COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, February 22, 2018

The Council met at 9:37 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor 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.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I would like to at this time recognize our pages that are with us here today. Anna Kozak, who attends Oak Park High School and resides in the Charleswood-Tuxedo Whyte Ridge Ward and also Max Thompson who attends St. Boniface Diocesan College and resides in St. Boniface Ward. Thank you both for joining us and for serving Council. Before we get into the morning announcements, I would like to put some remarks on the record regarding our current City Clerk, Richard Kachur, who is retiring on March 2nd, 2018. I would like to recognize in the gallery his parents, Mr. And Mrs. Jay. Kachur, his lovely wife, Danielle and also a few members of the City Clerk's Department. Mr. Kachur is the longest serving City Clerk in Winnipeg, since Unicity and the second longest serving City Clerk in the City's history. I know that I speak for all members of Council when I note that the City Clerk's Department under the leadership of Richard Kachur, has provided Council, senior administration and members of the public with the highest level of products and services. You are a true leader, Mr. Kachur. You have set up your team for future success by working in a collaborative, supportive manner, maintaining an open door policy with all staff across your department, regardless of their position. You have set the bar very, very high and you should be proud of your record of service to the City of Winnipeg. I wish you much happiness in your next chapter in life, your retirement. Thank you for your dedicated long service to the City of Winnipeg. It is an outstanding record of achievement. Congratulations to you. And I know the Mayor would also like to put some remarks on the record. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, I do have some more formal remarks later. I will just echo our Speaker's comments of appreciation. Thanks for the work that you have done. I want to obviously welcome and thank your family for being here. I know it's...these roles are demanding and the role of Clerk is demanding. So I want to acknowledge and thank you for your leadership, all of your efforts over many years and in a few moments I will have a little bit more to say. Thank you

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I would like to recognize our Deputy City Clerk to read a special motion in honour of you, Mr. Kachur, and your legacy here at the City of Winnipeg

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Sharma,
Seconded by All Members of Council,

WHEREAS Richard Gordon Frank Kachur, previously a Planning Analyst with the Provincial Government, was appointed to the role of Deputy City Clerk on August 17, 1992;

AND WHEREAS Richard Kachur was appointed to the position of City Clerk by the City of Winnipeg Council on February 9, 2001, becoming Winnipeg's 16th City Clerk;

AND WHEREAS Richard has faithfully served City Council and the City of Winnipeg for over 25 years;

AND WHEREAS over those 25 years, Richard has served 64 members of Council and including 5 different Mayors;

AND WHEREAS with almost 17 years as City Clerk, Richard is the longest serving City Clerk since the commencement of Unicity in 1972 and the 2nd longest serving City Clerk in Winnipeg's history, behind only Charles James Brown Jr., who served as City Clerk for 43 years starting in 1883;

AND WHEREAS Richard has announced that he will be leaving his position as of March 2, 2018 to a well-deserved retirement spoiling his family and soon to be 3 grandchildren;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this City Council express its admiration and appreciation to Richard for his many years of service to Council and the Citizens of Winnipeg and that he take with him Council's best wishes for a long, healthy and happy retirement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Congratulations, Richard. Mr. Mayor, on to you for your morning remarks.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do have a few remarks this morning. Firstly, welcome to all those that are joining us in the gallery and those that are watching on television or via Livestream and welcome to the second Council meeting of 2018. And the last one, as we have recently...or just now acknowledged, the last one for our retiring City Clerk, Mr. Richard Kachur. Richard, through the Speaker, I obviously want to echo our appreciation and thanks for your many years of dedicated service. You have survived five mayors, many councils, many civic elections and you have managed to do it all while keeping a smile on your face. You have been a valuable resource for all of us here in the chamber today as well as in the past and have consistently provided thoughtful council on important matters of process and procedure. You will certainly be missed but we do want to wish you all the very best in retirement. Please enjoy the time with your family, your grandchildren, friends and like many Winnipeggers, the lake. Thanks again, Richard and all the best. I was very pleased to once again help kick off the Winnipeg Police Service Half Marathon earlier this month. Registration is now open for the event which takes place on May 6th, rain, snow or sun. This is a wonderful event for the city that demonstrates how police officers in Winnipeg not only protect our streets and our citizens but invest their personal time in making the city a better place for us all to live. And, of course, it raises money to support brain cancer research through the Canadian Cancer Society. And I would encourage all members of Council and all Winnipeggers to consider participating and/or donating. February, Madam Speaker, is the month in which we recognize the progress, richness and the diversity of achievements and contributions of blacks in Canada and around the world through Black History Awareness Month. It's also a time to reflect on the issues and difficulties that were faced and continue to be faced within the black community. It was great to recognize and celebrate the achievement and contributions of black Canadians earlier this month together with Nadia Thompson, Chair of the Black History Month Committee. We should all be very proud that we live in a city and a country where we can and do cherish coming together to celebrate all of the ethnicity, religion and language that makes us so unique and at the same time, recognize we are equals together when we unite in celebration. Diversity is strength, Madam Speaker, and this is more true today than it has ever been. Madam Speaker, I was also pleased to host an all-party gathering of our Indigenous Accord members a couple of weeks ago. It was a great turnout and I am continually inspired by the support from our community. I was able to welcome Investors Group as a signatory to the accord. As a large employer in Winnipeg, it's great to have Investors Group join so many others in signing up as partners to the Indigenous Accord, and I'll take this opportunity to encourage all Winnipeggers, all organizations in this city of Winnipeg, to join with members of Council and the City of Winnipeg in becoming signatories to the accord and I would extend that invitation to all members of the private sector, not-for-profit, academic institutions and even media or news organizations to join us in our collective journey to reconciliation. Madam Speaker, I attend the Big City Mayor's Caucus meeting in Ottawa recently where we discussed infrastructure, cannabis, mental health issues and the opioid and crystal meth issues and crisis, very productive meeting once again. Madam Speaker, in Winnipeg, February wouldn't be complete without Louis Riel Day and Festival du Voyageur. I hope everyone found time to celebrate Louis Riel Day with family and friends. Festival continues for a couple more days. This beloved winter celebration is a tremendous opportunity to step back in time and discover our pride in Métis and Franco-Manitoban roots. Our voyageur history is something all Winnipeggers can appreciate and take pride in and if time permits, I certainly encourage you to take some of the sights, sounds and smells of this year's Festival. I also want to acknowledge the organization of our Acting Deputy Mayor, Councillor Allard. I was pleased to participate with him in the Wild Winter Canoe Race on the river. Only in Winnipeg would you have a canoe race in February on frozen ice. And I want to commend and thank all those who helped organize. It was interesting, I was just commenting with a Council colleague, he was trying to veer the canoe left, I tried to veer it right and we ended up settling somewhere in between. It was a great and symbolic physical activity. So that's all for my opening comments, thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Allard to speak about Festival.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you.

Translation of French Spoken: 9:48:26 – 9:49:53

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Allard. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, I'll just try and be brief Madam Speaker. I'm wearing my Dan Vandal miniature boutonniere, a ceinture flèchée, in honour of the Festival, going to a dinner tonight. Very briefly, when I was a candidate in 2011 for the

first time, I criticized the City Clerk's conduct to the by-election. When I was a candidate I called up Councillor Orlikow, who I knew a bit from volunteering on his 2009/2010 campaign, and he gave me very good advice, three sentences; what are you doing? These people are your friends. These people have gotten me out of all sorts of jams, the City Clerk. Do not piss these people off. They are your friends. Very good…I didn't agree on everything Councillor Orlikow did, but on that, it turned out excellent advice, indeed. When I succeeded in the by-election, I apologized to the Clerks, nobody missed a beat, and we've had a wonderful relationship. I wish our Clerk very well in retirement and I'm very glad I took the advice of my colleague, Councillor Orlikow. I learned to be friends and respect the Clerks and not be at odds with them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. We have a leave of absence motion for Councillor Wyatt before us. Mr. Clerk, would you read it into the record.

Clerk: Moved by Councillor Schreyer, seconded by Councillor Browaty, that Councillor Wyatt be granted a leave absence from today's meeting due to a personal family matter.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

MINUTES

Councillor Allard moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on January 25th, 2018, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into delegations. If Mr. Garth Steek could please come forward. He is in opposition to Item 2 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 13th, 2018. It's regarding the Deacon Water Treatment Plant Deficiencies Review. Following that, we'll hear from Mr. Gord Delbridge. We'll have ten minutes on the clock. Welcome Mr. Steek.

DELEGATIONS

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, thank you. Madam Speaker, might I have just 30 seconds to address Mr. Kachur before I'm on the clock?

Madam Speaker: Absolutely.

Garth Steek: Mr. Kachur, on behalf of the citizens of Winnipeg, I think it's well known that Whitman wrote, "Life, the powerful play goes on and you may contribute a verse, what will your verse be?" The verse that you have written has been direct and unambiguous. It has been a verse of rare eloquence. Your career has been one of exemplary service and exceptional achievement. It's wonderful to see Danielle here today. I'm sure your parents are extraordinarily proud as all parents would be. In conclusion, thank you Richard and many, many happy years in front of you. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your kind remarks.

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, members of Council, bureaucrats. This clause demands an external audit. When bureaucrats review bureaucrats, they protect bureaucrats. The omissions in this report are rife and they are startling. It's fascinating when you read the report that there's absolutely no reference whatsoever to the City Solicitor. Why not? The City Solicitor would have had the ultimate responsibility for this file. This file did not fall into the lap or a litigator without oversight. And yet, when you read this review, the City Solicitor is never referenced. The City Solicitor never appeared at Executive Policy Committee on the 13th of February. Why not? Last night I watched the Executive Policy Committee of the 13th, it's a fascinating meeting Madam Speaker. I don't know Mr. Jack, but I assume from the daft way that he handled the questioning from Councillor Gillingham that he must be a lawyer. He explained that in this particular situation, there were 10 defendants and because defendants finish their work at different times throughout the project that the statute of limitations would vary throughout the entirety of the process. Furthermore, Councillor Gillingham asked him why Public Works didn't have anything to say about this. And the response from Mr. Jack was, you'll have to wait till the next report comes down from Public Works. I'd like to recognize Councillor Gillingham because in watching Executive Policy Committee, he was the only member of that committee that saw fit to even ask a question about this extraordinary set of circumstances. If you go to Minute 25 of that meeting, Madam Speaker, and watch those questions, at Minute 30, it's all over. Neither the Mayor, nor any members of Executive Policy Committee made a

statement about this. How can that be? How can that be? Maybe nobody thinks it's important. I can tell you the citizens of Winnipeg do. But what was the most glaring deficiency in this report? Well, the report, Madam Speaker, makes no reference to the fact that the bureaucrats did not have any communication with members of Council. Why? Could it be that they thought the issue was too complex for you? Maybe they thought you weren't bright enough to handle the load. Or maybe some of the elite members of the bureaucracy simply thought that this particular file should be handled by the bureaucrats and they were the ones who should be running the City. It's incredible to think that none of you on two terms starting from 2012 through to 2017 were alerted to what was happening on this file. In 2012, Legal Services were notified there were problems. In '13, Risk Management was notified. And in the interim period, nothing happens. Furthermore, in view of all the media around this thing in 2015, why did no member of this Council come forward and question what was going on? I phoned a member of Council and I said, when you look at the problems in this water treatment plant, why aren't you going down to see what happens? And the response was, the bureaucrats would never let me in. How incredible. How incredible. You know, when you look at this report, one of the fascinating things about it, it says on page 6 I think it is here, there are no implications…there are no implications for receiving this report as information. I would argue there's a lot of implications. If you read the administrative report prior to this whole thing blowing up, it says point blank, we expect…or at least, $13 million in damages. Furthermore, we're going to have to hire outside consultants. So one of the major deficiencies in this report, nobody talks about the fact that what this thing is going to cost the citizens of Winnipeg. So what's it going to cost? Let's just use that bare bones number of $30 million, well $30 million, and I assume they're not stroking a cheque for it, $30 million repaid over 40 years at 4% is $60.2 million. And for those of you that are road warriors, $30 million alone would pave 4500 residential blocks at $665,000 apiece. I noticed in reading the report that you went to outside counsel. Why is the Hill Sokalski report not attached to this document as an addendum? Why do we not know how much it cost? How many of you have seen it? How many of you have read it? How many of you are perplexed by the fact that there seems to be no accountability here whatsoever? The other fascinating aspect of this, Madam Speaker, is when you read the report in its entirety, nowhere, nowhere, does the CAO come under review. Why not? This report came out under the hands of Mr. Jack, finalized by the CAO. How is it possible that the CAO does not bear ultimate responsibility on this file? Madam Speaker, is this CAO the same CAO who knew nothing about what transpired on Route 4? Is the same CAO who did not file quarterly reports as per his contract? It's astonishing. This report is condescending, it's arrogant, it smacks of incompetence. Madam Speaker, truth must speak to power. The truth is like a line, you don't have to defend it, you unleash it and it will defend itself courageously, heroically and in some instances, will have mercy. I'm hoping that in the question period, Madam Speaker, whether it be the Mayor or somebody in Executive Policy Committee, who clearly is a lot brighter than I am, can explain to me how it is that nobody, nobody on Council was informed by Public Works about what was happening here. Somebody explain to me that something I've said here is not factual. And finally, somebody explain to me why the CAO does not bear the ultimate responsibility on this file. If you had to come up with $30 million tomorrow and you couldn't borrow it that would translate to a 6% tax increase across the board. It is absolutely inconceivable that there was not an external audit on this file. The errors and the omissions on it demand it. Why no external audit? Is somebody here not perplexed by what has happened on this file? This about this, by '14 and '15, you couldn't even file and yet there was a mad dash to file. When you drop the statement of claim on the desk of the Chair of Public Works and told her to sign it with no explanation, how is that open, transparent and accountable? It's reprehensible and it's a breakdown. Once again Madam Speaker, through you, I see I'm down to my last minute.

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

Garth Steek: Someone on this Council has to be a leader. It is inconceivable at Executive Policy Committee that nobody raised their voice other than the current Chair of Finance. We're looking for somebody to lead us out of this wilderness. Hopefully the Chair of Finance will ask to see that report from Hill Sokalski. Make it a public document. You can delete the names of the lawyers in it, but what I'm having trouble in understanding is why at the meeting of Executive Policy Committee was the City Solicitor not there. Why the CFO not there explaining what the financial ramifications of this thing were. It's appalling, there's no other word for it. And you know what, we're going to the polls in October of '18. The citizens of Winnipeg will not forget this and I will promise you this, just as we were able to find out a great deal about what happened on Route 4 through access the information, we'll find out what the communications were between Legal Services, the Mayor's Office, the CAO's Office. Somebody in this room knows what was happened. Why between 2013 and 2015 is the file silent when you're in the period where you should be filing statements of claim? Madam Speaker, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Steek. We'll take any questions for our delegation. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you, I'll just take some issue with the inferences drawn with regards to the City Auditor. The City Auditor is appointed by all members of Council, acts independent in the work that is passed by Council to review matters as charged by this Council. I'm pleased to hear the delegate speak about accountability and why audits are important. I've read reports in the past about his unsuccessful campaign for mayor and the fact that he didn't file an audited report and was ultimately had to repay for personal expenses. I'm just

wondering if there's truth to those reports and if perhaps he can explain to us, since he's here today speaking about the importance of audits and accountability, why he failed to follow the rules when he was a candidate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Mr. Steek?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, through you to the Mayor, first of all, let me say this about the Auditor, I didn't impugn the Auditor's reputation in any way, shape or form. I do know here though, Mr. Mayor, that the Auditor did not come forward with reference to Item 2. There's no question about that. With reference to my own particular circumstances, yes, there were expenses that the City Clerk deemed had to be repaid and they were repaid.

Madam Speaker: Second question Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, my question was, did you fail to file an audited report as required under the rules or not?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Steek?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, that is correct. I was one of a number of candidates who didn't and it was a case of it was not without precedent. Was I incorrect in not doing so? Absolutely.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. It's a basically a 'did you know', while councillors were refused an examination of the plant to check out the problems later on, did…I'm wondering if it was ever explained, Madam Speaker, to Mr. Steek that a number of councillors were taken on a tour, I can't remember exactly when, prior to this other attempt. And the department was clear and open about some of the definite problems that they discovered with the Deacon Water Plant. So I'm just asking…I heard, Madam Speaker, our delegate talk about being refused but…and nothing being explained. So I'm wondering if he's aware that the department did allow us to go on a tour. They explained the problems at the time that they knew of and that was prior to the '14 election.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question. Mr. Steek?

Garth Steek: I'm not 100% certain on this question, but I'm going to do my best. When I spoke to the member of Council about this issue, it was well before the timeframe for filing statements of claim. All statements of claim had lapsed. There may have been something subsequent, councillor, but I guess the question is, when this thing was going so badly off the tracks in 2012/2013 and thereafter, why were you not contacted then by Public Works? The horse was already out of the barn when you went to review the plan.

Madam Speaker: Second question Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, while I appreciate that there have been a number of problems that have happened around the Deacon Water Plant and the deficiencies from the people we relied contracted, Madam Speaker, but Madam Speaker, I'm wondering…the question is basically, when the delegation was a City councillor, was any councillor or any mayor consistently staying on top and actually working directly on a file related to any other construction problems?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Steek?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, through you to the councillor, I can tell you this councillor, that when Red River College was going up, we were actively involved in going over and seeing what was going on. There weren't problems on the site, but nevertheless, we were interested in what was a $5 million project at the time and we went and saw it. I can't speak to the kind of problems that have been…you've incurred subsequent to my time here but I will tell you that the mess on this is without parallel.

Madam Speaker: Final question Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the delegation believes that any member of Council should day-to-day spend time working on a whole bunch of problems across a billion dollar operation?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Steek?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Eadie, when you're aware of the fact that there are problems on a file, the answer is a definitive yes, because unless I misunderstand the Charter, it's your job to create policy. It's the

responsibility of the bureaucrats to implement it. And if something is going sideways and you're aware of it, yes you should be involved.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Lukes: More of a 'did you know'. Did you know that in 2009 documents alleged that the plant had a series of failures in 2009? And that to this very day, we have no report at all on what deficiencies have occurred at the treatment plant. Are you aware of that?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes, I'm aware now, but having stated that, when you look at this report, there's clearly a great deal of communications between the Public Works Department, Legal Services and Risk Management. Why has there not been a definitive report outlining the cost? The administrative report that I referenced talked about a minimum of $30 million in damages. So what's the number really? You have no clue. And here it is, something that was completed in 2009, we're now in 2018, 9 years later, Madam Speaker, and you still don't have definitive information. Will you be getting it at Public Works? Will somebody here be demanding it?

Madam Speaker: Second question Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Again, this is more of 'are you aware'. Are you aware in November after we had many discussions on this and called for an audit that in November at the Public Works committee meeting I had asked for the department to produce a report in November. And at our last committee meeting, it was yet again delayed. Hopefully we'll have it at the upcoming meeting. Are you aware of that?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Steek?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes, in view of the delay tactics and the omissions in this report, one can only hope you're going to get it. And it's going to be incumbent on you, obviously, to stay all over it as a file.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Also an 'are you aware question', are you aware the department has made it possible for councillors to tour the water treatment plant numerous times during this term of office?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Steek?

Garth Steek: You know, I apologize, the audio wasn't that good, was the question was I aware that there was the opportunity to tour the plant?

Madam Speaker: That's correct, for members of City Council.

Garth Steek: I'm only aware of the fact that you started touring the plant post the meltdown on the statements of claim. And I guess the question then is, in view of the fact that everything was going sideways and you're on EPC, did you go through this plant prior to 2015?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'm not sure, I mean, the secrecy was such that we were Tweeting all about it and it was all over social media, so I'm not sure there was a great secrecy agenda here. But my question is, you apparently don't believe me, but Councillor Gillingham was part of the group that went to the water treatment plant, so I just want to be clear, you are aware, despite having said earlier, that accounts are reported to the bureaucrats would never let us go to the plant, that's what you said earlier, factual statement, the bureaucrats would never let us go. You are aware that the staff not only allowed councillors to go, but in fact, invited and encouraged and on multiple occasions made it possible for councillors during this term of office to visit the plant. You are conceding that point that you had misstated the facts when you said that you were not…the bureaucrats made it impossible for councillors to visit the plant, you are now agreeing that is not the case. Is that correct?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, through you, I stated the fact that the councillor I spoke to told me point blank the answer was no. Now, I ask you a question, did you tour that plant prior to the statement of claim fiasco?

Madam Speaker: That concludes question period for this delegate. Councillor Schreyer moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Two minutes on the clock please.

Councillor Gilroy: Point of order, the vote…can we hear the counts of the vote?

Madam Speaker: People need to speak up.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, fair enough, fair enough.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour of a two minute extension? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Mayes was it, no. Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. Is it possible…I wanted to know if…first of all, I feel inadequate as a new member of Council on this given the way former Councillor Steek has made his presentation. But I do want to ask the question, is it possible that we would learn something substantial, we would not need an external audit if the Hill Sokalski report was to be published, if it were to be made public?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Schreyer, I don't know what the Hill Sokalski report says but I certainly think it's a great starting point. Having stated that, in view of what's transpired on this file, Councillor Orlikow and the CAO at the time at Executive Policy Committee said they would be supportive of an external audit. Why would you not go an external audit to make absolutely certain this file is sanitized?

Madam Speaker: Second question Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: It may be because of the cost, and I know that's not the only issue here when it comes to, well, we'll leave that for another time, but Councillor Steek made the point that we won't…we don't know what the cost is of this but sure we'll end up knowing by a future budget.

Madam Speaker: Your question Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Would Councillor Steek agree with that that sooner or later it hits a budget?

Garth Steek: One of the members of City Council used to have a phrase he used here all the time, Madam Speaker, when he was asked a question when you wanted a timeline, and his response was, "You'll learn in the fullness of time", which meant never. No, I don't believe you're going to find out the full details on this thing. If you do an external audit you'll drill down and you'll find out what the final costs are.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes question period. Thank you for your presence at Council. Next is Mr. Gord Delbridge. If you could please come forward, we'll have ten minutes on the clock. Mr. Delbridge is the President of the Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 500. He is in support of Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment, the report dated February 1st, 2018. It's regarding the Pilot Project, the Multi-Family Solid Waste Collection Services Provided by City Staff. Welcome.

Gord Delbridge: Thank you and thank you for this opportunity to come up and present to you today. I as well would like to acknowledge Richard and his years of dedicated service to the citizens of Winnipeg and wish him all the best in his future on behalf of CUPE. So this is a nice change, you know, for me to be here today to present in favour of a recommendation. I know that's typically not the case. Hopefully we'll see more of that, but I do sincerely think this is a step in the right direction. It's a small step, but it is a step in the right direction. We know that, you know, right across the country, bringing garbage collection and waste collection services back in-house is a trend that is very favourable in the sense that it's seen as a more cost effective means and improved efficiency. Quite often we tout what the Ottawa model and we know that in 2006 the City of Ottawa brought solid waste services, garbage and blue backs…blue box, back in-house. Contracted in in one of six zones in 2011, the City announced that an independent auditor's report found that the in-house services had saved more than $5 million in four years. In 2009, the City of Ottawa City Auditors from Ottawa reported that the attributed savings using public services…using public employees to make significant improvements to the quality of service as well as cost. This goes beyond just Ottawa. This is happening, you know, right across the country we, you know, as recently in Hamilton since the amalgamation it has its own employees doing garbage collection in half the city in private contractors and the other half the City's operation has consistently been more economically efficient than contractors even though the City employees serve the majority…or I guess it's about 50/50 there in Hamilton. We see in many other areas across Ontario that are bringing this work back in-house. Quite often, you know, it's touted where it's brought up in municipalities across the country on cost savings. They often referred to the outsourcing fiasco in Winnipeg as why not to outsource garbage collection. So we know that this is a trend where this is

happening, it's (inaudible) straight across the country. And so, you know, once again I say, this is a step in the right direction. I hope this is going to give us an opportunity to, you know, get a good cost analysis and we have to look at it in every aspect and I think we have to do a very thorough review. I know that's been mentioned before in the past. We need to look at the economic impact that when we outsource this type of work to organizations that are based in other parts of the country and we're taking multi-million dollar contracts and the impact that has on our economy when hundreds of millions of dollars are leaving our economy to go to these organizations. We know that the work being done in-house is…that money is spent by the employees that are doing the work non-profit. It's spent here locally in our economy which is better for our economy, local business and does most certainly strengthen our economy. We want to have good jobs here in Winnipeg. We've seen some of the fiascos that we've had with previous garbage collection contracts and the exploitation of workers and the negative image that that's given us. I think we've made some improvements with the last garbage collection contract. We've put, you know, more stringent factors to ensure that we wouldn't be in that position once again. We know that it's more costly when we put those kind of factors in place to ensure that people are being treated with some dignity and there's appropriate health and safety provisions that we ensure with the last contract. As a result, which I'm glad to see, we know that the workers now are being treated with some dignity. They're paid significantly more. As a matter of fact, actually even paid more with the current garbage collection contract than the same classification would be if the work was to be done in-house, which we're glad to see that these workers are being paid more even when you take into consideration pension and benefits. So the private contractors currently that we awarded their main garbage collection contract to, the labour costs are higher. We were initially told that that was one of the reasons why we couldn't bring that work in-house because of the labour cost, but we know now, that those labour costs are higher even when you take into consideration pension and benefits. So we're confident that bringing the work back in-house, it's not a labour cost issue, that's been proven. We see that that's taken place and we know that we can, you know, show some efficiencies by providing that work. I would think that even if it cost us more to treat workers with dignity and to provide good quality jobs here in Winnipeg, even if it cost more, I don't know why you wouldn't do that, but I mean, if we could do it at a cost savings, that's a step in the right direction. This gives us good opportunity to prove this firsthand. I think once again, like I said, it's going to be better for our economy. We know this is what Winnipeggers want. We did polling and we knew that a majority of Winnipeggers wanted to see garbage collection done in-house. So here we're listening to Winnipeggers. This is a step in the right direction. And I want to thank you all for your support on this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Delbridge. We'll now take questions. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. Mr. Delbridge mentioned that, I'm not sure whether it was members of the administration or city hall in general, I guess, had mentioned that outsourcing was more efficient because if it wasn't…if it was done in-house it…the labour costs were higher. Mr. Delbridge then said that it was accepted here at city hall, that was not the case. I'm wondering if Mr. Delbridge could expand on that on how or why or when it was realized here at city hall that it is not an inefficiency to do things in-house when it comes to these type of services.

Gord Delbridge: So in reference to the labour cost to the current, the most recent main garbage collection contract that was contracted out to GFL and Miller, we were looking at…we were looking at the job postings and the job bulletins for the classifications to fill the positions that they need. When we compared with our classifications of the work if it was to be done in-house, they're paid significantly more. So then we thought, well, let's take a look at the…let's take a look at the pension and benefits. Well even when we took into account pension and benefits, we're still more affordable on labour costs than what it would be by the contractor.

Madam Speaker: Second question Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: What was the reaction by members of the administration or the appropriate standing committee to this information?

Gord Delbridge: I don't see much of a reaction. I think that, I mean, we can look around the room, you can see the reaction but I mean, at the end of the day, I think what needs to be realized is we're taking a step now in the right direction where we're going to, you know, get these actual figures, we're going to have an opportunity to do a cost comparison and I think that, you know, that's going to be presented to Council. And there's going to be no dispute. You know, as far as, you know, the labour costs being higher by the current contractors, that's not a bad thing. I mean, we always encourage, we want to see workers being treated with dignity. We want to see good quality jobs here in Winnipeg. I don't think that that's the route to go is just looking for the lowest tender. We tried that once before. We've seen the exploitation of the workers and the health and safety violations and the way those workers were treated. I think we did make a step in the right direction of going to the RFP model. As a result, when we equaled the playing field and wanted to have standards that would be similar to what we'd expect of our own employees and CUPE members, if they were to be doing that work, we found that the labour costs are actually higher. You have to take into consideration that when the work is done in-house it's done non-profit. They have a profit that they have to take into consideration and

there's many, many other factors that have to be taken into consideration. So it's no surprise that it's more costly. And you know, it's not the labour cost at all. But once again, by you know, taking on this opportunity this way to bring some of this work back in-house, this gives us a, you know, a clear example that we can compare and we can take a look at that which I'm confident we're going to be able to see those results.

Madam Speaker: Final question Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. But doesn't the City have an obligation to consult with Mr. Delbridge and the City workers when it came to the initial contract of the two zones? Did they not actually have a chartered obligation or a regulatory obligation to consult with them directly on that one as well?

Gord Delbridge: Well I can tell you when the initial contract, which when it was awarded, there was no consultation with CUPE. We had constantly requested and we had asked for that. As a result, you know, I think that there was an amendment made to the motion at that point in time that all future collection contracts would be consulted and as a result, we've been doing that. And we've been having those consultations with the Director of Water and Waste and their staff there. I can tell you that those discussions have gone very well. And you know, I think that's how we've gotten to this point of where we're at today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. I have question in regards to my original motion about bringing bulky waste and Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if our delegate can explain to me why this was dropped as an idea of bringing in-house the bulky waste collection.

Gord Delbridge: The way it was kind of recommended and presented to us, of course, we feel that, you know, all these services would be better served, you know, to the citizens of Winnipeg if the work was done in-house. But I guess, the way it was explained to me was that the consistency of the work with multi-family bin collection would be a better cost comparison…comparator than the bulky waste bins. The bulky waste work is fairly sporadic in it would be hard to get the, you know, an accurate cost analysis on doing that comparison. At the end of the day, you know, our position was and we'd been pushing for it for that bulky waste for it to come in-house as well as we think that, you know, core services should be done non-profit and in-house and they shouldn't be outsourced. I think in every example of where we outsourced any work in this area has turned out to be a problem whether it's the way workers were treated over the…and the exploitation over the last contract. The improvements then when we went to try to address those by awarding it to GFL and Miller, we've seen that we've addressed those concerns, but the costs were significantly higher. So at every avenue, as much as we're trying to dodge and trying to bring this back in-house, I think at every angle it's just not working for us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if through the research that CUPE 500's done in the area of garbage if they had found in Calgary and Ottawa, is that…does those cities find it cheaper to have bulky waste collected by public workers? Did you find any information out about that?

Gord Delbridge: Specifically on bulky waste, I know in Calgary…I know all of that work is done in-house. The reason they do that is because they want to be able to have the flexibility. They know that there's cost efficiencies. I think it's well known right across the country now that the trend is to bring waste collection services back in-house at a cost savings. And efficiencies, I've mentioned before, that I've heard from other CUPE Locals right across the country, that have mentioned that it's been brought up at their council meetings where when they start talking about outsourcing they often refer to the fiasco and problems that Winnipeg has had by outsourcing garbage collection. We're kind of used an example of what not to do.

Madam Speaker: Final question Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just to make sure, I think you mentioned it, but just so…remind everybody, what are your concerns regarding the report matching a two year pilot against the seven year contract and how do you think we as a city should approach doing that at a cost evaluation?

Gord Delbridge: Once again, you know, I think it's a step in the right direction. Typically the reason it's gone to seven years is because I guess it's been heard from the private contractors that in order to amortize the cost of equipment and the lifespan being about seven years, that's why they request a seven year contract and so that they can maximize the value of the equipment. We're going to a two year. I think, like I said, it's a step in the right direction. We're going to have

to do some…we'll have to do some…get crafty with our figuring on, you know, comparing, you know, the work in-house as opposed to outsourced work. It's…there'll be a little bit more of a challenge doing that because two years isn't really a long time to really get an accurate depiction on what those costs are going to be. I know that the contractors are heard when they request the seven years and their reasons why, there's…I understand the rationale behind that. But in this case, it's presented at two years and two years is like I say, it's a step in the right direction anyways.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, 48 seconds.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for the presentation. And to touch on some of what's…I'll try and be one question then. You're aware it's more than just labour costs, there'll be capital cost. There's the challenge, as Councillor Eadie points out, two years, seven years. But we get calls in here about, it's not just the wage rates, it's, you know, what about the pension. You should be putting in the cost of the vehicles. So keep these ready to go and to do those sorts of analysis, I assume, to look at not just the labour cost, the hourly wage, but the other associated costs and trying to come up with, as you said, something that's comparable.

Gord Delbridge: Absolutely. I think that we need to take…we need to take all costs into consideration. I think often, and I mentioned it is, we need to look at the impact it has on our economy when we start outsourcing and awarding contracts to, you know, to…

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

Gord Delbridge: You know I mean we start awarding multi-million dollar contracts to contractors that are based outside of our province and what kind of economic impact does that have on our local economy when those dollars are leaving our economy. We got to look at all factors when we're looking at what's going to be most cost-effective. We know, once again, that if the work was done in-house, non-profit, that that's a benefit to our local economy and to local business when all of the dollars are being spent here. All aspects need to be looked at, absolutely.

Madam Speaker: Second question Councillor Mayes. With that, that concludes our question period. Thank you for your presence at Council today.

Gord Delbridge: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Madam Deputy Speaker, could I call you up to the Chair please at this time. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: So we are now on the report of the Executive Policy Committee. We'll call on Speaker Devi Sharma.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED FEBRUARY 22, 2018

Councillor Sharma: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I would like to ask for suspension of the rules to change the order of reports before us today and move that we consider the walk-on item from this morning's Executive Policy Committee, the appointment of the new City Clerk. I'd ask that we deal with this now. We have a number of special guests in the gallery; the parents of Mr. Richard Kachur and his wife and members of our City Clerk's Department. So if we could consider this item now so they could be here to witness it, I think Council would be in approval.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Any opposed? It's carried. Madam Speaker.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. It's my pleasure to move Item No. 1 – the Appointment of the City of Winnipeg City Clerk. Our current City Clerk, Richard Kachur, is retiring on March 2nd, 2018. I note that our City Clerk's Department under the leadership of Richard Kachur has been a leader among municipalities in embracing open government, e-government technology, and in the operations of elections. To ensure that our City Clerk's Department continues its leadership and its provision of the highest level of products and services, we have undertaken an extensive recruitment for the new City Clerk position. This position was bulletined on January 19th and closed on February 5th, 2018. The position vacancy was advertised through many avenues; the IIMC, the International Institute of Municipal Clerks, IPAC, which is the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, through the municipal information network, our City's website, our Facebook and Linkedin accounts, as well as Twitter. A total of 61 applications were received. The City's Corporate Staffing and Diversity Branch, Human Resources, screened the applicants and the Governance

Committee interviewed the final contenders. I would like to thank the members of the Governance Committee that sat on the panel; Councillor Browaty, Councillor Dobson and Councillor Gilroy for your work and the time you invested in the recruitment process. I am pleased to move the unanimous recommendation that our current Deputy City Clerk, Marc Lemoine, be appointed as our new City Clerk. Marc Lemoine has a Bachelor's Degree and a Master's Degree in Business Administration. Mr. Lemoine brings us almost 20 years of senior managerial experience and competencies developed in our City Clerk's Department. He has demonstrated knowledge of our City governance structures, processes and rules and legislation. Mr. Lemoine is a comprehensive leader with demonstrated experience in strategic planning and a demonstrated track record of achieving results in a fiscally prudent manner. He also respects diversity, is customer focused, has strong ethics and has earned the respect and trust of all members of Council. I am confident that Mr. Lemoine will lead our City Clerk's Department with great success. Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, you wish to speak?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I'd like to rise to speak to the report from the special meeting through Governance's diligent work in finding us, Madam Deputy Speaker, a new City Clerk that will be able to take us into the future with confidence and excellence. I refrained, I just wanted to quickly mention that…and clearly, Richard Kachur has done great work and as the leader of the Clerk's team, has cultivated and developed many excellent clerks that work within our department, Madam Deputy Speaker. I have to say that over the years I've gotten to know…prior to being elected, Madam Deputy Speaker, I've gotten to know Mr. Kachur as well as Mr. Lemoine. And I have to say that one of the most…things that I'm most appreciative about Mr. Kachur is when I was running for election in 1998, Madam Speaker, Mayor Norrie…it looked like I was going to win. And the former mayor, Mayor Norrie, was stating on the TV that, I don't know how a totally blind person's going to be able to do all that reading, Madam Speaker. And at the time, as the Deputy Clerk, Mr. Kachur was developing what is called the Decision Making Information System. And at that time, I knew that that was being developed as I was following what's going on with the City, Madam Deputy Speaker, and what was really great about it was that it was electronic and with electronic documentation, being able to follow the Council process, it was clear. And you know, there are clerks, there's hiccups, but ultimately, one of those projects, the Decision Making Information System, made it possible for people who are blind to actually become City councillors and actually get that reading done. Although, it could have been done in a more difficult manner in having somebody read every report and having to actually pay them, but ultimately, the efficient, effective, open government at the time, you know, this was the beginnings of this open government, Madam Deputy Speaker, and with Mr. Kachur, I really appreciate that work. But clearly, as budgets have shrunk, Madam Speaker, from the 1990s to today, it just is beyond me and this demonstrates great leadership that Mr. Kachur could actually accomplish all the work that our Clerks Department does and the excellent work that Mr. Lemoine has done. And Mr. Lemoine, my elections became very accessible and Mr. Lemoine was at the crux of finding accessible voting systems for us to be able to, as people who are totally blind, people who are quadriplegic, so on and so forth, being able to vote and participate in the democratic process. And so, Mr. Kachur's team has developed our new City Clerk and I really appreciate the work of our new City Clerk and I know that this is a great appointment and that we can be assured that things are going to run smoothly. And I'm sure that we're having a governance review apparently in the budget, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I think that Mr. Lemoine is the perfect person to be at the head of the Clerks. Although, maybe not actually doing the report, but I'm sure that our Clerks Department have great ideas about how to move forward with governance as they are essential, critical part of that democratic process and sharing of information. Thank you Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you so much Councillor Eadie. Are there any other speakers to this item? Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much Madam Deputy Speaker. I rise in support of the report before us. And I wanted to take an opportunity to thank Mr. Richard Kachur for the work that he's done throughout the many years that I have had the opportunity to work with him over the last 15+ years here on Council. And you know Richard, sorry, it's been great because I've had an opportunity to golf with Mr. Kachur and I'm not a very good golfer, but Mr. Kachur is quite the golfer and got a great swing and showed me some of the ropes, you know. And it's funny, I had a great story here one time, Madam Deputy Speaker, I was golfing at a catholic foundation event and I was like the first golfer to golf and I think it was like the second Texas scrambler, or what do you call it, Texas scramble tournament and I kind of leaned on some of the advice from Mr. Kachur, but unfortunately, it didn't play out that day. There's was all these people behind me, I had the Bishop… the Archbishop behind me and it was called a hope and a prayer. And I swung the club, Madam Deputy Speaker, and the ball I think moved like 11 feet. And the Archbishop says, Councillor Pagtakhan, you're going to need more than a hope and prayer on that one, or more than a swing and a prayer on that one. But I want to thank Richard Kachur for his work and his inspiration over the years. It's been a real pleasure. I wish him well. I do want to say, I proudly represent Mr. Kachur, he's a resident of the Point Douglas Ward, so it's been a pleasure representing him as well as a Councillor for the area. And I want congratulate Mr. Lemoine for his appointment as our new City Clerk here at the City of Winnipeg. Definitely look forward to working with Mr. Lemoine as well.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Any further comments at this time? Seeing none, did you wish to close? A recorded vote has been called. 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, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan, Schreyer, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, and Madam Deputy Speaker Councillor Gerbasi.

Madam Deputy Speaker: The vote is unanimous. This is a very significant moment for all of us. And it's going to be a great future for this Council. Thank you. I'll turn the Chair…or, Madam Speaker?

Councillor Sharma: Madam Deputy Speaker, yes, I'd like to lead the applause. I know we're starting a new tradition here and our City Clerk will be departing and vacating the seat for our new City Clerk. Congratulations to you both.

Madam Speaker: Actually, Mr. Clerk, former Clerk Richard Kachur, if I could call you down. Councillor Pagtakhan is reminding that we should have a final photo with Council... Mr. Clerk, are we ready? Mr. Mayor, on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 6th, 2018

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED FEBRUARY 6, 2018

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I move…I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 6.

Madam Speaker: Okay, No. 1's been pulled. Okay, I'll call the question on Items 2 through 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 – Winnipeg Food Council – Nomination of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'll be brief, with respect to the Food Council, I want to acknowledge and thank Councillor Mayes for his leadership on this initiative. I think it was one of the topics that he first spoke about in our…in the early days of this mandate. He has been consistent in his advocacy for the creation of the Winnipeg Food Council supported by this Council and I'm very pleased to support appointing him as Chair and would ask for the support of my Council colleagues in doing so.

Madam Speaker: Okay, any further speakers? Councillor Mayes, pardon me, Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Schreyer: I'm in agreement with His Worship's words on this. I called this one down really because as the…our mayor has created a new Food Council. I guess the logistics of it, the mechanics of it, I guess, had to be ironed out and in this case, we had to nominate someone for the Chair so I was pleased to nominate Councillor Mayes as the Chair. The committee members as well, most of them seem to know Rob Moquin and voted…nominated and voted for him to be the Vice-Chairperson of the Winnipeg Food Council. Councillor Mayes has been consistent as His Worship has said. And as well, as I would say the unofficial Chair of the unofficial Agricultural Committee, it is consistent that he have this official capacity in this case to manifest his concerns and his experience on these food matters. And on that basis, I'm pleased to support this item as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Let's keep this going. It's wonderful hearing all this praise. Very nice comments from the Mayor and Councillor Schreyer, Councillor Schreyer's also on the committee, he's the Mayor's appointee. We're under way, we're doing some good work. Very good, deep talent pool there, people from all different sectors. I find it somewhat ironic that now that the Ag Committee is sort of being formalized, the ward boundary changes result in all the farms in my ward now going into a different ward, into the St. Norbert Seine River Ward. But whoever that councillor will be will, I think,

have the opportunity to represent some of the ag community as do some of the other councillors here. So we…what doesn't appear here is the first order of business which was passed, which was sent to EPC, a look at community gardens and our policy on provision of water. That report's going to be coming back to the Water Committee. So we are determined to do some real things, get something done at this committee and my thanks for the support of Council in creating the committee and I'm honoured to be the first Chair. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor on the report dated February 13th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 13, 2018

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 13.

Madam Speaker: Right. Okay, 2. 1? Okay, and we'll also pull 10 as there's an amending motion. I'll call the question on Items 3 through 9, 11 through 13. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Grant Expenditures in Election Year

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait to hear from Council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker and thanks to Councillor Pagtakhan for seconding this. This motion is sort of part of the general parcel that I think we have tried to do in this Council of openness, transparency, everything from the Lobbyist Registry to the Code of Conduct you'll be seeing to other provisions, open government provisions. This is…comes out of a Free Press editorial of late September 2014 that took us to task, some of us a bit for making some announcements which we had every legal right to do, or within the rules. I found it somewhat frustrating, one group I've been encouraging for years to get a grant application in, finally got it in in early September of '14 so I was pleased to support that. But the criticism bared consideration in terms of how do you try to level the playing field a bit between incumbents and non-incumbents. This isn't a formal legal provision like the Province has. There is no window that comes suddenly crashing down, 90 days out you can't make any more announcements. We saw a great flurry of announcements prior to the Provincial window. I remember Shelly Glover, with whom I got along well, making an announcement one day before the Federal fury had kicked in. This is largely…puts it on us, really, the Mayor and councillors and a provision that says, you should refrain from making any announcements. There is no formal definition here of announcements, so people will have to use their judgement as to what they feel is appropriate. Some of the…I think at least one of the things I announced last time, I wouldn't do this time. So we're trying to continue that commitment that I think the Mayor made very front and centre in his campaign to be more open as a city government. So I'm pleased to see this going forward and maybe we'll have a rush of meetings, community committee meetings, in late August to get in before the 60 days but that's, I think, a small price to pay in order to try and reflect this but put some limits on what can be announced in the…in the days leading up to the election. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise, of course, absolutely in support of this particular motion, Madam Speaker. And thanks to my colleague, referred to one of my concerns is, what would one consider to be an announcement. But an announcement, usually, we know what those terms mean. That's usually a media release with all kinds of proclamations so to speak or whatever you want to call them, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, this is and does make total sense that this is only fair in a democratic system where actually, non-incumbents have a really difficult problem in terms of running, Madam Speaker. And I'm absolutely for fair, democratic elections. So I totally support this. Definition of announcement might be needed but I believe if this is passed, and I'm not quite sure where this goes, Madam Speaker, we're adding this, but it seems to me, Madam Speaker, that this will have to be interpreted by whoever's heading up the City of Winnipeg's municipal election in terms of if there's any perceived violation. So, and I'm good with that. Have no problem with that, Madam Speaker. I should remind all of us councillors though, there will be no fury to pass or do things at community committee in August, Madam Speaker, as Madam Speaker, you know, August is

still prorogue in the City of Winnipeg. This particular year we have two prorogue periods, one in which August, but also during the election, there's also prorogue. So just to remind people that that's there and I thank, I believe, Councillor Mayes moved the motion originally, and I appreciate that this is a great motion. Thank you Madam Speaker. Voting for it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this motion that puts in the 60 day prorogue period for announcements. As Councillor Mayes says, it's…we're creating a precedent here at city hall in terms of the City of Winnipeg. And so how we go about it, I guess we'll work our way through. I think we understand it basically, the intent. And it's the right thing to do. I say it's a precedent here at City of Winnipeg, Councillor Mayes said that a previous cabinet minister made an announcement a day before the Federal election. Do wish to make the point, which is important, the leadership on this has been by the Provincial Government here in Manitoba in terms of our realm here and the previous administration either under Premier Selinger or Premier Doer brought in a similar regulation for prorogation of major funding announcements before an election. I guess they called it a funding blackout period and I'm pleased to see that we were…we are following in the leadership of Premier Selinger on this one. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I'd like to start off by thanking Councillor Mayes and Councillor Pagtakhan for bringing this motion forward. Without a doubt, there is a benefit to incumbency, but I think this helps level that playing field at least a little bit. Again, if I was drawing this motion up, I'd maybe make a couple more things specific. Council prorogues for the month of October in election years. Perhaps following the date of the close of the nomination process, councillors that are not…councillors that are not seeking re-election could have a window there where they could perhaps do a per capita grant or community incentive grant. Again, per capita grants are pro-rated in election years. It is 10 months' worth of per capita that are given, not the 12 months. Small change, but again, I don't think it's really that consequential. Also it mentions that the Mayor and councillors refrain. The Mayor does not have a per capita grant or a community incentive grant account. I would probably strengthen it up to make sure that there are no political funding announcements for the Mayor during that 60 day period as well. That would be my other suggestion, if we were to take this a little further. So, those are my only comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Okay, seeing none, Mr. Mayor back to you. Okay, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Deacon Water Treatment Plant Deficiencies Review

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce Item 2?

Mayor Bowman: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. This report responds to the City Council's request for information regarding the Deacon Water Treatment Plant deficiencies. I want to thank the public service for, obviously, following that direction and providing this. I'm also pleased to see it includes steps being taken to prevent this from occurring in the future.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I asked to have this report stood down, Madam Speaker. I will be voting for this report but I just wanted to express a number of issues because I think that there is a lot of false information that's out there as well, Madam Speaker, in terms of how things happen and what happened, Madam Speaker. The first thing I would say though is that this report provides us with information, Madam Speaker, but it's my understanding and through our administration continues, and will have to continue dealing with the issues related to this Deacon Water Plant. So this report doesn't mean that all of sudden nothing is happening in regards to it, Madam Speaker. It just means that we've gotten our report. We as City councillors, Madam Speaker, and even the Mayor, we don't run departments. We don't do the detailed work, Madam Speaker. Our Legal Department had to do some work on this. Our Water and Waste Utility did a bunch of work on this, Madam Speaker. And I have to say, our Water and Waste Utility, while again, there was a councillor that was refused a tour to look at the problem, and I happened to be with that person, Madam Speaker. And the way things work when we get tours, we have to make arrangements and I have to say Madam Speaker, we did just show up at a very high…it's a very secure place, Madam Speaker, the Deacon Water Plant, and for very good reasons. So, I don't know why we would have been refused to come in and have a look. There are people in the plant that could have showed us it. But Madam Speaker, I want to make it clear that I was, and took a tour with several other councillors, I can't remember exactly when it was, but our Water and Waste Utility was quite open and frank about the problems they were facing with operating the Deacon Water Plant. And the problems were as a result of

contractors and sub-contractors who built this thing. I'm not going to name any company names or anything, Madam Speaker, but I have to say, one thing that doesn't come from this report because we work in silos, Madam Speaker. But you know, what should have came out of this is that when we have any utilities, any construction, there should be a place where we can share with other municipalities our experiences to ensure that when we are contracting with builders, the people who build the things, we, our City workers, don't actually build these things, Madam Speaker. We know that. And so, we need to ensure that protections happen. But anyway, Madam Speaker, I digress a bit. So I just want to be clear as well, again, I'm not happy about what has happened here. It's not good. Potentially one of the problems in this province…other provinces it would've been easier, Madam Speaker. This is a difficult province in…like, you don't know if these things are going to appear for a long time sometimes, Madam Speaker. Some of the problems that have happened, they started to happen beyond the scope for us to identify and then try this. So it's a very difficult thing and we know that in our Legal Department somewhere, somehow, somebody missed dates and so on and so forth. That's being reviewed. There are different…there is the report. I don't need to and I did not see the report from the external legal group on this, but I don't need to Madam Speaker. I just want to ensure that it was covered. I've made it clear, as a City councillor who has great concerns about all this stuff, it's very important to be understanding of what's going on and trying to get answers to questions that we might have, Madam Speaker. And so, as we're proceeding further into the future, I know that we have a sub-contractor in terms of sewage plants, because we should be concerned that this is just water, Madam Speaker. I know in terms of sewage plants, we are now putting out specs that are so detailed, Madam Speaker, that we can identify how much it's going to cost and what the expectations are from the sub-contractors. And if we're testing this stuff as the building goes along, making sure of oversight, as it goes along…and that is an administrative task, Madam Speaker. Not a City councillors' task. And so, you know, we have great expectations on our City administration and I still have that. I will be voting for this report. It's a recommendation from EPC to accept it as information, Madam Speaker, and I will do so. But I am confident that there's constant pressure through the administration to ensure these kind of things don't happen again. And it is going to cost us money to fix this. And it's really a shame that the real, what do you want to call it…the real cause of the problems, the contractors and sub-contractors, are not going to be held accountable. They're not, Madam Speaker, which is a shame because when we're building a water plant or something so critical, one would expect perfection or as very close as you can get. And it's clear in some of the things that were built at Deacon, we didn't even get anywhere near close to perfection. And so…anyway, I'll leave it at that. I'm voting for this report but you know, the demonizing of Council members is uncalled for Madam Speaker. Uncalled for. There's no way you can stay on top of a billion dollar…like, how much…so we've got road construction, should I be watching every piece of road construction that happens in my ward? Should the Mayor be watching every piece of construction that's going on throughout the whole city, Madam Speaker? Let's be clear, we have a roll. It's important that we question and push the administration to achieve budgets to do the things they need to do, but to expect us, Madam Speaker, to actually be on everything is impossible. We are governance. We are not carrying out the detailed day-to-day work. And when we hire, Madam Speaker, administrators and when our senior administrator hires decision makers at lower levels, they have to ensure that they are upholding and trying to achieve the best they can, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you Madam Speaker. I was unable to attend the EPC meeting to speak to this, but I will rise today. I want to rise to speak to what I believe is incompetence displayed on this file by the public service and by political leadership. The oversight and inaction has resulted in a multi-million dollar cost to taxpayers at which we do not know the true value yet. I understand what Councillor Eadie is saying regarding individual councillors, but I also understand that a $30 million statement of claim is not that common and that this is why we hire administration and this is why we have political leadership. I think the handling of this file will go down on record as one of the great failures of this Council and I'm extremely dissatisfied that we are still allowing procrastination to occur on this file. Just to recap, on November 26th in 2015, the Mayor and I signed, I as co…as Chair of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, signed the authorization to file a statement of claim. The statement of claim indicated that while it was not yet possible to quantify the dollar amount, the Legal Services Department estimated the deficiencies to be around $30 million. Somehow at this $30 million at some point became discussion of $20 million, but I want it on the record that the statement of claim was for $30 million. And this estimate was provided by the Legal Services Department overseen by the City Solicitor and the CAO. Madam Chair, when a Council seminar was called to share the missed deadline, the Mayor did not attend. The Mayor did not attend the Council seminar where councillors were told the Legal Department missed the deadline in filing the statement of claim. At that what was astounding that telling Council a $30 million claim was missed and I thought it was a very significant meeting and I thought the Mayor should have been in attendance. But under the strong mayor model, we know that the Mayor had discussed this with previous members of EPC and it appears that's all that mattered. It was irrelevant that he attend the councillors seminar to possibly answer questions that the non-EPC councillors may have on what about the next steps. And what would the next steps be? The Mayor had the opportunity to demonstrate leadership and serious intent to start cleaning this mess up. The Mayor could have brought forward a motion at the September EPC meeting to get to the bottom of this multi-million dollar fiasco, but nothing, absolutely nothing. Instead, Councillor Wyatt and I brought forward a motion asking for a timeline and explanation. Councillor

Gillingham and Councillor Orlikow stated they too would be bringing forward a motion to find out why the Legal Department missed the deadline. And where was the Mayor? When members of Council and members of his Executive Policy Committee were calling for an audit, why would he not be the lead to call out and find out why taxpayers are going to be on the hook for $30 million due to the missed deadline? He could have easily called for an audit right off the bat. He could have demonstrated concern and leadership. And why do we have to call an audit, Madam Chair…Madam Speaker, to get answers? We've had to call for an audit on two situations to get answers from the public service. And as for the CAO, the statement of claim was for $30 million under his watch. Where was the oversight on this file? How many $30 million claims do we have? We read the report, all in the hands of one lawyer, one lawyer. We have 1.5 million plus of senior management layer of bureaucrats, lawyers, accountants, engineers, communication people, wasn't anyone providing more oversight on this file? And what of the Water and Waste Department, itself, reporting on the deficiencies and of the CAO's responsibility to keep Council informed? According to court documents, the deficiencies started in 2009, in 2012 significant and catastrophic failures. Granted, the deficiencies started occurring under previous Council, but many of the public service members are still here. The prior City Solicitor, staff in the Water and Waste Department, they could have easily briefed the CAO who could have then briefed Council. In November of 2017, I called to have a deficiencies report produced by the department. And at the last Water and Waste meeting, I was told it was still delayed. This is 9 years after the first deficiencies were identified. In one of the CAO's e-mails on this file, he stated, "The decision to brief Council", and we all received this e-mail, "would have been outside the public service's authority." So Madam Chair, if the CAO states that any decision to brief Council is outside the public service's authority, then who has that authority? Madam Chair, the Mayor has that authority. The Mayor has the authority to ensure all of Council is briefed and to this day, we still don't know what happened 9 years, and I ask you why. And it's very disappointing to be…to be here bringing this up and I feel we're re-hashing it, but this a $30 million statement of claim. We don't know what's happened at the water treatment plant. We have to call for audits to get answers. And quite frankly, it's just unbelievable. It's extremely disappointing. And we will be speaking again of another audit in the near future and I think everyone at Council knows my disappointment in the leadership and administration and it's just very disappointing for the taxpayers of Winnipeg. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, the motion that prompted this report ultimately was a really a consolidation. As many of you know, of motions...or the intent of motions that were going to be brought forward by Councillors Lukes and Wyatt and Orlikow and I know when I discussed with the Mayor, I appreciate the Mayor's support on this and certainly having this review, and the resultant report that's before us. Of course, the motion called for a review that would provide a chronology of the department's actions or inactions among other things, we'll look at ways...or examine the possibility of other ways whereby the City could recover some of the costs related to the Deacon Plant deficiencies. I'm disappointed that it appears the City has no recourse, that there is no means, apparently, to recover the cost to repair those deficiencies. That's not good news for the citizens of Winnipeg, for the taxpayers of Winnipeg and it is disappointing. And while this matter has led to changes within the Legal Department, frankly, Madam Speaker, it should not take, in my opinion...it should not take a multi-million dollar mistake to prompt such process changes as the changes that we now see are being implemented. I do recognize and I think it's important that we realize that this report, frankly, that's before us today should really be read in conjunction with agenda Item 13 of this same report. The audit of Legal Services Department there, it outlines the nine recommendations that the Auditors have put forward to the Legal Services Department. Those recommendations are prompted specifically from this Deacon Water Plant matter. I do appreciate that Legal Services has indicated that they agree with all nine recommendations and are working to begin implementation of those nine recommendations. But I think it's just important to state again that the citizens of Winnipeg deserve that the best processes are in place within all of our departments. The best processes that will protect the interests, the tax dollars, the utility rates that they pay, and I trust...I hope that the changes that are being implemented right now within this department, within Legal Services Department, will ensure that there is not a repeat of such a matter, a fiasco in the future, because the citizens deserve that we are constantly improving. The citizens deserve that individuals be held to account. And so, again, I look at these recommendations, I think it's important that Council watch closely and ensure that the recommendations are implemented, that we get updates on the improvements that are being made within any department and specific to this matter within our Legal Services Department. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We are here to vote on a report and to vote on it to pass it as information. And it says that there are no implications of receiving this report as information. So, what's the point in voting on it, I guess? There are other things that come to us, to Council, through, again, auditors report. They come to us but we don't pass them. They just appear on the agenda and we don't vote on them, but they're written here. In this case, I guess I'll learn more about this, what's the point on voting for something for information if it has no implications for voting on it as information? On that basis, Madam Speaker, I would have to say logically, what is the implication for

not passing it as information? Is there any implications for that? I'll talk to my fellow councillors about that and with our new Clerk, and just to understand the logic of this. Because, Madam Speaker, it's been pointed out by our previous Clerk that sometimes a report comes from Governance Committee or audit…I'm not quite sure the distinction in this case in which it appears on the agenda, as a report, and we do not vote. So what is the relevance of voting on this when there is no implications at least for voting in favour of it and passing it as information? So I guess it's a question of principle, whether we accept this or not, and I'm a little torn in the sense that while I am glad that we did this report, although it seems to me it might be incomplete given what the previous councillor…former councillor, Mr. Steek has said today. I didn't hear all his points refuted. I didn't. And they are rather grave. I would like to make the point that Councillor Eadie who said he is going to vote in favour of the report, makes a point that implicating the adequacy of a previous Council was uncalled for and I would like to make the point that I agree with Councillor Eadie in that it is impossible for a single councillor...for every councillor to be on top of everything. And that's true. Having said that, Councillor Lukes' points are...well, they weigh heavily on me and I'm not quite sure what to do about this because I'm just going to be straight up about this, Madam Speaker. I don't believe that this report is adequate enough. Of course, there is the Hill Sokalski report that wasn't published. Well, I'm not sure yet how I'm going to vote on this. It doesn't matter, according to this, there's no implications for receiving this report as information. So, I don't know what that means in this case. We're going...we see it anyway. Maybe there are implications for not passing it because we're saying it's inadequate. Well I'm saying right now, Madam Speaker, it's not enough. And I would like to see the Hill Sokalski report published or an external audit. But it doesn't mean that this isn't a beginning, that it offers us something. And Madam Speaker, I'm going to mention something that hasn't been mentioned. Councillor Steek said that...former Councillor Steek said that there was two minutes of questioning on this at EPC when it came to something regarding 20...or as Councillor Lukes pointed out, it's not 20 but $30 million. Now of course there is a report on this, so maybe there didn't need to be further questions. But I'm not sure of that at all, Madam Speaker. But, you know, when it did come to my issue of ward allowance dynamic and how I paid for my expenses including the use of the credit card, the Executive Policy Committee, which I think is the Audit Committee, spent 15 minutes of questioning on an issue that actually, by proof, saved the City of Winnipeg, in my own little way, you know, thousands of dollars…I could have done otherwise. I was certainly in a position to charge more of those credit card expenses to the taxpayer on a monthly basis, but I didn't. And...but it took...when it came to a savings of money through that ward allowance, 15 minutes of questioning on that. So, Madam Speaker, you know, I have to take a look at that. And if that's worth 15 minutes of questioning, when it comes to a savings of money, which is all obvious, it's all there, a savings to the City of Winnipeg, one of the lowest spending city councillors along with Councillor Dobson, Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Morantz, depending on the year or the month, you know kind of unusual. I have to question that because my motivations were questioned. My adequacy, in terms of being fiscally responsible were questioned and not properly addressed. Including not properly addressed at that meeting. I will say that the members of the EPC, members of the Audit Committee, were misinformed at that very meeting and I will say specifically, Councillor Orlikow in his questions was misinformed to his questions. So, if that's worth 15 minutes, a savings from a ward allowance expenditure process, and this gets two minutes for 20 to $30 million over something that happened to which we are pinning it on one lawyer, we solved this problem in terms of the who done it by saying one lawyer. And I'm supposed to believe this, Madam Speaker? Winnipeggers are supposed to believe this? Madam Speaker, I don't believe it, okay. I don't believe it. I know people are going to be mad at me or whatever, for saying that or what, for my belief that it's one lawyer's fault and now, because of this, through this process of creating a report, we'll solve it now. We solved it. Well, Madam Speaker, wouldn't we solve it better and be more informed and be more comforted by something that doesn't cost us any money, publishing the Hill Sokalski report. Or, consider we are talking about 20 to $30 million, having an external audit to make sure these things don't happen again. Wouldn't we learn more about how not to make these mistakes if we had an external audit? We're talking about 20 to $30 million that happened over...well, over a period of years, we are blaming it on one lawyer. So, Madam Speaker, you know, I'm supposed to vote for this report because it has no implications of receiving it as information if we pass it. I don't know what to say, Madam Speaker. I don't think that's the point of what we're trying to do here. We're trying to understand this so that we won't do this again. Well, Madam Speaker, if you take a look at this whole thing, I'm not sure we're not going to do these things again, given the implication of this report. Madam Speaker, I just convinced myself, given what I have heard today, I can't vote for this on principle. And I know it has no implications to pass it so what's the point of having it here, but Madam Speaker, I think we have to go further than this, thank you Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: I'm fine thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, we're wrapping that up. Thank you. Any further speakers? Okay seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? Okay, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 10 – Audit Plan January 2018 Update

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Mayor to introduce the Item and the amending Motion No. 2.

Motion No. 2
Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,

WHEREAS Section 3.11 of the Councillors' Ward Allowance (CWA) Policy states "The City Auditor will prepare an annual audit of the CWA and report through the Governance Committee to Council for its July meeting.";

AND WHEREAS in the Audit Plan January 2018 Update the City Auditor is recommending that Council approve overriding that section of the Policy for 2018 only. The targeted completion date for both the CWA Policy audit and the Mayor's Office Expenditure Policy is now targeted for communication by the December 2018 Council meeting.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That "Audit Plan January 2018 Update", Item 10 of the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated February 13, 2018 be amended to require the City Auditor to provide an annual audit of the Council Ward Allowance expenses and the Office of the Mayor's expenses to Council for its July 2018 meeting, through the Governance Committee of Council;*

2. *That the City Auditor be authorized to engage external resources for the purpose of completing these 2 audits, if required;*

3. *That an over expenditure not to exceed $200,000 in the Audit Department's 2018 operating budget be approved for this purpose, to be funded by any general revenue fund surplus in 2018.*

Mayor Bowman: Sure, sure. Thanks very much, Madam Speaker. Firstly I want to thank the Auditor for following the direction of Council which was to reprioritize the audit of the Sterling Lyon Wilkes extension. This Council was very clear in its direction to the Auditor that that should be a priority and the Auditor followed that and then reported back to Council on what the implications of that reprioritization would be. Through dialogue with the majority of members of Council that had an opportunity to speak with, over the last week, that is resulting in this amendment which I thank Councillor Sharma, our speaker, for seconding it and would ask that members of Council support the amendment as well as the audit plan January 2018 update. Essentially for those that are following, what the amendment does is it does require the Auditor to provide an annual audit of the Council ward allowance expenses and the Office of the Mayor's expenses to Council for its July 2018 meeting. It asks that it be authorized to engage external resources if required and that any additional expenditures would be subject to the review of our Finance Committee. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Again, I do support the annual audits of the councillor ward allowance accounts. I should point out that there isn't that level of scrutiny on the discretionary funds in the Mayor's Office. I think going forward that'd be something, in the eyes of openness and transparency, would also be done. There is not a separate…there's a different level of scrutiny given to the City overall expenditures versus the individual audits that are done annually on the CWA accounts. Again, funding here is a little rich, too. I mean, $80,000 times 15 wards is about $1.2 million and they are looking for an over-expenditure of approximately $200,000. As a percentage of the cost of 200 grand for 1.2 million, it seems a little high. I'm part of all sorts of organizations, we have independent auditors that come in for doing audits. To do an $80,000 audit, that seems a little high. But again, I do hope that they do whatever they can to minimize that expenditure. It does say up to 200 grand, in my mind it should be way less than 200 grand.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise...I'm going to be voting for this but I do have...well, actually I might not vote for the amendment, Madam Speaker, and I'll tell you why. You know, this has budget implications on the 2018 budget, Madam Speaker. Now, if I was to move a motion to amend or do something that, say, affects, I don't know, could be any item, I am required to actually identify the source of funds, Madam Speaker. Required. Otherwise, I believe, the motion is out of order because this has budget implications. In this we are talking about merely asking the Finance Committee to do something. But this is an amending motion, Madam Speaker. It actually is amending the budget. Because the Auditor has made it clear within the budget that the Auditor's Office has, can't get done until December. So now, this amendment, which I think is good, I mean it's good, we still need that report by July, absolutely, but it doesn't identify where the money is coming from. Why didn't you just simply identify that...you know, take the money from the $17 million surplus that the City of Winnipeg experienced by the end of December 31st, 2017? I think we should identify it and I don't know if you want to try amending it as we go here, Madam Speaker, but clearly, I think you need to actually indicate. Just merely referring money matter over to the Chair of Finance, it's…well, the number as

Councillor Browaty has referred to about the number, you know, there are a lot of expenditure records in 15 City councillor wards. And then, if you add in the Mayor, although I still question whether or not all the money that the Mayor gets to utilize, because the Mayor, in this city, has a different budget structure, while there is an office...direct office expenditures and so on, Madam Speaker, I am pretty sure the Mayor gets to utilize budgets all over the place for various things like maybe attending the Grey Cup game and paying for tickets in Ottawa, Madam Speaker. I don't know, but the Mayor has that job. That's the Mayor's role. So I'm not quite sure what our audit is going to achieve. I don't know if 200,000, I'm not going to judge, but you know, there is a lot of work to auditing because I believe the Auditor goes through almost every expenditure. It's almost like a forensic audit, Madam Speaker. I don't know if they test only X number of records but it seems to me as I've looked at and heard, you know, there's been issues with individual records. I mean, it's been pointed out, Madam Speaker, to me. So anyway, I am totally for prioritizing. Of course I am not opposed to prioritizing the whole fiasco down there in southwest Winnipeg. But anyway, Madam Speaker, I just...I am not actually going to vote for the amendment because it doesn't actually indicate where the money is coming from, whether it's 200,000 or whatever, I think that it could have indicated where the actual money was coming from, Madam Speaker. And...but I will be voting for the report as again, I believe that that situation is of utmost priority and I have every faith that our City Auditor will do the proper job. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The funding source is identified in point number 3 in the report. My understanding is part of the reason why it does take resources for the Auditor to complete the review of councillor and Mayor's Office expenditures is because not all councillors are as diligent as others in providing receipts to the Auditor so there is a number of...there's a lot of resources that are required to track down appropriate receipts. I simply ask for those members that are expressing concern right now about the cost, I would join the majority of members of Council and provide those receipts in a timely and appropriate manner to reduce the costs for our Auditor. And so…

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, point of order. The last speaker was myself, Madam Speaker. I have all receipts. I report all receipts. Is this an inference to this City councillor, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. That is not a point of order.

Councillor Eadie: I would like him to retract that statement.

Madam Speaker: You've had your opportunity to speak and the Mayor did not name anyone. Mayor did not name anyone. Mr. Mayor, continue.

Mayor Bowman: I'll reinforce the statement that I just made, Madam Speaker, that I think it's incumbent upon every member of this Council to provide receipts and to make it as efficient as possible for the Auditor to review all members of councillors expenses. We know that the Auditor, the Clerk's Office do spend a lot of time providing that accountability for taxpayers, and I want to thank them for doing that. And just say that for those members of Council that don't want to see the Auditor have to spend the amount that's contemplated here and that would be subject to Finance Committee's oversight, I would simply just remind us all, to make sure we're doing everything we can to ensure that the Auditor and the Clerks have everything that they need in order to do their job in an efficient manner. I would also just, for the record, state that Councillor Browaty's comments about the Mayor's Office and audit, I am very pleased to remind all members of Council and those that are watching that I'm the first Mayor to actually voluntarily bring in a Mayor's Office Expenditure Policy which does ensure that the expenses are audited by the Auditor which I think was long overdue in the Office of the Mayor and I think is a positive step. And so, this would ensure that every member of Council, myself included, would have expenses audited and done so for the July Council meeting to ensure that that level of oversight is done according to the regular schedule that this Council and Winnipeggers expect. And so I would ask for the support for the amendment as well as for the Auditor's schedule as well. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll call the question on the amending Motion No. 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And the main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now move on to the notice of motion from our January 25th, 2018 Council meeting regarding acknowledgment at committees that we are on Traditional Indigenous, Métis People's Lands. The motion is published as part of the agenda. It's on your screens. Councillor Gerbasi, to introduce the motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Moved by Councillor Gerbasi,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg recognized 2016 as the "Year of Reconciliation", to demonstrate the City's commitment to reconciliation with Winnipeg's Indigenous community;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is committed to identifying ways to implement the five Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action including article 47 which reads:

> *"47. We call upon federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to repudiate concepts used to justify European sovereignty over Indigenous peoples and lands, such as the Doctrine of Discovery and terra nullius, and to reform those laws, government policies, and litigation strategies that continue to rely on such concepts."*

AND WHEREAS on March 22, 2017, City Council unanimously adopted Winnipeg's Indigenous accord as a demonstration of the City's commitment to the ongoing process of reconciliation;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord states that Winnipeg is located within Treaty No. 1 Territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinabe (Ojibway), Ininew (Cree), Oji-Cree, Dene, and Dakota, and is the Birthplace of the Métis Nation and the Heart of the Métis Nation Homeland;

AND WHEREAS on November 1, 2017, His Worship Mayor Bowman appointed Councillor Jenny Gerbasi as Secretary of Urban Indigenous Opportunities;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Gerbasi as Secretary of Urban Indigenous Opportunities and as a signatory to the Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord, committed to working collaboratively with the Mayor's Indigenous Advisory Circle, the public service and the community to make changes in the policies and practices of the City of Winnipeg to encourage the continued act of reconciliation;

AND WHEREAS one change in practice and policy that has been adopted in this regard has been to acknowledge at some meetings of City Council and its Committees that the meetings are taking place on Treaty 1 land, the traditional homeland of the Metis Nation;

AND WHEREAS ensuring this change in practice and policy occurs at all City Council and Committee meetings will show Winnipeg's continued on-going support of its Indigenous citizens and Winnipeg's history and heritage;

AND WHEREAS the Procedure By-law No. 50/2007 governs the procedure at meetings of Council and its Committees;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Procedure By-law No. 50/2007 be amended to require that at the commencement of each Council or Committee meeting, the Chair acknowledge, in wording of their choosing, that the meeting is taking place on traditional Indigenous & Métis peoples' lands;*

2. *That the City Solicitor / Manager of Legal Services be directed to prepare the necessary by-law amendment for Council approval within 60 days.*

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Mayor Speaker…Mayor Speaker. Thank you. I just wanted to put this forward as a procedural thing that is a really important moment and I really wanted to hear from my colleagues today about it because it's just how we do our meetings and it's just procedural so we'll move ahead with that if that's okay Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gerbasi. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to applaud the work of Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Gilroy and I want to thank all members of Council for their support in all matters pertaining to reconciliation. I was advised when we were...the night we were sworn in, November 4th, 2014, and I provided the acknowledgment that we are on Treaty 1 Land and the Traditional Homeland of the Métis, I was advised that that was the first time that that was used on this floor. And I know that, Madam Speaker, you have begun every Council meeting since, or at least more recently,

have been regularly acknowledging that we are on Treaty 1 Land and the Traditional Homeland of the Métis. I think it's an important statement to remind all Winnipeggers regardless of their background, that we are all Treaty People. And certainly as we continue on our journey to reconciliation, while we have been regularly at committees as well as at this Council meeting providing that Treaty acknowledgment, I think, you know, certainly the formalizing that with the motion before us is a positive step. And I am looking forward to supporting it in a few moments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that I will call the question. Councillor Schreyer, you'd like to spear?

Councillor Schreyer: I was raised in a way in recognition of this and I certainly don't have a problem whatsoever in making it an official recognition. I do wish to state, for the record and on principle, there's many things that we should recognize as Canadians and as Winnipeggers, as Manitobans. This is certainly one of them. But as you know, we are in an era of reconciliation. In this time we wish to make the point officially, beginning of our meetings in Winnipeg and I think that's appropriate. Madam Speaker, this is fine with me. I was sort of raised on this. But you know, when you have Chief Dave Courchene of the Grand Chief of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood as it was then called, in your living room every couple of months, speaking with your dad and others, this is how sort of you are raised. This is your understanding of these things. But, Madam Speaker, it does say that we sort of recognize this in our own way. It's open in terms of interpretation how we will express this. I know, Madam Speaker, that you have a certain way of saying it...a certain format. And in fact it's left for me, at the…when I Chair the Citizens Equity Committee, I think the format similar to yourself, Madam Speaker. I do wish to state that as has been stated in this Council chamber in different ways beforehand but His Worship and yourself have a certain specific format, I am pleased to know that it is open to interpretation. And one reason is, Madam Speaker, we say these things in principle. We say these things in recognition. We say these things in celebration. But, Madam Speaker, I was raised on understanding in a way, having a certain appreciation for the fact that we are on Treaty Land. Whether I am in Winnipeg or whether I'm in eastern Manitoba whether on Treaty 2 or Treaty 3 Land, that we are on Treaty Land and it is part and parcel of the Canadian way of constitution. Not the entire Canadian constitution is written, back in the British North America Act of 1867, nor in the repatriated constitution of 1981 and those amendments. And therefore, we interpret our constitution and the essence of who we are through other statutes, and I would say treaties as well and that's the Canadian way. That is the nature of this country. Madam Speaker, I have a question. Who has read Treaty 1? I'm just going to put it out there, Madam Speaker. We wish to state this at every meeting and that's fine. Madam Speaker, I'm not completely at...I am at ease with the fact that we are on Treaty 1 and this should be recognized, this is part of the challenge we have as Canadians, as Winnipeggers and part of this era of reconciliation we are in, Madam Speaker, but I wish...I ask if we are going to do this, that we all read Treaty 1 so that we know what we are talking about and we'll go from there. And I believe reading Treaty 1 will be part of the process of reconciliation because I am not completely at ease with Treaty 1. I recognize it. I don't completely celebrate, Madam Speaker. It's not just reading the words of Treaty 1, but the implications. I ask everyone to read Treaty 1 so that we know why we are saying it at every meeting. And we know...it gives us a sense of where we are in our point of history, and why we are potentially…I believe we are, in another era of reconciliation, ongoing process, Madam Speaker, to everybody if we are going to do this and make it meaningful, let's read Treaty 1 and we'll continue from there. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Seeing none, I'll call the vote. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move on to by-laws under EPC. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time; By-law 14/2018, By-law 15/2018, By-law 16/2018, By-law 17/2018, By-law 18/2018.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 14/2018, 15/2018, 16/2018, 17/2018, and 18/2018.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor on the second reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I move that By-law Nos. 14/2018 to 18/2018, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 14/2018 to 18/2018, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor on the suspension and the third reading.
Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-law 14/2018 to 18/2018, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for the Mayor. Councillor Browaty.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. Taxpayers in Winnipeg keep getting hit with more and more costs. 25 cent fare increases this last year, water bills continue going up, maximum taxi fares that go up March 1st, still with no Uber or Lyft, parking fees up. Annual property tax increase, luckily have been held to 2.33%. During year-end interviews, the Mayor suggested that this is no longer going to be the limit going forward at 2.33%. Mr. Mayor, can you tell us today, what is your idea of limits for future budgets. Is it 3 or 4%?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I made a commitment to Winnipeggers when I was campaigning in the last municipal campaign regarding taxes. I want to thank the majority of members of Council for supporting that, that commitment being honoured in terms of our budgets. We have had to make some difficult decisions as a Council. Councillor Browaty just referenced the transit fare increase and as members of Council will know, that was as a result of the Province making a unilateral decision to end the transit cost-sharing arrangement which saw the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg cost-share 50-50 the losses of transit. I know Councilor Browaty and I may differ on our support for public transit and I know that that was a very difficult decision for all members of Council and I think we did the best we could under those circumstances. I would urge the Councillor to use his extensive connections as a Conservative and a card-carrying member at that, to leverage those contacts with the Province of Manitoba as well his position with the Association of Manitoba Municipalities to advocate on behalf of Winnipeg and Winnipeg taxpayers in those ways.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. With the $17 million surplus in 2017, we could be offering an over 3% property tax reduction to citizens. We didn't have to increase transit fares. Will the Mayor tell us then, he didn't' say no to 3 or 4%. Will he say no to property tax increases going forward of 5 or 6%?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, this Council voted on the budget that's now being implemented for this year. We obviously had to make some difficult decisions in the budget, and I'm very pleased that we were able to do so in a fiscally responsible and balanced way with many competing demands. I again would urge Councillor Browaty to put his energies towards advocating on behalf of Winnipeg and Winnipeg taxpayers in relation to other levels of government that certainly with respect to the transit cost-sharing arrangement, made a decision that wasn't favourable to the City of Winnipeg. I'll continue to be a strong voice for Winnipeg and for Winnipeggers, and would ask Councillor Browaty to join me in advocating in the best interests of Winnipeg, especially given the fact that he does have such extensive and historical ties as a Progressive Conservative. I know he's, during even this term, tried to run as a Federal Conservative. He certainly is extremely well connected with many of the backroom operators who are on Broadway and in Queen's Park as well as in Ottawa, and of course as our representative on the Association of Manitoba Municipalities, I would suggest he should be advocating for Winnipeg and for Winnipeg taxpayers and I would join him and ask all members of Council to support him in those efforts to advocate on behalf of Winnipeg in those forms.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final question Councillor Browaty?

Councillor Browaty: At the end of the day, there is one taxpayer. We need to keep our own fiscal house in order. Will the Mayor commit to not increasing property taxes more than, he said…he didn't answer 3 or 4%, he didn't answer 5 or 6%...where is your ceiling Mr. Mayor? Is it 7 or 8%? There's one taxpayer at the end of the day, whether it's Provincial, Federal, School, you name the tax. You only can go so far. Will you get your own house in order? We had a $17

million surplus in 2017. We still went and…after the poorest of people by going after transit fares. This is a Mayor that I don't think really does support transit. I would like to hear the Mayor's answer.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: You can tell it's an election year when you hear someone who's been a politician for many, many years, engaging in the kind of rhetoric that folks that are watching are witnessing.

The commitment that I made to Winnipeggers was to keep property taxes at 2.33 specifically. It was with respect to the rate of inflation. That has been honoured, and I want to thank all members of Council and in particular I want to thank our previous Finance Chair and our current Finance Chair for their efforts to ensure that tax dollars are being managed very well and that we can keep property taxes as low as possible. I'm sure there'll be ample time in the coming campaign for Councillor Browaty to advocate on matters of taxation like he's doing here today, and he's been well noted for many, many years of public service being here at City Hall for his positions on transit. Support for transit is something that I continue to support, and I'm grateful for the support of all members of Council to support not only rapid transit but also transit, and I want to thank Councillor Morantz who's been doing a great job in his stewardship of the Committee that oversees Transit. We do have some difficult decisions to make. I'm pleased that we are engaging in a full operational review of the transit system so we can make it as efficient as possible and we can position it for success going forward. And again, all members of Council, including Councillor Browaty, certainly during this term will have an opportunity to be part of that process, and I'm pleased to hear he is supporting public transit. That's great. I would suggest he may want to channel those energies to working collaboratively with myself and with our Chair of IRPW.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, your Governance Committee is shepherding through the new Code of Ethical Conduct for us City Councillors; the political side of the running of the City of Winnipeg Madam Speaker, and you know, it hasn't…for awhile now we've heard, we understand that a senior person in the CAO's office who was working for the Province on the Cannabis file is now the City point person working with our Council committee looking towards how this Cannabis thing is being implemented and the problems. To me that is a conflict Madam Speaker, and it's about perceived conflict as we have been told within the Code of Ethical Conduct for all of us members of Council. It's not just if it's a direct conflict but also the perception, the possibility, people thinking that that may be there Madam Speaker, and so the Employee Code of Conduct is a Council Policy. It's stated, you go to Council Policies, it's listed there, the Employee Code of Conduct, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I'd like to know and I'd like to know if the Mayor will support the idea that we should have somebody other than the CAO's office where we've heard there's a lot of problems, a lot of issues, other than the CAO's office responsible for coming up with a new Employee Code of Conduct.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I'd ask that perhaps the Councillor can just clarify the question. I heard him speaking about a number of matters, so I'd just ask for clarity on the question and I'd be happy to answer it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, re-state your question please.

Councillor Eadie: Yes Madam Speaker, just to be clear, a number of ethical situations have happened with our employees and right now I was told that the CAO's office is renewing the Employee Code of Conduct which I always had a problem with Madam Speaker. So just clearly, will the Mayor support the idea that we have somebody external work on and create an Employee Code of Conduct and not have the administration come up with that?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Again, not…perhaps the Councillor…and I can speak more thoroughly after today's meeting about his specific concerns. The one thing I will say is he is correct in the sense that we will be voting on a Code of Conduct that has been worked on by Winnipeg's first ever Integrity Commissioner later in the meeting, and I think there's been some great work there. Of course, within the Public Service, I'm pleased to hear from our CAO a report at the most recent Executive Policy meeting that there is renewal happening of some of the checks and balances within the Public Service in terms of Code of Conduct, and that there will be a centralization on the website, a single-page point of entry for visitors to the website, to more easily find that information. I also believe the Integrity Commissioner hopefully will be able to provide some thoughts and some feedback to the CAO in that work and some of the other work that the Councillor was alluding to.

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

Councillor Eadie: Simply put, Madam Speaker, we all know an Employee Code of Conduct exists. So does the Mayor. The Mayor is our leader Madam Speaker. So my question is just simply, will the Mayor take charge of the renewal of the Employee Code of Ethical Conduct and have an external person review and come up with a proper Code of Ethical Conduct for our City's administration?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'd welcome further dialogue with the Councillor so I can better understand his concerns. Currently the Public Service obviously works on policies that are within respective departments. But I'd welcome the opportunity to speak further with the Councillor about the specific concerns that he's raising today.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final question Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: Final question. Has the Mayor…Madam Speaker, I'm wondering has the Mayor actually looked at the Employee Code of Conduct that's listed as a Council Policy and has he seen that it is a Council Policy, not administration policy?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, I'm certainly…I think all members of Council received the Code of Conduct for members of Council. The work is being…certainly that policy with what we're voting on today as well as with the benefit of Winnipeg's first ever Integrity Commissioner is being strengthened, and I want to thank Councillor Eadie and all members of Council who have chosen to be part of that dialogue with the Integrity Commissioner. I'm looking forward to voting for the Code of Conduct before us today shortly, probably this afternoon.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you Madam Speaker. At the last Council meeting, I asked the Mayor if he could tell us when the Executive Policy Committee plans to start the process to lay out the steps in a governance review, and he replied that he'd have to undertake to get back to me. I've not received an answer. He's not gotten back to me so I ask the question again, what are the steps…when is the Executive Policy Committee…what are the plans to start the process to lay out the steps in a governance review that is funded in the budget?

Madam Speaker. Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I haven't had the benefit of conversation with Councillor Lukes since the last meeting. I'd welcome a conversation with her on that. In terms of the governance review, Councillor Lukes should be pleased that we are undertaking a governance review. She speaks often about matters pertaining to governance. I'm pleased that Council has provided the direction as well as the funding for this, and I'd welcome the opportunity to speak with her more fully about questions or concerns she may have.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: So I take it then I should call him as he said he'd call me, so fine.

I'm wondering Madam Speaker, can the Mayor provide Council an update on the performance review process that…our recent performance review process for statutory officers and how that Committee is going. I'm wondering if he could give us an update on that please, or if it's going at all.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: There is a committee that has been struck. I can certainly undertake to provide further information after today's meeting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: I'm wondering Madam Speaker if the Mayor can provide an update to Council on why the performance review process that was laid out in the CAO's contract, not adhered to. It is published on-line and I'm wondering if he could give us an update on why it's not been adhered to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Just ask for some clarity from the Councillor in terms of specific suggestions she is making.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes?

Councillor Lukes: The CAO's contract is published on-line and there is a paragraph in there that specifically lays out activities that must occur related to performance and performance review, and during the time that I was on EPC, of course the contract was not public. I was not aware of what the CAO was to be doing related to performance, and now that it's published, I'm aware that none of that occurred during my duration on EPC and I'm wondering why and is it occurring now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lukes. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Bowman: Councillor Lukes was a member of EPC and did regularly provide feedback to the CAO on her views of his performance. Members of Council on Executive Policy Committee do meet with our CAO and have been providing feedback. I'm surprised to hear Councillor Lukes not remembering that we've had those meetings. I know she speaks publicly about them quite often. I do, however, think that there's an opportunity for Council to formalize and better make public those expectations of all four statutory officers. We have a new one effective earlier today, and I'm looking forward to that process rolling out sooner than later. You know, we're certainly making some positive changes. I know Councillor Allard was a strong proponent to have the review and the oversight of our four statutory officers improved and strengthened, and I'm very proud to support his efforts and those efforts that are supported by Council, and that obviously…that work is ongoing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. We're coming up to almost three years since the hiring of the CAO. In his employment contract, it was very specifically said that there would be performance reviews included. Could the Mayor tell us what the status is for setting up those terms and when that will be coming forward?

Mayor Bowman: As I just mentioned, there's ongoing work in terms of the Committee that's providing the guidance on the review of the four statutory officers. That will obviously roll out in the near future, but certainly as a former member of Executive Policy Committee, Councillor Browaty will know that feedback is provided to the CAO regularly in terms of performance.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: A new round of questions if I may.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Browaty: Can the Mayor give us an update on any information he has in terms of discussions with Manitoba Public Insurance or the Provincial Government in terms of changing the regulations regarding personal ride-sharing vehicles? It's good news – I hear there's a Canadian company that is planning to launch in Winnipeg in early March, which is great, but again, the rules that MPI have come up with are completely different from what the two dominant players in the North American market, Uber and Lyft, operate under. Is there any progress to changing MPI's rules?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. With respect to ride-sharing, members of Council, I know, are still recovering from a lengthy debate we had on the latter part of last year. I was very pleased to hear TappCar entering the marketplace with their announcement this week. I'm hoping that they are the first of many options for Winnipeggers to be able to choose from including taxi's, which we are also hearing are planning to make improvements to their service, and that's one of the benefits of having competition in the marketplace. I have met previously with MPI but certainly not since Council provided our direction with respect to ride-sharing. They are tasked…they are tasked with certain matters as per Provincial rules. I have not spoken directly with MPI regarding their work that they're doing right now and that being said, I've certainly made it be known to Winnipeggers publicly that I'm hoping that between MPI and some of the ride-sharing services that he's referencing, that they're able to find the road to (inaudible) sooner than later. I think it would serve Winnipeggers well to have even more choice in the marketplace.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Final question Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you Madam Speaker. I thank the Mayor for that response. Would the Mayor then be willing to commit today to reaching out, within say the next two weeks to either senior officials at MPI or the Minister in charge of or the Premier on this file.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'd welcome further discussion with the Councillor. The Councillor, as I previous mentioned, has extensive connections with the Provincial Conservatives. I would expect that he has had discussions with members of the government, and I'd like to know what the nature of those discussions have been or have not been. Perhaps in a follow up question, he can let us know if he has, in fact, spoken with any member of Cabinet or the Provincial Government. There are certain parameters that they are responsible for. We respect them. But I would like to hear from the Councillor about any discussions that he's had with his Conservative friends.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I didn't have any questions again but we've through this at least twice Madam Speaker. I thought it's understood. Madam Speaker, ride-sharing is when my wife gives me a ride to work before she goes off to her work, or if I might give Councillor Eadie a ride home. That's ride-sharing. It is so respected in its definition in North America that certain jurisdictions have car-pool lanes for people that ride-share. Ride-share is very important, and it should not be disregarded.

Madam Speaker: Your question Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker. Ride-sharing is not for profit. Madam Speaker, His Worship just used the term "ride-sharing" I think half a dozen times. Does he not realize that we're talking about a for-private enterprise, not ride-sharing?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, the term "ride-sharing" is commonly used to describe some of the personal transportation providers that were referenced in our by-law. I certainly will take under advisement, once again, the Councillor's hostility to the term "ride-sharing".

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I think that concludes our Question Period, and seeing the hour, Council is to now recess for lunch unless there is a suspension to work through the noon hour.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I would like to adjourn for lunch as I will start getting hangry.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We will recess and reconvene at 1:30 or...okay, 1:15? 1:15, thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 22, 2018, at 1:27 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of February 22nd, 2018. We are on the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation. We have no report today, no motions, and no by-laws. We will now have question period for our Chair. Any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Okay, seeing none, let's move to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Orlikow on the report dated January 8th, 2018.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 8, 2018**

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Chair. I would like to move Item No. 1, please.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Orlikow on the report dated February 2nd.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 2, 2018**

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Chair. I'd like to move Items 1 through 14 inclusive, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We have a notice of motion before us from our January 25th Council meeting. It's regarding the zoning for drug rehabilitation facilities. The motion was published. It's on the agenda on your screens. Councillor Schreyer, will you introduce your motion.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT,
HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
NOTICE OF MOTION**

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. Thank you Madam Speaker. Do I read the motion?

Madam Speaker: This is your opportunity to introduce it. You may read it if you wish.

**Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
Seconded by Councillor Dobson,**

WHEREAS the drug problem in Winnipeg shows no sign of diminishing;

AND WHEREAS the City needs to be involved in establishing more drug rehabilitation units in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS a lack of proactive process in choosing an appropriate drug rehabilitation facility has led to unfortunate and unnecessary misunderstandings, impugning people's motivations as Winnipeggers goes about trying to establishing drug rehabilitation units;

AND WHEREAS other Canadian cities, such as Calgary, have a progressive and proactive process that has established criteria by which drug rehabilitation facilities can be established;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the City administration be directed to initiate a proactive and progressive process of establishing a set of criteria by which drug rehabilitation facilities can be zoned and established within the City of Winnipeg and;*

2. *That the City establish a list of City-owned sites where drug rehabilitation facilities can be established.*

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. This is in response to last month's Council meeting, Madam Speaker, in which we were, I believe, we all expressed concerns over the need for drug rehabilitation centres in Winnipeg and elsewhere, that this is a North American-wide if not a greater problem that we need to show to do our part as a city. It's not merely the responsibility of the City, by no means, but when we are in a position to assist that we should. But, having said that, Madam Speaker, what I felt unfortunate about the last Council meeting, when we were deliberating, and voting on a certain specific venue, is that we brought together two or three different factors at once and brought them all into one

debate, and one vote. And I felt it rather unfortunate. Madam Speaker, we had mentioned in the last Council meeting, I think the word...one of the words used was 'epidemic' in terms of how devastating the drug use and drug addiction issue is in our city and in our society in general. But, until that meeting we never talked about it. And last Council meeting we did. And basically, we all said, basically, the same thing. But, until that meeting nothing was said. But, Madam Speaker, unfortunately, we put together the issue of venue with the issue of the City involvement and a final agreement on different factors that brings together a drug treatment facility at a certain place and it brought…it impugned the motivations of many people, Madam Speaker, none the least those proponents who want to bring in the drug rehabilitation facility. Because, Madam Speaker, until that time, within a very quick period, all of a sudden a single venue was offered. And it took many people by surprise. What I would like to do, Madam Speaker, is considering everything that was said in the last meeting by basically everybody in this room, we talked about how important it is that we have these drug treatment facilities. We talked about how the City should do its part regardless of the fact that it is primarily a Provincial and Federal responsibility. But of course the City plays its role. That many things were said, Madam Speaker, including talking about being proactive, that we should be proactive and we should show leadership. Madam Speaker, what comes down to the City's responsibility, ultimately, is location, zoning and those things. So, Madam Speaker, what I would like to do, based on everything that was said basically, in the last meeting, based on the City doing its part based on being proactive. Based on recognizing the need for these things, what I would like to do is bring in a process, Madam Speaker, so that all these things can be considered in terms of venue on the City's part, before the City ends up making a vote on the next drug rehabilitation centre. Let's be proactive. Let's show our leadership, but leave the politics...let's try to take as much politics as we can out of this, Madam Speaker because I felt bad for a few different parties that were involved. It was a pretty hard meeting last time and it doesn't have to be. When it comes to the City involved in having appropriate venues for all sorts of things we have in the city including drug rehabilitation centres, let's do that. Let's not be reactive. Let's not be reactive and wait until there's a specific proposal for a drug rehabilitation centre. I really found that distasteful and I found it unnecessary. Let city hall deal with whatever we've got to deal with in terms of what's an appropriate facility before we bring in proponents that have to stand up there, on whatever side they are taking, because, when we're talking about something so important, when we're talking about something so sensitive, although we never spoke about it like that until we did last Council meeting. If it's that important, Madam Speaker, let the people that have to come up here and propose these things, or if they are going to be opposed, let it be done in a separate meeting and a separate process. I think it's misleading to the public in terms of what we were actually voting on last time or the reasons people were voting for or against. And I felt bad especially for the Oake family, because they were caught in the middle of this because while we weren't being proactive, we were being reactive. So let's be proactive, Madam Speaker. So what I'm proposing is, given that the drug problem in Winnipeg shows no sign of diminishing and whereas the City needs to be involved in establishing more drug rehabilitation units in Winnipeg and whereas the lack of proactive process in choosing the appropriate drug rehabilitation facility has led to unfortunate and unnecessary misunderstandings, impugning people's motivations as Winnipeg goes about trying to establish drug rehabilitation units. And whereas other Canadian cities such as Calgary, have a progressive and proactive process that establishes criteria by which drug rehabilitation facilities can be established. Therefore, be it resolved, that the City administration be directed to initiate a proactive and progressive process of establishing a set of criteria by which drug rehabilitation facilities can be zoned and established within the city of Winnipeg, and, that the City establish a list of City-owned sites where the drug rehabilitation facilities can be established, so that, Madam Speaker, so that next time we have these discussions, we are not scaring off people that wish to have a voice and a say on this, impugning their motivations on something that's very important, and very sensitive, Madam Speaker. We're talking about addiction, we're talking about overdose. We're talking about death. And, we're talking about life-altering circumstances…life-damaging circumstances. And it's very sensitive. I mean, as Councillor Allard said in his speech, I mean…he mentioned the point in trying to heal and recover from these problems. He said there is no shame in it, in trying to seek treatment and that's true. But, when we have these sensitive debates, Madam Speaker, you know, these factors are involved and people having to stand up here and having their motivations questioned, and we should try to take that away from those...from that process. And have a separate proactive process where, you know, politics or whatever, the debate continues, separate from the individuals that come in to be proponents of drug rehabilitation facilities. So, what I have done here, Madam Speaker, is a product very much of the last debate, of this last very important issue that came forward. And I mean, let's face it, it was a little rough on everybody involved in the last meeting, and I am just trying to, in a sense, yes, offer an extra phase of bureaucracy but in the end, the intent is to simplify this and take the politics away from those outside of City Council that are involved in this issue of their communities, of our society and involved in helping heal our society for those that are involved for the different reasons in the struggle for rehabilitation. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm just actually confirming with the department right now about the zoning issue, and just a little chuckle there because the person I was actually…is away. Again I just want to commend our staff. He is on vacation and he's halfway around the world but he's still responding to me right now about the zoning. I do hope our staff do get some holiday time on occasion. So, I think it's great that we are here today to talk about this. I find it a little ironic that the councillor who did not support the centre on fiscal conservativeness I think was the reason

why…is wanting the City to go even further and start identifying areas throughout the city and criterias and I'm not sure exactly of what the details of it would be. Because we actually have a zoning category for this already under existing zoning guidelines, and that's an appropriate place for it. The process works and in this case the process worked quite clearly by, you know, the Province selected a site and we have that ability for government to government process and that still exists so that could happen in the future. You know, there's the other option of if it's a private entity or non-profit group that they just want to come and ask us for a rezoning, they want to purchase a property and do through rezoning. Well, the Vimy site still has to go through that rezoning process. That's where we'll get some more of the details. However, the process right now does exist for people to come in, who wanted to do a treatment centre. We do have...we have care facilities, large and small, we have treatment. So we actually, in our guide…in our book, I'm just want to try and get my head around this, still, I believe we already have this in place for…the process in place, for groups because it is an epidemic. You know, you will see rising in carjackings, for example, going on right now. Well, that is directly related to this epidemic that we're having. We have...I think every neighbourhood of one of our neighbourhoods...every one of our neighbourhoods are facing increased crime. Mostly dash and grabs where they go in, break a window, get some money out of the cars or whatever they can find and then move on to the next one. Again, really being driven by this epidemic as well. So, while I appreciate that the area councillor has decided to support the drug rehabilitation facilities in a rezoning idea, I still say it's unfortunate that whether he supported actually the reality and really did get something done but that's everybody's right. However, that said, I don't...back...I can't remember when it was, before my time, the department was...we used to have hundreds and hundreds of different subsect zonings all throughout our system and it got incredibly confusing and difficult to do. So what they did through the by-law reviews is we've kind of put them into baskets where this...so there is a basket for this to fit in, like I say, it's a government to government it's a little bit different but in general a non-profit group would come forward, they would find surplus land that we have available such as Vimy and make a play for it and say, we want to do it. Again, this is not government to government, this would be a non-profit. And then they would go through the zoning process and all the other criterias would be involved as well. The public would be engaged. They would get the posters up and again, congratulations to Council who are providing further time to allow committees...communities to have notice about...where the reports are. And then we go through a public hearing process. And then at the end of the day, Council would vote on it. So again, while I think...I'm glad to hear that the councillor is definitely supportive of trying to find ways that we can still address this issue in the future. I believe that the zoning is already available for this and this motion is not required.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to hear from our Chair of Property and Development that there is in fact a process already in place. For that reason as well as reasons I'll outline in my remarks, I won't be supporting this motion and would urge members of Council to vote against it. What I believe is happening here and I think it's pretty clear, Councillor Schreyer and Dobson, the two that are moving this forward, both voted against the Bruce Oake Memorial Rehabilitation Centre matter that was before Council. It was a very difficult and a very emotionally difficult discussion for many of us. And there were some...out of...out of all the meetings we've had to date, I was...amongst...amongst all the meetings we have had I was incredibly impressed by many of the remarks of my Council colleagues in speaking about the need for rehabilitation as a health issue. And, it is a health issue. We have seen the benefits of rehabilitation for our citizens in areas of the city, including St. Norbert. Councillor Lukes in particular spoke eloquently with regards to the benefit of the centre in her ward. This is...this motion and the intent behind this is, in my view, an attempt to further stigmatize people who have addictions issues and I don't think that's the right way to proceed. And for that reason, I will not be supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I'm just reading the 'be it resolved' here; that the City administration be directed to initiate a proactive and progressive process of establishing a set of criteria by which drug rehabilitation facilities can be zoned and established in the city of Winnipeg and that the City establish a list of City-owned sites where drug rehabilitation facilities can be established. Seems to me at least in number two, that's the report that we considered at last Council, we had...that the City administration put forward what they felt was the best facility, the best site in order to establish a new drug treatment facility with the Bruce Oake Recovery Centre. And the…I find it particularly ironic that the proponents of this motion who are bringing this motion forward, are the two people who have voted against dealing with the addictions crisis that we are having here in the city of Winnipeg and...the motion by its nature and by its timing, I would...I would say is coming off as very disingenuous and does appear to be some type of political cover for those people who chose to not act on the addictions crisis in Winnipeg. And this seems like some type of political cover perhaps when they have to face the voters in the next election in terms of the types of actions...the types of actions that they have taken. And, they had a chance last Council to take action on this. It was a very tight vote and their support was obviously not there at the table. So those are my comments. Those are some of the reasons I'll be voting against this motion. This stinks of politics to me. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I didn't want to rise to speak to this particular motion for one of our reporters here, who Councillor Eadie seems to speak to all the motions. But I have to rise and speak to this motion, Madam Speaker. I actually won't be voting for it. It's a motion moved by two city councillors who are new this term. Madam Speaker, if they were around and they should know that there is a process. If an addictions treatment centre is required to rezone there is a rezoning requirement, although, I would point out if it's a Provincially-owned and run, they don't necessarily, they have royal prerogative and they don't have to actually follow, necessarily, our rules. But essentially, they do because good development is proper development. And as I had pointed out in the debate, Madam Speaker, we have River Point Treatment Centre in the Mynarski Ward, in a wonderful place along the Red River. Excellent place. It was established in what was already established as an institutional centre for seniors, as a matter of fact, Madam Speaker. And it became surplus to the Province of Manitoba in terms of the need for helping seniors there. So they redeveloped it and the Elk Foundation of Manitoba now runs a treatment centre there, Madam Speaker. They went through a process. They consulted with the community and they are great neighbours. There is no stigmatization happening, Madam Speaker, for those people who are getting treatment at that centre. They are good neighbours. The people who live in there are good neighbours. They are trying to get back on their feet. We know that there is a need for that, Madam Speaker. So, that's why I won't be voting because I know there is already processes in place. What was at issue last month was...and it was something that Council had voted in the past to say that that arena was surplus to the needs for an arena, and so, there it was. It was put up there and you know, I didn't vote for the Bruce Oake Centre to be...actually, what I didn't vote for was selling the land to the Province so that they can then give it to a private, not-for-profit organization, to provide services that the Manitoba Government should actually be using all the money they have, that they are earning from liquor and lotteries, to provide proper treatment facilities. Because that's what their net revenue...or their net profits are supposed to go to, Madam Speaker. As a matter of fact, the Province has surplus property right here in the city of Winnipeg and other places. And so the issue is, where do you try to help this addiction problem? I say, Madam Speaker, I think addictions go way up if you look at the regression in our funding of recreation services it probably corresponds to the rise in addictions, Madam Speaker. Something to think about. I don't like this...you know, when we were considering under governance, the code of ethical conduct, Madam Speaker, and we talked about treating individual members on Council with respect. Now, I don't know what motivated the councillor from St. Charles to do and vote the way he did, or make statements that he did, but I have to say as a Council member, I sat here and I didn't vote, you know...people around this table are trying to make it sound like people who didn't vote for selling the land for $1 to the Province, who has more than enough money to actually pay the real value for it but that's fine. I'm okay. Council made its decision. That's fine, it's over. This happens to be on here because I think that councillor from Elmwood is new and probably didn't know about the processes that are in place to deal with this. Okay, that's fine, Madam Speaker. But, I just want to reiterate for everybody here, I get passionate, too. And I make comments, Madam Speaker. But, I am really dismayed to hear from the councillor of St. Boniface and the Mayor of Winnipeg to demonize people like that. I didn't vote to kill anybody. I didn't vote to get somebody addicted. I didn't vote to not solve the problems. I prefer, Madam Speaker, for people not to get addicted because as again, I will say it again, as I did in my speech and people don't hear everything. I have friends who've died from overdose. I have friends who are addicted and live on the street, Madam Speaker. And for people like the councillor from St. Boniface to go around making statements like that, Madam Speaker, is uncalled for. And if he has any hutspa, maybe he will stand and apologize to the councillor from St. Charles. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Allard: Point of order Madam Speaker. I will not be apologizing for taking action on addiction here in Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer to close.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given what happened last month, I don't have a problem explaining myself and being accountable for my vote. I don't apologize for my actions either. I am trying to alleviate this from politics. I mean, I have to admit, saying that I voted...what was it, I voted against recovery? I can't exactly remember the word that was used but it's there for posterity. Madam Speaker, I'm trying to create a system whereby people are not stigmatized for being proponents of this and that, and having a separate process. Madam Speaker, I'm told I'm new so that I am not aware that there is a process. Well, Councillor Orlikow just explained how they changed the process. It used to be numerous piles or whatever and so they put them into a limited number of baskets. So, Councillor Orlikow just explained how there was a different approach and now we have approach now. Of course we have a process, Madam Speaker. Of course we do. What we did last time was a result of a process...what I'm saying is the process was, well in this case...well, it ended up looking reactive or reactionary. And that's my concern. Well, I'm certainly not trying to stigmatize anybody. What I saw was a mishmash of concerns all bundled into one debate. And now, in fact, I believe my motivations have been impugned by virtue of the process that led us to the last debate. My goodness, I voted

against…and I don't want to put words in Councillor Allard's mouth, but I voted against what was it recovery? Okay, Madam Speaker, well I'm voting for recovery here so I'm trying to present a process or help establish a process by which it will be easier for us, once it's done, to choose our venues. Madam Speaker, I'm not doing this out of the blue. I based it on last debate, or coming up to that debate, as well as my understanding that Calgary, who has got no less of an addiction problem than Winnipeg, my understanding, or very similar, let's face it, that they have got a different system that's evolved to this point, for the process of what they have to deal with. Are they being reactive? Are they being reactionary? No. I got the impression they did it because they are being proactive. That's why they did it. So I'm looking to a city like Calgary for an example of how to not have that debate again. Okay. Councillor Orlikow, fiscal conservative. Ironic that a councillor that voted against it by virtue of fiscal conservativeness. I mentioned it because in the debate that Councillor Gillingham said he has concerns because he is a fiscal conservative. Well for his reasons for calling himself that. Well, I am not here to argue about whether one perceives themselves as a fiscal conservative. I just said for the record maybe I am the most fiscal conservative, look at the record. It's not just my self-concept. I don't perceive myself as a fiscal conservative but my record shows I am a fiscal conservative now that I'm elected on Council. So, it's ironic that I voted against it over fiscal conservativeness. The issue in that case, Madam Speaker, was when we are talking about...well look, we're talking about money that could have potentially have gone towards a public transit system. Let's bring this all together again. We're talking about $5 million when we were 10 million deficient in our bus transportation system. Okay. Who needs buses more than anybody else disproportionately? I think people that...maybe life hasn't been fair to them. Maybe life hasn't been good to them since birth. Maybe they are poor. Maybe the circumstances under which they have lived their lives...well whatever, things lead to addiction and the people that are going to have the biggest struggle probably to get back on their feet and maintain a full-time job or part-time employment whatever, probably disproportionately going to need more public transportation more than anybody else in order to deal with their struggles and maintain a life that is desirable. But, we didn't ask for that $5 million from the Province is what I'm asking. We didn't even ask....maybe we could have negotiated 3 million. So to say...I mean, I can't believe the words being used today. We could have tried...from my understanding, Madam Speaker, all I got is the information I have. Is that we could have tried to use some of that few million dollars to go into our supposed $10 million deficit for buses, because the Provincial Government won't give it to us. Maybe we could have tried to get that money from the Provincial Government for this. But you see, we have this debate on many different issues on this issue, which shouldn't have come all together because now we're impugning everybody's motivations. Well not everybody's but, apparently mine. I'm trying to be proactive, like the city of Calgary. Stinks of politics; Madam Speaker, we had an issue in which, you know, talking about the opening of Portage and Main and then of course it doesn't look popular, it's not looking good so we changed what ended up being the final vote on the Portage and Main thing and then how it goes into the budget. You know, I didn't say it stinks like politics, but if what I'm doing is stinks likes politics, what do you have to say about that? I didn't vote for that by the way. I didn't say it's because it stinks of politics. Well because politics is around here. That's what we do. It's politics. Ideally it's about policy. Ideally it's about policy, Madam Speaker, not politics. And when it comes to a policy here, trying to take away this unfortunate process, look at all the different issues and angles we're dealing with, kind of separate it. Madam Speaker, yeah, it's my first term at City Council and yeah, this is the first time that we talked about drug rehabilitation facilities, so I wasn't exactly sure about the process. Do you think every member of this Council is? But Councillor Orlikow did say we had a change of process which brought us to this in terms of a certain number of baskets. Well, all I'm saying Madam Speaker, is that this was done out of trying to look at good ideas, better ideas and have a better process for this so that we don't have to go through this again because this, round two obviously today, Madam Speaker, stinks of politics. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, councillor Schreyer. With that I will call the question on the notice of motion. All in favour? Contrary? Motion is lost. We will now move on to the by-laws for Property and Development. Councillor Orlikow.

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

Councillor Orlikow: My computer has froze up, sorry, Madam Speaker. There we go. I'm back. Patience. Consideration of by-laws. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll move that the following by-laws be read a first time; By-law Nos. 12...I'm done? 12/2018, thank you very much, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Meeting's over.

Councillor Orlikow: By-law No. 12/2018, By-law No. 13/2018.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 12/2018, By-law No. 13/2018.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Chair. I that the move the By-law Nos. 12/2018 and 13/2018 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 12/2018 and 13/2018.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Chair. I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law Nos. 12/2018 and 13/2018 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for our Chair for Councillor Orlikow. Any questions? Okay, seeing none, our next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Start with question period since there is no reports. Any questions for our Chair, Councillor Pagtakhan? No? Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Morantz on the report dated January 30th.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JANUARY 30, 2018

Councillor Morantz: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'd like to move report...introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Item 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, with respect to the by-laws.
Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Morantz: The schedules to the by-laws were inadvertently not published with the by-laws themselves. I have been...thanks to the advice of my colleague through you, Madam Speaker, Councillor Mayes who picked that up. Clerks have now photocopied the schedules to the by-laws. We're going to need a motion to suspend the rules to bring the additional schedules in.

Madam Speaker: As a walk on.

Councillor Morantz: As a walk on. I'm not sure if I can make that motion or…

Madam Speaker: Yes, you just did.

Councillor Morantz: Okay, so I will move that the schedules are being distributed by hand right now for the three by-laws.

Madam Speaker: So all in favour of suspension of the rules to…yes.

Councillor Eadie: Point of order. What's being distributed? The letters from City Legal?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, we will put you to work today. Could you confirm what the documentation is that was just circulated?

Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Three by-laws; By-law Nos. 9, 10 and 11 all of 2018 have been published on the agenda but inadvertently the schedules to the actual by-laws have not been distributed or published on the agenda. So what they contain is the actual roll numbers of the actual local improvements that were affected, and the annual local

improvement tax that applies to each one of these roll numbers. So basically schedules to the by-laws for the three local improvement by-laws.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of the suspension? Contrary? Carried. Okay, Councillor Morantz on the first reading.

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

Councillor Morantz: So I will...sorry. I will move that the following by-laws be read for a first time; By-law No. 9/2018, By-law 10/2018 and By-law 11/2018.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 9/2018, By-law No. 10/2018 and By-law No. 11/2018.

Councillor Morantz: I'll move that By-law Nos. 9/2018 to 11/2018, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 9/2018 to 11/2018, both inclusive.

Councillor Morantz: And I will move that the rules be suspended and By-law Nos. 9/2018 to 11/2018, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for Councillor Morantz. Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: I'm just trying to speak to the By-law…so I'll phrase this as an "are you aware" question (inaudible). The By-laws we've just passed are some of the first ones we've done under the asphaltic lane program to actually get the local property…the local improvement taxes flowing…are you aware…this has been a great success this program. First approved in late 2013 by the prior Council, funded every year we've been here since 2014 with either 1 or 2 million dollars dedicated funding. We are in…I believe we are somewhere between 40 and 50 lane projects that have now been approved going from gravel to asphalt. It's a democratic process. People bring it on. It's a petition process that requires 60% support. My ward had to lead for a long time but has recently been passed by Councillor Allard's ward through some efforts there. The lanes that have been approved largely reflect the distribution of the gravel lanes within the City, so I just want to confirm that the Chair of Public Works is aware of this program and I believe it's ongoing for one more year as a pilot project.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: I'd like to thank my colleague for the question through you Madam Speaker, and yes I am aware of that and I concur that it is an excellent, excellent program. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Morantz. Any further questions for our Chair? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: This is…we haven't had a residential plow because we haven't had a lot of snow, but we've had a lot of…on the outskirts of the City a lot of the development has had blowing snow, and I've had to work with the Public Works Department to deal with a lot of icy ridges and such that have been in the roads that have actually made the driving conditions unsafe, and I guess I'm wanting to ask the Chair, usually mid to latter February there is residential plow that's called to prepare for the spring melt. Does he have any insight he can share with us on the timing or such of the residential plow.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz.

Councillor Morantz: Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank Councillor Lukes for her question through you. I'll have to take that question under advisement and I will inquire with the Department and get that information to her at the earliest possible time. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none let's move to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance.

We have no report, no motions, no by-laws. Any questions for our Chair for Councillor Gillingham? Okay, seeing none, the next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2018

Councillor Mayes: Thank you Madam Speaker. I will move the report dated February 1st, 2018, Items 1 through 4, inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Okay, pulled 1. Okay, I'll call the question on Items 2 through 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 – Pilot Project – Multi-Family Solid Waste Collection Services Provided by City Staff

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, do you wish to introduce the item?

Councillor Mayes: Sure. This is...CUPE President Delbridge was here earlier today speaking to this item. This is the pilot project. This comes out of three separate things really. The grievance filed by CUPE in relation to the award of the main garbage and recycle contract about 14 months ago that you heard some reference to earlier today. Recommendation 3 from that report which Councillor Gerbasi and I have discussed many times out here, is the recommendation that was innovative that called for the City to start consulting with CUPE to see if work could be brought in-house at a comparable cost. Additionally, Councillor Eadie had brought forward a separate motion which called for the bulky waste pick up to be brought in-house without...without any review. The arrangement that has been made or arrived at with CUPE was to instead of going with the bulky waste to be brought in-house, the move will be to do a pilot project involving the...one of the multi-family department type of pick-ups. Why you may ask? The bulky waste always felt was a sort of different, unique kind of service that involved a lot of manual labour, picking up heavier items whereas if we get some experience with in-house collection on the multi-family side of things that will help us to see what our experience is, what our costs are to get our foot in the door to make that then a possibility, six years down the line when we look at the City-wide garbage and recycle contracts to say, alright, should we follow the lead of Ottawa and designate perhaps one out of five zones to be an in-house zone? The experience in Ottawa…and I met there with the union, the staff, the councillors and the mayor all in one day last year to discuss this. All of them spoke favourably about the model, all of them said yeah, having both a public and a private presence kind of balances things out. None of them said, well, we say that publicly but behind closed doors we're going to tell you, don't do this. They all said, you know, this has worked out in Ottawa. So CUPE has called for the Ottawa model in some of its representations here over the years. I think this is a step towards that. There may be some choppy waters ahead in terms of figuring out exactly what comparable costs are, the pensions, the benefits, the vehicles, how to cost all those. But, Mr. Delbridge and his staff are pretty capable people. Our staff are pretty capable. I have faith that they can work something out. We'll do the pilot project. We'll see how that works and that maybe will give us another option whenever the time comes to introduce the next garbage and recycle contract based on a zone system.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Mayes for his introductory comments here. I just want to put on the record here, Council...I think the statement I made at Water and Waste when this was brought forward. The statement I made at Executive Policy Committee when we voted on this as well. And that is that really, what we're ultimately doing here is seeking the best service for the best value for the citizens of Winnipeg. And I do agree with what the statements that have been made by my colleagues and our delegations, Mr. Delbridge, today that we are really in this process need to do a thorough cost analysis to have a true comparison. And I think this is an effort to have a comparison. I mean, there's those that say it's better, you know to…from a financial and even service

point of view, to contract out. There's those that say, no, no, it's better from a financial and a service point of view to have it done by City of Winnipeg employees and have it done by the City's public service. What's the reality, what's the truth? We don't ultimately know so hopefully, the goal will be that this process, which includes the pilot project, will allow the ability and afford the opportunity to do an accurate comparison where we are looking at both service delivery and the cost, which will include salaries, benefits, pensions, the cost...or capital cost, life cycle costs of equipment that the City of Winnipeg would have to acquire and lease, whatever the case may be. And so, again, ultimately I think what the citizens need to understand and need to know is that the goal, I believe, or around this chamber, regardless of what side of maybe the political spectrum we would each come from, the goal is to seek the best service for the best value for the citizens of Winnipeg and that's really I think the aim of this pilot project and the analysis that will be done as part of this pilot project. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you Madam Chair. I am very, very supportive of this initiative. I think what's really, really exciting is not only the analysis that we're going to be able to do, but, having the ability to be able to do in-house contracting would allow us when we do have service issues like we've had in the past, having an in-house provider to be able to kind of deal with some of those management issues that we've had in the past by contract providers, having the ability to have the equipment, having the staff. If there is an issue we are having with different garbage contractors, we would have the ability to handle some of this stuff in-house and I think that that's really exciting on what the Ottawa model has to offer. So it will be really interesting to see the analysis but also, seeing what we can do in-house and if there are any issues that we have like we've had in the past, that we're able to deal with it here at the City level with our staff that we have. Thank you.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I am cautiously in support of the motion before us here today for the pilot project. Again, when we talked to residents of Winnipeg, when I talked to the constituents at the coffee shop, at the grocery store, you name it, the message I'm hearing is people want more for less. They want more service, they want better service and they want to pay less money than they already are paying. They feel they pay too much as it is. Obviously that's not possible. When it comes down to garbage and recycling and yard waste pick up, people are looking for a dependable service. And I don't think they are really all that concerned about who provides that service. In the past, I have been very supportive of projects where we have engaged with CUPE. A number of years ago when we first introduced the 311 service to Winnipeggers and we had an independent firm help us do the consultation, CUPE came to the table and gave us a number of concessions and we found a solution that kept the 311 service in-house. It made sense and it's worked well for Winnipeg, I believe. This is another opportunity where if it makes sense, you know, it's not about political philosophies or whatever, it's about getting the best value and the best bang for the buck if you will, for taxpayers. So again, if CUPE wants to come to the table, if we can work with industry to find a model that makes sure that it's going to be an ongoing, dependable service that's sustainable over the long term for Winnipeggers, sure we can try a pilot project and go forward, you know, looking at other opportunities to perhaps extend it permanently if the savings and the value are there for taxpayers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. As well, I'm cautiously optimistic and I give support to this. I say cautious because, you know, we are talking about being able to make a comparison in Winnipeg in terms of that which is contracted out and that which is in-house. And in other cities they are able to do that and that's why in confidence, they have greater in-house services, such as, well, most other Canadian cities, major Canadian cities, as well as many other smaller Canadian cities, Madam Speaker because they can say with confidence. And the reason is, they are comparing apples to and apples and oranges to oranges. Because, when it comes to garbage zones, they have…they are comparing apples to apples. They will have garbage zones, ones that are privately contracted and ones that are in-house. So you actually can make…do a comparative analysis. In this case, Madam Speaker, there will be nothing to compare to. We had that opportunity. We missed the opportunity. We had a number of smaller zones, a number of zones like Ottawa, and then they had one zone that is in-house. Most Canadian cities have minimum, one zone that's done in-house, if not half, if not the majority...if not all in some cases like Vancouver or Calgary. And the reason Calgary Mayor Nenshi says that it's done in-house is because, two words, "it's cheaper", quote from Mayor Nenshi. So, we're unfortunately not in a position to make a real comparative analysis here because we'll have nothing to compare to. We had the opportunity, Madam Speaker, when we had five zones or whatever it was, four zones to give one to…back to in-house, we didn't do that. In fact, Madam Speaker, we went to two zones and then said it was prohibitive for us to do it in-house before even having those consultations…those real consultations with Mr. Delbridge and CUPE. So, Madam Speaker, I never said it stank of politics, I never said that. But, Madam Speaker, if you look at what brought to us to have it...we are the only city left in Canada, Madam Speaker where...major city in Canada, Madam Speaker, where it's all privatized. And we've made a point last year, Madam Speaker, of making sure that we can't compare. So we bring this in...I never said it stank of politics by the way, Madam Speaker, I never said that, but what a strategy in order for us not

to have anything in-house and be the only city not to. But I never said it stank of politics, Madam Speaker. What I am saying in this case is that we can't make a comparative analysis because we've got nothing to compare it to. We'll have a small niche for this in-house service and as well, the reason Mr. Delbridge said we went to seven year contracts is because had to amortize the payments of the capital, of the capital equipment of the infrastructure. And, of course, it takes time to make your payments and make your equipment worthwhile. Again, in this case it's a two year. Mr. Delbridge is being optimistic saying we've got our foot in the door. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, two things. One, it can't be compared so we can be critical of it all we want but there is nothing to compare to. We can say it's great too, but we have nothing to compare to. It's just a niche, fraction market. And two, it's over a two year period in which we are not in a position to really analyze the full amortization. So my concern, Madam Speaker, is unlike doing what every other city does, basically, and having at least one zone of in-house workers to something more substantial, like garbage and recycling pick up, we have this instead. Okay. So as I said from the very beginning, I'm cautiously optimistic and I'm cautiously supportive. But, I've put on record right now why it's merely cautious. And hope everybody understands what I just said because we're the only ones here. We're the only ones doing this, Madam Speaker. Why is the rest of the country going back to in-house? And why didn't we? And so the result is this, in which we can't compare. And two, it's only a two year experiment if you will. So, I'm putting my...let's all put our best foot forward on this but I say this for the record because people have to know what the difference is between Winnipeg and the rest of the country, specifically, Madam Speaker, I'm not just talking fluff, and what is the unique aspects of this contract itself, which has limitations in terms of our ability to compare by virtue of size, lack of competition, Madam Speaker, and the fact that it's only a two year thing. So, let's mark these words. What the concerns are, and see what happens in two years. Not just for this, but, just in terms of those City paid for, taxpayers paid for services that may or may not be done in-house, that may be contracted out. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, construction inflation. And those things that are capital intensive and the inflation rates of capital intensive industries and city-run services. Because, Madam Speaker, after what…I think the last contract was five years, and it went up...the contract costs went up by 35 percent after five years...I'm sorry, I might be wrong. Scott Gillingham shook his head like I am wrong. Oh, okay, because I don't mind being corrected in this chamber, absolutely not. If I say anything wrong I wish to be corrected because we need to get our facts straight before we have a legitimate argument, Madam Speaker. But I believe it went up by, well, over 30 percent, around 35 percent. So that is a 7 percent increase. That's just year to year, but I mean, it depends how you look at it, you know, compounded kind of thing. But, Madam Speaker, that's classic construction inflation, Madam Speaker, and therefore, maybe that's why Canada has gone in-house. Madam Speaker, I believe in a balanced approach to economics when it comes to public administration. We don't have that in the City of Winnipeg. We could have like the rest of Canada. We could have had…and Mr. Delbridge can put his money where his mouth is and say it's cheaper to do it this way or we could prove Mr. Nenshi wrong, the mayor of Calgary, that even though it's cheaper in Calgary, it might not be cheaper here. We could have done that here Madam Speaker. We could have stayed with four zones and had one that was in-house and we could have made some real comparative analysis and see where Winnipeggers could have saved their money, how we could have saved taxpayers money, Madam Speaker. We didn't. We're left with this. I never said this stinks of politics, Madam Speaker, but bizarre and unfortunate strategy for the City of Winnipeg. I don't believe we saved money. Canada, municipally, doesn't believe Winnipeg saved money otherwise they would do what we do and they didn't. Why not Madam Speaker? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, councillor Schreyer. With that I will call the question unless Councillor Mayes, do you wish to close?

Councillor Mayes: One is reminded of the start of Dickens 'Bleak House' which starts, "Fog was everywhere". I'm glad Councillor Schreyer does not mind being corrected on the floor of Council and that I have that opportunity. There was no strategy to mislead. There was no strategy to make sure there couldn't be a cost comparison. There was no ability to make a cost comparison because we did not have a zone that was represented by in-house workers and an in-house union. Thus, there was no strategy to avoid any cost comparison, there was no bizarre strategy. The system used in Ottawa has evolved over 20 years not 20 minutes, not one vote. It began roughly 18 years ago with one zone coming in when the contractor went bankrupt. One thing they did say to me in Ottawa was don't do it the way we did where we had to go to auctions and pretend we weren't city people and bid on garbage trucks to start getting back into the garbage business. So we are not doing it that way. We're starting off with a pilot project like this so we can get some idea of what the costs are. Councillor Schreyer has said well, everyone else does it cheaper, thus, we misled or adopted a bizarre cost ineffective strategy. Actually, if you do the work and look at what the union in Ottawa did, they accepted fairly substantial concessions to get their foot back in the door. Public information, I have talked about it many times, the collective agreement that covers the zoned garbage workers is substantially less generous than the collective agreement that governs other workers in the city of Ottawa. So, there had to be some give and take. We didn't have any concessions proposed by the union here. Maybe that will be necessary as part of this process and maybe it won't. I guess we'll see as we go forward. But, there was certainly no attempt to mislead the public. The idea that somehow we're off on our own folly and every other city in Canada is doing it differently, I would actually suggest we are starting to follow the lead of Ottawa. Toronto has some in-house and some contracted out. It has retained some of it being contracted out. It hasn't brought it all back in-house. So, if it was always cheaper to do it in-house then it would be

bizarre not to bring all of it in-house. The balanced model that Ottawa has had in place, I think, we are doing something innovative here. We're doing something creative with the co-operation of CUPE and we're going to try and make that work. The poll that was cited earlier today saying by a two to one margin people of Winnipeg want it brought back in-house is there an important caveat on that. If you Google that, it's pretty easy to see that what it says is, if the costs were roughly comparable. So here we are, I think, acting on what the poll said, two-thirds of Winnipeggers say, or it's 60% of Winnipeggers, hey, if it's roughly comparable, yes we would support bringing it back in-house. So we're going to try and make it roughly comparable. What exactly that means, I don't know. We'll have to sort it out in the process of bargaining with CUPE and try and come up with a pilot project that will allow us to compare. No, it isn't going to be seven years, it's going to be a two year pilot project and that will give us some ability to see what the labour rates are. As Councillor Gillingham has pointed out, it's not just the labour rates you need to include pension benefits, capital costs. I honestly do not have any idea how construction inflation pertains to this since we aren't constructing things. But, if one talks vaguely about inflation, then yes, there is an inflationary aspect. Certainly we are paying more for the new two-zone system than we were under Entera. Of course, some of the very people who complained about that were the very people who got up here and complained about Entera being in place in the first instance and its labour record. So, yes, we did act to replace Entera. I think we made the right choice in doing that. I think the service has improved. I also think we should be doing a pilot project like this because that will give us some more flexibility. We aren't doing what previous councils have done and simply contracting out under the blind belief that that will always save money. I think we are taking a more innovative approach and looking at what the actual cost will be. If it's roughly comparable in-house, I think most Winnipeggers would say go ahead and do that. As Councillor Browaty has suggested and he did make the right vote at the golf…golf regime several years ago which was another collective agreement issue where we talked about how the fact that the original support that said, it's all the fault of the collective agreement, that's why the golf courses aren't making money and we got up and said, actually, Kildonan makes money and it's unionized so it's got to be more complicated than that. So in any event, the garbage situation, I think we are taking a pretty big step forward. And you know, the president of ATU when he was riding on the bus with Councillor Morantz and me said, you know, we would like to look at getting back in…getting our foot back in the door with Handi-transit. If they can make their costs roughly comparable then I think maybe we can take a look at that too. I don't want to put the cart in front of the horse but I think we are doing something innovative here and I think that is in line with what Winnipeggers want. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. With that I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Any questions for the Chair? Councillor Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE,
RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Eadie: Yes Madam Speaker, a little light heartedness. Madam Speaker, I was just wondering if the Chairperson could let me know when the reference to Bleak House was that Bleak House exists on Main Street at Seven Oaks Avenue, or is that in reference to some kind of book.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I believe Councillor Gillingham is the Dickens scholar so I will defer to Councillor Gillingham.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for our Chair. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker, Councillor Mayes, being forthcoming and providing this information which I truly appreciate. He said that he was going to correct me. I'm not exactly sure what it is he correct me on other than to say that there was no strategy to mislead. Madam Speaker, will the…I'm not sure how to phrase this as a question, but will the Chair of the Standing Committee recognize that we are not in a position…I guess the intent of what I'm saying was, because we don't have an in-house zone, that we can't compare, therefore we can't mislead the public because we can't provide that information. Would he accept that that is the result of the zoning that we have and how it's contracted? I'm not sure exactly how he corrected me, but I have to phrase this in the form of a question. I apologize the difficulty in this, perhaps, to answering…

Madam Speaker: And your question is…

Councillor Schreyer: Will he recognize the fact that…I don't recall using the words that to mislead the public on this. We can't provide them with a comparative analysis, is what I'm saying, therefore, I don't know why he said that I was…that I said that we would be misleading the public when we can't provide the public with that information.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I don't understand the question.

Councillor Schreyer: Fair enough. Madam Speaker, also Councillor Mayes said he didn't understand why I mentioned construction inflation. We talked about the 35% increase after 5 years of the contract. I said construction inflation, but I mentioned capital intense industries that happen to have the same…

Madam Speaker: And your question Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: Well will he at least recognize the fact that I broaden construction inflation recognizing it that as a capital intense industry such as these, capital intense industries, that it had…which I said Madam Speaker, had a similar inflation rate. Would he at least recognize that's how I mentioned it?

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Councillor Schreyer talked about construction inflation. I don't think there's a lot of construction involved in garbage and recycle pickup. There is capital involved. There are garbage trucks, there are recycling trucks. They need to be parked somewhere. Perhaps a garage will need to be built to accommodate them if we move to some sort of city in-house collection. Beyond that, I'm not really sure how to connect the dots here. Councillor Schreyer chose to talk about construction inflation. That's his prerogative. My point merely was yes, costs are higher under the new system than they were under the old system. I don't really think construction inflation bears on that. Consumer price index, other forms of inflation may bear on that. Rising wage rates, but…I think I've answered to the best of my ability.

Madam Speaker: Second question Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I was really making the comparison between construction inflation and the relationship, in this case, that was the capital intensity of the industry.

Madam Speaker: And your second question now?

Councillor Schreyer: Well, is he saying therefore…well that labour rates went up by 7% a year or…that's why we had this notable inflation rate with this capital intensive service. Was it due to 7% annual labour rate increases?

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: No.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions for our Chair? Seeing none, we'll move onto the final committee. If I could ask Councillor Pagtakhan to take the Chair. He's quite capable of being the Acting Deputy Speaker. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Okay, we are on to the report of the Governance Committee of Council dated January 23rd, 2018. I would like to recognize Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma.

**REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED JANUARY 23, 2018**

Councillor Sharma: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. I suggest that we…I can introduce the item separately as I know a member of Council will be recusing themselves for Item 2.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Separately, Item No. 1.

Item 1 – Report of the Integrity Commissioner: Report No. 1 – January 16, 2018 – Recommending the Adoption of a Proposed Code of Conduct for Members of Council for The City of Winnipeg

Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Clerk. Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you. We have before us Item 1, a proposed code of conduct for members of Council drafted by our first…Winnipeg's first Integrity Commissioner, Ms. Sherry Walsh, and I see that she is in the gallery today. She has been waiting patiently all afternoon for this item to be coming up on the agenda. Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I am very supportive of the recommendations in the code itself. I am also very pleased with the work that Ms. Walsh has undertaken to deliver us this code. She has conducted a very comprehensive cross jurisdictional analysis including interviews with many experts in the field both nationally and internationally. Ms. Walsh has also put this code together utilizing a very collaborative process. Five group sessions with all members of Council were held, each session lasted over two hours, wherein she introduced and explained each item of the code and fielded all questions while seeking continued input. In addition, Ms. Walsh conducted numerous one-on-one sessions with members of Council on request. Thank you, Ms. Walsh, for the exhaustive efforts that you have put into delivering us this proposed code of conduct. Enhancing the code of conduct is a very strong statement from City Council. We want to ensure public confidence and accountability in government. And I believe this code will deliver that. I urge all members of Council to provide their positive support so we can move forward in implementing this new code. Thank you.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma. I would now like to recognize Mayor Bowman followed by Councillor Eadie.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Mr. Acting Speaker? Deputy Acting Speaker…Acting Deputy Speaker. It flows off the tongue.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Tell me about it.

Mayor Bowman: I want to echo the comments of our Speaker and Councillor Sharma and I want to thank Commissioner Sherry Walsh for her outstanding work in her short term in the position. I think all members of Council should be incredibly proud of the leadership that we have provided to create for the first time, the position of an Integrity Commissioner and then to work collaboratively together on providing the feedback and the input to the Commissioner for what is before us to be voted on in a few moments. And also, I do want to commend...it's unfortunate that our colleague, Councillor Gerbasi isn't able to join us for this afternoon because she has long been a champion for an Ethics Commissioner, an Integrity Commissioner. We now are seeing the real tangible results of her advocacy and leadership for so many years, many years during the previous term when I wished as a taxpayer, that we had had that position in place. And the main reason I say that is I think the main benefit as members of Council will have heard from our Integrity Commissioner, the main benefit of the role is the proactivity and the education that she is already providing. This code, however, is a very positive step in our ongoing efforts together to build a Council and a city hall that is trusted more by our citizens. Some of the other measures that are related to this code include, as I've mentioned, the creation of the Integrity Commissioner position itself, but also, I will remind members of Council and those that are watching these proceedings of Council's leadership to create the first Lobbyist Registry. That was something that has been long called for and while it's voluntary, it's certainly a step in the right direction. We have also seen at city hall recently, the Board of Revision practices and procedures being updated. We have taken steps to advocate for whistle-blower protection. We are now Livestreaming not just this proceeding here today but all of our committee meetings as well, including the Board of Revision. Capital expenditure, monthly reports are now online and we have an open government, annual open government report and our open data measures are being recognized nationally in the most recent external ranking of cities. We have moved from 10th place in the country last year, surpassing cities like Calgary, to now be in third place nationally and that's something I think we and Winnipeggers should be very proud of. This code of conduct is something that will strengthen all of those efforts and for those reasons, I urge all members of Council to support this today. Thank you.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much Mayor Bowman. Next up is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. Of course I rise to vote for this new code of ethical conduct. I have to congratulate our new Integrity Commissioner on what was, I felt, a very consultative, collaborative process in coming up with this code of ethical conduct and we had a lot of discussions. And while I support this new code of ethical conduct I have no problem with it because, since I have been elected in office I have been very ethical and always have been and always will be, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. But I do have to say that we can see how political power can exercise and change a collaborative process in that I think a $50 threshold is enough. The Mayor got his way. He got a zero and I think it has to do with the power at the office and I look forward to what I think will make government even better in this city, is a new…the review and a new way of governing City Council and the City of Winnipeg, to achieve the ultimate goal. What I really find interesting is when it comes to conflict of interest and gifts it goes far beyond the Municipal Code of Ethical Conduct Act or whatever it's called, I can't remember its exact name, but it has a long name and actually it's a very difficult document to read. I have gone through it and this new code of ethical conduct is very clear. The rules are very clear, succinct and you know, leave enough room for interpretation from our Integrity Commissioner because you know, you can't actually pass a policy or anything that's going to really cover all the issues perfectly or exactly and so you know, that's the way it is, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. What I do like about it is...and we are reminded and it talks about principles, it talks about all of the important concepts that go into this. And it's not really necessarily that you have a direct conflict. There are circumstances in which there may be a perceived conflict. And that conflict, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, that conflict can either be positive or negative, but thus still a conflict. For example...and I've had to recuse myself in what wasn't really necessarily a conflict of interest. But I was really concerned. But you know like, for example, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, you know, if they were talking about not wanting to or wanting to replace the primary dike and I happen to own a property on Scotia behind the primary dike, there is a secondary dike there as well, which actually protects my property as well. And I wouldn't want to be voting on that because it either…it's going to affect me positively or negatively and technically I am in a conflict if I have an influence in a vote on that. I think, you know, that could mean the difference between the value of my house being $300,000 or $400,000, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. So I give those examples because the things I hear that are happening around here with City Council, people need to consider that. We have a lot of learned people, who while not practising, do understand law and do know how to undertake their obligations and responsibility. And so, while I am voting…and I am voting for this, I hope that everybody actually looks into it quite in-depth and ensures that they are making decisions that are involved because you can always delegate some decisions if you are not necessarily...if you are in a perceived or in a direct conflict for sure. And that's your family, too, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. Your close relatives and so on. In terms of the gifts, I just wanted to speak to that because it can be confusing. It's clear we are talking about gifts that you have received while undertaking your work as a member of Council, whether you are the mayor or a City councillor. And so we are going to be reporting those. And our Integrity Commissioner is actually quick. I had to ask her a quick question yesterday and I'm glad I got that and so, for example, if I go to the Rogers Hometown event and I get a gift of a shirt, a sweater, a jacket, I have to report that. And I will if I do, absolutely. In terms of gifts, one thing…a question we still have to ask, but I know I have received a gift just sitting here in this chamber, of a t-shirt promoting certain weeks, certain days of the year. And I think those are good, I guess we have to report those now, too, because I am doing my work and I am getting a gift. I get a pin or maybe a flower, I will have to report that. That's fine, that's good. The complexity is when is a City councillor or member of Council not doing their job or being a part of it? And it will be the general public's impression as to whether to file a complaint or not. But I was glad to hear that when I go out dancing on the weekends, promoting the Royal Canadian Branch 30 Legion, they have great bands on the weekends, if somebody buys me a beer, that's my…I am not working. I'm going out dancing. That's where I go. I am a member of the Legion, that's fine. I'm glad because there is no way I'm going to be able to keep track of all these things. But you know, some difficulties we that we might talk about, for example, I'm member of the North End BIZ and this will be a question and we will have to determine this. I was offered a ride home after that. I could have taken the bus. Close to the bus stop. I was offered a ride home. I was tired. It was already 7:30 at night. I took the ride, is that a gift? Hmm. I was doing my job as City councillor, eating food at a supper meeting. I don't think I have to claim the food, it was a supper meeting, I'm being fed for my work as a member. But, you know, often people know who I am. Now, I happen to be blind, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. Am I going to have to report...and this happened to me the other day. I was on Portage Avenue after a doctor's appointment out at Deer Lodge and thank goodness there was an audible signal at whatever the name of that street is, there was an audible...I got across the street, I was taking a bus and somebody says, is that Ross Eadie, City councillor? And I said yeah. And I needed to get back to city hall because the appointment took much longer than I thought and I took the ride. And the only reason that this guy knew who I was, if I just happened to be some blind person he didn't know who I was, I probably wouldn't have gotten a ride. Do I have to report that as a gift? Those are the things we're going to have to ask ourselves all the time. Something to remember, something to think about. But, whether it's zero or $50 we're going to create some bureaucracy here. It may be simple or it may not be, I don't know. I know that our Integrity Commissioner wants to make this the best for everybody and so I have confidence that that will happen.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Councillor Gillingham moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: So anyway, I just want to say that I really support this. But, to really believe in it, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, is to constantly consider those things and remember that. It's very difficult. I can't imagine what it would be like for the one member of Council who has a much bigger portfolio than us but at least they have the resources to help us keep track of all of that and I believe in the rules that are set forth and will do all my best to try to accomplish that. But, you know, there are circumstances where we have an FCM in Halifax. I guess I guess I'm not going to be going to any of the hospitalities or anything because that'll be receiving gifts from people who could potentially be lobbyists. They are not registered, but they could potentially be. And so I remind all of Council not to accept any invitations to anything. Just go to your workshops. Thank you.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Any other speakers? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Acting Deputy Speaker Pagtakhan. Sure, I will be voting in favour of this, bear in mind there are a few things I would like to put on record that we all have to take into consideration. One, as our new Integrity Commissioner has stated right here that it's intended that this code operate together with and supplemental to the statutes, by-laws and policies which govern the conduct of members including but not limited to. So obviously we already have by-laws and policies which govern the conduct of ourselves as councillors. And she mentions the City of Winnipeg Charter the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act so there is already an act for municipal council conflict. The Human Rights Code of Manitoba, Freedom of Information Protection of Privacy Act, the Criminal Code of Canada, City of Winnipeg policies, by-laws and protocols, codes of conduct for City boards and commissions and within these things there are greater rules as you look in. So as she is explaining, we already have a process in place for ethical conduct of councillors. Councillor Orlikow mentioned that we already had a process in place by which we end up...the Province ends up choosing a site that they choose but we don't negotiate on what they're going to pay for it. But, nonetheless, in this case, there is a process already in place. But, we are changing the process, we're adding to the process, something that I tried to do in my last motion. But, there is a process in place here, Madam Speaker…Mr. Speaker…Acting Deputy Speaker, but we are trying to enhance it. We're just trying to make things better. No doubt in my mind things...it has that potential, no doubt about it. I guess the most important point, this is my interpretation, I want to see if anyone has a different interpretation, the difference is that there is some greater definition. Again, most of the definition in terms of our conduct is already itemized by what already pre-exists to which this will be a supplemental. But the major difference as well is that the interpretation will be done by the Integrity Commissioner. Is that not the proper interpretation? Let me know. But I suspect that is the main difference between what we already have and what we are voting on today. And so I just want to make that point. And on that point, Councillor Eadie did speak on this and he mentioned some points, these are the things that we need to be cognizant of and get some answers as we go. Perhaps soon because the Federation of Canadian Municipalities is coming up at the end of May, beginning of June and so we need an answer on this in terms of how we deal as we always deal every year with our fellow councillors and also those that lobby municipal councillors from around the country every year. And that's just one example, Madam Speaker. Now, I don't personally know, but I'm new, in a sense, I can't use that for much longer as we are in an election year. I don't…I would like to know what happened in the last term that would be different had we had the Integrity Commissioner...or before then. We have operated off (inaudible) for generations based on others codes, but we wish to enhance the process. I'm not saying this stinks of politics Madam…Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I am voting for it. Although we have a process in place, we're enhancing it. And I am optimistic…cautiously optimistic that we will be the better for it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much Councillor Schreyer. To close, Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. Councillor Eadie, he raised some good points, I feel, around gifts. And the comments he made around hospitality suites at FCM, etc., they are real and they were discussed in the collaborative process with the Integrity Commissioner. Personally, I have to say I feel we are swinging the pendulum a little too far when we take the gift amount from $50 to $0. The good thing is, this new code of conduct I view it as a living, breathing document. It's not a document that we're going to put on the shelf and not look at and follow, but it's also something that I think that we can amend in the future and in a view to looking to improve it…improve it further. This is our first Integrity Commissioner. She has worked long and hard at this document but there is always room for improvement. It is a very good start and a tremendous amount of work has gone into drafting it by Ms. Sherri Walsh. As the Mayor said in his remarks, it is a positive step forward and to that end I am happy to support it today. Thank you.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Okay. Thank you very much Councillor Sharma. So on the Item No. 1. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Allard, okay, you will be recusing yourself. Okay. Just being advised by the Clerk that Councillor Allard has requested to recuse himself due to a perceived conflict of interest. Thank you very much Mr. Clerk. Correct, we are on report number two. Mr. Clerk, I believe.

Item 2 – Report of the Integrity Commissioner: Report 2 – January 16, 2018 – recommending a process to address complaints about conduct which predate the enactment of a by-law to enforce the Code of Conduct for Members of Council for the City of Winnipeg

Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Okay. Thank you Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. Item No. 2 of the report of the Governance Committee provides a process for dealing with complaints our Integrity Commissioner has received between her appointment by Council on April 1st, 2017, but prior to the adoption of the new code of conduct that Council just voted on. The Integrity Commissioner has advised in her report that she will be treating any complaints received during this time period in the same manner as she would for complaints received going forward from today. The only difference would be that she would be evaluating the complaints received previous to today against the old code of conduct which was adopted by Council in 1994 rather than this new conduct today…code today, pardon me. This makes a lot of sense for the reason that it holds Council accountable to the code of conduct that was in place prior to the time period in question. Thank you.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma. Okay, any other speakers? Seeing none, I'll call the vote. All those in favour of Item No. 2? Opposed? Carried. We'll now movie on to the Governance Committee of Council, consideration of by-laws. Mr. Clerk...or, sorry.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Sharma: I move that the By-law 19.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Clerk advises you are okay, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Sharma: I'll move that the By-law 19/2018 be moved first time.

Acting Deputy Speaker: All in those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 19/2018.

Councillor Sharma: I'll move that By-law 19/2018 be read a second time.

Acting Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 19/2018.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: I'll move that By-law 19/2018 be read a third time and that the same be ordered to be signed and sealed.

Acting Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. Councillor Gillingham would you like to move adjournment? Sorry, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Yes, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, just before we adjourn I would like to ask all members of Council and the Mayor to remain so we can sign a special document for our outgoing City Clerk, Richard Kachur just after the meeting, if everyone could take a moment to do that. Thank you.

Acting Deputy Speaker: Right, the motion that was moved this morning, thank you very much Madam Speaker. Councillor Gillingham now moves adjournment. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried. We are now adjourned. Thank you. Roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 2:59 p.m.