retired seniors who are living on fixed incomes and get a real grass roots committee going to evaluate Council compensation, so I will conclude my comments there and if you have any questions, I'll certainly do my best to answer them. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Craig on this item? Okay, seeing none. Thank you for…oh, yes. Councillor Schreyer, you may rise.

Councillor Schreyer: How many questions am I allowed, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: There's no limit, I believe.

Councillor Schreyer: There's no limit? Just so you know, I have to…this is my first Council meeting. I have to take all these things into consideration in making my decision. What I've found…may I preamble, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: …that in dealing with this issue, what I found is even those who are opposed to severance for Councillors, even if they're not realizing at the time when they're talking about it, the end of talking about how much the severance is, in fact, you sir, in speaking about this, you said, yourself if I may paraphrase that if Councillors want others to…if we have to create cutbacks that perhaps the Councillors should tighten, as you said, "tighten your belt a little bit more". In fact, you sir mentioned the issue of relativity, a proportionality. You said a little bit more. So one of my questions is if it is a question of a little bit more, why is it an issue of whether you get rid of severance completely or not and whether you cut back a little bit more on severance?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer, just answer your question. I believe we follow the model of Question Period which will be three questions per Councillor. You may answer.

Colin Craig: Thank you for your question. What we're talking about is eliminating the perk completely. We recognize that the City has to offer competitive compensation and benefits, not just for members of Council, but the administration as well. One of the concerns that we have as an organization is that over the years, there's been a huge growing gap between the public sector and the private sector. And when you look at this particular perk as I mentioned earlier, it's just not common in the private sector for someone to receive a "goodbye" sort of bonus cheque on the way out for serving for a long time. So what we're saying is eliminate that because it's not common in the private sector and that would be respectful for the people that are having to foot the bill for the Council competition

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Schreyer: You had mentioned "not common in the private sector". You know, you talked about a disparity… growing disparities between the public sector and the private sector. I'm aware of that in the last generation or so, CEO. perks have increased 100 times for CEOs of major corporations in this country and this continent, about 100 times, so that it's quite possible for other CEOs and the other Chief Executive Officers to be receiving in the private sector, millions, tens of millions of dollars in forms of compensation. How do you rectify this and the issue when you're dealing with growing disparities between the public sector and the private sector?

Colin Craig: I guess two thoughts come to mind. First is that with all due respect, members of Council are not CEOs and you're serving a public institution rather than a private institution. CEOs typically are chosen…they rise to the top of an organization based on ability and in some cases in elected office. It's not someone's ability, their own abilities, it's rather that, you know, they're getting elected for other reasons, but you know, there's a wide gap between what CEOs earn and what is earned in the private and in the public sector. I think that's well known. What we're talking about is sort of a respect for the average member of the public; the person who's bagging groceries at a grocery store; the person who's a dentist; the person who's working at a retail outlet; the person who's managing a small business; that we believe that council compensation should be mindful that people that are footing the bill. In the private sector, individuals have the choice too, to support a company or not. You have the right to decide if you want to go out and support a company that has a CEO, who's getting paid millions of dollars and all kinds of other bells and whistles in their compensation package. In the public sector, you don't. People have no choice, but to pay their property tax bill if they decide to live in the City of Winnipeg. So in that respect, we think it's a bit of a different scenario.

Madam Speaker: Councillors, do you wish to suspend the rules to add more time for question period here? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Schreyer, do you have a third question?

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, again, I have to try and relate this and try to come up on a decision related to my own life experience as well. One of the ways that I've received some sort of financial compensation for temporary wage loss is, as in just an example of one of the industries I worked in as a roughneck working on the oil rigs in Alberta. It's seasonal. We choose seasonal work. My…

Madam Speaker: Do you have a question, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, Ma'am, that was my preamble. My point being that the maximum employment insurance in this country quotes about $50,000. We choose to be in this where we have the option of receiving $50,000 a year in annual employment insurance which in a career, can end up being a couple of million dollars. And I ask…so I'm asking you if you take these things into consideration and the jobs people choose to have, knowing that they're going to be laid off when they take it anyway, whether in your making your judgment, you're taking these things into consideration and

sort of creating your markers of where things stand. The fact that people can make millions of dollars in a career just unemployment insurance when they know, they choose it. When they know they're going to be laid off.

Colin Craig: I think the employment insurance program needs a lot of tweaking. I think you've touched on a good point and that is the ability for people to abuse the employment insurance program. A lot of people do. In different parts of country, they treat it as sort of like a seasonal form of income. And I…we would advocate that that's not how employment insurance should work. There needs to be a better structure so that people are more accountable for how often they're actually using the program and so that they have the incentive to take employment rather than relying on employment insurance. A couple other things that I would note, many of you know Colin Fast, the Policy Frog, a local blogger. He raised a good point on Twitter yesterday and that is that Council's existed for decades here without this type of perk in place. Why is it all of a sudden needed now? And, again, we would say that we don't think it is necessary, but that, you know, again, the compensation that's offered to Council should be mindful of what the people that are footing the bill are actually seeing themselves. And I would note a couple other things on this vain is that when news broke earlier this year concerning the severance payments that members of Council were eligible to receive, a lot of people in the public were upset because they didn't know that this was in place and they thought it was outrageous that someone could quit their job and walk away with a big cheque for doing so, on top of the other benefits that members of Council receive. So that was the public's reaction. We would certainly encourage members of Council to go out and, you know, once again, speak with everyday Winnipeggers and ask them what they feel is appropriate. And just to touch on the final point that you raised there about people making decisions to work in different places based on the pay and perks that are available. Again, we would note that a lot of people didn't even know that this was in place. So I'm guessing a lot of people around the table here, a lot of people other people that chose to run for office weren't aware that this goodbye perk was in place when the decision was made to do so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We need to move on to Councillor Mayes at this time, Councillor Schreyer, but we could come back to you later. Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah. Oddly, the expert on this who was brought in by Council before my time didn't use the term goodbye perk or golden handshake. But then again he's only an expert that is the new co-chair of the Worker's Compensation Board, and other respected arbitrary positions. What he said was "I believe it is appropriate to bring Winnipeg in line with other jurisdictions and eliminate the disparity with members of the Legislature. A severance allowance will assist Councillors in transition. Now, as they do not receive employment insurance". So, he's using the term severance, not political pay-out or goodbye perk, but what does he know? He's just the expert. But here's my question to you. You've compared…you said repeatedly people in the private sector don't get a goodbye handshake if they quit their job, but you're aware this is broader than that. This would…this would disqualify people who are defeated as well at the polls and you said, well that should be considered just cause. And then later you said something about, of course, sometimes elections aren't decided by the merits of the individual, there decided for other features so I'm wondering if you can clarify your remarks on that.

Colin Craig: I should've been making notes there while you were making your comments. I'm trying to recall the first point that you made there, Councillor.

Councillor Mayes: I guess my first question would be you're…let me rephrase it, if I can. You're comparing us in one breadth saying, accurately I would say, a lot of people, the majority of people in the private sector don't get a severance payment if they leave voluntarily. Then Councillor Schreyer I think pointed out most people in the private sector get employment insurance so our executives get a different allowance in the private sector. And as far as I can tell you then you said you should compare yourself to private business owners, they don't get employment insurance. But then we shouldn't compare ourselves to people who are CAOs because that's the private sector. So which group are we comparing ourselves to? If your point is compare yourself to the majority of workers in the private sector, fine. But you seem to be saying compare yourself for…to this group for this purpose, but on the employment insurance, compare yourself to independent business owners and on the perks issue, compare yourself not at all because it's different, it's private and public. So is it different? Is it private and public?

Colin Craig: Yeah. I guess, you know, what I was saying first and foremost is that this is not common in the private sector. Most people in the private sector when they decide to quit their jobs or if they're terminated for just cause they don't receive a severance package, a golden goodbye handshake, whatever people want to call it. I'm not saying that it doesn't ever happen. Of course it does happen sometimes, but we're talking about what's common in the private sector. At the same time, you mentioned Mr. Werier's report and I think you hit the nail on the head on a very important point is that part of his process looks at what other elected officials are receiving, elected officials in the public sector. And our comment, as I mentioned before is that or concern is that the gap has grown immensely between the private sector and the public sector in terms of competition. No matter how you want to look at it, people in the public sector make more money, their pay cheques rise faster than in the private sector. They have much more golden pension benefits, about

85% I think it is of public sector employees in Canada have a work place pension. Most of those individuals are part of defined benefit plans which are quite generous compared to defined contribution. In the private sector, it's only about 25% coverage in terms of people that have a workplace pension. Sick days are another great example. Look at the number of sick days that are taken in the public sector versus private sector and there is a huge gap there. Job security is another major concern and again we're not criticizing everyday employees in the public sector who are just getting up and going and doing their jobs under agreements that are negotiated by their unions. We're just saying that the gap has grown and it's time to close the gap; do it in a fair way and, you know, that's…that's sort of the end result that needs to happen is we need to make government more sustainable because if you look at some of the tax increases that have been passed by this Council, never mind the Provincial government, the tax burden in Manitoba is increasing quite rapidly compared to what peoples' pay cheques are increasing by. So that's causing individuals to have to go in and trim their family budgets in order to meet the bills that the tax man is handing them. So, that's really where we're coming from is that we think that, you know, some of these additional perks and benefits that individuals in the private sector tend to not have, need to be trimmed in the public sector. Like I said, there are ways that it can be done fairly. If you look at the administration, you could grandfather the benefit out. You could stop individuals from being allowed to accumulate, save those days that contribute to the pay-outs. You know, so there are lots of different ways it can happen. I think the Mayor was pretty clear when he ran for office that this was a benefit that he was going to work to get rid of. While we support that, again, it's not common in the private sector. If he had said something like, you know, we're not going to allow members of Council to take sick days or something like that, we probably would've said, well, that doesn't really make sense, you know. Members of Council are people, too, you're going to get sick. It's a normal benefit that exists in the private sector. Just make sure that pay and benefits are in line with what individuals in the private sector are receiving.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Just…I'll try to limit myself to this question. There was a comment about Council existed for decades without this provision, why now? Did…I just wonder if you gave credit to the Councillors of the day. I wasn't here in September 2011, but page 20 of the report says: "the use of a tax-free allowance is part of an overall compensation scheme, makes it difficult to compare the value of total compensation with other elected officials across Canada. This is not a transparent system and transparency builds the public's trust in our political system. Therefore, I would recommend that the Mayor and Councillors' salary tax-free indemnity should be eliminated". So my…the colleagues here, the Councillors of the day and the Mayor in September 2011 voted to eliminate the tax-free portion of their remuneration because it was seen as not transparent. Just wondering if there was any mention of that made in the same column that said, well, we existed for decades without the severance. Was there acknowledgment that for decades there was a tax-free component and in an effort to be more transparent, the Council of the day eliminated that?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Craig?

Colin Craig: Yeah. And to be clear, that was a tweet that was made, 140 characters. I'm not sure that he worked that part in. But, you know, like I said, perhaps I didn't comment on that, but we think it's good that Council made that other choice several years ago to end that tax-free portion because people would look at Council pay and say, wow, Councillors are only making this much? Maybe I won't consider running for Council, when in fact, behind the scenes people knew that or those around the table were aware that, you know, third of the amount was tax-free so it's actually really this amount and made it more of a competitive position for a lot of people to pursue. So I guess, you know, just maybe to go back to what you were wondering about in terms of CEO compensation and that. Was anyone around the table a CEO of a major corporation before running for office? And I'm not trying to belittle anyone, but I'm just making the point that to say that, you know, we deserve…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Craig, the questions will be directed to you. This isn't an opportunity to ask members of Council questions. Councillor Mayes, do you have anything further?

Councillor Mayes: I was the head of the Brian Mayes Law Office. I have no further questions.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We will move on to Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Interesting presentation from…Madam Speaker. The actual City Councillor in Winnipeg, it's that their career has quite changed over the decades, just for…and this is important context. It used to be a part-time job. There used to be, what, when the City merged, cities merged, we ended up having, what, 52 Councillors, all 59? Okay, all City Councillors working part time. That's where the indemnity actually came from, just a little education, Madam Speaker, but I have a specific question because I keep hearing all this reference to the private sector and this particular presentation is talking about dragging the public sector down. Why don't we bring the private sector up, but my question is simply this. Is a political career unique amongst all other careers? In the workplace, let's call it.

Colin Craig: I think that…it's pretty obvious.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, Councillors, do you wish to suspend the rules? Should we add more time to this item? No? Okay. All right, we will move on to the next delegation. And we're actually going back to Mr. David Sanders who is now here. Mr. Sanders, are you here? Mr. Sanders is in opposition to Item No. 6 of the report of EPC dated December 3rd regarding the insurance recovery report for the WPS. Mr. Sanders, you have 10 minutes and I understand you want to speak on other items?

David Sanders: Yes.

Madam Speaker: We'll have you do that after the next delegation. Thank you.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My name is David Sanders and I'm appearing as a private citizen to comment on a number of items this morning. This is the first regular meeting of the new council and I would like to congratulate you all on your election and to wish you the very best in conducting the City's business during the next four years. And these will be very challenging times. With regard to the first item, the Winnipeg Police Headquarters Redevelopment Project, the insurance recovery report, No. 6 on your agenda, I made a presentation on this matter at EPC, which is appended to its December3rd minutes on the City's website. The Winnipeg Police headquarters building at 245 Smith Street was to have been handed over to the City on August 25th of this year. However, the building was damaged by the rain event, so-called rain event on August 21, 2014. Now, more than three months later, the Winnipeg Public Service is asking the Council delegate unlimited authority to the Chief Administrative Officer or his delegates to approve contract over-expenditures with Caspian Projects Incorporated, Adjeleian Allen Rebeli AAR, the Consulting Engineers and Integrated Designs Incorporated to respond to the cost of repairing the water damage and to upgrade the roof drain litres to prevent such problems in the future. The report does make it clear, at least if you read between the lines, that not all of the anticipated expenses will be covered by insurance. And so we're definitely looking at an increase in the total project cost to the city. Last week, I asked a number of questions, most of which went unanswered last week. Why has it taken three months to recommend this course of action? Which Standards Council of Canada firm has been hired to carry out the testing and assessment of the damaged electrical systems and at what cost? When is that firm expected to submit its report on electrical systems which need to be repaired or replaced in order that the work may begin? According to the City's 2014 operating budget, the insurance reserve fund contains four million and three. And I ask who has authorized the reservation of $2 million from the IRF for the proposed work and how much will be unrecoverable from the insurers and, therefore, added to the total cost of the police headquarters project. And shouldn't the authorized over-expenditures today be limited to the $2 million said to be available. I mean how much are the delayed costs? The penalties and the fines which have already been incurred by the city during the past three months and how much more such costs may the city expect to have to pay the contractor now. When will the City expect to receive an interim occupancy permit, enabling the Winnipeg Police Service to begin to occupy the building. It doesn't sound like it will be this month after all. And finally, has the City pursue to claim with respect to the original engineering design work undertaken by AECOM Incorporated at a cost of 5.4 million which had to be redone by AAER. Perhaps we might receive some answers today. At EPC, there was some discussion of the need to limit a financial authorization, but in the end EPC just added a recommendation that the Winnipeg Public Service report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and, I quote, the complete cost of the damage once it is fully known. So, the proposed authorization to spend before you today remains unlimited and Councillors will not find out the cost until it is fully known. This is the kind of blank cheque and lack of regular councillor supervision which have contributed to the notorious cost overrun surprises on this project. I would suggest that the authorized contract over-expenditures be limited to $2 million and a full and detailed written report be provided in advance of the next Finance Committee meeting on January 8 of 2015. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Sanders on this item? Okay, seeing none. Mr. Sanders, if you could just wait on the bench? Thank you. We will now move on to Mr. George Fraser who is here today. I did see him. You are in opposition, Mr. Fraser, to Items 8, 9, 10, which would be the report of EPC dated December 3rd, regarding Severance, Reduced Additional Salaries and Amendment to the CRA Policy. Welcome, Councillor.

George Fraser: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And in light of transparency, Councillor Sharma is my Councillor. And in light of transparency, too, as when I was at Executive Policy Committee, I indicated that I am a retired taxpayer. I'm also a retired Councillor and I'm also a retired Deputy Mayor who performed as the Free Press often describes the ceremonial role of Deputy Mayor. I wasn't as flamboyant as some previous Deputy Mayors, but I had my moments. And Madam Mayor…Madam Speaker, sorry, I was talking to the Clerk's Department. I think I've got 30 minutes? Based on all of the time factors that I know of and I promise I won't be 30 minutes. But if I get rolling, I might be. And at Christmas time, as the Mayor indicated, you often get some pleasant gifts and surprises and this morning I received one, too, because Commissioner Bill Durwood and I finally caught up with each other after 40 years. We used to chase each other around the hockey rinks of West Kildonan Community Centre and Bill was a pretty good hockey player. He chased

the puck well. And the most amazing thing about the Durwood family, we have a street named after them in West Kildonan, is not only did we chase the puck at that time, but Bill's father was out there chasing the puck, too and he was a pretty good hockey player. We're not here to discuss that. But we are here to discuss and I'm sorry my thought process got disoriented a little bit because I thought I would be doing this sort of in transition based on the delegation listing.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Fraser, just for clarification, are you speaking to the three items concurrently?

George Fraser: I can. And I'm going to try to real hard. I will. The first is the severance allowance and the labeling of that in the report by Mr. Werier perhaps should've, indeed, not said "severance", but should've emphasized transitional allowance. Councillor Mayes has read from a section of that report, but I might add that it goes on to speak specifically to the comparative element of his comments there and that's with the Manitoba Legislature. He also compares it with the City of Calgary; he also compares it with the City of Edmonton. He also compares it with the City of Toronto. And the City of Toronto, for as an example, just that they're very meticulous at this and they do an entry point comparison of salaries whenever a new Council is elected and you can go online if you want while I'm talking, if I'm getting boring, and you can find that information. Right across the country, there are Councils who deal with this very difficult issue. Legislatures deal with this very challenging issue and they try to do it in the fairest and most balanced manner. I congratulate the previous Council, and as I said at Executive Policy Committee, I do not agree, and I did not agree with many of the decisions made by the prior Council, but this was a good one. And they went to a good source because Mr. Werier is no slouch. Mr. Werier is also the appointed commissioner for the Province of Manitoba for matters such as this. And he has been in counsel with the Provincial government for quite a while on these matters. And so he brings some special expertise to, as Councillor Eadie I think said, to a special situation. And I think that context is important when you're making a final decision like this. And his words looked at a fair balance at the time and I think it has held. I think it's important to understand, too, that there was mention made of the removal of the one-third allowance for taxation, income tax, under the Income Tax Act, and he began to compare more appropriately the two main comparative situations, Manitoba Legislature, City Council. And so the apples have begun to line up with the apples, okay? And I think that's a great victory. I feel very strongly, as I said to the Mayor, on the topic of compensation for Councillors. I don't want a discounted Mayor. I don't want discounted Executive Policy Committee members. In this report, Mr. Werier looked at not only the severance issue, as a special new item, but he also looked at the comparative situation as he saw it in comparison to, again, the Province of Manitoba in particular. But he branched out and he looked at other jurisdictions, too. On the comparison with Manitoba, I think there is congratulation to the Council as we worked our way through this. And this was the first review done in 20 years. I was part of the previous review in the early 1990s, 1991 with the Jones Report. And basically with the implementation of the one-third allowance issue being removed, as I said the apples have become comparable and Councillors are easily compared now with MLAs. There's always been a battle, 31 MLAs representing the urban area of Winnipeg, 15 Councillors and a mayor representing the City of Winnipeg on civic issues. And there's always been discussion about who works harder, who has more responsibility. And one of the comparatives has always been the representation. There are Councillors here today who are representing over 50,000 people. MLAs, because of the nature of the boundary commission reports that come in, generally are representing 20,000 people. So you have that type of comparative. The ministers of the crown, who are currently paid about $138,000, are compared to the Executive Policy Committee members, which what was to be put in place was about $122,000. So, I'm suspecting that Mr. Werier looked at some of the complexities of that extra additional work which, by the way, Mr. Craig has to acknowledge that if you're in the private sector, you are in other sectors and you take on additional responsibilities, you can expect to be receiving additional remunerations for the work you do. And, again, Mr. Mayor you apologized to your wife for reducing the salary and I think you should've apologized to her for the time you are going to lose away from family and friends and the events of your personal life. I've been there, I know it, and I've done that and I think that's a very important consideration and it's all about Mr. Werier arriving at this particular decision and this particular recommendation. So, yes, it's a serious consideration that you should have, take…to take into account. And Mr. Mayor…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Fraser, your comments will come to the Chair and not directly to any member of Council.

George Fraser: Sorry. Madam Speaker, my apologies. I forgot where I was at. That was back 20 years ago. Madam Speaker, it's…the process is really important. In fact, a wise person once said that process is one of the most important friends of democracy. And on this, I'll deal with the issue of the transitional allowance first and there was comments at Executive Policy Committee that perhaps, it should be referred back to the Governance Committee. And I think that has some value after listening to the discussion at EPC, preliminary at that point. Some of the questioning here that occurred for Mr. Craig's presentation, I think a referral back to the Governance Committee might be in order for some sober second thought if the severance issue requires it after your debate. And if not, if not Madam Speaker, then I think there should be another motion on the floor to quickly eliminate the Governance Committee because it becomes somewhat redundant. In this Council and in other legislative bodies across the country, one of the other savoured and supported elements of any elected body is delegation of authority and the balance of duties within any elected body. And so the

Governance Committee on the previous Councils under different names, but governance of late, has that responsibility. And they're the ones in the…previous Council that brought forward these recommendations, Madam Speaker. So built into that whole system, Mr. Mayor, just as you said this morning about human rights, one of the important elements is respect and there has to be respect in all issues and this is one of them. So if there is hesitation, if there is doubt, if there is an element of change that has to be included, I think the Governance Committee should have a look at it first because we're not on a significant rush from this perspective because it impacts the next election. Now, Madam Speaker…

Madam Speaker: Would you like to move on to the next item now?

George Fraser: No.

Madam Speaker: Well, the 10 minutes were up for the first item.

George Fraser: Okay, well, I was told that I could bundle. I had to change my thought process.

Madam Speaker: Move on to the next item, Mr. Fraser.

George Fraser: And not continue on this one?

Madam Speaker: Well, you have 30 minutes, but it's not to speak about the same item for the 30 minute duration.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the Rules to allow him to continue.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour of adding…see, there's 10 minutes per item and there is 30 minutes, but you can't bundle it to speak about the same item for the entire duration.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, I understand the rules. I…I was wondering if I could move to suspend the rules so that…

Madam Speaker: Sounds like you're wrapping up, Mr. Fraser, moving onto the next item anyways, is that correct? Okay. I'll let you continue.

George Fraser: I'll try to do that. Sorry. Sorry. This is like a Jet hockey game. Madam Mayor, just to wrap up on, again, I favoured referral at EPC And there is one element, for example, that hasn't been considered in other jurisdictions to become involved in and that's these transitional allowances in other jurisdictions can be paid to the estates of deceased members, for example, and some jurisdictions do that. Again, out of respect for families and we have, during my time and other times, that has occurred or people serving in office become disabled. And they're not able to continue in representation. I also in wrapping up would day that if it's referred there should be a legal opinion from the City of Winnipeg with respect to when this is implemented. I would contend and other legal minds would contend that I spoke to that this social contract may fail if the severance is taken away in a court of law. If a disgruntled member were to bring a lawsuit against the City of Winnipeg in the future, based on what is before them, the legal opinions that I have indicate that there is a solid case that the City of Winnipeg would have to pay out severance regardless. When you take the Oath of Office as you did just recently, that was a condition of your social contract, your engagement as a Councillor. So, Madam Mayor, I'll end that.

Madam Speaker: You've given me a promotion.

George Fraser: Sorry, Madam Speaker. Now you want me to move on to…

Madam Speaker: Is to reduce additional salaries and the amendment to the CRA policy, the two items that you wish to speak on.

George Fraser: Okay, on the reduced additional salaries, when I was at Executive Policy Committee, I challenged the Mayor to indicate publicly, and I would still do today that why 50%. Why not 100%? And I understand he's left the room here, but there's someone who's indicating that 100% reduction may be in order. There's no rationale. There's no indication that there's public support for that. Madam Speaker, I…I know the Mayor had it as part of his campaign promise and I gave an example of a campaign promise in the election that you were involved in. The third candidate captured 2900 votes promised in our ward that he would remove the…reduce the insurance premiums on my house and my cottage if I voted for him. I didn't vote for that person. So if we come…again, campaign promises and campaign promises. So, the essence is the…is the 50% reduction. Councillor Orlikow at Executive Policy Committee indicated that he's supporting this reduction because it comes closer to his personal position with respect to a similar target I

understand of everyone being equal here in City Council. So, in the ice bucket challenge that's going on here, with Executive Policy Committee, I also point out to the Council that while the Mayor is taking the same amount as EPC, he should be taking more. Based on my calculations, he's $34,000 short of a 50% objective. Under the Charter, he is the Chair of Executive Policy Committee. And he's a member of Executive Policy Committee, too. And in the basis of Mr. Werier's calculations of establishing base, the exact same thing that happens at the Legislature, the base is the common denominator, MLA's salaries now at about $89,000 and here Councillor salaries. So I would argue that the top-up, using your term, Mr. Mayor, the top-up for you approaching over $80,000, that if you are in the 50% mood, you have to contribute more money. And when I listened at Executive Policy Committee, these all have to be good reason and Executive Policy began to create a crisis, a crisis around budget. My reading of history of Councils is there was a crisis from day one when this Council was established back in the late 1800s. There was a crisis during the time that I appeared. There will be a crisis tomorrow and there will be a crisis in the future. It's not an easy task because this council is charged to have a balanced budget. It's not like the Legislature where you can run deficits. If you are looking for another example of how a politician handled that particular issue, you have to look to the current Premier Selinger. Current Premier Selinger said Mr. Werier, go do your work, set the salaries, but there is a caveat and the caveat is during the economic downturn and during our deficit budgets that are coming through the Provincial legislature, all salaries will be frozen, all MLAs and Ministers of the Crown will take a 20% cut and I will take a cut of 20% on my top-up, at that time about 75%. And he did. He did. It was fair and it was applied evenly. And, hence, my comments towards the Mayor with respect to contributing the full 50% if we are, indeed, in a crisis. In fact, if we are in a crisis, this Council should return to the same principles as the Premier put before the Legislature. Freeze the salaries and also freeze the Kohler Clause that's in place if we are in crisis. I would argue you should look at the budget first. You should determine what's the level of crisis and then you should make this decision. So I might say that the proposal from the Executive Policy Committee should be tabled and let's see what comes out of the budget discussions. Madam Mayor, I think I will move on with your…Madam Speaker, I will move on with your permission. I'm dealing with ineligible expenses at this point, is that correct?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

George Fraser: Mr. Mayor, I have to say or Madam Speaker, I have to say that the Executive Policy Committee has picked off some low-hanging fruit with respect to the expense issue. And I would also, at this time, look to Mr. Werier's additional work that he has within his commissioner role at the Province and he has a great deal of experience at looking at expenses. There are other expenses in there, and I won't get into them today, but there are also additional areas of budget consideration that previous councils had access to that I think are uncomfortable in terms of their application. And they should, indeed, be looked at. If you cherry pick, you get yourself in trouble, Mr. Mayor. And if there's a concern about ineligible expenses, then I think that that matter should be sent off to the Governance Committee for their consideration and report back to Council. If you want to if Executive Policy Committee wants to cherry pick and they want special items to be reviewed, right directly to Council with no regard for delegation of authority, then again I emphasize the Governance Committee should be abandoned and the cost savings should be allocated somewhere else and Executive Policy can, quite frankly, pick up that challenge and handle that function. Why not? Now, the Office of Policy and Strategic Initiatives, Madam Speaker, am I there now? Is that fair?

Madam Speaker: Not at this time, Mr. Fraser.

George Fraser: Not at this time?

Madam Speaker: No, but we will take…yeah. If you can just stay on the bench and we will hear from Mr. Sanders and then we'll call you both up for questions. Thank you. Mr. Sanders who is also in opposition to the same three items.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker. With regard to the proposed repeal of the severance remuneration, which is the term in the by-law, I wish to speak in opposition to the opposed repeal of the City Council Severance Remuneration which the present council members are entitled to expect to be paid when and if they choose not to stand for re-election or are defeated. This form of remuneration is commonly provided to elected officials in other jurisdictions and also of course to private sector employees and it's intended to encourage, in this case, good candidates to seek public office where job security can certainly be uncertain. When the present Councillors decide to seek election in October, these were the rules and it was only on October 11, I think less than two weeks before the election day, that Mayoral candidate Bowman suggested these rules should be changed. At EPC last week, former City Councillor George Fraser, who heard again today, made an equally eloquent submission in opposition to the repeal of the severance remuneration. I agree with what he said then and what he said today. The preamble to the motion before you states that a city hall that works requires trust in government, establishing priorities and addressing the most challenging issues. I don't think that eliminating severance remuneration which might be paid to some Councillors four years from now is either a priority of one of this Council's most challenging issues. In fact, I counted some 125,000 voters elected the 15 Councillors here on October 22 and I don't think any of you promised to eliminate your future severance pay, so I don't

think Council, as a whole, has any compelling popular mandate or obligation to do so. Personally, I think the proposal should just be defeated today. On the other hand, if the majority of Council really does think the idea has merit, then I suggest that the proposal should be referred to the Governance Committee for proper study and report as would be the normal procedure for dealing with such matters. With regard to the second matter, the proposed reduction in additional salaries, for generally similar reasons to those I've just given you, I wish to speak in opposition to the proposed reductions in compensation for the Mayor, Speaker, Deputy Speaker and members of EPC. Personally, I would like to encourage well-qualified and effective politicians to seek election to City Council, to devote all their time, energy and talents to their public duties and to conduct themselves ethically without fear or favour of potential future employers or business partners. And I would like our Councillors to be beyond financial temptation and above reproach in their decisions. I think it would be worthwhile, certainly worthwhile to review the role and function of each Standing Policy Committee and chair and to clarify the responsibilities in reporting relationships of each position. For example, it's not my impression that committee chairs here presently exercise a degree of responsibility that the Minister of the Crown does, but should. Again, it would make sense to me to refer this entire matter to the Governance Committee for research and recommendations in due course. And then thirdly with regard to the proposed declaration of certain expenses of Councillors would be ineligible for the allowance. I also wish to speak in opposition to the proposed cosmetic restrictions on Councillors' expenses which I think pander to the prejudices of those who do not appreciate the nature of the Councillors' work. For example, I would like Councillors to be able to make full use of modern communication technologies, including high-speed internet service in keeping on top of City business from home while maintaining some family presence, some work-life balance. Unless you wish to forbid Councillors from holding breakfast or luncheon meetings to discuss City business, I would much rather have the City, not someone else, pay for such meal expenses. And likewise, I do think that city Councillors should attend professional sporting events and concerts from time to time. And I would much rather have the City, not someone else, pay for their tickets. Again, if anyone thinks that the existing CRA fund policy is open to abuse, I suggest the matter be referred for review by the Governance Committee of Council which is specifically charged with this responsibility. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Fraser and Mr. Sanders on these three items? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sanders, are you…or Mr. Fraser, are you here? If you could come forwards, please.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah. I just…I'm just…it's more of an aware question.

Madam Speaker: Who is your question for, Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, well, I think it's more for the former Councillor Fraser.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Fraser, this question's for you if you'd like to come forward.

Councillor Eadie: And, Madam Speaker…

George Fraser: I can't hear well.

Councillor Eadie: Sorry, should I speak a little louder?

George Fraser: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Because I can, despite my eye itching here. But Madam Speaker, your predecessor who shepherd this in as the Chair of the Governance Committee, the former Speaker Nordman, I'm not sure and actual friend of the former Councillor Fraser, I'm just wondering if Mr. Fraser's aware that past speaker who shepherded this through…who actually had the report commissioned by Werier is that it is subject to a review in 2018. The former speaker of this Council Chamber saw fit that it should be reviewed and it's supposed to be reviewed through Governance or third party could look at it again and it's scheduled for 2018. Were you aware of that, Councillor Fraser or former Councillor?

George Fraser: Yes, I was aware of it. I think, again, Mr. Werier pointed out that don't wait 20 years to do this. He suggested and recommended a timeframe of eight years and this Council may be in a bit of a dilemma in that it may wish to revisit this prior to a next election or it may take councillor, it may take the same position that, say, Toronto does as this matter is resolved by the new Council when they appear. So, yes, the Governance Committee, if it stays in place and if it has things referred to it to do, but if it's just sitting in a closet and it's not doing anything, my position is strong, disbanded and allowed the Executive Policy Committee. Under the Charter, Executive Policy Committee is supposed to

deal with the issues of policy in and around this. And I would answer it shortly from that perspective. And, yes, of all former Councillors are friends of mine.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I would quite believe that and I know the former councillor and I had a long relationship, not as mine as being elected, but we never necessarily agreed on any particular political ideal or practicality for that matter because the former Councillor Fraser was a practical person, Madam Speaker, but Madam Speaker, the…so, another aware question. The Governance Committee does conduct its work and under our current, Madam Speaker, there was a review of Councillor Representation Allowance and new…we recoined it because really it is a ward allowance. It's not a…necessarily a representation allowance. It's a ward allowance and a number of us, Councillors utilize it in different ways. And that, that is…and it's audited every year and that's why the public gets to hear about somebody buying their employee lunch while they're working at lunch. Now, I typically use my own personal remuneration money to do that for my employee, but that is, again, it is the ward allowance in that discretion. But so I just want to clarify. So, what Mr. Fraser…Madam Speaker is just referring that now EPC is overstepped its bound. Is it naturally the work of the Governance Committee, is that what he's saying, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Fraser.

George Fraser: Well, Mr. Councillor, the danger is there, absolutely. And that's the essence of delegation of authority. Don't take it lightly and honour it, respect it. So the Governance Committee can and should play an important role. If it can't, for whatever reason, and this is a prime example, then it should be disbanded.

Madam Speaker: thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks very much. And thank you very much to both of you for your presentations here today. Mr. Fraser, thank you very much for your years of service to people of Winnipeg. I understand you served for about six years and by current calculations, you would be entitled to around $50,000 in severance and I'm just wondering yes or no, if you would accept it.

George Fraser: I didn't work under a severance model and nor for the public record am I a member of the Council Pension Plan. I want to make that very clear. The issue of whether or not you take an allowance is a universal one, Mr. Mayor. And the universality of it applies right across North America, across the world. And you can't set standards…

Mayor Bowman: I wanted to get yes or no. That's all.

George Fraser: I'm giving it to you in a political sense. Mr. Mayor, that question comes up all over the place. The recent Mayor of New York, Mayor Bloomberg, all the salary structures set in place and it's not set in place for a yes/no answer. It's there for everyone to receive based on a final decision. You can take whatever you want and you can give it to charity. You could go down to the Siloam Mission and you could make a contribution as an individual, as Mayor Bloomberg did, and as other Councillors, by the way, across this country do. If they have greater means and they have no need for transition, they don't take it. They spread it. And my answer to you is I would be obligated to take it because that was the decision of Council, a condition of engagement for everyone.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Mayor, second question?

Mayor Bowman: No, I'm good.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: I wanted to rise, firstly, I want to say I'm honoured to rise for the very first time in this chamber. It's very exciting for me and I'm excited to represent the constituents of Charleswood-Tuxedo and Whyte Ridge. I just…do you want to clarify though...with Mr. Fraser, he used the "crisis" word when it came to our budget and I don't know if this requires an answer or not from him, but I want to clarify that. I don't want the impression left in the public, at least from my perspective that we're in a budgetary crisis. We have budgetary challenges that we have to deal with and we do have to bring a balanced budget, but I do object to the use of the word "crisis" in the context of our current budgetary discussions. So I just wanted to make that point.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? No? Okay. Mr. Fraser, you may return to the gallery and Mr. Sanders, we will…pardon me?

Madam Speaker: Yes, right. Mr. Fraser, No. 11. Item 11, the report of EPC dated December 3 regarding the Office of Policy and Strategic Initiatives, would you like to address that item?

George Fraser: Yes, Madam Speaker, and I'll try to be very brief on this. The Executive Policy Committee, based on a motion brought forward by the Mayor, establishes the Office of Policy and Strategic Initiatives and that group, that office, reports directly to his staff. And the only comparative situation here, Mr. Mayor, and I understand what's going to happen, the report came forward with no financial impact and no description of numbers of staff years, what the roles would be with respect to that office and policy and strategic initiatives. But I guess one could guess. There was some table talk at Executive Policy Committee. You gave an indication that it would be within budget and within the staff-man years, the staff-person years I should say that supported previous structures. And this also goes to an item of the Werier Report because the Governance Committee came forward at that time and they came, the one weakness in that whole presentation back in 2011 was, indeed, I think as Mr. Craig from the Taxpayers Federation would agree, there was no financial information with it. There were three Councillors who voted against it and one who objected to that when it came forward. There was no implications from a financial perspective. So, Mr. Mayor, I would hope that in this discussion today or in the budget discussions, the office of policy and strategic initiatives will come forward with all of that type of information and I challenged you with one other question that when we were having part of that discussion and it involves the severance issue. And I'm not trying to go back there, but I also challenged you to also reveal within this office that's coming forward and also within your own political staff whether or not there are severance agreements in the contracts that you have just signed off on or are going to be signing off on. And as my grandmother used to say, Mr. Mayor, you can't have your cake and eat it.

Madam Speaker: Are there any questions for Mr. Fraser on this item? Okay. We'll move forward to Mr. Sanders on the last two items. You are in opposition to Item 12, the report of EPC dated December 3 regarding the Strategy to End Homelessness and also in opposition to Item 1, the report of Finance regarding the Financial Status Update. Thank you.

David Sanders: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not exactly in opposition to the long-term strategy to end homelessness, rather I'd like to see us do more. I would like to thank Mayor Bowman for placing this matter on City Council Agenda at this, the first regular meeting. And I do hope that City Council will unanimously support the city taking a leadership role in implementing the recommendations of the long-term strategy to end homelessness produced by the task force of the Winnipeg Poverty Reduction Council and the United Way. However, in my opinion, the particular recommendations before you fall short of what the community is hoping for as an expression in the preamble to the resolution. The task force is recommending the establishment of a new community organization, which will be able to pool public and private resources and co-ordinate the delivery of programs and services effectively. The new organization will no doubt need to core funding, but it does not appear that Council has yet been given any specific request or suggested terms and conditions which would indicate whether the proposed $150,000 per year for five years is adequate for the purpose. Maybe it should be a minimum of $500,000. I don't know. If we are serious about this, we don't know. I suggest a detailed report and explanation should accompany the recommended inclusion of this grand in the upcoming 2015 Operating Budget. Do not think that the Chief Administrative Officer should be directed to find the funding source from within existing budgets in 2015. Firstly, the 2015 budgets don't exist yet at least, not public. And secondly, as the CAO expected to tap some presently hidden slush fund or is the CAO being directed to recommend which program or service should be cut back by $150,000 in 2015. If ending homelessness is a priority, and I hope we all agree it is, the recommended grant should simply be included in the proposed operating budget because balancing the overall budget would be a much, much bigger problem than this. I do agree that the City's Director of Community Services should be appointed as the City's lead representative to the board of the new community organization. But if we are serious about this, there needs to be a coordinated approach by a number of City services, including housing and building inspections and Police and Fire Paramedics as well as Community Services. And I'm sure there are others. And I believe there should be relevant reporting to each of the responsible Council committees, all of them initially and at least quarterly thereafter. I don't think Council should just give the Director of Community Services a cheque and send them off to report back to EPC a year from now as resolution suggests. And finally, I would suggest that Recommendation No. 5 should be amended to read as follows that the City of Winnipeg be an active partner within new organization in preventing homelessness and in facilitating opportunities to create housing for people who are homeless. Prevention is part of the preamble, certainly required and I suggest we make it part of the City's commitment. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I see questions for Mr. Sanders. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, it's a more of "did you know" question again, Madam Speaker. Having been at the presentation of the…I can't remember the exact name, the United Way's housing committee made a presentation and an ask of the City a year ago and this is the exact ask that was made that the City support their plan to move forward to end homelessness and to have a central body try to organize that and find a private investment, private money developers to help us end this and it's difficult to do. But it would be much easier to do. CentreVenture is able to

work at the, you know, creating business and trying to create more homes. But just specifically in the downtown area. This central body was important and the former Mayor Katz was very supportive of it as well. And the ask was for the City of Winnipeg to offer $150,000. I believe the Province was asked for a similar amount for operating dollars. Not sure where that's at. But I…so, in just information…so I'm not sure if Mr. Sanders was aware that this was the ask and this is actually the proposal that was pitched to the City of Winnipeg over a year ago by the United Way housing committee. So, I'm not sure if he is aware or not. And, you know, while I'm up here, I'll just say I really appreciate that our new mayor is very supportive of this. And the question I don't know is I'm not sure if Mayor Katz had a separate $150,000 or what he was going to do with it, but I was asked to move a motion in that regard of the $150,000. But the Mayor today is doing it and I think that's great. Anyway, I'm just wondering if Mr. Sanders was aware of all that.

David Sanders: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. No, I'm not aware of the $150,000 figure. It does not appear in any of the documents that are public and there is nothing in the report presented on the Council floor in which would indicate the source of it. But I'm glad to hear it. If that's the number then, that you're proposing to meet the request as requested.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There was another question on this side of the chamber. Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Thanks, Madam Speaker. Thank you for raising this issue, Mr. Sanders. I think it's an important one and it didn't get much attention when we debated it at EPC, so I had meant to pull it off the agenda here today, but since we're raising it here on…in the delegations, that's commendable. I think I do want to commend the Mayor for bringing this forward. There were some people like me who said, you know, we share the cost of this. And the Mayor essentially said we're going…we're doing this. We're going ahead with doing this, it's important. So I think that's…I've come around and I think it is important that we go ahead. You're encouraging us to vote yes here I think, but you're saying there should be more reports. There is I think an annual report coming back to EPC. Are you suggesting that there should be more frequent reports from Mr. Wightman our representative on the committee? I'm just trying to figure out what it is you're recommending here?

David Sanders: Councillor Mayes, I'm suggesting more reports because I think there should be more action on the part of the City, as my understanding, it's not that they're just requesting a cheque, requesting that the City pool its resources and provide coordinated services along with the others in a proactive way. So I'm expecting to see organizationally and in terms of dollars, the City of Winnipeg playing a role which goes well beyond the $150,000 core funding grand and I don't see that in the resolution and that's why I'm suggesting that Council should consider.

Madam Speaker: Any…

David Sanders: For example, as the City is administering, sorry, the City's administering the Federal homelessness funds. It's a huge role to play. I'll…that's commitment to coordinating that with this year exercise.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for Mr. Sanders? Thank you very much.

David Sanders: On the last item, then, the report on Finance, forecast until September 30, 2014. It would be helpful to know today what the most recent 2014 operating budget forecast is. This report only goes up to September 30. Assuming that 2014 ends as forecast in this report, the Public Services proposes to withhold payment of supplementary taxes and interest revenue from transfer to the financial stabilization reserve fund and then to withdraw whatever additional amount, may be required to cover the rest of the operating deficit. The figures in the report are not entirely clear. But after covering the 2014 shortfall, which was then estimated at $14.9 million, plus the additional $2 million for Federal reductions, the reserve fund may be reduced to $62.1 million or only 60.4% of the 2014 operating budget. This means that the City will be withdrawing a total of $29 million from the stabilization fund in 2014, with the expectation that the City will then replenish the fund, at least by $15 million in order to meet the reserve fund target of 8% of the operating budget in the coming year. So instead of taking 29 million out, we're expected to put 15 million in. The 2015 and 2016 operating budget forecast, which are approved by City Council last December, show a potential operating deficit of 79 million in 2015 and 109 million in 2016. And that's without any provision for extra spending on infrastructure or other good things or the replenishment of the reserve fund, which looks as if it will be necessary. Since the City must adopt a balanced budget before March 31, at the very latest, financing committee in Council now face, in my view, a huge financial challenge, maybe not a crisis, but a huge financial challenge and wishing and hoping will certainly not be good enough. I am concerned Dialogue Partners, a consulting from Toronto were retained by the City to conduct a public consultation process for this year, named our budget forward. The consultants and the general public are still awaiting further direction from the new Executive Policy Committee which, as far as I know, has still not discussed the issue in public. So I ask, does the new Council have a new 2015 budget process and when and how will citizens be able to express their opinions on the proposed operating budget whenever EPC releases it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any questions on this item? Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Sanders. We'll now move on to reports of EPC, committee reports. Mr. Mayor, on the report of EPC dated November 19.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2014

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move adoption of the consent Items 1 through 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, on the report of EPC dated November 28.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED NOVEMBER 28, 2014

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 4.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: (inaudible)

Madam Speaker: Okay. Consent Agenda Items 1 to 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, on the report of EPC dated December 3.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED DECEMBER 3, 2014

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move adoption of the Consent Item…Agenda Items 1 to 4, 6 and 7 and Items 11 through 13.

Madam Speaker: Could you repeat that, 1 to 4?

Mayor Bowman: No, I'm only going to say it once. Okay. I'll say it quicker now. Okay, so Items 1 to 4, inclusive, 6 and 7, and Items 11 to 13 inclusive. And ask that we stand down Items 5, 8, 9 and 10.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, 11.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, 4, 6 and 12.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All right. We will vote on Items 1, 2, 3, 7, and Item No. 13. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item No. 4.

Item 4 - Winnipeg Police Pension Fund Letter of Credit

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce. Would you like to introduce the item? It speaks for itself.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. It does speak for itself.

Madam Speaker: This was stood down by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise and I stand this down. I'm supporting the report. I'm only standing it down just so members of Council become familiar with this item and the fact that this is a concern that we have to

have on our radar screen as we go forward. The issue here, of course, is a liability which rests now with the City, and as you can see in the report, it rises to a total of 30.9 million by September of 2015. This is due to the fact that we have a defined pension plan with regards to the Winnipeg Police Association and we have to carry, therefore, a letter of credit on file against that defined pension plan. There's an annual cost. It's approximately just under $100,000 and rising and basically what that means is that in the event of the markets turning south, at any point in the future, which as we know can happen and it has happened not just in our lifetime, but in recent memory, that potentially the liability in terms of our cost to the City could rise as high as $30.8 million. And please keep in mind a letter of credit is not an insurance policy. It is a letter of credit which basically means it's debt. If that letter of credit is called upon, that is debt that we are assuming on behalf of the City of Winnipeg. One time debt that then we'll have to pay into the future if the markets do not recover. We did request solvency from the WPA about a year or so ago. We did not obtain it against that pension fund. So it's still an outstanding issue so I, therefore, would encourage that a new Council take this matter on as quickly as possible with our public service, the simplest solution and the immediate solution would be to introduce a new pension fund whereby all new members, new hires on the Winnipeg Police Association…Police Force would be subject not to a defined fund, but to an undefined fund to protect the City as we go forward. But as it stands right now, this is a huge liability on the City of Winnipeg, all members of Council should be aware of this. I stand it down just so that you read the report if you haven't already, and that you're aware that this issue has to be dealt with and has to be dealt with shortly. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: I'd just like to thank Councillor Wyatt for his comments and for support. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 4? Contrary? Carried. Item 5, Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 - Oshki Anishinabe Nigaaniwak – The City of Winnipeg's Aboriginal Youth Infrastructure Training / Apprenticeship Program

Madam Speaker: Good pronunciation. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You've heard me saying quite a lot about the…about the need to create greater opportunities for all Winnipeggers, including members of our City's youth and our growing Indigenous community. Since taking office, you heard me mention that while we have a long way to go to ensuring all of us behave like a community, we're making headway and we're off to a great start. Since the City implemented its Aboriginal Relations Division in 2012, we've seen a number of successful programs such as the Aboriginal Paramedic Care Training Program and the Aboriginal Youth Internship create positive pathways that we're working to build more upon so that really everyone in our community can reach their full potential and capabilities. Through Oshki Anishinabe Nigaaniwak or OAN and the Aboriginal Youth Strategy, we built the framework to keep building and continue the mentorship with young, talented people from Winnipeg's Aboriginal community. Let me tell you, there is no shortage of gifted talent and I want to thank the Corporate Services Department and the Aboriginal Relations Division for their great work creating this partner agreement program that will allow us to provide more training and career opportunities for Aboriginal people in the public and the private sectors and of course, Madam Speaker, I wish to take a moment to acknowledge former Mayor Katz who also served as Secretary of Urban Aboriginal Opportunities. Former Mayor Katz dedicated a decade of developing opportunities like this for aboriginal young people in our City and I thank him for his passion that opened many doors here with the City of Winnipeg and through training and leadership programs across the community. I'm very pleased to introduce this partnership for internship and training and certainly urge all of my council colleagues to support this wonderful program as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? Mr. Mayor, you do have an opportunity to close if you wish or I can call the vote. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item number 6, Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 - Winnipeg Police Headquarters Redevelopment Project – Insurance Recovery Report

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'll let the motion speak for itself and look forward to hearing from members…comments from members of Council.

Madam Speaker: This was pulled by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I rise. I'm not going to be supporting this report, Madam Speaker. The reason I'm not supporting it is I'm concerned with regards to some of the wording inside the report, specifically the fact that it's alluding

to uninsured costs which may come out of the water damage claim. Frankly, as far as I'm concerned, there should be no uninsured costs here. Whether it be our insurance policy or the bond being carried by the construction company or construction companies that are working on the site, this coverage should be fully insured. We should not have to obtain any extra costs as a city with regards to this water damage, whether it be by the equipment that has to be replaced or the business interruption with regards to the fact that our WPS or Winnipeg Police Service cannot move into the facility soon enough or whether it be the fact that we have new costs associated with the fact that we cannot decommission and repurpose the existing Public Safety Building sooner instead of later. So I'm concerned with regards to the delegated authority being given to the Chief Administrative Officer and with the fact of the wording of the reports specifically referring to costs that could be uninsured with regards to a…with regards to a rain incident that occurred and should be fully insured, one way or the other. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to add anything at this time?

Mayor Bowman: No.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 6? Contrary? Carried. Okay, so noted. Mr. Clerk, Item No. 8.

Item 8 - Amendment to the Elected Officials Compensation By-law No. 158/2011 - Severance Remuneration for Members of Council

Item 9 - Amendment to the Elected Officials Compensation By-law No. 158/2011 – Reduced Additional Salaries

Item 10 - Amendment to the Councillors Representation Allowance – Ineligible Expenses

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move Items 8, 9 and 10 that they be spoken to concurrently and voted on separately. And I move Item...Item 8.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of speaking to them concurrently, but voting separately? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to speak to each of those items at this time? Do you wish to introduce?

Mayor Bowman: No. I look forward to hearing comments from Council first. Thank you, and then I'll close.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: We're speaking to Reports 8 through 11? Is that right?

Madam Speaker: Eight, nine and ten. Maybe we'll have…

Councillor Eadie: Oh, eight, nine and ten, yes. I stood down 11 so, okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker. So on these three issues, I think I'll start with the simplest of the motions. The…the change to what we will be calling in 2015, the ward allowance because the allowance that we have does affect the ward. It's not just Councillor representation. It is a ward allowance and that's what it is. I'll be supporting this report, although I have to agree that the Governance Committee, if this was to be removed, probably would've been the better format to follow in that Madam Speaker, you were actually elected by Council to deal with these issues under the Organization By-law. And I know that…that I know that the Mayor's Office can set the agenda for whatever committee and that's important, but that aside, I will be supporting this. I actually…I I have no problem with it because I never spent money on…I…if I buy my assistant, actually if I make him work during lunch, I actually pay for his lunch. So…and I've decided to do that and actually when I have meetings with most people in the community, it's usually I go "Dutch". The constituent doesn't pay my lunch and I don't pay theirs. That is usually…that is always my intention, but…so, you know, these are low-hanging fruit, of course, to get rid of and just in speaking to that though, there has been reference to allowances that other levels of governments have, for example, the Manitoba MLAs, members of the Legislative Assembly and their constituencies. I would never, ever, and I just want to go on record, ever see us limited to the way that the only thing they can spend those public dollars on is actually advertising themselves. They used to be able to help organizations out in their constituencies and they can no longer do it because of this so-called political perspective that somehow, I guess, the majority of the population is against? I didn't hear that in my ward. In my ward, what I hear, even though I take a public beating every year when the audit comes out, I hear from my residents in my ward and they appreciate where I was trying to put that money from the ward allowance. I'll just leave that there. In regard to the…well, I'll call it a raise from being promoted to the chairperson of EPC and under the previous Council, I was…when I voted, you know, for this remuneration and all that sort of stuff, I was never going to be on EPC and that's fine. That's fine, but you know what. I've been down here at City Hall,

advocating for things for persons with disabilities, advocating for good library services over the years. My first advocacy effort started in 1991 when I got to meet the former Councillor Fraser. And so going back to that, I know that every EPC chairperson has more, more work to do, more responsibility. If you start cutting their wages, I don't understand why they should be asked to take on all this extra responsibility without being remunerated and, you know, I know it's a political thing. And I'm…you know what, every chairperson of every standing committee and, Madam Speaker and Madam Deputy Speaker, you know, I appreciate. I will be voting against that particular motion because it is not appropriate. It is a raise due to added responsibilities. And, frankly, the Mayor, I have a lot of respect for the Mayor's Office and to say that the Mayor is going to be much busier and not to mention the toll it does take on your family when you're not there, but we all got elected because we have a cause. We have a cause. We want to make the public's, we want to make things better. That's why we run as politicians. Yes, that's true. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't be remunerated appropriately for the work we do. Like why do our families have to be punished financially when they don't get to see us as often. I want to ask you that question because that's really what it's about. And I spoke to that. When we voted for this remuneration package, both…actually I heard people, Councillors who were opposed on almost everything speak in harmony about the need for being remunerated appropriately for what is a very unique, very different job than any other in any other place and I heard somebody say, well with all due respect, a City Councillor is not a CEO, but let's look at a CEO in a private sector. They are the spokesperson for that corporation. They get called at midnight at, whenever. The CEO takes that responsibility. They're the ones you call. The Mayor is actually the one they call. When there's an emergency in this City, it is the Mayor who gets a call. But I get calls. In the evenings, on the weekends, late at night, from people in distress thinking that I can somehow help them. And I want to help them. That is part of the unique career we call politician and to disrespect it with the language I heard regarding the severance is disgusting. It is severance. It is not political payout. I don't know who wrote that or who came up with that, but that's ridiculous. Makes me sound sleazy because I'm going to vote against getting rid of severance. Makes me sound sleazy and I really am angered by that. Now, in regard to severance, I talked about…I will not be voting for EPC members and Madam Speaker and Deputy Speaker to take a 50% cut. I'm not on the so-called top-up, I call it a raise. On the severance, you know, a public career is very different. And we actually heard from a presenter who actually reflects the private sectors' view of politicians. The private seconder doesn't think we deserve it. The private sector doesn't think we do work. Private sector thinks that somehow we don't need some kind of transition. We do. Every one of us around this table, Madam Speaker, has their own unique circumstances. But I know. I know my own and I think and I know from experience, having won and lost, actually, with somebody hiring me after, no, because you know what, they didn't believe in my beliefs. The people who voted for me believed in what I'm trying to do for them, to make life better in the North End, in West Kildonan. They believe I can do that and I do do that. And you know what, when the time comes, I'll, you know, I think that 10 to 12 years, three terms is long enough to serve the people. And I'm not going to commit to say term limits, but, you know, the reality is 10 to 12 years of this public life…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Ten to twelve years of this unique job is enough. Now if severance disappears, I will continue to do the job. But you know what, why would I step down? Because I know I'm going to have a real difficult time, very difficult time finding employment. So why…what's to stop me? And many of the people who…in the public who say, get rid of all these perks as they call it, are the same people that say, we should have term limits. Well, let's be realistic then. If we're going to have term limits, then that's…so be it. But anyway, I just wanted to make these points and…and that with all due respect to all of you, you know I know it's a very tough political position to be in. We're putting it…I just learned today that on October 11, all of a sudden, this was a platform item. I don't know why, but I guess it was. I never heard about the issue at the door. I knocked on lots of doors. I'm sure many of…everybody else here in Council knocked on many doors. I kept hearing about and the former mayor didn't run, but I kept hearing about the issues related to those incidents on Council. I didn't hear that they thought that I, on Council, was part of some problem that we have here that somehow we're not trying to represent the public. I do it every day, I'm proud to do it. And even though I love doing it, you know, I still need to be remunerated and it does take a toll on your family. And I'll leave it at that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Before we move on to other speakers, I'd like to clarify the recommendation heard since it did come forward with no recommendation. Mr. Mayor, would you like to do that?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm asking that Council support the motion to enact the amendments to the Elected Officials Compensation By-law as reflected in the agenda and in Schedule A attached.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, would you like to read the recommendations, please?

Clerk: On December 3, 2014, the Executive Policy Committee submitted the following resolution to Council without recommendation. "Whereas a City Hall that works requires trust in government, establishing priorities and addressing the most challenging issues; and whereas it is desirable that the City no longer continue to provide severance

remuneration to members of Council, including the Mayor, who choose not to stand for re-election or are electorally defeated in a municipal election; and whereas eliminating severance remuneration for members of Council requires an amendment to the Election Officials Compensation By-law No. 158/2011; therefore be it resolved that Council enact the amendments to the Elected Officials Compensation By-law No. 158/2011, attached hereto as Schedule 'A'."

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So the Mayor has put forward a number of motions today which we're now debating. And I'm pleased to support most of them. I will not be supporting the motion to eliminate severance, which I have said. And I just want to point out, you know, we do have a process of Governance Committee where these things are supposed to go and I agree this isn't maybe the ideal process, but we've had an election. The Mayor has the right to put these ideas forward and we have a right, as each member of Council, to vote with our conscience in what we think is right. The Governance Committee did recently review a number of these matters already. So you know, sending it back, I'm not sure it would really come back with anything that different. So I think we do need to just make our decisions today with our conscience and do what we think is right. I just wanted to mention on the other items, I will be supporting the changes to the ward representation allowance. I don't have any problem following the changes that are recommended, generally for the most part what I was doing anyway. And I'm happy to make those minor changes. And in terms of the reduction in pay for EPC members and the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, I am willing to support that. I agree with some of the arguments that have been made today by the former Councillor, by Councillor Eadie and others that people should be fairly compensated and it shouldn't be an arbitrary process. But having said that, we do live in a political world and I think we do need to give something back. It's a difficult budget year. There's no question it's going to be a difficult budget year and the salary reduction is something that would be a predictable, annual savings of a certain amount that can be budgeted for in each election going forward. So when we're doing our budgets, we know that we have that number of, you know, to contribute to something else, it's a consistent number and it is sending a message that we as Councillors are prepared to tighten our belts, which is something that I think the public, some of the public, feels is important. So I will be supporting that. In terms of the severance, it's…I believe it's really a symbolic gesture, which doesn't deliver a predictable budget savings. It's four years away, depending on how many people leave. We don't even know how much it is. This was a very unusual year to have it be what it was with half of Council changing. I don't think I've ever seen that. So it's not really as significant financially. But a couple of the points have already been made earlier, but severance was recommended because Councillors are ineligible for employment insurance. It was recommended to help people transition back into the workforce. And I don't think it's really…to think of the fact that if you decide not to continue running or you get defeated to go to absolutely no pay cheque, is fairly harsh. Like I realize some people who go into the wrong business, they're in that situation, but most careers and professions, you know, there's some kind of severance or there's some kind of unemployment insurance or something else. Most of the careers I've been involved in, I certainly would've had that including nursing and other jobs I've had. And perhaps people who work for minimum wage and have terrible situations, you know, should have better working conditions. And a lot of people aren't aware of the facts around this issue, either. I don't think people realize that Councillors are ineligible for employment insurance. I would also point out that a modest severance package is common and reasonable and I…I keep hearing it's not in the private sector, it's not in the private sector. Well, maybe in some cases, it's not. It's also very common in the private sector and in professional type of jobs, it's very common even if you're fired, you get some kind of severance. So and losing an election isn't really being or deciding not to run again is not being fired. It's deciding you've served your time and you're going to give someone else a chance to run. I mean, a lot of people support term limits. I don't, but you know, you can't have it both ways, you know. So I just want to point out when you run for office, you step out of the workforce and out of a previous career path to serve the public. And you know, politicians are often maligned, but most of us here, I mean, I know why I went into politics. I know why Ross went into politics because we care about our community. That's the type of people we are. That's why we chose this rather difficult job at times, which we love to do, but we chose to do that to serve the public. And I'd also like to point out something I haven't heard anyone say, but that for women, we're already underrepresented in politics and a lot of us have already taken several years out of our career paths to devote ourselves to childcare. And it's already a challenge to attract women to politics. This means it's a lot more risky than attractive. I know myself I took nine years of working weekends as a nurse as opposed my career path to nursing professor which I gave up to be in politics to go back to that now. You know, I mean, it's just my situation, but even to just work as a nurse, I would have to go back to school for six months just to get training to be where I was when I started. When I stepped out of my career path to enter public service, so and I'd also point out that not everyone has a duel income. I'm a single income family. I know others here who are single income family. So, I think it is a risk to say that you have to be a well-healed, independently wealthy or have a rich spouse or have a practice or law practice waiting for you to take that risk to run for office. It's already risky for women. It's already risky for people of lesser means. It's already risky for single parents and it's a real challenge. And when I decided to run again, I knew that I was going to have a severance at the end of it. That was what I was expecting and that was the deal, that Council had voted on and then two weeks before the election, October 11, the Mayor made a promise to take that away. So that does have some unfairness to it. I'm sure it's unintended, but I don't know if the whole picture was considered when bringing that forward. Currently, severance does not reward somebody who quits in the middle of their term. So, if you leave to run for another

office, if you get arrested or whatever, no longer in office, if you don't complete your four year commitment, you don't get severance and that's the way it is now. That's…we don't have to change anything to have that. So, like we make a four-year commitment to step out of our other life, to not be doing other things, to do this. And we…if we decide to risk ourselves in the democratic process and if you lose that election, you know, you put yourself out there. But you don't really deserve to be punished. You're being punished already, I think, by the humiliation of losing that. But, you know, you put yourself out there. You put in the time you committed to put in and if you decide to leave room for new, younger people to come forward or new, fresh people you've done your time and you feel it's time to step down, you know, should you…is that quitting your job? I don't think that's quitting your job. I'd be quitting my job if I left right now, okay? I'm going to be here for the next four years. That's my commitment. And that's a big commitment. Trust me, some days. So I…I guess, you know, in summary, I've said most of my points, but I mean it's a standard practice in spite of what the gentleman from the Taxpayers Federation that said…it's a standard practice to have some kind of severance for most professional positions. It's not unheard of. It's not excessive.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Gerbasi: It's not an excessive…it's not some sort of sleazy kind of payout or something and I also think there's a concern that if there was no place to land, the minute you finish your job, you're probably going to spend the last year of your term job hunting or focusing on other things. And for Councillors, that's not that good of an idea like it wouldn't be me, but there are Councillors who are interested in real estate and different things like, do we really want them feeling they have to start working on their next career while they're still doing this job, I don't think so. And I think for many of us, we intend to put in our four years. I intend to right up till the last day of my term of Council because I'm very committed to my work when I take something on and so to…for me to say, okay, that's it. I don't have an income the next day, sorry. I just don't think that's reasonable or fair. It's not what I signed on for, it's not what any member of this council signed on for because they knew the rules when they ran or they should have. And I think it's very clear that council, like Councillor Eadie made some really good points about the difficulty of transitioning back. You know, some professions, you can just go right back like I believe with a law practice, it's not difficult. But with most careers, especially some people here had political jobs, they had other jobs. You know, if your politics isn't the popular politics of the day, you might not be able to get a job that easily. If…you know, there's many reasons why the transition is difficult or you simply need to start over. You need to go back to school or various things. So I think I've made most of those points and I think that, I just hope that everybody votes with their conscience and votes what they think is right and fair and those are some of the arguments I'd like to make and I thank you for the opportunity.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As others have echoed today, it's an honour to rise for the first time in this chamber to represent the good folks of St. James-Brooklands and Weston. I will be voting in favour of all three of these motions. I appreciate my fellow Councillors call…appealing for us to vote with our conscience and I will be doing so. I want to speak specifically to the severance motion. I support this motion to end Councillor severance for the following reasons. I believe that we on Council are provided sufficient remuneration over the course of four year term in office allowing us to safe our respective futures. If we have the privilege of being elected for additional term or terms, then that time for saving is extended. Those savings of course will serve as a bridge income to new employment if we lose in election or not re-elected. I also believe that serving on Council for a term or more provides each of us with the unique, desirable, marketable skills, experience and extensive network of contacts, that position most if not all of us well for future employment. Perhaps more…most importantly, I'm supporting this motion because I believe that ending the severance closes the trust gap between politicians and the people who elect us. We're elected by the public. We're here to serve them. We are well paid by their tax dollars. The tax dollars of hard working citizens I would say the majority of whom do not have the luxury of severance if they quit at their places of employment. And further, to be frank, voting us out of office is their prerogative. I don't see it as being fired from a job, it's more like not having our contract renewed and to my knowledge. Most contracts, if they are not renewed, there is no severance. It's true that political office is unlike any other employment. But let's be frank, each one of us came into this position with full knowledge that for the vast majority of those who are elected to public life, politics ends before life ends. However, unlike the private sector, each of us, as one of our delegates mentioned today, each of us has job security for the next four years, barring criminal investigation or missing three Council meetings, and so 47 months from now I would argue is ample time to prepare for a future that may find any or all of us voted out of public office. We're leading the City at a time when fiscal prudence is necessary. We're going to have to make difficult choices in upcoming budgets. So I believe that we need to lead by personal example as others have said. Each of us has four years to prepare. We have four years to prepare for life after public office if need be. So I ask that today we take a step forward regaining the public's trust and confidence. Anecdotally, the people that I have spoken to in my ward over this when I've asked the public has said "Don't take the severance. We don't get severance, why should you get severance?" Let's end the severance. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. About five years ago when I was a school trustee in Brandon, my older son was in kindergarten and they had a whole thing on jobs, professions, occupations that serve the public. So I suggested, you know, you saw what you normally see, the police officer, ambulance officer, not ambulance driver, we've all learned that message, ambulance officer, police, firefighter. And I suggested school trustees or politician, and people didn't laugh at that, people didn't ridicule that. People said, "Yeah, you know, we can see that, that's a job where you serve the public." So, I think that stayed in my mind today. We've heard a lot about, you know, how self-interest and people are in this for their own pocketbook, et cetera, et cetera, and I think that's not accurate. I think most people do this job because, not because it's in their self-interest or because they want to get wealthy, frankly I made more as a lawyer in Brandon than I do doing this and I know the Mayor made more as a lawyer in Winnipeg than he makes doing this. But I think people do this because it's an honourable profession and because they believe in democracy and I'll come back to that in a bit and the importance of democratic control around here. I had been talking about trying to have sort of compromise on this. There doesn't seem to be the willingness to do this. I want to commend Councillor Schreyer who came to me and said yesterday, well no, he had been interested in that as well. So I think he's asked some good questions and made some good points today. I actually think Councillor Gillingham's presentation was far better than some of the other rationale that we've heard on this in terms of, you're here in comparitance of well, let's compare to the private sector because most people in the private sector don't get money if you quit. So then you ask the question, so you're saying, it should apply to Councillors who don't quit. No, I didn't say that because small businessmen don't get it and they don't get EI and we've had comparisons all over the map. I mean we heard that here earlier today. Well, first we're going to compare you to this group and you say, okay, so we don't get EI though. Well, you shouldn't be like people, small businessmen don't get EI. What about, you know, write-offs for business, oh, no, you are not like, you're not CEOs. We heard some fairly I think odd comparisons made. The comparisons that should be made are what then, if we can't compare to the private sectors, even some of the folks here today. So what should comparisons be? I would suggest that the presentation, or the study that was done by Mr. Werier is pretty thorough and comprehensive study of the appropriate group for comparators and he looked at other jurisdictions, he looked at other levels of government in Manitoba. And we also heard the remarkable comment, "well, you survived without severance all these decades, how come you need it now?" Well, page one of the report, one of the pages says, there's been a tax free components since 1972. And apparently when Council did away with that to be more open, apparently that wasn't mentioned and the answer, you know, that wasn't mentioned recently that Council did, Council did away with something they had for decades. There wasn't enough room on twitter is the response. Sorry, there wasn't enough room on my tweet to put in that fact. Well, I'll put that fact on the record, I wasn't here in September of 2011. The people who voted in September of 2011 on this cut a pretty, a perk, to use some of the terminology here, they cut away the one-third tax free allowance that they had to be more open, to be more transparent, and that's right in this report that that's what should be done, and that's what they did do and we heard, well, people didn't know, well, is there a public report, it was debated by Councils. It's been on the internet for multiple years, I printed it off this morning pretty easily, so this report's been out there. I didn't vote on it. I wasn't here yet. Councillor Orlikow was not in the chamber that day, but the other councillor of the day and the mayor of the day did vote on the report and had a chance for public debate and public presentation. So the point I'm trying to make here is there's been a public report. It was very thorough. It talked about eliminating that tax free allowance to be open and transparent. This wasn't Michael Werier trying to pull one over on people. Wasn't misnaming things, obviously openness and transparency were important to him. So that, then leave this too. What did he have to say about severance? Who wrote that in the last minute under the table? Well, actually, it's right here in the report, pages 29 and 30. It's called severance and he talks about how members of the Manitoba Legislature gets severance, talks about how Calgary elected officials get severance, Edmonton, Toronto. I suspect we will hear a lot about Calgary and Edmonton in the coming years. I just want to put on the record that their Councils do have a form of severance pay. What exactly it should be again I still think we should be looking at referring this to Governance, but I don't think there's the appetite for that. The details though and I found it interesting, I've got six or eight emails on this issue, and half of those even said of course, if you leave voluntarily, you shouldn't get it but if you are defeated in election you should get it. So I think there's no great uniformity of public opinion on this. Councillor Browaty got 78% in the election, he voted for this package back in 2011 so I don't think the raft of the voters was delivered on him for having voted for severance package. Councillor Gerbasi got over 70% as well. So I think the public is concerned about people who leave voluntarily who get it, but I think there's generally an acknowledgment that we don't get employment insurance. Frankly that you'll hear, well, nobody gets this in the public…in the private sector. Well, obviously many employees do get it and I know that, because Michael Werier chaired the Employment Standards Committee review. Didn't listen to my presentation unfortunately on expanding rights for cleaners and security workers which shows he's not that easy to convince, and which is useful to bear in mind when we're looking at this report. But Mr. Werier I think acknowledges we don't get employment insurance, and therefore there's a different consideration at play and looking at the…at how we should remunerate public officials. So I think what Councillor Gillingham had to say frankly was a better defense of voting Yes than some of the other rhetoric we've heard. It is…it's called severance by the Council because it's called severance by the third party who we hired or who was hired to make that report. It's called…and does it apply if you are…if you leave in midterm as Councillor Gerbasi pointed out, if somebody leaves and creates a by-election, they don't get the severance pay, they don't get any of that. It only applies to come to an end of a term. Frankly, I see nothing…some of my constituents would agree with me, this should probably be treated differently if you leave voluntarily or if you're

defeated, but that wasn't the recommendation here so I'm not going to press that issue here today. But, you know, when I was in Brandon, we set our remuneration based on the settlement that the teachers got each year and we were accused of being self-interested. As if we were going to give away millions of dollars so we could get an additional $120 a year for remuneration. So the pressure there was referred it to a third party, referred it to an independent third party, which is exactly what was done by the Councillors of the City of Winnipeg. They referred this matter to an independent third party and these are the recommendations. So I think what it comes down to at the end is you've got a group of people here, 16 people overlooking a civil service of 9,000 full-time equivalents, roughly 9,000 employees. I think we need to keep the focus on making sure that we have control over the public service and the recommendations and the actions, I've actually had far more emails on the issue of…they came up two weeks ago about the riverbank management funds and what happened to those funds and why did some people in the civil service seem to think they were missing or have been appropriated elsewhere. I've had way more emails on that, Madam Speaker than on the issue of severance. So I think it's important to realize we are elected here to do a job on behalf of the City of Winnipeg and part of that job is to oversee a very vast civil service. As you yourself once said, Madam Speaker, well, why don't we just all go volunteers, that would save a lot of money and that's true, but the challenge here is to have a reasonable compensation for overseeing a very large and complicated bureaucracy. I don't think it serves the public well to have the public view the elected people as somehow being in this for, to line their own pockets or perks or golden handshakes. I have a few more comments if I may, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried

Councillor Mayes: Certainly, I think it's…you know, I don't…that, that people say we don't get it in the private sector, well you do if you are given notice. Even the public sector as well, the three gentlemen who do a very fine job were here before us, earn more than we do. If we have to let one of them go because of the budget restraints, we have to give them a lengthy period of notice or severance. I mean I think that's common whether they're unionized, non-unionized staff in the City of Winnipeg. So I think the comparison, you can get confused by comparing to the private sector and CEOs and everyone else. If we look at other elected officials in the Province of Manitoba and in western Canada and Toronto, there's an element of compensation at the end of a term of office. And I do think to loop back to my original comments, I think the Mayor is doing…is not in this for the money. I don't think any of us are in this for the money. I think we're in this because we believe in democracy and I think that's important to keep in mind that we need to have respect for these positions. Certainly, I'm voting, I will be voting to reduce the pay by 10%, so I'm sure we'll have numerous people on twitter and elsewhere saying we are in this to line our own pockets. Frankly, I'll be voting to reduce the top-up by 10% of my remuneration, I believe the Mayor's going down by 6% of his total remuneration and the other Councillors are staying at the same. I think that's a fair, signal a fair belt tightening that we are concerned. And somebody emailed me and said you're not being ethical. Well, I think I'll take my chances and say, look I think cutting my pay 10% shows I'm committed to belt tightening and to the well-being of the City. So I think the Mayor is going as before the eight suggestions here, I think he's going to have at least seven of them pass. I think somebody said that gets in the Hall of Fame in baseball pretty easily. I think it's a pretty good signal that we're on track with the Mayor's agenda. You know, under the old regime, I would…you know, we had some people say you're just yes men to the Mayor. Well, we've got a new regime here, I want to commend the Mayor for having an open vote on this. I'm not going agree with him on the severance issue, but I do commend him for having an open vote subject to…we're in the full light of the day. It's never easy talking about your own pay in this job, Madam Speaker, but I think it's important to remember what elected by the citizens of Winnipeg to oversee a pretty vast civil service. I think the thing to remember here today is, we do this for …we do this because we believe in democracy. We don't do this to line own pockets and this is appropriate. I think the severance is an appropriate democratic measure as recommended by a third party.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've never had to discuss my own employability and compensation and potential loss of employment and historical loss of employment, at least temporary. I've never had to discuss that publicly before, not to this extent, that's for sure. I do want to say something, however, in defense of my predecessor, Councillor, former Councillor Thomas Steen. This is a fact, and I do truly believe and if you went through my ward of Elmwood-East Kildonan and you saw the signs, you might believe when I say that I visited more people this year in the ward of Elmwood-East Kildonan than anybody else. And I want to say in defense of Councillor Thomas Steen that despite the fact that trust at City Hall was the number one issue for people. It's not number two, maybe fixing our streets and our infrastructure. If it was not that, it was trust at City Hall. But I do want to say for the record, that this is just what I saw going door to door to door, that not one person, I cannot recall a single individual, single group, singling out Thomas Steen or mentioning actually in this campaign that they had a complaint with their sitting Councillor because of any misuse of funds or budgetary allocations as it stood then or including being…begrudging him of compensation for losing the election. I did not hear one thing. And I went…I wish I could tell you how many doors I went to, a couple thousand. So that tells me something. So may I speak with authority, and at least in terms of my ward, what I saw, what I heard. And no one attacked Thomas Steen on that. I certainly didn't. That's not why I was running. Trust in City Hall was

paramount to people but it did not have to do with Councillor Thomas Steen's remuneration or compensation of any kind or use of his budgets. Now, as well, in terms of dealing with the issue of severance, some are saying it's a question of conscience, vote with your conscience, how you feel, what this means to you. So I have to deal with the idea that I have been, it has been availed to me in some aspects of my employment, excellent employment insurance; being paid very well in high paid manual industries. In terms of relating to people in my ward, I share in my adult life making a living both in offices and both in factories as well as in more extraordinary aspects of heavy manual labour such as the oil rigs, outdoor construction throughout western Canada, which is seasonal. And some of the people that I got to know very well, working with them side by side, month after month, season after season, in the cold of Alberta northern winters drilling for oil, which is the backbone of our economy, we depend on these people. We depend on these people. Can you imagine if they weren't drilling for oil? They were eligible for seasonal employment insurance at the max levels. That was them. That was me as well. Now, I usually didn't take it because I would go back to university; put the money towards education, one cannot accept employment insurance when you go back to university, at least in my circumstances. And that was fine. That was me. That's what I decided to do. Or, you know, you get paid well, so you know, you are off, you are laid off. I traveled. So I wasn't eligible for employment insurance, but that was me. That's what I did. As well, depending on the industry I was in at the time or the season, I might find other employment. So I wouldn't take my employment insurance. But that was my empowered circumstances. That was me. Those were not necessarily about co-workers, they were not necessarily in the same circumstances. I was young and single. Many of these people were not. I was empowered to make different choices. That was me, not my co-workers. It didn't occur to me to begrudge the fact they were eligible or a right to it because there was a process that took place by which it was established that there was a reason for it, but there was eligibility for it. That doesn't mean that I always took it or that they always took it. But it was there for them for a reason; it was established through a proper process, which we all understood. Working for Abalon Foundation Specialists in Winnipeg, as an example, not as well paying, but I came back home; found my future wife, and I wanted to hunker down, stay home for one season, you know, continuing to learn another trade; fixing home foundations, very heavy manual labour. The way Abalon Foundation Specialists does it, we dig down six feet manually with shovels before we deal with fixing the foundations, fixing people's homes. Well, half the people, the majority of people I worked with shoulder to shoulder every day were Aboriginal status, actually coming from First Nations. They weren't as empowered as was I am, but I don't…I can't be in everyone's shoes and see what circumstances they were in, but these were my co-workers and I would say, hey let's face it, the majority of those people just weren't in the same empowered circumstances as I was. But that was me. I didn't begrudge that their employment insurance, their circumstances for which, and all these cases by the way that I mentioned, this is seasonal manual employment. When you go into the job, you know you'll be getting laid off, you know you will. So it's a choice you make knowing you're going to get laid off, but nonetheless, these are jobs and industries people depend on and thus it's set up this way, consciously, through process. And I didn't always take this compensation. Usually didn't, but it was availed to me because it was availed to my co-workers. Now, it all comes down to this point, Madam Speaker, is it's one thing for the Mayor or for me to not accept remuneration, to not accept compensation, to not accept some sort of financial adjustment after employment, when going into a job that we know will, sooner or later may end. But in this job, my job is not nearly to think about myself, my job is to think about others, and just as for my co-workers, and they will be begrudged the opportunities from employment insurance given that it went through a process, and I might disagree on the amount. To me this is about how much. But I…I would like to hear some discussion because I'm new to City Council. The difference between thinking about my personal circumstances and thinking about others around you because I've been in this position in different circumstances, one could say this is different, sure, but I've been in a position at least I can tell you, been in a position for years, decades of my life.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Move extension.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Schreyer: Where people may or may not be in position more empowered by the circumstances to find other employment as easily or be in financially circumstances where it's not as important. But I can tell you something, Madam Speaker, when I think of the people that I worked with at Abalon, I'm so impressed with these guys. When I think of the guys that we relied on to work on the oil rigs, oh my God. I…I…sure, I worked on the oil rigs for a few years, but they do work that's real, it's hard, and it's not always that easy given their circumstances to find easily some sort of compensation after the fact of losing a job, for whatever reason it is. And I just think it's really important that I feel obliged to not just think about myself here, but to think about others around me and not prejudge their ability to find employment after the fact, and how important it is for them to sustain income for months after change of job or losing a job or after a certain state of employment. So my question is again, discussion on this because I'm new here, the difference between thinking about your own circumstances and making decisions based on what you think of others.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing the hour, I call that Council is now adjourned and we will reconvene at 1:30 pm.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, why don't we just continue until we get this done and keep moving? I think that's probably the thing to do.

Madam Speaker: Is that the will of Council? Okay. I call that Council is now adjourned. We'll reconvene at 1:30 pm. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
December 10, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.

Madam Speaker: …to call the meeting back to order. We are still on the Executive Policy Committee report dated December 3, dealing with Items 8, 9 and 10. Councillor Morantz, you have the floor

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm delighted to stand to speak to this very important issue and I just want to say that there have been some very personal comments not directed at each other, but about ourselves expressed by Councillors today and their personal experiences. I just want to start off by saying, you know, about my personal experience, which is that I grew up in a small business family. I can tell you the stresses around a family trying to make ends meet in business. There was never any thought of severance or EI or anything like that. It was just about trying to make good decisions to support your family and hopefully, along the way, help the community as well. And that was really my experience and I can tell you that most small business people do not agree, nor understand, why we should get severance when they could never hope to. And there are many, many small businesses, the largest employer, and their employees could never hope to have severance or EI. Well, they would have EI, but not severance. As a practicing lawyer, neither I nor any of the lawyers I ever worked with were entitled to EI or severance. Instead, we all tried to set aside money to prepare for difficult eventualities. I would like to point out that it is not easy as some have implied, to go back to practice law. Your clients find new lawyers when you leave. Building a practice takes years. And laws change, times change, practices and procedures change. So I just want to point out, and when it comes to the legal profession, I think there are challenges for those who choose public service, to go back if they are defeated or decide not to run again. Now, we are in a difficult budget cycle and we have to lead by example. If we are asking the civil service to reduce their budgets then so must we. I commend the Mayor for his leadership on this issue and the political will to see this through. Many people agree that this amendment should pass. The Mayor was elected with an overwhelming mandate and severance was a key part of his platform. If this amendment does not pass, I guarantee the public, the people who voted for all of us will not be impressed and nor will they be silent. I will never accept severance. This isn't about a job. This is about public service. I, for one, am of the view that it was a mistake to bring severance into our compensation in the first place and I am far from alone this is about giving back to our community and our great City. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. On all three of these matters, I'd like to start off by saying I don't particularly like the idea of us politically medaling in all of our own compensation. All three of these matters were part of a recommendation that was passed by this…by Council in 2011. At that time, we had an independent third party consultant come in and made a recommendation. I'm on the record at that time stating I had concerns. I didn't agree with every aspect of what was in that Werier's report back in 2011. Yet, rather than going in and cherry-picking the points we like or didn't like, we passed it as a package. If I remember correctly, there wasn't a single amendment to the Werier recommendations. I believe we could've delivered the same benefits to Council with less cost to Winnipeg taxpayers by continuing to use the one third tax free portion. To me, that made sense. We could've, you know, if the issue was making a fair adjustment to Councillors' pensions, that was an option that was available to us. So again, on all three of these matters, I disagree with the fact that these are even before us today. In regards to the specifics about them, on the item of severance, I believe that every member of this Council and most elected bodies, people do it for serving the public. But again it's unlike anything else. It's very disruptive. When you leave your career, whether it's acting as a lawyer, whether it's acting as a professional, whatever you are doing, it is very disruptive and there's normally going to be a segway to return to the previous career that you were in. The other aspect that I think was completely, in my mind troubling, was the whole idea of if you are voted out of office, it's for doing so with cause. I've always stated and I said it on the floor of Council many a time. If I am defeated for doing the right thing, for doing what is right, perfect. But at the same time, that whole notion that you don't deserve severance because you've been voted out of office because for just cause. Look at all the bold political leaders we've had out there over time. A lot of the things that, you know, at the time may have been publicly unpopular later were shown to be completely right. What if, you know, Duff Roblin lost his job because he did the right thing and built the floodway which has saved this city? Billions of dollars over the years. The other aspect on severance that I have considerable concern about is this last term, we saw a number of Councillors, an

unprecedented number of Councillors not run. The cost of one by-election, the St. Vital by-election in 2011, according to the Clerks when you include all the rebates and everything that's involved in it: $334,000. The total amount to severance paid out last…after the election? Probably between 350 and 400. If we had one or two Councillors on a normal election cycle leave, any savings from eliminating severance is completely gone because of the cost of running a by-election is that significant. Again, a lot of people who choose to run for office in Winnipeg aren't independently wealthy. We're not all Michael Bloombergs or even Sam Katz is in many cases. We're working folk and the cost of doing so is very costly. And again, I'm not suggesting that we should get golden parachutes and none of us do. This is I think a small amount of transition payment and I will be supporting that aspect of it. In regards to the Councillor representation allowance, the eligible expenses, I generally agree with George Fraser's comments, but I will be supporting that aspect of it. In regards to the 50 percent, I think I should, Brian Mayes…Councillor Mayes said it more correctly. The Council taking a 10.5 percent salary cut, the Mayor taking about 6 percent salary cut, I think if the Mayor really wanted to walk the walk, he would cut 50 percent of his top up in my opinion, but nonetheless I will be supporting the motion as is. Those are my comments and again it's disappointing that we are politically meddling in an independent recommendation, but it is before us today and we do have to deal with it.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Councillor Sharma, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Sharma: Madam Deputy Speaker, I feel the need to rise and address these items before us and I will be brief. I firmly believe members of Council should not be setting their own remuneration or benefits. In other municipal governments at other levels of government, this is commonly done by retaining an expert consultant who conducts analysis and makes a recommendation. I do not see any analysis here, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am not a benefits or compensation expert, nor do I have training in this area. I feel it is very inappropriate and even a conflict for me to set my own remuneration and benefits. However, I will hold my nose and vote to approve Item No. 9 regarding reducing salaries to show support for our new Mayor and in view of the budget ahead of us. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. Thank you. For 14 years, I've been an advocate, many times, standing at that same podium seeking change, sitting through long meetings and debates and discussions like today. And over the years with many partners, I've been able to lead great change in the St. Norbert Ward and in the City of Winnipeg. To fund my desire for change, I've worked on contracts for organizations. I volunteered. I've raised money for organizations so they could hire me. I have virtually been self-employed all my life, other for…from other than one particular period in time, but it was again in a private company. This past election, the residents of St. Norbert Ward gave me a tremendous mandate to continue making change by sitting at City Hall. I consider this mandate, becoming their city councillor an opportunity of a lifetime. To now sit on this side of the table and to have the support of administration and resources and to know that I'm going to be paid for four years to focus and to continue on making change is an honour and privilege. I am here to make change and I see my position as a window of opportunity that won't last forever. It's a real privilege that opens doors and provides you with skills and enables me to make…enables me with tremendous insight to the inner workings of the city and to make change. I've…I'm fortunate that I've been able to travel the world and I understand how very lucky we are to live here in Canada and Winnipeg. I believe that we are being paid adequately for what we are doing and I know that many Winnipeggers agree. And I know that I can plan my finance accordingly over the next four years and I know that what I learn here today will mean…will make me valuable in other initiatives that I take on. And I do hear and I do understand, everyone has their own perspective on this situation and it is an awkward position to be in, to be talking about your own finances and salaries, for many people. I've always done that and I've not felt awkward about it. I will be supporting Items 9 and Items 8, 9 and 10. And I do hope, on a side note, that this kind of thought and decision will go into some of the multimillion dollars decisions we'll be making going forward. I know I've got a lot in the Public Works agenda and I'm new here and I'm obviously…I'm overwhelmed by the amount of thought and consideration that is going into this for each individual, and I really hope for the citizens of Winnipeg we spend this kind of time on these other multimillion dollar projects that we are going to be making decisions on. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And so, I think this is the first substantive time I get to spend a little bit of time speaking to the floor, so thank you everyone for your consideration. I'm going to be very brief. A lot of things have already been said by other speakers. In terms of Item 9, the top up, I will be supporting that motion brought forward by Mayor Bowman. Mayor Bowman is speaking about a more collaborative Council, a Council that's not just run by EPC. And I think reducing the top-ups is going to flatten Council in a way, and I think it's a good step towards a further collaboration and a flattening on Council, so I'll be supporting nine. In terms of Motion 10, on the CRA expenses, I have personally, I have no problem with the proposed changes. I think they make sense and I think Mayor Bowman is on side with what the public wants us to do on our CRA, so I'll be supporting Item 10. I will not be supporting Item 8. And that is

the item on severance. I was thinking extensively about this issue preparing for today's meeting, and recently, Dan Lett, I feel, wrote a thoughtful article on the topic on December 6 and Madam Speaker, may I paraphrase or speak of a third party in the chamber? I don't know if there's rules regarding that.

Madam Speaker: If we don't make references to media articles, is that correct, Mr. Clerk?

Councillor Allard: For the record? Am I able to paraphrase the words of Dan Lett or the ideas of Dan Lett? Okay. So I'll do that and maybe a very tight paraphrasing. It might be really close to the original source but I'm sure it won't be exactly the same. So, he says there's nothing particularly objectionable about the severance provisions for City Councillors. Most municipalities, provinces and even federal government provide for some form of compensation to help elected officials who leave office on their own or with help from voters. Independent studies and commissions on political pay and benefits have almost unanimously found severance to be a reasonable concession against the inherently risky and uncertain world of elected office. The reality is that while many Winnipeggers do not enjoy the protection of severance, many do. Tens of thousands of unionized and non-unionized workers like to have access to severance benefits. And now, I'll stop the paraphrasing of Dan Lett which is pretty close to the original article. So, I've personally received severance in the past, which has been essential for me in starting up a successful business with my wife, Joelle, the business is called Au Courant Consultants. So my wife and I are self-employed professionals who for some time leaned on our own savings including severance to get by. So it's been pointed out that not everybody gets severance. I don't see this because other…because not everyone has access to severance, I don't feel that we should necessarily be making the decision for that reason. I think too many people in our city struggle when they lose or cease their employment and this measure contributes to the race to the bottom. I believe this Council should be focused on improving our economy and rewarding work. Councillors should be focused on the job until the last day of their term. This Council arrived here with a mandate to restore accountability to City Hall. And I don't believe that creating a financially uncertain post political future for City Council will assist that. Indeed, I feel that it may hurt it. There is much talk about the valued public service and of the selflessness of those here in the chamber. Personally, I have a young family and when I chose to run for office, I discussed it with my wife and my loved ones. They made sacrifices with me. I believe that this measure, if passed, will contribute to anxiety about the future of my family. I have a five year old daughter and a new baby expected to be born any day now. I'm thinking about that baby right now. At the end of my first term, my wife and I's unborn child will be four years old. So, I'm of the belief that our City Council should draw its pool of talent from people of all incomes, including those from less privileged economic situations or backgrounds. This measure will tilt the scale towards those who have greater personal financial means. So some people may choose not to run for office because they feel that it's that much more of a risk. So, looking to the future, I want public service to be honourable and valued. My own daughter, Camille, yesterday, said that she plans to run for Mayor, so watch out Brian Bowman. And on the day my daughter's elected, I want her to know that her contribution is valued. So thanks, everyone, for your consideration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I wasn't planning to speak until I heard the colleague from St. Boniface quoting Dan Lett. That was…sorry, paraphrasing. That was a little bit too much to take. I know journalists love it when we quote them on the floor. Yeah, I wasn't planning to speak, but you know, this has been a rather painful meeting. I can't recall the last time that we went through such an episode of navel gazing and collective whining as we have today. There is a change. It is called a general election, folks. And a new Mayor was elected with a new platform and new priorities. And I heard more than once October 11, I don't know what happened October 11, it was obviously a big day. As maybe that was when the seas parted and everything changed. But October 11 I guess was the day that Mayor Bowman made the commitment on this matter. And, clearly, it was a significant day because maybe it was the change in terms of that election. Maybe that really was the lightning bolt that struck and caused what everybody predicted was going to be a certain Mayor win. Everybody predicted that a certain individual was going to win for months, it was predicted, to a different person winning, a completely unpredictable sheriff getting elected. And we have a new sheriff in town and he is basically saying that this should be something that we should be addressing and obviously, so the citizens of Winnipeg spoke loud and clear and overwhelmingly by voting for him. Was it the only issue he raised? Was it the only reason why they voted for him? No. But I do recall when he made the statement that we are going to get rid of severance and we are going to not support…try to eliminate the severance package and I think it actually had a resounding response from the citizens of Winnipeg. And you know what, it changes. And you know what, yes, you ran on the election and you knew that severance was going to be there, and now we are changing it. Is that somewhat unfair? Maybe. But life is unfair. Businesses go through challenges at times and you know, sometimes you're doing well and the next year, business turns and you're not doing well. Is that fair? No. But that's life. So listen, folks, quit the whining. We've heard enough whining in one seminar, okay. Support this. This is common sense. Let's go forward; show that this is a new Council. Show that we are prepared to make sacrifices like the rest of the citizens of Winnipeg do on a daily basis, on a daily basis. And let's go forward together. All of these clauses, all three of these clauses should be passed unanimously in this chamber. And there will be a recorded vote on each one. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? We will call the question. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: I hadn't decided if I would speak, but now I will. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to begin by thanking all of my fellow Council members, all of you, for your comments today on all of these matters. We've taken some criticism in the past week because it's been perceived by some that we are not working collaboratively as a Council. And I disagree. I think this is a healthy, this is an open debate, and that's a big part of collaboration. While I'm new to office, I'm certainly not naive enough to believe that collaboration equates to seeing eye to eye on every issue. Collaboration is the process of working together, working honestly in open dialogue, and I believe everyone in this chamber today has brought that to the discussion and should be commended. So thank you to all my fellow Council members. I'm very proud to see the support around the room today for the reduction in the salary top ups as well as the support for the elimination of a number of eligible items to the Councillors' representation allowances. I've made no bones about the fact that I believe there should be a smaller difference between the compensation for EPC Councillors and non-EPC Councillors. I've taken money from my own pocket as well in a show of solidarity to my EPC colleagues, Speaker and Deputy Speaker, by the same dollar amount. And I'm very confident that this is the right action to commence and lead into a very difficult budget process. But I'm also proud to see the support around the room today to eliminate political pay out referenced as severance. This is not an easy issue. And this was an immensely lively discussion, filled with product placements, references to children, all good things to raise, but I don't know about the product placement, but I think it's paramount to address immediately as we go forward, newly elected, returning Councillors to work collaboratively not only with one another as a Council, but with all Winnipeggers on their behalf. As elected officials we must begin holding ourselves accountable first to higher standards and, if we are to expect that anyone else, namely our citizens ever could, we must treat them with fairness and act openly and transparent in all our decisions. Offering ourselves more than $1 million in personal cheques is not the way we are going to accomplish that. Not today, not ever. Because, if all of us in this chamber today either choose not to run or lose our races for re-election four years from now, the taxpayers will be responsible to sign payouts for our departure to the tune of $605,000 for 381 collective weeks of severance payouts. This was calculated using the lowest baseline salary of $1,587 weekly. So this is a minimum amount that we could see. But the real number is more likely to be upwards of three quarters of a million dollars given actual EPC salaries and two percent inflation increases on our own salaries until 2018. In the coming weeks, we have a difficult budget ahead of us. We'd be looking under every rock, under the sofa cushions, scraping the barrel for all the savings we can find as well as looking at being the most innovative elected leaders moving into this year's budget process. Three quarters of a million dollars, as I've heard some mention, is small potatoes when we're looking at a billion dollar budget and $7.2 billion infrastructure deficit. And I understand it can be difficult to put that in perspective when it's not your own money. But that's over $750,000 of taxpayers' hard earned money. Now, if we are to combine that $750,000 in potential severance payouts with more than $400,000 citizens just paid to outgoing members of Council after this past election, we're looking at in excess of $1.1 million. To put that into context, for my fellow members of Council, Madam Speaker, Winnipeggers will have paid out enough in four years to politicians to sustain our partnership on the strategy to end homelessness for more than seven years. It's enough to fund the entire three years of the program. We just voted unanimously to approve for the Aboriginal youth strategy infrastructure training and opportunities for full three years of the program, and even enough to add an additional fourth year to the program. Sure, we can be entitled to our entitlements, Madam Speaker. According to the Council record, when members of this Council back in September of 2011 voted to accept the recommendations implementing payouts for outgoing members of Council members, we are as we speak in fact just that, Madam Speaker, entitled. But given the fiscal work we have ahead of us, all members of Council have ahead of us and given the fairness Winnipeggers expect from their elected officials, the only ones who should feel any sense of entitlement today, Madam Speaker, are the citizens of Winnipeg who each and every one of us here, have the responsibility and the obligation to report to. I've heard comments from some members of the chamber today that we've never heard from constituents or they've never heard from constituents in their wards that payouts are an issue. Some also take issue with the fact that I'm referring to what Mr. Werier in his report as severance a political payout. A big cheque for tens of thousands of dollars and in some cases where members have been here longer than eight years that number is close to $50,000 and a handshake on the way out of a job, Madam Speaker, is nothing less than a payout. Fifty thousand dollars is not a bridge into another career out of office. It's more than most Winnipeggers see in an entire year's salary, Madam Speaker. In fact, $50,000 is equivalent of the national medium annual income for a full time worker in Canada, Madam Speaker. And we've heard the point that some Councillors don't have a cushy lawyer's job to go back to. We've heard comments about employability after being out of the private sector regular career market while in public service. The truth of the matter is, none of us have cushy guarantees of anything to go back to. We all come from very different walks of life and thank goodness. We've all made sacrifices to serve our fellow Winnipeggers as their members of Council, Madam Speaker. But make no mistake. We are very well compensated above the average Canadian to make the sacrifice. According to the 2011 census data, the country's wealthiest 10 percent are making more than 80,400. Every one of us here today, every one of us, even without these additional payouts and even without our pensions and benefits, sit in the category of the top 10 percent of wealthiest Canadians. And I checked the records back in 2011. No one at the time argued quite so passionately as all of my Council colleagues have done today and recently in the media to receive these entitlements. I think that could be in part, at least, to the fact.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Bowman: I think that could be in part at least to the fact that they recognize we are well compensated for our service and for that reason, we must start to behave more accountably. It's hard now that we entered the other side of the street to being owed something. Sending this back to Governance for review is not going to restore the public's faith in this council. Reducing the payout amount is not going to change that it is still a payout most Winnipeggers will never in their lives will ever receive. Noble, hanging it up on the semantics of lost races and stepping down. I'm going to venture to say that most Winnipeggers aren't guaranteed, even as much as four years of certain employment. Layoffs or dismissal happen in a moment's notice. It's a perk many members here today may want to receive but it is without question, above and beyond what most of our fellow citizens could ever dream to receive. And the issue here is not if we as elected officials deserve more. We worked very hard. Every single member of this Council, I have seen works tirelessly for Winnipeggers. We may very well deserve much more. But we are in no position to be upping our salaries or benefits when we haven't yet demonstrated we can improve the lives of all of those who voted us to be here. Like I said, we have a choice in front of us today, Madam Speaker. We can vote to restore public trust in all of us as a Council or we can vote to ensure that we stand firm, entitled to our entitlements. We can vote with our consciences as some here today have offered as an option or we can vote for our constituents' best interests. It's my hope, Madam Speaker, that my colleagues will vote to support my recommendation today and enact the elimination of severance from the compensation of elected officials. Thank you. Merci. Migwetch.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I believe there is a call for recorded vote. All in favour of Item No. 8, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Gillingham, Lukes, Morantz, Orlikow and Wyatt

Nays

Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gilroy, Mayes, Pagtakhan, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 10.

Madam Speaker: Motion is lost. Item No. 9. Amendment to the Elected Officials Compensation by-law. All in favour? Recorded vote, yes. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillor Eadie

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 1

Madam Speaker: Motion is carried. Item No. 10, amendment to the Councillors' representation allowance, ineligible expenses. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: The vote is unanimous, thank you. Item No. 13, Mr. Clerk. Number 11, right, sorry. Item No. 11 was stood down by Councillor Eadie. Mr. Clerk.

Item 11 - Amendment to The City Organization By-law No. 7100/97 - Office of Policy and Strategic Initiatives

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce.

Mayor Bowman: I welcome the comments from the Councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I actually rise in support of this motion and I wanted to speak to it because in light of the other three motions and the whole idea to trust Council and making sure that Council makes the right decisions as we move along because to help everybody understand and I know you all ran in the election, to help everybody understand. There was a number of big issues that hit the headlines. They were called budget overruns, there was processes, jumps, skipped, there was a whole host of items that you could say where Council or Administration or whoever's fault, you know, there was lots of blame being thrown around and different things like that, but so when we talked about the trust, there was also some conflict of interest issues that really the public felt that they wouldn't…shouldn't trust Council. And so, when you look at a secretariat policy branch from, well it's connected to EPC and the Mayor's Office. I think it's an essential one because…and you know, the Mayor has a contract with the many thousands of voters that voted for the Mayor in this upcoming election in the past election. And it's very, very important to be able to meet the obligations of that contract. I have a contract that was signed by over 6,000 voters who talked to me about the trust issues, actually, talked to me for four years. I tried to move motions with fellow Councillors around the table, different things to earn trust and the Mayor's Office…this was a re-establishment of a policy office as I understand it in the past. It did exist under Mayor Murray. I'm not sure what Mayor Thompson had in place because there was a big change in 1998, of course, everybody knows that. But really important though, is that no one individual council, no one individual mayor is able to be knowledgeable and be able to accomplish and drive and solve all the issues and come up with a policy and actually help things move along. So the Mayor has that contract and EPC has that responsibility. Of course I think I was the only one that stood…you get a raise for a promotion and it's a lot of work and sorry that concept isn't understood, but…I thought that was understood by millions of people in this country, but when they get promoted and get a raise. But anyway, that aside, this policy office will be able to provide the support to the EPC Chairs that they're going to need. I was interested in the last thing and hopefully they'll help us in a…developing a budget because the calculations that I heard on the last topic about how much money we might save in four years, that's a guess. The average number of people who leave Council every election is about two. So, if you want to calculate the rate, then you should. Anyway, I digress because this policy office, the change to the organization I think is so important. And it is part of the Mayor…the Mayor also has his allowance and there is, as I understand it, nothing…the trust of the citizens of Winnipeg, they didn't trust the former Mayor and the former Mayor did post his Mayoralty office transactions up on the web, they were up there to see. But as I understand it, the Clerks are formulating a policy booklet for them, similar to the ward allowance, the Mayor's allowance and I think that's really important that that's there and I'm glad that that's continuing in place because…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, would you speak to the item, please?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, to the policy? Yes. No, no because this is kind of a branch of the Mayor. So I agree wholeheartedly with this. I note that it's a budget neutral from the past budgetary item for this and I think that's good, but so I just wanted to point that out that you know, Winnipeg and hopefully this policy could help us continue to steer the City of Winnipeg who's gotten…kept our credit rating because the economic outlook for Winnipeg is really, really good. Trouble is we've got some problems with our budget in terms of where does the revenue come from and we'll be debating a lot of that stuff I know in the future. So thank you, Madam Speaker, for allowing me to speak to this particular motion. I think it's a very good one and I hope that they get some good solid advisers in that office to help EPC along their work and maybe they can take on some of the extra responsibility that you just took a pay cut for. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor? Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I wanted to speak to this item as well. It's something which I think is welcome. Creating this office is a great opportunity. I hope the office is there to serve and not just work with EPC and the Mayor, but also to work with all members of Council and assisting members of Council with their work. I note the fact that we…the Mayor is quite verse in social media and the methods of social media, and I think all of us as a corporation, as a City, need to be coordinated, I think, in terms of how we handle social media and how we work together. I think this is an opportunity to coordinate that work. And to ensure that members of Council are working together with regards to that and the uniqueness of social media. I hope this is an opportunity to do that. I believe it is and, and I think the communication part

of the work of this office will be tremendous. The other part that I think…and it's in the title of self-strategic initiatives felt for some time and I think other members of Council as well who've been here know the importance of our organization, of failing to be able to produce strategic planning, we have a City where we have departments and we have a public service that has done strategic planning, but the political arm, the elected officials have not done strategic planning. Show me a Council that does not have a solid strategic plan and I'll show you a council that will have a hard time determining what its budget priorities are and what it should be funding and where we should be going over the next four years. Every one of us was elected on different platforms. Many of them are similar such as issues such as infrastructure, issues such as our roads, concerns that we have in our city with regards to safety. You know, so we have enough common ground to be able to come together and build a strategic plan. And I would hope that this one of the main initiatives and one of the first initiatives of this office would be to do just that. We did attempt in the last council to do a strategic plan. EPC did get together and write a strategic plan at one point and then it was attempted to involve the rest of Council but that's where the wheels seemed to fall off the cart, never went any further after one or two meetings. We need to have a strategic plan as an organization. Most Councils, most cities like ours do. So I would hope that this would be a great opportunity to do that. Another interesting part of what I understand the mandate of this office will be and I'm excited by this as well, is to have a better liaison between members of Council, the Mayor's Office and the work we do at community committees. I understand that staff will attend community committee meetings to observe or to provide oversight or monitor. I think that's something that's actually a positive step. Community committees are one of those unique meetings that still exist in the evening, at a time that's kind of a left over from a time when council was part time where everybody else had…basically all Council members had jobs during the day and they met in the evenings and that's why they had the meetings not just to make it more accessible to the public but because they had to. Well, we've kept that tradition alive. We've kept community committee meetings by in large in the evenings and it's something which the local press covers, being the Metro and the Herald and so and so forth. But to have that better communication between the rest of the public service, between the Mayor's staff, between ourselves through our community committee meetings, I think is a welcome thing. So that's a development that I think is tremendous. I believe that the management of reports, this system as many of you know and some will soon find, is really driven through the reporting system. Reports drive everything that happens here. It's crucial to have good co-ordination. We should try to move away from kind of the got ya politics of a report coming forward and not having all the is dotted and ts crossed just because the oversight that should've been there, that could've been there was not done. It's great for the media. It's great for generating headlines, but it's not necessarily great for creating confidence and understanding of civic government in our society as a whole. Therefore, I believe this office will be able to play a tremendous role in that coordination. Coordinating reports, ensuring that they're well researched, well thought out, that we are coming forward with initiatives that make sense, that other members of Council whether they are on EPC or not, can and will support, which means it's crucial and I believe that this office will have the ability to do the liaison work, to do the tough work, and when I say that, the tough work means talking to Councillors. Talking to members of Council, whether they are on EPC or not, especially the ones not on EPC because it's the ones that are not on EPC to get their pulse, to think what they're thinking and where they're going and to try to build that into the policy that is coming forward. That's why I think this is extremely exciting. I welcome it, I thank the Mayor for having a courage actually to raise it during an election campaign, to be able to make is something that was…something that was actually supportable by the general public and not an issue as it has been in the past. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and I'd like to thank Councillor Eadie and Councillor Wyatt for their support and for their comments. I can assure members of Council that this office is intending to support the work of not only the Mayor's Office and EPC members, but all of Council and I take Councillor Wyatt's lengthy and valuable comments under advisement. Certainly, there wasn't anything that I heard there that conflicted with the intention of this office. I really appreciate the comments and support. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 11? Contrary? Carried. Item number 12, Mr. Clerk.

Item 12 - Long Term Strategy to End Homelessness in Winnipeg

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: This is an issue that a lot of Winnipeggers care deeply about. And in speaking with members of Council, I know all members of Council believe that we as a City and at City Hall, we need to do a lot more to help our fellow citizens affected by homelessness. I'm proud of the support that EPC showed to this motion last week. I urge all Councillors to support this, so that we can get on with the important work of supporting the United Way's plan to end homelessness. I'm hoping that our leadership on this effort will also assist us in our working partnership with other levels of government, so that we can, in fact, set out a course to end homelessness in our City. Thank you

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm not sure if I pulled this or not, but it had been my intent to…and my question that lead to the Mayor is to get some discussion. I don't think this item got the attention it deserved when it came through at EPC and I want to commend the Mayor for bringing this forward. We had a great debate back six months or so ago talking about a TIFF grant we gave to Siloam Mission to create some new housing for the homeless there, and it was a good...I know I talked about…I wrestled with it, am I my brother's keeper in this sense? Should the public sector be doing it? It should be all charitable and I think there is a place for the public sector here in the presentations we got also talked about all for the private sector and charitable sector. I know the Mayor, I know we're not supposed to cite media sources, Madam Speaker, so to say in a recent article, in a downtown magazine, the Mayor used the opportunity to talk about his priorities for downtown. He talked about community…the acronym was "CHAD": community homeless advocacy workers. And I wondered if he could discuss that as well and have that in to connect with this initiatives because it…I know to the Mayor, this has obviously been a priority in his campaign and in what he's brought forward in his first hundred days or so. So I wonder if he can just flesh out what the vision is for those additional workers. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to speak briefly, I'm really, really pleased to see this leadership come forward from this new Mayor. This issue has been worked on in terms of developing the strategy with a number of community partners, led by the United Way and downtown stakeholders, all sorts of non-profit groups, NGOs and other organizations that have been basically saying we need to show leadership on this issue of homelessness and if you look at the way some other places have handled it. In Alberta, they have leadership from the provinces, the cities. They all got together and they said what can we do as a province and in our cities together and they came up with strategies, cities like Vancouver have done this. And we…I really think we're just not really from the Council's point of view, not really showing that kind of leadership. There was actually budget cuts to the United Way initiatives, a couple of pretty minor savings, but cutting, you know, in the last term of Council, cutting support for the initiatives that are actually related to this initiative and getting to this stage and when it came to making that commitment to say yes, the City of Winnipeg is going to be part of this with the Province, with the City and with the private sector and the non-profit sector, we just weren't doing it. I know the Mayor talked about it and I guess maybe he would've at some point stepped up like this, but I'm just very pleased to see this happening now. It's long overdue. Because without us at the table, you know, it's…there's a limitation on what can really happen. We are one of the major players and I don't think it all falls to the City of Winnipeg. The Province has a huge role in this and I hope that they, too, will come on board. Sometimes someone has to step up first and I think that it should be acknowledged that our Mayor believes this issue is essential to the health of our city and to the well-being of our citizens and it's the right thing to do. So, I really…am really pleased to see this new direction in terms of showing the kind of leadership that we need and I know we're going to have to work through how to do it all and do a lot more work on it. But I think it's a great first step, so thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I just wanted to as well commend the Mayor on this important first step. Addressing homelessness is definitely a priority in St. Boniface Ward. Knocking on thousands of doors over the campaign, several local issues came up and in some communities definitely, definitely was top of mind for a lot of voters and they want…constituents to St. Boniface want to see action on this issue and it's great to see Mayor Bowman and I hope today Winnipeg Council take a leadership role on this. Thank you very much, His Worship.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, this is a positive initiative. I think all members of Council will most likely be supporting it. It's a significant amount of money. It's $150,000 a year that we are granting to the United Way. I hope it produces results. I hope it produces results. Poverty Reduction Council has been around for some time. It's not a new entity. And neither is poverty. And we know that we have issues with poverty inside our city and homelessness is one symptom of that poverty that exists inside our city. The reality is we really need to commit not just to fight homelessness, but poverty itself. In many ways, we should remind ourselves though that the other two levels of government directly and indirectly contribute to the poverty that we see not only in our city, but in cities across Canada that we can't solve this alone. The Federal Government in many ways through their archaic and ancient Indian Act have somewhat and I'm not just speaking about the government that's in power now or the party that's in power, but has washed their hands of indigenous affairs of the aboriginal community that the minute somebody of aboriginal Canadian descent steps off a reserve and into a city, it now becomes a city's responsibility, the City's challenge and no longer theirs. That historic agreement, those treaties, that go over a hundred years ago that were signed between Her Majesty Queen Victoria and those bands, have been ignored and have been broken, and the fact that the federal government refuses, one government after another not to address that, until those challenges are addressed, we're not going to

solve the poverty in this city. We don't need to spend $150,000 a year to tell us that. We also know that the Provincial Government, Madam Speaker, which refuses at times to raise its social allowance rates, its welfare rates, its social assistance rates to the levels that they should be especially for single individuals to get them out of poverty. The previous Premier almost bragged, Premier Doer, about how he froze welfare rates for so long in this province. But that poverty that was created from that is directly related to their refusal to solve the problem with regards to social assistance. And if you recall, we as a Council, along with the other municipalities of Manitoba, over a decade ago signed an agreement with the Provincial Government to get out of the social assistance business. It's still costing us, by the way, over $20 million annually in terms of our annual funding, a permanent cheque that we write to the Province of Manitoba as part of that agreement. But it's their social assistance system which is created the cycle of poverty that they refuse to address. I hope this is not just a solution to wipe out homelessness, Madam Speaker, but to address real poverty because if it's all about just brushing the poverty out of the way, so we don't see it. We don't see the individuals who are out on the streets day in and day out, then surely we should not be supporting this, Madam Speaker. Because at the end of the day, the face of the poverty and the homelessness that we see is the problem. It is the core of the issue. The fact that it's actually coming forward and facing us, whether we…when we drive home or we drive to work or we walk down the sidewalk and we encounter those who are homeless and in poverty. We also know, Madam Speaker, that a lot of these issues are related to addictions. They're also related to mental health. They're also related to people who are down and out socially on the outs with society. Those are complex issues. But the fact of the matter is we also know that we've underfunded, not us, other levels of government, all of those areas. So, the challenge can be addressed. It's not a question of having a five year program. I would've preferred to have seen us give the same amount of money, but in the course of one year and have the solutions brought forward to us in a timely fashion. I don't want to see it studied to death, which I fear may be the case. I don't want to see it as a way to create jobs for policy analysts and others to study this, only to recommend another study after this study is done. I sincerely hope that it actually produces results and that we don't have to wait five years to see results being produced. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I have to say, I still am enjoying…this is our first regular business meeting, I'm still enjoying the Councillor from Transcona, he's very on top of the issues. The…so there's not much more I could say other than…there was a seminar I'm not sure of the existing Councillors who was at the seminar when this was presented to us, but there was a seminar presented to us over across the street at the admin building and there was a lot of discussion and, you know, I can't remember, can I mention someone from the public's name, Madam Speaker? I had a conversation with…

Madam Speaker: Depends on the context.

Councillor Eadie: …one of the committee members who are coming up with a…this strategy and coming forth with this idea of this housing organization, and you know, Councillor Wyatt…Madam Speaker, Councillor Wyatt brings up a good thing. Are we going to study this or we're going to take action? So I just wanted to talk about where this is coming from because, you know, I had a frank dialogue with Mr. Steve Chipman who was one of the members of that committee and the frank commitment I asked is how are we bringing private developers into this? How are we working together to achieve this goal of ending homelessness, which…depends how you want to define ending homelessness, but technically there's been homeless in our society ever since our society was created, I'm sure. For many of the circumstances that Councillor Wyatt has mentioned and that's…those are very difficult issues to deal with. I'm hoping that with this money, this is to establish an office to undertake work. We did this for CentreVenture and I don't think anybody would deny that CentreVenture is getting a lot of results. They have certain tools available to them. I'm hoping that the tool will be developed with this funding and this office organization that's being created to help us deal with ending homelessness. So, but…so there are some real difficult issues to solve, but what I do know, what the United Way came up with was a real action oriented type move forward because they actually spent a bunch of time doing that study trying to figure out what to do. Our City administration contributed to those dialogues, private sector, all kinds of people had…there was dialogues and we discussed it. So…and I really appreciate that the Mayor has taken this on and a continuance because we were supportive. And I believe the Province is going to be involved somehow with this and but I also wanted to speak to the indigenous thing because of about poverty. Rent geared to income is a very essential tool. In Edmonton, they developed housing with the private sector where it's rent geared to income. Then, you know, this medium market stuff which is…we're trying to recognize that there is a commercial private enterprise of apartments and so on and they do need to make money to earn the money back and nobody is going to deny that a business should be making money, but so we need to…we need to I think deal with rent geared to income and there are some of that housing that's actually as I understand it coming off because there's no Federal commitment any more. But one of the things we should note in the progress and, you know, and I mirror Councillor Wyatt again hopefully they move to some actions that are going to start getting things done but our investment of 150,000 here, in terms of getting a bunch of people places to live, that means we won't have to be responding with our medical services to those people out on the street because they are freezing to death. When they have a place to live, we know the housing in regard to people with

mental illness housing first is very essential and very important and it does help. And it will, in the longer term, ending homelessness or as much of it as we can, and the transition of…we have a lot of people moving in from the outskirts, if the rural areas from reserves into our city. There was a…I'm sorry I was sitting in the hospital yesterday, I missed the housing for indigenous people moving into the city. I think that was an essential…study that was done. So there's actions to be taken and hopefully that will lead some guidance for them as well. So, and, but I'll tell you right now, until we spot this whole mentality of colonization, I think the indigenous people need to figure out how they're solving their problem because some of the things that I see we're trying to do for housing like creating private property…private property hasn't worked for us because people not of the indigenous culture, ethnicity, they are living in poverty. They don't have homes. The private ownership has not answered that question and that's from the colonizers. We, everybody that forms this government, we are the colonizers. We need to give the indigenous people the ability to make those decisions, what's going to work for them best to move ahead. And I know that I'm sure, that our current Mayor is moving along that model, not…with a number of initiatives. And I think that that's very important because it's their voices and their ideas that are going to be…it's them, taking responsibility for themselves, taking responsibility for themselves that's going to get them out of poverty because I tell you, I have been through a lot of different ups and downs in my life. I've been homeless and I've been poor. I've lived on the streets. I was happy to sleep behind my buddy Steve. I warmed up with Mom's furnace, I have to say, every once in a while. And I'll tell you right now, that, you know, there's nothing more empowering than you as an individual being able to do that yourself, taking responsibility, trying to do your best, trying to overcome addictions. It's very difficult, very difficult, but it has to be within the individual. And that's why you have to have as an indigenous people, from within them, figuring out the best way out. That's the way to do it. So I'll leave you with that. This is an excellent motion. I really appreciate Mayor Bowman's efforts here and I think it's great. And like Councillor Wyatt, let's see some action. I'm hoping they can attract that private investment in ending homelessness.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, over a year and a half ago, I made a decision to run municipally and when I first told people around me, those closest to me, some were surprised. They balked and I pretty much predicted their initial reaction and their subsequent reaction. Their initial reaction, why would you want to go municipally, why wouldn't you go Provincially or Federally or why would you leave your job working for the Minister of Infrastructure and transportation? And I just felt that this is where I felt the stars were aligning, letting me know that this is where I'd be most useful. I didn't…a long time, over a half my life ago when I was in my early 20s, I realized that there were certain things in my life that I felt I was understanding, beginning to understand that I would learn about that I felt were very important to our society. Things maybe I had personal insights into that I felt were very important to helping our society, issues that I think were still in development or existed. I learned them from other people. But that weren't fully, truly developed yet and had a ways to go to be so meaningful to us. But what I didn't know…I didn't even know this this morning, what I didn't know, Madam Speaker, is how gratified I would be at this moment, looking at these issues, looking at these issues of homelessness, looking at how Councillor Wyatt says, "I hope this isn't just about homelessness. I hope this is about poverty." When I see Councillor Eadie talking about this Mayor's initiative and talking from personal insights or what issues that are so important if we are really going to deal with these issues that have always been so important to me and my…throughout my entire adult life that have motivated me towards my political inclinations and when I see people from…people from all different parties in this non-partisan, well non-party municipal chamber of governance all speaking on these same things, all in harmony and yet, I bet all challenging each other, oh my goodness, Madam Speaker, what a great day this is for me and I'm so glad to be here. I feel that I'm going to be more useful than I thought. I just want to work with these people, the motivations they have; all the resources available to us including working with our community and the media and I'm just so glad to be here. There is so much I think we can do on this issue and I'm just glad to be here, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speaker? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: I don't think there's much more to say. I just want to thank all the Councillors for their passion and their commitment to this important cause. I echo the comments that have been made that it really is about action and it's about action for Winnipeggers. It saddens me when I hear people talk about the homeless as if they are not us. These are Winnipeggers first and foremost and those of us in a position to do something to assist those in need have an obligation on every level to do everything we can. And this is an important step and it is just that, it's a step. We're going to have to do a lot more work after this. I can…I should acknowledge the question about the community homeless assistance team in the Downtown Winnipeg Biz. This is not directly related to that. That's a discussion for another day but also a very worthy effort. This motion is an important one though and I thank everybody for the discussion and for the support.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary. Carried. We will now move on to motions. We have Motion No. 1 before us.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Councillor Gerbasi: Madam Speaker, could I ask that we suspend the rules to deal with this?

Madam Speaker: We do need to deal with the item. There's no suspension required.

Councillor Gerbasi: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: That's right. Motion No. 1, by…moved by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Councillor Allard, and it is regarding the appointment of Councillor Allard as representative to the Canadian Capital Cities Organization. Councillor Gerbasi, would you like to introduce the motion?

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS The City of Winnipeg is part of the Canadian Capital Cities Organization (CCCO) as Winnipeg is the Capital of the Province of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS the CCCO has requested that the City designate a member of Council to be the representative to this organization;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Allard has expressed an interest in being the representative to CCCO;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Councillor Allard replace Councillor Gerbasi as the City of Winnipeg representative to the Canadian Capital Cities Organization.

Councillor Gerbasi: It's just straightforward. Councillor Allard showed a great deal of interest in this and I'm happy to pass it over to him to work on this over the year. I had taken the responsibility on the org. meeting and once I looked into it a bit more realized that it wasn't necessarily…it might be a good opportunity for councillor Allard to take on and he is interested in that so I'm just officially making that official with the will of Council on that. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Was this a…this was an item I guess maybe for clarity…was this something that Councillor Gerbasi voted on or chose to do in the last org. meeting we just had? Is that…?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: I see her nodding there. Was this circulated to all members of Council prior to this motion?

Councillor Gerbasi: No. Basically, Councillor Allard said that he was willing to do it, the thing, so we are putting it forward as a motion basically to make these positions available. You can vote on it if…

Madam Speaker: Could we perhaps…could I suggest that we leave it till…

Councillor Gerbasi: I'm not sure what the process is.

Madam Speaker: Can I suggest that we maybe leave it till next meeting because you are right, Councillor Wyatt. Previously when we had someone change for an FCM member in the middle of the term, we did circulate it beforehand to make sure that everyone had an opportunity. I'm not….do we need to do that again or…?

Councillor Gerbasi: I don't know what the process is.

Madam Speaker: Time Councillor Gerbasi when it was the FCM we were looking for someone new, we had circulated it because Councillor Browaty was interested, however, we wanted to give everyone an equal opportunity and I think that's what Councillor Wyatt saying is it's not being done right now.

Councillor Gerbasi: I don't know. That's okay with me.

Madam Speaker: Point of order, yes. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Eadie: I wanted to make sure we're clear and understand. Madam Speaker, you organized an organization meeting prior to us and we vote on a whole motion to appoint people to or not appoint but we vote…have a private vote to determine who is going to be if there needs to be a vote. I think the issue here would be for this particular motion in that we didn't have a meeting to actually vote who would be that person. I don't think it's a matter of circulating a motion. I think it's more of a matter of…did we have an actual meeting to have that private discussion about and vote, which I know that our current Mayor believes we should be doing for all EPC members. So I just wanted to point that out.

Madam Speaker: The informal meeting Councillor Eadie is just once a year. In between we circulate openings. That's what we did when there was an FCM opening and that wasn't done prior to the meeting. That was the Councillor's point. Councillor Allard, did you want to make a comment? You were saying point of order.

Councillor Allard: Well, I just…I'm not sure about process and I mean, it was sort of an informal discussion Jenny and I had. I just want to mention it's my understanding that there may be an organizational meeting for this particular conference in January so we may want to make a decision on this soon and if there is somebody else interested. I mean…

Councillor Gerbasi: Madam Speaker, perhaps I could clarify that. They are beginning their work, there is a meeting early in January. It is…I guess it is my mistake to kind of quickly take care of this and get someone in place because Winnipeg is actually hosting the Capital Cities Organization conference. It's a small conference in the summer and I just wanted to get the new person in place. They are meeting early in January. It'd have to wait then till the end of January if we lay this over and I just, you know, I guess…I didn't…there wasn't…this doesn't happen very often so I just went ahead and said, well, there's someone willing to do it who will be great. Let's get it done before so I apologize about that. I mean, imagine if we put it to a vote, you know, I don't know the outcome will be. It will be different either way, but…

Madam Speaker: Given the fact that that the next meeting is in early January, I think it's important we vote on it, but in the future in between organizational meetings, it is important to circulate openings so each member of Council has an equal opportunity. Thank you. All in favour, the motion before us? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Madam Speaker: Okay, we'll move on to By-laws, Mr. Mayor. We will strike 137, Mr. Mayor. We will strike the third last one, No. 137.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the By-laws be read a first time, By-laws 116/2014 through 122/2014 inclusive, By-law No. 136/2014, By-law No. 138/2014, By-law 139/2014.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 136, 138 and 139/2014.

Mayor Bowman: I move that By-laws No. 116/2014 to 122/2014 both inclusive and 136/2014, 138 and 39/2014 both inclusive be read for second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.
Clerk: By-laws numbered 116 to122/2014 both inclusive and 136, 138 and 139 both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: His Worship.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the rule be suspended and the By-laws numbered 116/2014 to 122/2014 both inclusive and 136/2014, 138/2014 and 139/2014 both inclusive be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now, move on to Question Period for the Mayor which is 30 minutes I believe on the clock. Thank you. We've got lots of hands up. Councillor…okay, let's leave the hands up for just a moment. Councillor Allard.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Allard: Thank you. I'm just loading my notes here. And so, Madam Speaker, this question is for the Mayor. And this is about an important priority for St. Boniface. Which is the Marion Archibald functional street upgrades. So two years ago, Council identified it's infrastructure priorities, which included the Marion Street widening/grade separation, the Waverley Street underpass, the widening of Kenaston Boulevard, and the Chief Peguis Trail extension. And specifically in terms of capital commitment, there was $5 million put into the 2013 capital budget. I personally, made a point of raising this issue with our regional Minister Shelly Glover, our Premier Greg Selinger, and Minister Kevin Chief, who apparently has a bromance with His Worship. I'm sorry, I don't know if that's appropriate or not. But it's my first meeting.

Madam Speaker: Not.

Councillor Allard: So I'm just going to continue. So Council's capital priorities include Marion and Archibald have been identified, and were sent in October of this year to the Canada-Manitoba Infrastructure Secretariat for consideration. My question, Madam Speaker, for His Worship, is what discussions has His Worship, Brian Bowman, had with other levels of government regarding the Marion and Archibald Street upgrades?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I thank Councillor Allard for the question. And I also commend him for his interest in this issue, in his representation of the constituents in his ward. We've had discussions in the past about this and we are having ongoing discussions with our federal partners. We don't have any announcements at this time, but I can assure the Councillor that this is a priority and it's something that we hope to be in a position to have something more substantive in the New Year. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: In this recent election, the Mayor made a series of commitments about 19, I believe, that he wanted to get completed within the first 100 days of taking office of the Mayor. Madam Speaker, I want to know if the Mayor could enlighten this Council on those commitments and the status of those commitments.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Thank you very much. I thank Councillor Pagtakhan for his question. There were a lot of commitments made by many members of this Council, including myself, over the recent election campaign. I'm pleased to respond to questions on what sort of work we've been able to get done in the early days of this mandate. Tomorrow is day 50, about the half-way mark. It is the half-way mark of the 100 days of action plan that I announced during the campaign. By my calculations, we will have 9 of 19 complete. Other than having a new CAO for the City of Winnipeg selected, we're on schedule to meet the deadline of February 1st. February 1st is the 100 day mark. So I it buys members of Council and public to stay tuned as I believe we'll have much more to announce and even more completed commitments in the days and the weeks to come. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. The City of Winnipeg is excited to host the Grey Cup in 2015. I understand recently Mayor Bowman had the opportunity to travel to Vancouver for this year's Grey Cup and he's meeting with various Mayors and people from the Host Committee in regards to the aspects of running that. Can the Mayor enlighten us as to how plans for the 2015 Grey Cup are progressing and can he guarantee that the Bombers will be in the Grey Cup in 2015?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I thank the Councillor for the question. Yes, I had the opportunity to represent Winnipeg in the Grey Cup, at the Grey Cup festival, not in the Grey Cup. And you know, I did have an opportunity when I was in Vancouver to meet with the Mayor of Vancouver, Gregor Robertson, had an excellent opportunity to sit down with him for an afternoon and have a discussion about a number of issues that we share as communities including issues related to the challenges that we have as a community with missing and murdered Aboriginal women and girls, on issues related to rapid transit, on matters related to homelessness. Very good discussions in the early days of our mandate and my mandate that I look forward to continuing to have those discussions with Mayor Robertson. I also had the opportunity to meet with the Mayors of Calgary, Mayor Nenshi, and Mayor Iveson of Edmonton, also excellent discussions and

acknowledgment of the good work by some of the members of this Council that have returned in past years, and a real interest in working in a much more actively with this Council under my leadership in the years to come. The support that I provided was also, when I was out there, was for alumnae and alumnae of Winnipeg and Manitoba, and also for the Blue Bombers in Vancouver. As you know, we are hosting the 103rd Grey Cup here. I cannot provide a firm commitment that we will not only get in the Grey Cup and win, but I'm hopeful and I'm sure all members of Council share my support for the Winnipeg Blue Bombers in their quest to not only get in to the playoffs, but to be in the Championship game. And I would encourage all Winnipeggers to not only support the Bombers, but the fine work of the committee that really kicked off a lot of their active work over the course of the last couple of weeks. One of those efforts was to open the new store in Winnipeg Square, and I would encourage everyone to go out and get your holiday gifts there, for other members of the City to show our support for our home team. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, this question, a major issue during the past election, that many of us faces, how we as elected officials purpose to address the situation of finding a new leader for our City's public service and the Mayor mentioned the search for the CAO just a moment ago. I know recently that the Mayor announced that he along with members of EPC and to non-EPC members, Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Allard would comprise the CAO Selection Committee and I was hoping to receive from the Mayor an update in regards to the progress of selecting a new CAO.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I thank Councillor for his question. This is a key priority for City Hall and for me. By the end of the weekend, advertisements in all planned locations, local and national media, will be posted. And by the end of December we'll be able to commence the evaluation process, an interview process can begin with a target of having the right person in place by February or March, at the latest. We've struck a committee as the Councillor will know, including not just members of EPC, but Councillor Allard and Councillor Gerbasi to assist in the CAO selection process, and I thank them for their action participation in the selection process, as well as the members of EPC. This is something that I know is a key priority for all of us and we'll be giving it that attention that it deserves in selecting the best person for the position as we go forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Mayor, I saw from one of your infrequent tweets that you were at the Firefighter Ball recently, which is to your credit I think it shows you don't hold a grudge obviously they hadn't endorsed you, so I commend you for that. But there's some other unions around the City who I know we're in talks, or soon will be with MGEU, ATU, CUPE. Do you have plans to meet with any of those bargaining agents? There's been some talk in the media back and forth, and I just wanted to find out if there's any talks scheduled or if there's attempts to schedule those talks, because I think that we'll have some fairly big bargaining agents going in to negotiations.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I thank the Councillor for the question. There's no truth to media reports of any refusals to meet. And that's because members of our civil service are valued members of the City of Winnipeg. We need to support the work that they do, we need to support and work respectfully with the union representatives and that's exactly what we've been doing from day one. I've already met with senior leadership of CUPE and WAPSO. And our staff are coordinating to schedule a meeting formally with UFFW and the WPA soon. So far we've had great discussions and the message that I've provided is that this is a new council, there's an opportunity where we do need to work for positive change a little bit more aggressively than perhaps in the past that that's the intent with me and I'm sure with members of Council. We've stressed the importance of innovation, in working with the front line staff and members of the unions, who are in a great position to be able to find solutions to some of the problems that we collectively share. And I look forward to building that relationship in the months and the years to come. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes. Second question.

Councillor Mayes: It's an unrelated second question, so am I still procedurally?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Mayes: Okay my second question, I was out for a run recently in an area of Winnipeg that was pretty much a shambles 10 or 15 years ago but it's now really reformed, and that's Juba Park which is near City Hall, but it did

remind me that when former Mayor Norrie passed away a few years ago there was talk around Council about a street, a park, doing something to commemorate Bill Norrie. I know there's a large mural. I know a number of my colleagues here went to that when that was unveiled, but just wonder if there's any, if we can have report back at some point. We continue to approve new neighbourhoods. There's one coming later today in fact, Precinct "E", and I'm just wondering if there's anything in motion, or that could be put in motion in terms of honouring former Mayor Bill Norrie.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. Bill, it may surprise members of Council to know Bill Norrie was the first person to suggest I run for Mayor. I had the opportunity to get to know our former Mayor when I was president of the U of M Alumni Association. He invited me for lunch in my capacity as president of the U of M Alumni Association and encouraged me to run, and I felt very good about myself until I then heard him suggesting to about 10 other people that they should run for Mayor. And what really impressed me about Bill Norrie was his passion for public service, and I know all members of this Council share his passion that good things can be accomplished if we work together. He was an incredible leader, he got a lot of good things done for the City of Winnipeg and I think we have a lot to learn from him and the legacy that he has left for all Winnipeggers, and so absolutely, I would be more than happy to work with the Councillor and all members of Council to look at ways that we could appropriately honour Bill Norrie and other past mayors as well. Thank you very much for the question. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

M**adam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you Madam Speaker, a question for the Mayor through you. During the campaign, the Mayor committed, and rightfully so, to the principles of transparency and openness, and with respect to that ideal, the City has many boards and committees, and I'm wondering if the Mayor could comment how he will be implementing those ideals into choosing who will sit on those boards and committees as we move forward?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: I thank Councillor Morantz for the question. The issue of additional appointments is something that we are actively working on. I'm expecting that we'll be able to bring additional recommendations to Council in the new year and I look forward to having continued discussions with all members of Council in that respect. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you Madam Speaker. Back on June the 25th, 2014, Council voted on the Building Canada Fund priorities for the City. Passed by Council were the following projects: the Waverley Street Underpass, as pointed out previously; the Marion Street widening/grade separation; improvements from Archibald Street to Lagimodiere; Chief Peguis Trail Extension from Main Street to Route 90; Louise Bridge Replacement; the William R. Clement Parkway Extension from Grant to Wilkes, and the widening of Kenaston (Route 90) from Ness to Taylor Avenue. These were passed by Council and as stated in all of our recommendations in terms of motions made by Council, the following words, "That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing." Then on November, I believe it was November the 6th, the Thursday, one of the first Council seminars that Councillors received, they were informed department that the public service, Building Canada Fund applications, four applications, currently are being considered: Kenaston Widening, Chief Peguis Trail Extension, Waverley Underpass, Marion Widening and Grade Separation. The two projects, two other projects out of the list of six that the public service did not mention in the seminar was the Louise Bridge replacement and the William R. Clement Way Parkway Extension from Grant to Wilkes. Then later learned that the public service has not filed those applications with Building Canada. This is now, that was a motion June 25th, it is now December, some six months later nearly and the applications have not been filed by the public service. Could the Mayor shed some light on why that has not occurred?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. I thank Councillor Wyatt for the question. The City staff are continuing to make progress on studies and that includes public consultations that will help with a better understanding of the design and the costs and the time-lines. No award of funding has been announced though. It's a standing question and ongoing discussions with the Federal Government. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, second question?

Councillor Wyatt: I guess the concern that we have here is where a Federal election is pending. We know that there is going to be making announcements. The Louise Bridge has been in multiple capital budgets for the last number of years. William R. Clement parkway was voted on some time ago. Can we get a definitive time of when the public service will be filing this application to live up to the Council recommendation?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I can certainly report back to the Councillor on the specific time-lines. I thank him for the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker. Just in aware, just when I sitting on Protection and Community Services and on the Winnipeg Public Library Board, I'm not sure if the Mayor knows, but Mayor Norrie was very deserving of the naming of something and Council has done that for politicians in the past, but I'm not sure if the Mayor is aware that I think, I believe there's a move to name a newly renovated or newly constructed library in the future after Mayor Norrie. I'm not sure if you're aware of that?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker and I thank the Councillor for the question. I was not aware but I appreciate the suggestion and look forward to following up with the Councillor to get additional information and if there is additional information that I can receive from others in the community in that respect or any other ideas from any member of Council, I'd welcome them. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, second question?

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, with all due consideration and I'm just taking a responsible question, but somebody asked me this question. We know that the Mayor is to promote the City of Winnipeg and that is a very essential job of the Mayor, but a resident asked me the question, "did you receive Grey Cup tickets for free or did your office purchase them?"

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. That's a fair question Madam Speaker. The actual tickets to the game were provided by the CFL and I thank the member for the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, anything further?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, uh no. I thank the Mayor for being transparent.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: As we approach the end of my first day in Council, it's my pleasure to ask a question of the Mayor regarding his initiative on the long term strategy to end homelessness. We've heard from Councillors Allard, Wyatt and Eadie. We've heard various factors that deal with not homelessness and as Councillor Wyatt says, hopefully not merely homelessness but the issue of poverty. Various issues were mentioned: economic; social; historically, ethnically, social of various kinds, and I ask, and this is foreshadowing Madam Speaker in terms of the priorities I think we need to address and this as we sort of deal with the matrix of recognizing and deal with the factors that contribute to homelessness. And I ask thus, will the Mayor consider the issue of nutrition as being absolutely essential to dealing with any and all of these issues as they contribute to homelessness and poverty in general and empowerment and quality of life in general.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker and I thank Councillor Schreyer for the question. Food security is a matter that is of the utmost concern to me and I know members of Council. It was a matter that was discussed a few times during the mayoral campaign and I'm sure in your wards as well, and it is of the utmost concern. I look forward to working with Councillor Schreyer on what we could substantively do to assist helping more of our citizens have good healthy food security, and that's something right now that not all Winnipeggers do enjoy, and you know, the issues of homelessness are not easy. They are complex. And issues of poverty are not easy and are complex. But what I'm hoping and expecting of this Council is that we're not going to be afraid to tackle these complex issues and to provide leadership and that's why I'm so pleased that we had unanimous consent on the support for the United Way's plan to end homelessness and I would welcome further discussion on food security matters in the future. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker and for the record, right now, and to pose this in a question for the Mayor. Will the Mayor take it under advisement, if I may counsel on this issue, that I'm not speaking merely about provision of the four food groups. I'm talking about a serious analysis about how nutrition affects, as we mentioned, mental health, depression, concentration, the ability to get an education, ability to empower oneself so that one does not end up being homeless.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker, and I thank Councillor for the question. Absolutely taken under advisement and agree that food security does go well beyond the four food groups and like I said in my first response, it's a complex issue that I welcome the opportunity for us to have additional discussion towards, but yes I take it under advisement. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Mayor? Seeing none, we will move on to Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, the report dated November 25th. Councillor Orlikow.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2014

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. I move Items 1 through 21.

Councillor Wyatt: Seven and eight. Okay.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of 1 through 6 and 9 through 20. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item No. 7, Mr. Clerk.

Item 7 - Secondary Plan – Corydon-Osborne Area Plan - SP 2/2014

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to introduce?

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. I'll wait to hear from my learned colleague.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. I stood this down. You know, I read the report and it's extremely lengthy report or plan that is before us. I'm not sure if all members of Council have read it. But it is extremely detailed and fairly prescriptive. I note the fact that we are always trying to achieve infill development. However, in this report, if you read it, there are actually great areas that are actually being limited in terms of development. In terms of residential development, in terms of density, in terms of all the things, Madam Speaker, that we often hear about in terms of why suburban development should not be allowed and why we should be renewing our older and existing neighbourhoods which we will no doubt hear as the councillor for the area stood down Item 21 I noticed on the agenda, Precinct E. And so even though we don't want…some members of Council don't want to see development occurring in the so-called suburbs which I believe really aren't suburbs. They're the original municipalities of the City of Winnipeg, the 13 original municipalities of the City of Winnipeg. They don't want to see development occurring in those original 13 municipalities, but at the same time, they're actually bringing forward a report such as this one, a plan which, you know, makes it look like that instead of on the 7th day, God rested after he created, on the seventh day, he created the Corydon Osborne area plan because of the detail that is actually listed in here and their restrictions on business. And if anybody believes in small business and if anybody believes in free enterprise and if anybody here in this chamber believes that actually we should be encouraging infill development where there's existing services, where there's existing infrastructure both above the ground and under the ground, they should not be voting for this report. They should not be supporting the document before us. Now, this is a document, by the way, Madam Speaker, is…we have spent not just a hundred thousand dollars as referenced in the document on consultations and bringing a committee together, but hundreds of thousands of dollars. Hundreds of thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars of public time, of the public staff time, of outside consultants being hired to produce a document which basically Madam Speaker, provides a vision, there's no doubt about it. It provides a vision for this area. And in some areas, some parts of the vision I think are very constructive, but in other areas, it is extremely restrictive, extremely restrictive, so much so that it actually affects values in the area, negatively, in terms of private property ownership, indirectly, down zoning those private properties without having due course. Because this document, Madam Speaker, will be referred to if passed by this Council, mark my words, will be referred to over and over and over again at any application that is filed in this area and comes forward for a subdivision and

rezoning. And it will be used as justification of why applications cannot be supported. And that's why something like this has to be treated cautiously and we have to be very careful when adopting massive plans like this. I couldn't make the last property meeting though I did request that a Council seminar be held on this prior to us adopting this. The feeling in the community I understand was that, that that shouldn't be done. Fine. It's here today. It's at the open council meeting. We all have a right to participate here. I have some grave concerns after having read this a number of times. And if you haven't read this, then don't vote for it just be safe or move a motion to refer back to the standing committee if you need time. I can tell you, Councillors if you do though, believe, in small business and if you do believe in the ideal that we hear over and over again that density is good and suburban development is bad, then you shouldn't be supporting this either. So Councillors, give it some serious thought. If you haven't read it today, there's no time for you to read it now. But, I've already spoken so I can't move a motion to refer it back. That's the rule…one of the rules we have here, once you speak, you can't move a motion to refer. However, there are others here who haven't spoken and I'm sure that there would be support. But even if you glance at it and you look at the restrictions and I will draw you into the document which in the summary states quite clearly, "Though had support at the open house, conversely, many of the comments suggested that the draft is too rigid and restrictive, impeding future development." This is in the report itself. I don't believe that we should be impeding future development in our City. For too long, Madam Speaker, we had a slow growth city, for too long. Finally, finally in multiple generations, the City is actually growing and growing fairly aggressively. Why are we trying to slow it down? Why are we trying to impede it? Why are we trying to impede it in one of our most successful neighbourhoods, Corydon Avenue where many might want to live to raise families, to be part of, to make it a success. But that's exactly what this document is doing. Councillors, please, give this some serious sober second thought. Don't proceed with this today. Send it back and allow for some serious consideration so that this is not used as a bridge head against somebody's political agenda in their own neighbourhood. Corydon Avenue belongs to the entire community, Madam Speaker. Corydon Avenue belongs to the entire city. We all like to go to Corydon Avenue at times with our family and friends to buy gelati to enjoy. It belongs to the entire City. What a wonderful neighbourhood. Why are we trying to slow it down? Why are we trying to undermine it? Those are my concerns, Madam Speaker and I can't support this nor the second one which has a similar type of milieu to it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Well, there is indeed a lengthy history to this neighbourhood planning process. It was envisioned before I was even elected as an area that needed secondary planning. We started with the Osborne Village secondary plan, which, as you might notice in our agendas over and over you are seeing density in Osborne Village, you are seeing infill, you are seeing mixed use developments and you're seeing exactly what our Winnipeg calls for in Osborne Village. The reason you're seeing that without adversarial public hearings, fights and so on, is that we have a neighbourhood plan in Osborne Village to accommodate increased growth. This is the…been in the works for many, many years. There has been a significant amount of consultation with the business community, as well as the residents and even city wide. There were pre-planned studies that were started in…was it 2005? We've essentially been working on this plan. This isn't new. I mean, obviously there's some new members of Council and you're not going to be up to speed of every file. But trust me, this has been something that has been in the works for years and years and years and years. And there was something that happened you might recall a year and a half ago, or a couple of summers ago. The plan was under way. There had been designs, meetings. It was being worked on and Councillor Wyatt moved a motion at Property Committee to basically stop the neighbourhood plan. And he succeeded in that. Business people came forward, a couple of people came forward requesting that. I wasn't notified. And the plan work was stopped. And basically, the people in the Corydon area were pretty upset about it. We had a town hall meeting. The Mayor realized that this wasn't really the way to do things. And a new process was started. It was agreed that it wasn't the right thing to do to stop a neighbourhood planning process based on one or two disgruntled business people or associates of a councillor. So what happened was an additional hundred thousand dollars had to be spent to hire a consultant and the business people that Councillor Wyatt is concerned about, before, who weren't happy, were included in the process of determining the new consultant. They were included extensively in how things were going to proceed and to try to get a plan back on track. It got back on track and then those, that process continued on which has led to this report here, which built on some of the previous work and in also is a completed plan for us to move forward with. I just wanted, you know, a couple of the points that Councillor Wyatt said, he said that it was going to stop development. On page 71, it says that there's a total of 4,540 to 8,730 new residential units predicted in the core. Like I'm sorry but this is not an anti-development plan, okay. The residents in the area and it includes a high-rise area on Pembina and it includes mid-rise buildings on Pembina, Corydon Village low rise buildings and increasing the density in where appropriate in the residential area. So this is all about increasing density. It's all about doing what Our Winnipeg wants to do. But the key thing that it's doing it in a way that respects the existing neighbourhood with input from the neighbourhood including the business. The businesses, the property owners and everybody else was consulted over and over and over. And I would point out that the way there was protections are in place are design standards which are part of this and those design standards, you know, protect existing property owners, so overbuilding of lots that block their views and things like that, but still allows the increased density where appropriate. And protects the character of what is a beautiful neighbourhood for all of Winnipeg. There is a delicate balance in the Corydon area between the

business strip, the residence and all of that. And that's what protected here. I could point out that there was a public hearing at community committee held to hear this matter following the years and years of other meetings where everybody was able to go following. I could spend a lot of time outlining the different meetings that were held, but at the public hearing, there was one person in opposition and their concern was that we weren't allowing…the high rises should've been narrower I believe was the concern. There was no business people from Corydon or anywhere else saying they were being stifled. This is really about fostering density while respecting the existing character. And honestly, I'm baffled that anybody would at this stage in the process after it's almost been ten years since 2005 when we started this for studies on this and this is coming from the same place that basically stopped the work, almost completely killed having any sort of planning at all and forced us to spend additional money to complete it again, which we did. Extensive consultation was done with the business community with property owners, with all the people that could have any concern or interest or be stakeholders and yeah, the report is transparent. It mentions comments that were made. Not everyone was a hundred percent happy with every aspect of it. I don't think you're going to find a plan that says that, but the fact is we had a public hearing process and people didn't come and complain about it, they were comfortable with it for the most part because they were part of it and that's how planning should be done. So, I guess I just hope that you'll put some trust in the work of our planning department, of the private consultant who was hired to complete the plan, of all the other consultants that worked on it over the years and on my reputation as somebody of integrity who has been working on this. I've been bringing our people along in the neighbourhood, hearing them out and their concerns and just facilitating a process of planning our neighbourhoods so that we can accommodate more growth and that in a way that respects their rights to an existing neighbourhood. There's nothing preventing development in here if you look at this plan. It's just asking it be at a standard that respects the people who live in that neighbourhood. And we have an example in the Osborne Village Development Plan that this works. If you look at our agenda last night and I know the Councillors from City Centre will attest that when we have a meeting, yeah, another hearing in Jenny's ward because we just approved another four-storey building in Osborne Village. We just approved another 40 units, another 80 units, another 20 units. Look at where the infill is happening. It's happening in the areas where we have done this kind of planning. And it's been effective. So I hope you're not going to let whatever reasons, real reasons are driving this initiative to derail this again. I think that would be really wrong and I hope that you will allow us to continue, you will respect the community committee and the planning department and the residents that I represent and the residents who across the city who are part of the process who care about Corydon Avenue as part of our city and you'll let this move forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was around for the derailing of the first consultation, so I think it's unfair to say that there hasn't been a lot of sober thought look into this particular plan. Actually, I'm quite jealous as a City Councillor practiced for four years so far and there is something that really gets the residents of any older neighbourhood going, and that is, hearings about development and how it should go. The developer believes they should be able to do whatever they darn well please. And the people who have been invested and living in these neighbourhoods for years have a different belief that somehow there's going to be a big problem. With a neighbourhood plan, when you divide these, there's always opposing discussion and view. With a plan, you need to try to achieve a balance that moves the City along with Our Winnipeg, complete communities, the whole bit. We need to move along developing in those terms. And so this secondary plan, there's two reports on this one. There's an amendment to the Osborne Village plan, I believe. And one of the most densest neighbourhoods in the City of Winnipeg. Like…like really it's quite dense already and density and there's a lot more density…like, this is a really thought out, deliberate plan to make sure that the growth happens the way the public wants to see, the people who voted for us. And you know, having just unfettered ability to put in density in places where it really shouldn't be because you know if you look at the big city planners and you talk, you know, if you read Jane Jacobs, she talks about a mix of housing in different things, lots of density, yeah, but usually the density is in certainly located, but it has to have a mix, a neighbourhood that is really well, is one that has a mix of character, different like choices for people to make and decisions to do. So that's what you want to see in a plan and actually, one of my promises, I really want to see this happen, is we need to have actually secondary plans. There is one on Henderson Highway has two secondary plans, very old, not very detailed, but not very constructive and not very useful, actually, from what I understand. I'm not the councillor for the area so I'm not sure if one section across both Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Browaty's area, but it's important to have a secondary plan because you know it gets a little more detailed. It, you know, looks for opportunities for that development to happen. And then avoids, you know, losing some character on some streets and different Councillors have different perspectives on, you know, who should be making decisions about what gets built, but I know that there is a secondary plan of sorts in Transcona that's so detailed that it even tells you what colour of fence and what it can be made of and what you're going to do. Like it's so detailed, so detailed. And that's because there was lots of consultations done with the business community. They came up with this is the look and style we want of the Transcona biz, okay? And that was good planning. That was good thing to do because really, honestly, a business environment that's created by business people is important and here in this case though we have a mix of both business and residential and everybody has a fair stake in all of this. And so does the developer who will be making lots of money under this current plan. There's no reason to

send it back at all. It's finally done. We spent a lot of money as the City of Winnipeg on this plan. It' what we need. We need a plan along all our major regional routes to determine where density opportunities are and where maintaining character of older neighbourhoods still exists as well. That balance that needs to be struck, Madam Speaker, the balance that needs to be struck and you know, it shouldn't be so typical that it would take since 2,000, well, so there was a want for a plan pre 1998 I believe that's when Councillor Gerbasi first ran. But so this whole process for this plan, 2005, how many years is that? That's a lot of time, energy and it is a good plan. It's the one that's supported by the most number and achieves the balance of most numbers and yes, there is some dissension on some of the points. But you know what, the reality is we need to make sure that these neighbourhoods are good and safe as well because you know, infill, I know that the councillor from Transcona has been involved in a hearing where yeah, buyer beware. So we let somebody build an infill house with not enough room in between the walls. One of the existing houses which won't be ripped down needs to have fire wall, does not have the fire proofing, but still we make a decision to say, okay, move that wall, but whoever buys the existing house is going to have to, you know if they try to renovate that house, they're not going to know because the building code, you want to talk about thickness, you're looking…you're looking at the secondary plan. Take a look at that building code, the fire code, the plan, all those codes, take a look at them. Try to read your way through that. Anyway, the only point I'm trying to make here is the secondary plan is an essential piece. I'll call it legislation because it sets out some rules for development to proceed and so when developers are looking at purchasing properties, they can look to this plan and say oh, well, that doesn't fit within my thinking so I'm not going to buy that one, but maybe another developer as Councillor Gerbasi alluded to, Madam Speaker. There are people who say, "Oh, there's an opportunity. I'll build 40. I'll build 20 and it predicts 5,000 to 8,000 new family units, new homes. How many have we achieved in downtown and we're saying we're doing okay, but we need to have more success? I think we've built over the same period of time since 2005. What did we build downtown? About 5,000 new homes? I can't remember. I'm sure that Councillor from Transcona would remember. But the point is this is building density as well. So that kind of argument, fellow Councillors, the ones who…new colleagues, this is a great plan, let's just move it along.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Well, thank you very much and I thank everybody for the comments you made today. They're not new comments. We have, you know, different views on how we should develop the city. We have some…and again, it's not just around this table, it's even outside of the city and I've heard it where let the free market reign that the market will decide verses don't change my neighbourhood at all. Don't move a blade of grass. We're elected to try to find that balance, somewhere that allows density to happen and where it's appropriate to also preserve the character of these neighbourhoods. But we do want to grow up and so first of all I do want to congratulate, we haven't always agreed on some issues, but Councillor Gerbasi…been on City Centre with her for now, five years now, has really embraced densification and I would say that's been a brave stance that she's made because they didn't have a plan. The neighbourhood is completely nervous about where this is going to end up, but she was able to stand strong and explain to people why we needed density and even mid-block density, things that you know I would go "oof", but Councillor Gerbasi knew that it was important to move the project forward and so she's done it and now she has not…Winnipeg has this plan now that provides those residents a little more understanding of where this density is going to be occurring, how it be occurring, how much, lot sizes, where it's appropriate, where it may not be appropriate. So I believe that this plan here that I've read through it by the sheer fact that community committee or at the standing policy committee, we did have one person in opposition again, we only really have that much for rezoning in a neighbourhood. One person came forward because I believe that is representative of the incredible process that it went through to try to answer people's questions as much as possible. To me, when people don't come forward, it is a sign that the process actually was good. I have not received phone calls from individuals either residential or business oriented on this matter. A lot of the issues that are being brought in here are already in place. They're just been taken from pieces and put together. And so yes, the question is, do we need to densify and find ways to move up rather than out? Absolutely. And I will also be speaking on the other part on Precinct E, sounds like we pulled that down. I'll be speaking to…it's not an either or. It's how do we accommodate this in the best way possible to move Winnipeg forward. I think for an urban, you know, mature neighbourhood such as this…where this plan is going into, this plan is extensive. It does allow business opportunities. It allows five to 8,000 units to go into the neighbourhood. It allows mid-block infills. It allows mid-block infills. It allows infills on corner lots that are very dense, Corydon, well in my opinion but again, the neighbourhood is okay with it, the area Councillor is okay with it. The committee was okay with it. The public administration is okay with it and as I said having been hearing a huge opposition from the public at large either business or residents. So I believe this plan has found that medium. We're going to…I believe I asked people to support it because what I have been hearing as I have been meeting my colleagues around the table, they all want plans. They all want neighbourhood plans. How are we going to develop our neighbourhoods in a sustainable way that will be not only beneficial to the developer but also protects the interests of the residents? So one of the common themes I've been hearing is how do we get some of these neighbourhood plans and area plans and PDOs and secondary plans through our system at a more efficient rate? Because I think right now we have about 40 of them on the backlog. This process took far too long in my opinion for numerous reasons, however, that is a key issue for the committee to try to figure out how we can get

this process going forward faster. So developers will have some assurety at what they can come in and build and the community has some assurety of the protection that they have in the neighbourhood. So again, it's about finding that right balance and I believe this plan does that. So I ask you to support it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 7? Contrary? Carried. Noted. Item No. 8, Mr. Clerk.

Item 8 - Secondary Plan – Amendment to the Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan By-law No. 220/2006

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I'll wait to hear any comments.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and this was stood down by Councillor Wyatt? No? Okay. Any further speakers?

Councillor Gerbasi: Just to clarify, I believe it's just realigning the two plans so that the boundaries basically make sense because there is a Osborne neighbourhood plan and then the Corydon Osborne plan also includes the area around the transit station. So it's really almost housekeeping. It's not a substantive part of the plan so it really goes with the other piece.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Any other speakers? Councillor Orlikow? Okay. We'll call the vote. All those in favour of Item 8? Contrary? Carried. Item 21.

Item 21 - Secondary Plan – Precinct "E" of Complete Communities - SP 4/2014

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce.

Councillor Orlikow: Just to introduce it Precinct E. I'll' wait to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now on to what I love to talk about, suburban sprawl. No, thank you, Madam Speaker, and I do recognize the chair of the committee's comments that it isn't an either or. Obviously, we are going to have growth in the City of Winnipeg and I obviously recognize that. I think the question is, how are we doing it or what are we doing about it and how are we dealing with it in our policies and various other aspects of that and that's what I would like to talk about today. I am very concerned that we continue to move forward with these large number of new precinct plans pretty much almost every meeting we come forward with another one, that's a greenfield development precinct plan. And the problem is, is that we look at each one that comes forward in isolation as a single vote, you know, are we going to approve this particular precinct without really looking at the big picture and the impact of how we are encouraging development to happen in our city and at what rate and what cost? The Our Winnipeg plan is very good on talking about increasing density, infill and transit oriented development. There are some very good policies there. But at the same time, when the plan was approved, it opened up this wide range of greenfield land for development and it opened it up without staging or identifying processes or policies to determine which make sense to develop first to just open it all up. And then the developers…developer-led planning is what was done so whoever wants to develop comes in, does their planning and the thing starts moving forward. There's not enough happening to make significant infill development a more attractive choice as opposed to building on empty greenfields. This Corydon plan is a good thing and it's a good first step and some other steps, but its still…if you look at the numbers and the amounts and the way the development is happening, it's a lot more attractive to do other kind of development and about a year or so ago, those of you were on Council and others who were watching would know that the Public Service advised us very clearly that greenfield growth as we're doing it now is not paying for itself. They brought forward a plan that had been…we thought was going to go, that to change and allow us to charge lot charges or certain fees for the cost of new development, to cover the cost of things that aren't covered through the standard development fees and charges which we currently have. Unfortunately, we need changes in the Charter to get the authorities to do that without problems and the City, the Provincial Government refused to give us that. I don't know if everyone is aware of this, but other municipalities in Manitoba, under the Municipal Act, all have the authority to oppose these fees. And the City of Winnipeg does not under our Charter. We operate under a different Charter and I strongly feel we need to take this battle up again. We've got the bromance happening over here. We've got a new Council. There's a new political environment perhaps we can revisit this, but we have to find a way to cover the cost or slow down the rate of the development or do something to slow down or to recover the costs of the way our City is developing. I believe this needs to be a top priority and I think our Mayor is placed with his positive inter-governmental relationship that he's been demonstrating so far. I'd like to point out that the growth we're seeing has a significant impact on City services in our operating budget. The new development…this one that's in front of us today will stretch the City's services parks.

There's four new parks. There's new transit service. There's other services that will be required. It's not considered infill. It may be relatively close to roadways, but it's starting on the edge and it's not…it does not…it's going to have all those services. Over the last ten years, over the last number of years, I've seen tens of thousands of approvals of new houses and new houses going up on the fringe of the city that require parks, fire service, police and transit. We've had to build new fire stations. We've had to stretch our transit service and I have not seen a parallel increase in Public Works budgets, in parks, in transit operating hours, in our operating budget. And that means either somebody is getting less service which I think we've all seen. Those of us that are on council know that our parks people are stretched to the beyond the limit and that they're just reacting to problems as they come up at this point. We face a very difficult budget situation and I don't see this City expanding its services in the upcoming years to take care of these four new parks. And other increased services that this particular precinct will need and this is one of the smaller developments relatively speaking to some of the ones we've seen that are tens of thousands of new homes. In Waverley West, a couple of years ago, up until a couple of years ago, the parks were a responsibility of the developer, but now that will expire and we will have to take on the work of cleaning, maintaining the parks in Waverley West as well. And I'd like to know where the staff is going to come from that? Is there a plan to expand our operating budget in relation to the expansion and growth in our city? And I have not…that's not the sense I'm getting or what I've seen over the years. We've already had tax freezes for years, even cuts, back when the…in that starting 98 for three years eating the cost of inflation and service is already impacted significantly. So infill development, where we have existing transit service, parks, schools and fire protection should be the priority for our planners and I'd like to point out that even though planning on these precinct plans are developer led, it still uses a lot of our planning resources to support the applications, to review them, to correct them, to advise them to make sure that they are done properly. Believe me. It takes a lot of our planners' time to see these other plans done even if we aren't leading those plans. We still are a big part of them. Everything has to be reviewed by all our departments and we have one of the smallest planning departments in Canada. We do not have the resources of other planning departments. If you looked at the numbers, you'd be quite shocked and how few planners we have for the size of our city. So, without the appropriate growth charges and by providing planning support, the City of Winnipeg is actually subsidizing lower density more automobile dependent development that is resulting in more traffic congestion, higher needs for infrastructure investment to service that traffic. When you compare Winnipeg situation with other cities that are seeing a lot of growth in Canada, we are the cheapest place to do density, low density greenfield development. We are giving it away. And there's other issues at stake here. We don't have requirements like some cities do for affordable housing to be included these developments. This is something we can consider as a policy, having a 10 percent requirement for example. We could also require higher density levels. We don't. It requires some density. It's not all simply single family, but are we requiring enough density? And, of course, we need the appropriate charges to cover the costs of these services like parks and infrastructure needs. And you know, I remember when Sage Creek was approved and the Councillor at the time, Councillor Magnifico, I've mentioned this before, he said, "Oh, you're not going to need transit service here. We're not going to need anything here because, you know, it's fine, we don't need it, well since then we've extended transit service and built a fire hall. So that's just not the reality. And so for the last ten years, I have, many of you know, I've often felt like I was kind of rolling a rock up a hill here with a few of us speaking up about this. And usually when I stand up at each one of these precinct meetings, there's a general pylon from the Councillors accusing me of being anti-development and anti-progress which I think I've just approved a plan that's 8,000 new units, but whatever. But in recent years…so...and I think that we just continued down this path of reactively approving everything. So, I guess what I'd like to say is with a new Mayor and Council, I hope you remain open to the idea that we can do things differently. I hope you believe we can take action to deal with these issues. I don't want to fight about it. I'm tired of fighting about this for ten years. I just want to work with all of you. I want to work with the development community, with the residents, with our city…I think there is an awareness in our city about this that's growing among informed people who see what's happening in our city, downtown advocates, people who care about Winnipeg who know we have to address this issue. I know Mayor Bowman has expressed a lot of respect for other Mayors that he's met recently, Nenshi, Iveson, Robertson, and our western Mayors and I would know that they take a very different approach to the growth that's happening in their cities than we've been taking. They are investing most of their infrastructure dollars in public transit. A hundred percent of their gas tax money is in public transit, okay? They're charging more appropriate fees for new growth. They are raising taxes. I believe Calgary is 60 percent, our 4 or 6 percent or something like that. Ridiculous. To cover the operating costs for the new growth, they've raised special taxes to cover operating cost to the new growth areas in some areas and innovative policies to require higher density and other desirable and social environment goals such as affordable housing. So, developers want to develop, of course they do. Winnipeg needs some new housing. Of course, but our policies, our fees, our incentives, our allocations of planning resources are guiding how our city is developing. And we set the circumstances and motion and we can have an impact on whether our city develops in the way that future generations can afford that it's fiscally, socially and environmentally sustainable. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Speaker Sharma. Well, my…just for the new people, my arguments are usually pretty solid along with Councillor Gerbasi's on the…what I call just the unplanned growth because greenfield growth does

need to happen in the city, there's no doubt about it, how it proceeds is of that utmost importance. I just want to talk about this Precinct E because I voted for this one actually and I've been known to vote against Precinct plans that are opening up space where we don't have regional road yet or different things like that and the Precinct E here, the future Chief Peguis Trail will go to the north of it. You have Court Avenue to the south of it and just south of that, you have the Wellness Institute and the Seven Oaks Hospital or as Councillor Zuken used to call it the North End Hospital. The issue here, this is what you would call a contiguous development. It's not sort of out on the corners, reaching out to rural land or to the boundaries of the City in those terms. Now, what's interesting about this plan and they do have some density in here. Is it the right amount of density? There's four different components to this Precinct E. And Precinct E has already developed all the way up to Walmart. Walmart built over there between Court and Templeton and actually there's a lot of traffic booting its way up to Walmart. It's developed there. There's a couple of roads, Chief Peguis Trail comes through…that will take some of the traffic pressure off of Templeton one would hope because there's a lot of residential there along that street. The residential that grew there was kind of, not the kind to block off traffic noise. So, but anyway, I digress a bit, but so, here, what we have is on Pipeline, there is…the infrastructure's already underground down Pipeline up to the north limit of this particular precinct. So that's kind of into the area. The developers will have to pull off of that and move the water into there. And there's parts and there's all kinds of things planned here. But I got an e-mail from Josh Brandon who's into the housing and trying to find affordable housing. That's his kind of thing and he said that I didn't know this, but our charter was amended supposedly, regarding some zoning issues that would allow us to somehow achieve a goal of providing affordable housing for people. Edmonton has done this, where they've used the incremental financing model to do rent, 10 percent of the units and you know, you have to have a lot of density in an apartment block for this, but 10 percent of the units need to be rent geared to income. It's a really important methodology because there are some really poor people in this country so those on social assistance for example. Anyway, and there will be people on social assistance because they'll…I'm sorry to say there's a lot of people that will never find employment even though they want to. They won't be able to find employment so they do have to live on social assistance, income assistance. But anyway I digress a bit. This is…nothing of this plan moving ahead prevents the City from entering into an agreement with the developer here on some kind of incremental financing when they move ahead to build the density on these areas and I can't recall the exact density for Precinct E which is contiguous development, it's not necessarily just reaching out, I believe there's development on three sides of it, two for sure and I think the third side has started. So anyway, I'll just leave it at that. I think I spoke a lot and it's been a long council meeting, but I will be supporting this although I don't support unplanned growth all over the place because we can't build Chief Peguis Trail, William Clement and also take care of our Arlington Bridge, all these things we need to…infrastructure we need to take care of and you know what we do have to find a way to pay for the services that we will bring in here, but I can't say one thing about this contiguous development here, the 38 bus would only have to go a few more extra blocks to serve this particular area. It already goes up to Walmart and could serve so it would require probably putting another bus on it, but I think it might not be so difficult to provide those extra services. But definitely, green fill growth right now is the way it works in this City, does not pay the full bill for all the services that we need to supply to it. What it does do, the former Councillor Swandel made a very good point, the more frontage that we add and the more that we have people buying City water, they'll be paying for our infrastructure, our sewer separation that needs to happen in our old neighbourhoods and those things too so that we're not polluting the environment. So there is some benefit, but on the other side though, it's not enough benefit to cover off all the money that we need to pay for all the extra services that need to be supplied to, but this is contiguous, the underground infrastructures are already done Pipeline to the north side of this thing. So, and I'm pretty sure, Walmart had to bring up a bunch of water services up to this far…west as they are so I'll leave it at that. I'm voting for it. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes and Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Mayes: Usually it would be about this time that Councillor Swandel would get up and get into an argument with Councillor Gerbasi, but I think we've moved beyond that phase of our history so I will try to be brief and just say I think we have to be a little bit careful about pitting the suburbs verses the downtown and the rest of the City. There are as Councillor Eadie briefly touched on near the end. There are certainly some cause, some benefits from all development. I mean Councillor Lukes and I have been talking with the…there's a joint venture by Qualico and the City of Winnipeg at the south end of St. Vital that's put millions back into our confers that we used last year that people around here voted to expend on Jonathan Toews Community Centre. So we are realizing some benefits from some of the new growth and secondly there's certainly some costs that impact more on older neighbourhoods. The frozen pipes from was far worth in Councillor Gerbasi's ward than mine, for example. No fault of hers. No fault of people who live there, but nobody in my ward called me up to say, "Well, you know, the hell with them? They bought older houses. They can pay for their own frozen pipe problem." So I think you have to have a little bit more comprehensive vision of the City as a whole of all of us being in this together and as Councillor Eadie said, the combined sewer problem of course is almost unique to the older neighbourhoods and we are going to need people from throughout the City to pay for projects like the Kyle Rossi, combined sewer separation. It's a problem. It should be dealt with. We shouldn't say, "Well, you bought an old house. You've got to pay for it." I think we have to look at some of these problems. Some are unique to the older neighbourhoods, so I…I just don't want to get us into what are they…four year long back and forth on this

subject. I think we have to take a look at more comprehensive view of yes to problems with growth, yes to problems moving farther out in the City, but we've also got problems some of the older neighbourhoods I'm going to have to try to balance all those together. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. And I'm rising to support this as well. I think it should be stressed that…and Councillor Orlikow spoke eloquently about a huge process that was involved in terms of the previous report that we discussed and public consultation and all the work done and all the different groups that were consulted with. And the…I think the same thing could be said regarding the complete communities, Our Winnipeg process that took place. There was an extensive public consultation that took place city wide in Our Winnipeg. It was an extensive period of time that the work went on and it involved our entire planning department and involved the Province of Manitoba, members of Council, various members of the public. And it's interesting that the…what came out of Our Winnipeg, one of the documents, complete communities is one of the major policy documents. If you haven't had a chance to read it yet, please do and in it, it identified a number of things, identified for example, redevelopment areas, older areas inside the city that could be redeveloped and renewed. Some of them are quite literally brownfields which are polluted sites that will take some work and creativity and find ways to actually bring those lands to productive use. And it also identified so-called greenfields in the different precincts. And the Figure 1 of Precinct E is identified in the complete communities document amongst various other precincts. So this is not random development as was alluded to earlier in the Council Chamber. This is planned and this was planned as part of Our Winnipeg and it was a very public process. You can't argue 20 minutes ago or 30 minutes ago that you believe in the public consultation process and you believe in a planning process and you believe in having input from everybody, but then, arguing only 30 minutes later that the same type of process that gave us Our Winnipeg is creating random reckless development side of the City of Winnipeg. No. That is clearly not the case. This is clearly part of a plan. Precinct E is not only infill, but it's actually part of a plan. Whether it would be peripheral or actually considered partly developed in terms of the fact that as some would see it as infill, the reality is, whether it's that or not, it's part of a plan that this City developed through in-depth public consultation process with its citizens, with various professional groups, with stakeholders and was adopted by this Council and adopted by the Manitoba Legislature. So we should be very proud of the fact that this is actually coming forward and actually happening. I will say this, that Councillor Gerbasi is a hundred percent correct in this regard, and that is her point with regards to impost fees or development area charges and the development area charge issue was an issue that was identified about a year ago and identified by this Council as something that should be a priority. Unfortunately, it barely made the light of day when it was torpedoed by the folks over at the other house on Broadway. Now, that was very unfortunate because if you want to build rapid transit, if you want to build better services for the citizens of Winnipeg, if you want to renew our older infrastructure such as pipes below the ground or pavement above it, if you want to build the site for the City that Councillor Gerbasi was talking about, the idea of having greater density of having rapid transit, you need these area charges. You need these impost fees and the development community, of course, was part of that torpedoing, part of that effort to undermine those impost fees and quite rightly, the surrounding capital region all around us are charging them. They're charging them on their development right now by various amounts. And if you look at other cities in western Canada, they're charging them. Saskatoon, one of the fastest growth cities in western Canada today successfully has been charging area charges far greater, development cost charges far greater than what we have ever comprehended or ever contemplated and yet, they're growing and they're investing and they're building. So we need to take another run at this. We have to. I mean the fact that the Province got scared because it was on the heels of them introducing a PST that they did a terrible…they consulted nobody with I think had a lot to do with that. The fact that there was a spin that this was going to be a cost on top of your purchasing for a home. The reality is how do we invest it? How do we actually handle leadership nine, ten years ago when it was first being contemplated? At that time, it was worked out about $5,000 a lot, $5,000 a lot, nine, ten years ago. We all know what the price of lots have gone up by since then. Okay and that would've generated upwards of $12 million that annually could've been invested back into our city whether it be for libraries or community centres or for rapid transit. We should take another run at that and you know, does…do these areas actually pay for themselves? I think that's a very subjective debate. The reality is the fact…the fact is the folks who are moving into the newer neighbourhoods, newer homes on the square footage basis are paying more than others in older neighbourhoods. There's no doubt about it based on assessed values, and that's the system we have. We have an assessment system based on market value. We've accepted that for some time now, but they are paying far more in terms of property tax than other neighbourhoods are paying, older neighbourhoods are paying. So I think it's a very…we've got to be very careful when we get into this debate about who's paying what, but in terms of actual having development cost charges similar to other cities in western Canada, similar to other municipalities right here around our city. Absolutely, we should be doing this and the Provincial Government and those who have contacts with the Provincial Government should be encouraging them to reconsider and to reinvest because of the fact that we cannot afford just on property taxes alone to be building overpasses and underpasses and rapid transit which is really what we are being tasked to do right now. It will financially be impossible in the next 15 to 20 years to do that. So I encourage everyone to support this and I appreciate the time. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I am supportive of this, but however, I just want to really iterate Councillor Gerbasi's comments. I think it's important we talked all day long about this being a new Council. I think this is a really good opportunity for us to open up this debate and have these discussions. You know, I've going on a whole bunch of different tours, learning lots about our different departments and, you know, right now I know we don't even have the money in our budget to cover our infrastructure now. We have people that are buying 400,000 or 500,000 dollar homes, and we don't even have a plan yet on how we're going to build the infrastructure around there. So I think it's important to have these discussions for all of Winnipeggers. I don't really think this is a suburbs and non-suburbs debate. I think it's something on what we need to do moving forward and as a new Council we all have things to bring to the table and hopefully we can find some collaboration on how we can build a better City moving forward. That's all I wanted to say. Sorry, my throat's dry and everything, so sorry about that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm very excited to have Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Wyatt on the Property and Planning Development committee. There will be some lively discussions as we move forward and that's the whole point of democracy. Yeah, it should be interesting, but again, we are Property and Development as I call the engine that can…it's the engine that propels Winnipeg to go forward, how do we develop and how we properly do that and it's also quite a duty for us as a Council and that I hope I'll all see you there tomorrow morning at 9:30 for the Council seminar on Our Winnipeg so we all have a common set of language tools to communicate this with. It's hard to communicate with each other right now when some people call it sprawl; some people call it something else. So this will give us a framework on how to communicate with each other from this and the process won't stop there. We do know…I've talked to the Mayor about this and he's quite supportive of moving this whole file forward. I'm still not sure what it means, an activist chair, but he said I can be. So I'm quite excited about that but again we'll be doing that in collaboration with the whole Council. We will be looking at numerous opportunities to consult with not only Council but with the public and the development community as well because we are all stakeholders together on this one. And I don't believe it's neither or. I really don't. I believe that this…we can find ways that we all benefit moving forward, both the brown fields, the green fields, the transformation spaces. You know, that last four years was difficult for us, but we kind of got overshadowed on so many incredible projects that have come through this, incredible infills that happened and almost every ward here that would never be, I would say six, maybe ten years ago, no one wanted these lands. No one even wanted these lands as a sugar beet land, which was a huge, massive infill right in the middle, right off Bishop Grandin servicing there, but it had a whole three feet of lime over top of it. So that's a huge barrier for people to do this. Councillor Gerbasi has the Fort Rouge Yard. That's a whole transformative spot. There's developments are going on with joint ventures together, brownfields. We have some in the south line. We have some brownfields, but these sites, I'm amazed that people are going to go in. We're not sure what's underneath that soil but people know that I believe they want choice and many people choose to live in different environments for different reasons. And that is with that. Because that means it's unfettered choice and we should just allow anybody doing anything they want? Absolutely not. We are the City, the governance. We're going to try to figure out how to get this engine to work. So again, we can do stuff, deal with our infrastructural deficit. We can deal with our structural difference that even exists in our operating budget. We can start dealing with ways that how can we grow up in a way that protects mature neighbourhoods or existing neighbourhoods? What are the greenfields that we want to open up right away or not. These kind of discussions, it isn't an a or b. We had some of the dialogue today where people started to say this is over here and this is over here. Well again, I stress it is in there. There's a lot of different pieces that move together and it's very complicated once you get down to it. If we get off the verbiage and posturing and we also…and I believe that's here in this Council to start really working on the details and how do we move this file forward. So again, I'm looking forward to it. I hope to see everybody who can make it especially the new Councillors tomorrow morning so we can start doing Our Winnipeg. And this is just the start of a process that I know the Mayor is supportive of, I believe. I've heard today, all Council seems supportive of. How can we keep the engine running? How can we beat Saskatoon as the fast growing city? How can we be that example of excellent development for the rest of Canada? And I think we can do that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of Item 21? Contrary? Carried. So noted. We will…there's no motions for this committee. We'll move on to By-laws for second and third reading. Councillor Orlikow.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Councillor Orlikow: I move for a second and third…just a second, I do right now. I move By-laws numbered 97/2014, 99/2014 and 100/2014 be read the second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 97/2014, 99/2014 and 100/2014.

Councillor Orlikow: And I move for the third time By-laws No. 97/2014, 99/2014 and By-law 100/2014.

Madam Speaker: Be read a third time? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Bylaws for all three readings, Councillor Orlikow.

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

Councillor Orlikow: This one here, okay. I move that By-law No. 114, 115, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135/2014 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 114, 115, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133 and 134 and 35/2014.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I do this again. Same thing? Is that what I do again?

Madam Speaker: No, you're on to the next one, 114.

Councillor Orlikow: Excuse me? Move that…move By-law again. Is that what we're doing?

Madam Speaker: By-laws numbered 114…

Councillor Orlikow: To 115, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134 and 135/2014 inclusive...

Madam Speaker: I'm sorry; I think it's the next section, Councillor for 114, 115, 125, 130…

Councillor Orlikow: I think I just did that, didn't I? Oh, I see. Suspend the rules By-law No. 114/2014, 115/2014, 125/2014 and 135/2014 both inclusive be read a third time and the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Orlikow last one.

Councillor Orlikow: Same thing I guess?

Madam Speaker: Okay, we're good.

Councillor Orlikow: We're good? I just stand I'm told. Okay, good. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: There's something not right on this sheet. We'll figure it out later. We'll now move on to Question Period. Any questions for the Chair? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: I don't think I ever had a question for Councillor Browaty when he was Chair of Property and here is Councillor Orlikow and his first meeting. But I do have a question which is, in May of 2013, we voted on an issue pertaining to the golf course; not the park, the golf course at John Blumberg, and that vote was to declare the property surplus, and I remember this vote because Councillor Pagtakhan and I were both on EPC at the time and we completely cancelled each other out on the two votes. One was for contracting out that he voted for, I voted against, and vice versa; and we haven't heard anything back on this seeking expressions of interest on this whole Blumberg sale. We've got a

different Council now. I don't know how Councillor Dobson feels about it. It's also an oddity in that as you know Madam Speaker, we've got the three parks that have no Councillor assigned – Little Mountain up in your area, La Barriere in Councillor Lukes' area and Blumberg just west of the City. So and we were moving to sell the golf course not the park. Anyway a number of complexities here. We've never heard anything back and I'm also conscious that you need a two-thirds majority to actually sell any park land and maybe that'll be persuaded by Councillor Pagtakhan's eloquent words against declaring this property surplus, but I'm just wondering where we stand on this because we've got a different Council now and I'd hate to sort of go down a long road and then have basically be wasting the time of potential buyers. I'm just not sure where we stand on this process.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Councillor Mayes for the question. Right now where we stand is that we're accepting expressions of interest, proposals, especially of interest for proposals. I'm just looking over at our CAO there. So it is on our website, so if people, if interested parties do have a proposal that they wish to submit, they can do that. There is no time-line right now on it that I am aware of, but I'll get more details and get back to you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Councillor Orlikow, I'm wondering if you can give us some advice or guidance or how you're going to be dealing with new members of Council. Property, Planning and Development is a complex world, and there's a lot of things that go on in community committee meetings that certain new Council members may not be aware of or familiar with. Are you planning to have some sort of, maybe a little more one-on-one on your world and on the world of Property, Planning and Development for the new Councillors? That's one question and the other, it's not really a question, and maybe would've been a comment to. Can I do this?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, I just want to remind you that the questions come through me.

Councillor Lukes: Sorry. Yes! The second point on this is Waverley West is in the St. Norbert Ward, which is in my ward, and I've had, pardon me?

Madam Speaker: Is this a different issue? This will be your second question then.

Councillor Lukes: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Sure I can answer the first one. Councillor Lukes is aware that I have been meeting with individual Councillors to see what some of the ward priorities are or issues that they may have. I believe I've met with almost everybody so far. A few left to go. I've also started the process of meeting with the Administration, both the Director's level all the way down to the managers. I've started that process to see where they're at, and I've also started meeting with some residents' groups and also I started meeting with some developing groups. However, what I do endeavor to do is that, and some of you have already seen it, when an issue comes up at PP&D that's related to your specific ward, that I think you need to be aware of or just to make mention of, I reach out to Councillors to make sure they're aware of it so they don't get shocked when something comes forward. And I'm also looking at, with the indulgence of the Mayor, to hold, and again and the Committee has to approve this as well, to hold more meeting seminars on specific issues that we can start looking at some of the more details and complexities of some of the development, how we do development parameters, those kinds of things. So we'll be looking at doing some more conversations. The problem I find right now with our standing committee format, is it's regulated and it has the process for a reason, but it doesn't allow a lot of dialogue. But I believe those discussion should be public, so we'll be looking at creating something like that as well.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, second question?

Councillor Lukes: And I would like to ask Councillor Orlikow, and it's sort of relevant to Precinct "E" but it's Waverley West. It is in my ward and it was set-out to be sort of a cutting edge example of development in the City of Winnipeg and now as it's being handed over from the developers to the City, there's many.

Madam Speaker: (Inaudible) question, there isn't preamble. You have to get right to the question. Do you have a question?

Councillor Lukes: There's been many challenges, I guess, I'm hearing from my constituents. And I'm hoping, and maybe this is not even really a question, maybe just a statement I guess. I'm hoping and I'm very, very looking forward to working more collaboratively on the points that Jenny has been bringing up and that Ross, Councillor Eadie's been bringing up with Councillor Orlikow on the whole, how we handle our infrastructure deficit in relation to these new

developments, so maybe it's more of just a statement that I'm saying is that I'm really looking forward to this, because this is a huge challenge of mine and as I see more and more of these precincts in developments occurring, it's causing me great concern.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for the Chair? Okay. Seeing none. We will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. Councillor Browaty on the report dated November 24th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED NOVEMBER 24, 2014

Item 1 - Extension Agreement with WRHA for Provision of Emergency Medical Response Services, Inter-Facility Transport and Community Paramedicine

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. One whole item. On the item, I am going to speak to it just to ever so briefly. It's of course a concern of mine that the offloading time of ambulances across the network is still way too high. The Winnipeg Regional Health Authority and the Province has set targets of 30 minute off load times, 2011, 66.03 minutes on average, 2012 was 74.6 minutes, 2013, 75.6 minutes, through September of this year, 77.8 minutes. Ambulances are tied up delivering patients to hospitals and are not available to go pick up people, they're having chronic issues in our community. Again, we provide the service with the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority through this funding formula and through this program. We need to work at improving those metrics and statistics because again it's a matter of public safety. At the Protection Community Services meeting, we charged the department with finding a way to find a way to better report these…this information to the public and again, hopefully that will be a step towards helping improve the service to people. So I move the report. This is a one year extension to the current agreement. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, you'd like to speak to the item?

Councillor Wyatt: Yeah, I would actually because this is a…quite a concern. I thank Councillor Browaty for speaking to it and for giving the statistics that he did. None of that is in the report so it must be directly from the department. The…clearly, it's heading in the wrong direction if you are going from 66 minutes in 2011 and now to the point in time, we are in 2014 to over 77 minutes, an average patient offloading time. That's a real concern. It has a direct impact on our ability to operate our paramedic service. EPC will be hearing no doubt or the Budget Chair or the Finance Chair will be hearing an EPC. They're after pressure to add another ambulance or more ambulances to the system, and this is directly related to the offloading time. This is a one year extension and I recognize that I just think we should be sending a very strong message to the Provincial Government and to the WRHA that this is just a one year extension that the existing scenario of 60 minutes is not acceptable. There was originally a plan to get down to 30 minutes in terms of offloading times. The fact that we had paramedics tied up now in our hospitals, tying up an ambulance for 77, 78 minutes is just unacceptable. That's an ambulance that's not on the road, that's ambulance and paramedics that are not being able to respond to other calls and so it creates this artificial situation of a lack of ambulances and therefore pressure on us to add more ambulances and more paramedics to the service and that is the direct cost that would…has the implications, not in the hundreds and thousands, but in the millions of dollars in any given year over the course of years that the cost of a new ambulances added. So I would encourage EPC and the Mayor to make this a high priority that we cannot…we are not the health authority. We are not supposed to be, but in de facto, we are becoming the health authority because our paramedics are having to stay in the hospital, rightfully, understandably stay in the hospital with the patient before that patient is assigned to a caregiver inside that hospital. So we are becoming the health authority. We are becoming a sense, a part of the hospital and that was never the intent of the municipality delivering ambulance services. I appreciate the fact that there is a joint operations committee and that they're going to do quarterly reviews, but so far their quarterly reviews have obviously not been up to snuff because they're going in the exact wrong direction and that's unacceptable. So, this has to change. This can't continue. We can't see a report like this a year from now. We cannot see a report like this a year from now. We have to put the health authority and the Minister of Health and the Premier a notice because a…this is only going to get worse if this continues. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Browaty, would you like to close?

Councillor Browaty: I thank the Councillor for his comments.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to Question Period. Any questions for Councillor Browaty? Okay. Moving on to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Lukes on the report dated November 25th.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2014**

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to introduce the report dated November 25, 2014 and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 to 7.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Okay. All in favour of 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 3.

Item 3 - Delegation of Authority to Adjust Accounts or Fees for Water, Sewer or Solid Waste Services

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, do you wish to introduce?

Councillor Lukes: I'll hear from Councillor Eadie and then I will address this.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Speaker Sharma. I don't really have the ability to speak to an issue that I'm dealing with currently in my ward related to frozen water pipes, but I noticed that we are delegating the authority here for the department to make a decision regarding waiving of fees. There's three circumstances that they talk about in it, talks about situations where there's an increase charge made, maybe because of a decision made by Water and Waste to…for example, in the frozen water pipe, run your…run…what is it? For…you had to run your tap for a certain period of time, and so what a whole bunch of people did was they also at the same time conserved water. So what happened is in the end their water bill, the amount that…from taking the readings, basically said that their actual water bill came even. They didn't end up having to pay any increase for the extra water they were running because they actually took responsibility and actually looked for various ways not to consume too much water because, you know, one of the things we were telling people during the water and…the frozen water pipe thing is only the people who have been identified to run the water should do it because if everybody turned on their taps to run that much water, we would have a huge sewer problem happening in this city. So, at any rate, what I don't see in here is delegating authority to deal with the situation where this person should have a credit against their water bill. They took the responsibility to not use as much water, but they ran that water and so they suffered with not using as much water because, you know, like people like to have showers, they like to wash their clothes quite often, they like to do all those kind of things. So, in this circumstance, in this delegation of authority here, it doesn't allow the Water and Waste Department to do anything for this particular household because, again, they ran the water exactly the amount, it was four litres every or one litre per minute or I can't remember what it was. Anyway, they measured it property. They ran the water and that's how it ran for months and months and months and months and then what we want to do is compare water bills from a previous year to the next year when it should be compare your water bills in those quarters in question. Anyway, all is I'm saying here is, well, I'm going to vote for this particular report, what I don't see in here is an ability for the Water and Waste Department to deal with that specific situation that probably does exist in other places because I know a number of families try to reduce their water consumption and rightfully so in those extreme circumstances but should be credited. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the item? Councillor Lukes to close.

Councillor Lukes: This particular motion here regards…is regarding a standard process that already is occurring in Water and Waste and what is happening is this is just formalizing what they've been doing for years. This is in speaking with Diane Sacher about this. We didn't speak to your concern, Councillor Eadie in this overview here, but I will ask her if there's another area in Public Works that addresses that, but this particular one addresses sort of the cost of billion collected that are either small amounts or from a collection standpoint that is two years old. It's a process that's always been ongoing and this is just formalizing the process giving them authority up to a value of $10,000. Does that…?

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. All in favour of Item 3? Contrary? Carried? Item No. 5, Mr. Clerk.

Item 5 - Local Improvement Projects to be advertised – St. Mary's Road in the block bounded by Lillian Avenue, Cromwell Street and St. Mary's Road

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes. Okay. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I've pulled this as I did it at EPC not in opposition but I just want to highlight what's been a very successful program and some good work done here in St. Boniface Ward by former Councillor Vandal and Councillor Allard. You'll see 13 more of these asphaltic lane improvements coming out of St. Boniface Ward and St. Vital

Ward. We all know that almost half the city's gravel lanes are found in those two wards because I've gone on about it a lot, so I think most of my colleagues who were on a previous Council are familiar with the fact that the gravel lane situation, it really is concentrated in those two wards, so certainly some found in I think in all wards have some gravel lanes. This is a great success, this program, has offered people the chance to do a local improvement using asphalt sharing the cost with the City. We've got excellent public service support from a guy named Henly Pheifer who's been terrific on this in the Public Service so it's an example of a program that really does seem to be working. In fact, it seems to be oversubscribed. We've got more people wanting to access the finding than current funding levels so I just want to highlight a success story here in terms of public policy and I've noticed that it's the 14th anniversary of my late father's death who was a French professor so given that this affects a lot of the French part, so I will, if you'll indulge me Madam Speaker, I'll conclude by saying…

(Speaking in French) Les ruelles en graviers sont une grande problèmes pour le quartier Saint-Boniface et Saint-Vital and le Conseil doit chercher une solution and je pense que cet programme peut nous aider avec une solution. Merci.

Translation:
Councillor Mayes: Gravel lanes are a considerable issue in St. Boniface and St. Vital, and Council has to find a solution. I believe this program can help us find one. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Yes, yes. Councillor Allard, you'd like to speak to the item?

Councillor Allard: Yes, I just like to commend Councillor Mayes for speaking French for one and also to just to reiterate that the gravel lanes are huge problem in St. Boniface Ward and what's great about this asphalting program. It's new and with the local improvement process empowers communities to better their conditions, their infrastructure conditions. Reading the report, I see that there is brand new dollars coming in from the private sector and the form of new revenues and that the residents choose to take on with these projects so I think it's a very positive initiative and I'd like to see it growing in future. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Lukes. Do you with to close?

Councillor Lukes: I was ready for lots of questions on this and I prepared many notes on it and I haven't got any questions but I guess thank you for now, I'm sure they'll come. There was some items in here that I thought we ended up speaking to that I guess we will be speaking going forward these items will go through, but we will have Energy East discussions I'm sure. Much on our agenda in the coming year, in the coming months, due to a desire to convert a gas line into an oil line, we've got a…I just want to touch on some of them that I think are large dollar values that.…

Madam Speaker: It's just an opportunity to close on this item.

Councillor Lukes: Pardon me?

Madam Speaker: It's just an opportunity for you to close on this item, a local improvement.

Councillor Lukes: Close on it. Sorry. Sorry, process.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Sorry. So, all in…would you like to say anything more about the item as you close?

Councillor Lukes: No. It's all right.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you. Move on to By-laws, Councillor Lukes. Pardon me. We do have one motion, that's right. I've forgotten this motion. It's been such a long day.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,

WHEREAS Canada Post must take responsibility for their facilities installed in the public boulevards like any other property owner adjacent to the public boulevard;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service:

A) Establish a definition for Canada Post's community mail box installations as property that is adjacent to the public boulevard and define the property owners responsibilities regarding the adjacent public property in the relevant by-law and policies and;

B) Create a protocol and amend any policy or by-law to install no parking / loading zones on roadways adjacent to community mail boxes, to be paid for by Canada Post to make their property and service accessible to the users and;

C) Clarify the responsibility of Canada Post to clear any snow windrows around community mail box installations, in the same manner home owners must do with any snow windrows that block their walkway to the street.

Madam Speaker: Yes. We have a motion, No. 2 in front of you all. Was it circulated, Mr. Clerk? Yeah. Motion 2 from Councillor Eadie and myself and it's regarding Canada Post mail boxes. It will be an automatic referral to Public Works. Now, we will move on to By-laws. Councillor Lukes.

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

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law No. 123/2014, By-law No. 124/2014 and Bylaw No. 140/2014.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 123, 124 and 140/2014.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I'd like to move that By-laws No.123/2014, 124/2014 and 140/2014 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws numbered 123, 124 and 140/2014.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: And I'd like to move that the rule be suspended and By-laws numbered 123/2014, 124/2014 and 140/2014 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question Period for Councillor Lukes. That's good. She has a lot of reference material there so she's eager. Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: As a matter of fact, Speaker Sharma, in her, she began off, I believe it was in, when they first announced this transition of a pipe to carry the bitumen from Alberta that goes right by Shoal Lake, which is where we get our water from. Madam Speaker, I moved that motion, I can't remember who seconded it, but I'm wondering if Councillor Lukes could, Madam Speaker, could let us know what's been happening in that regard and my specific issue with it was, were they being ordered to carry enough liability for the kind of disaster that could possibly happen to our water?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much for your question Councillor Eadie.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Sorry. Thank you very much. Actually what's happening right now, this money that we are passing to move forward on is to start doing, preparing and working with specialists to understand the proposed pipeline design and its impacts and risks and exploring all the available options and alternatives and actively start protecting the City of Winnipeg's critical assets. We have to do this to be in a position to respond during the regulatory approval stages of this pipeline, so what's happened is Energy East has given the intent back in the summer and the broad outline of what they were considering and mid-September they released more details around their intent, so now we must prepare our response and present it to the National Energy Board, and that's going to be occurring mid-summer, and we'll have a much better idea at that point during our research and what we're going to be doing in preparing for the response, so we will know liabilities and such during this next process.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I did see two hands up on this side. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Was there anything else that the Councillor wanted to speak to? She was very eager, and was there anything? No

Councillor Wyatt: Was there any?

Madam Speaker: Here's your opportunity.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker. No, you know what, all of this that I'm very passionate about, is very interesting and if anyone has questions they can ask me. I won't go on about it. It's a long day and there's still a lot to cover so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Last winter, Madam Speaker, we had a very harsh winter and we're now into this winter. One of the issues that arose was a difficulty of the City keeping sidewalks plowed and ensuring that the City's fleet was operational. Could you, if you don't have this information now and you need to get it, it's not a problem, but would we be able to find out what steps the department of Public Works have taken to ensure that we don't re-live what happened last year with regards to sidewalk snow removal.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, Councillor Wyatt. Last year as you know was an extreme winter condition. I think we had a lot of challenges. I saw them myself first-handedly. We have Public Works right now working on actually a plan that they will come forward to every Councillor and go through even more specific areas for sidewalk and snow removal. I think that it's all that I can say on this right now. I can pursue this further but in light of the fact of last winter and in light of the fact that they are working on this plan and will be coming forward with it to review with Councillors, I hope for now that answers your question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third question?

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the fact that we're in the winter now, hopefully they will be in touch with us soon and the plan will be soon and in light of the changes we made for snow clearing in September, adding more snow clearing on sidewalks, that'd be great.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, Madam Speaker, I actually asked the Director of Public Works when that would be and he said it would be very soon. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, am I to understand that a representative from the Department of Public Works will contact me to review this issue personally with me?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, yes. Councillor Schreyer, personally, someone from Public Works will be giving you this report of recommendations based on 311 calls, based on their analysis and before it goes forward they will be talking to you personally to review it with you and see if you've got any additional input, shortly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question?

Councillor Schreyer: I thank the Councillor for her explanation of this process, which is new to me.

Madam Speaker: …for process. Question Period is for questions. Are there any other questions? Okay, we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. Councillor Morantz on the report dated November 20th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED NOVEMBER 20, 2014

Madam Speaker: Would you like to introduce the report? You have one item.

Councillor Morantz: Yes. I will introduce the Financial Status Report and Forecast to September 30, 2014.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have no motions or by-laws. Question Period for Councillor Morantz. Councillor Wyatt.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Wyatt: Again, thank you Madam Speaker. Again, I know the Councillor is definitely taking in a lot of information. Him and I've had some very good discussions, and if you don't have the information now but to get back to us. In the last couple of years we've attempted to, prior to the Capital Budget, bring forward reports to on projects, specifically road projects, regional road projects, so that we could issue tenders early in the year to get those projects out as soon as possible. We are now confronted as well with the challenge of a Provincial Government that is spending more on capital than ever before and that drives up our costs of projects, especially if our tenders are late getting out. Normally we try to get the report out through November or December. Has the department indicated anything to do at this point in terms of a report coming forward, ideally now, I guess January, prior to a Capital Budget, to get these projects moving since they were in the five-year forecast?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank Councillor Wyatt for his question and I'll have to take that matter under advisement and respond to him later.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Anything further for the Chair? Okay. Seeing none we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management. Councillor Mayes on the report dated November 27th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 27, 2014

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce the report dated November 27, 2014, Items 1 and 2 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour of Items 1 and 2? Contrary? Carried. Question Period for Councillor Mayes. Any questions? Okay. Seeing none, I move that Councillor Gillingham moves that Council will adjourn now. Okay. Merry Christmas, happy holidays and happy birthday to my husband today. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Dobson, Eadie, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer and Wyatt.

Council adjourned at 4:47 p.m.