COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, January 25, 2018

The Council met at 9:46 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 Allard.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. I would like to now recognize our pages for today's meeting, please welcome Anak Akeen who attends Gordon Bell High School and resides in the Daniel McIntyre Ward and Max Thompson who attends St. Boniface Diocesan High School and resides in the St. Boniface Ward. Thank you for joining us. Thank you for joining us and assisting Council today. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, we'll hear from you on your morning announcements. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker and good morning to everyone. Good morning to everyone who's joined us in the gallery and those that are watching online television and good morning, my council colleagues who are here today. Firstly, welcome to the first Council meeting of 2018. Not only that, but welcome to what might be the first Council meeting on a Thursday. It's good to see everyone adjusted to meeting on a Thursday rather than our typical Wednesday. It shows change is possible at City Hall. It's great to get back as a council to debate and discuss many important issues on today's agenda and in the meetings to follow this year. Welcome to…welcome, too, to the upcoming Year of the Dog which is marked by Chinese New Year in mid-February of this year. Over the last several weeks, I hope everyone has had an opportunity to enjoy a safe and happy Christmas, happy Hanukkah and overall, an enjoyable holiday season with family, friends, loved ones and community members. 2018 looks like another busy year and there's lots of work to look forward to, the remaining months of winter and our summer will again be full of festivals and events of all kind throughout our community including the Festival du Voyageur, the Fringe and Folklorama among many, many others. Madam Speaker, last week I had the distinguished pleasure of meeting and welcoming to Winnipeg Mr. Claude Elliott, he's the former mayor of Gander, Newfoundland. Mr. Elliott was the mayor of Gander for over 20 years and oversaw the response to thousands of stranded airline passengers on 9/11, following the terrorist attacks in the United States. I also had the chance to experience the musical 'Come from Away.' Mr. Elliott and the musical's portrayal of the response following September 11th both demonstrate the Canada we all know and love, a Canada that is open, is compassionate and is a place of sanctuary. And it's a heart-warming, truly Canadian story and it was great to welcome Mr. Elliott to our community of and City of Winnipeg. I want to quickly recognize the organizers and participants at the 4th Annual She Day Conference that's taking place in our city tomorrow. This event has been a huge success every year since it started a few years back. In Canada, we are grateful for the continued advancements in women's rights which are, after all, human rights. But we still have work to do on the road to gender equity and equality and we are lucky to live in a country where we can openly have this conversation. Madam Speaker, we need to continue to push the glass ceiling to break down barriers and encourage respect, tolerance, and equality, and the participants and organizers of the She Day Conference are doing exactly that. Finally Madam Speaker, I do want to note that Saturday, January 27th, is International Holocaust Remembrance Day. In 1945 on January 27th, the Red Army entered the Auschwitz-Birkenau extermination camp complex liberating more than 7,000 remaining prisoners. Just days earlier, the SS had forced nearly 60,000 prisoners to evacuate the camp and embark in the infamous death marches in which many thousands lost their lives. Every year on January 27th, the world marks and remembers the Holocaust and its victims. Seventy two years from the liberation of Auschwitz, it is more important than ever to remind ourselves of the universal lessons of the Holocaust and to foster a shared culture of remembrance. To acknowledge this day, flags at City Hall will be lowered to half-mast from sunrise to sunset on Saturday, January 27th. Thank you, merci and megwich, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Allard, your opportunity for your morning announcement.

Councillor Allard: All right. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I feel like...I feel that I have been scooped by the Mayor somewhat, but I'll expand a bit on the Festival du Voyageur happening in February. It's the largest winter festival in western Canada. Wanted to share the dates with everyone as I don't think I will have another opportunity before the next Council. So it's from February 16th to 25th and most of it is happening in the heart of St. Boniface, however, the Festival is ever expanding and has more and more venues, so please check it out. I think novelty is wood sculptures to add to the beautiful snow sculptures, so always something new to see. And there is, for young families, there is a new deal where there is...they've raised the age exemption for children and so it's now more affordable for families to go and check it out. So if you've got a young family, this year's your opportunity, so thank you very much for your attention this morning on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next is Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, thank you very much and good morning, Madam Speaker. I just want to highlight that there is a...on February the 8th is a public information session, Madam Speaker, and it's regarding all the good work that's been occurring on a major capital project that the City is working towards, the Arlington Bridge. So this public information session occurs on Thursday, February the 8th at 6:00 o'clock till 8:00 o'clock, Madam Speaker, at the North Centennial Recreational Leisure Centre at 90 Sinclair Street. It's a drop-in format and I encourage members of the public, all members of Council to come to the open house and to see what's been going on in terms of the project team and the consultant that has been working diligently on this project. Kind of interesting, there is going to be a 20 foot…21 foot model, Madam Speaker, with trains and cars and streets and, of the actual proposed design of the Arlington Bridge. Over the last few years, Madam Speaker, there has been sort of a two phased approach with regards to the planning for the Arlington Bridge. In 2014 till 2015, essentially there was a CPR functional design crossing study that was done and there was many formats that were taking place, Madam Speaker. There were face-to-face meetings. There were open houses. There were dialogue groups, many community workshops and online telephone and social media surveys that were taking place. Thousands and hundreds...thousands of Winnipeggers...tens of thousands of Winnipeggers, Madam Speaker, weighed in in terms of what they want to see and overwhelmingly as a result of that, Madam Speaker, it was almost...the question was posed, is the Arlington Bridge even relevant, Madam Speaker, and you know what, the overwhelming response is that it is relevant. There is over 15,000 vehicles that pass on that bridge every single day and those are figures that are old figures from 2001 to 2015. So the relevance of the Arlington Bridge has been solidified in that functional design and from that point until now, Madam Speaker, to this open house, a preliminary design is being undertaken. And the same thing, there's been lots of face-to-face meetings, lots of social media requests, online surveys, telephone surveys, community meetings, and again, Winnipeggers weighed in in terms of what they want to see. They want to see the actual bridge being built. They want to see public art. They want to see how it remembers history and how it can serve Winnipeggers by utilizing…by ensuring that the bridge accommodates Winnipeg Transit, our Fire and EMS services, people that want to walk and take strollers across and places for people to sit and most importantly, for vehicles and bikes. So you know, this is a culmination of some great work, Madam Speaker, and I really want to applaud the project team and I want to applaud this council for embracing the work that's been happening over the last several years. You know, to work towards a Class 3 estimate. I can tell you as the project...as the Council Liaison for Asset Management and Major Project Management, this is a huge thing. It's kind of the gold standard, Madam Speaker. When we did the cross functional design and the CPR crossing study that was a Class 4 estimate so now with the preliminary design work that's being done now, Madam Speaker, we're at a Class 3 estimate. So this is kind of the gold standard, like I said. We want to make sure that when this council does major capital projects that we have a Class 3 estimate prior to doing any kind of construction work. So really proud of the work that's been going on and I just wanted to make sure that folks have an opportunity to be aware of this public open house on Thursday, February the 8th at 6:00 o'clock to 8:00 o'clock at the North Centennial and I invite all members of Council and the public to attend. Thanks so much.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to share an announcement that we have in South Winnipeg in honour of Chinese New Year and the Year of the Dog. In appreciation of the rich culture, heritage and enterprising qualities of Winnipeg's Chinese community, it's my great honour to work with the community to bestow the name Hua Mulan Park on a beautiful new playground and park in Bridgwater Lakes. The legendary female warrior, Hua Mulan, symbolizes the deep principle and strong family values of Chinese families settling in Winnipeg today, and I invite everyone to come out to the many Chinese celebrations of New Year in the coming month. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. We now have a leave of absence motion for Councillor Wyatt. Mr. Clerk, will you please read the motion into the record?

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
Seconded by Councillor Dobson,

THAT Councillor Wyatt be granted a leave of absence from today's meeting due to a personal family matter.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

MINUTES

Councillor Pagtakhan moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on December 12th, 2017 and December 13th, 2017, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

DELEGATIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now hear from our delegations. Yes?

Councillor Dobson: The Vimy Arena issue is a very involved issue affecting many people so I would like to put a motion forward to suspend the rules to allow more people to speak in delegation on Item No. 14.

Madam Speaker: Do you have a list of names you are proposing?

Councillor Dobson: Yes, I do have a list of names.

Madam Speaker: If you can let us know what those are.

Councillor Dobson: Would you like me to read them out or just give them to the Clerk?

Madam Speaker: Give them to the clerk, sure.

Councillor Dobson: I have seven names listed.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Yes, yes, absolutely. The list of names is; Greg Hammond, Honourable Steven Fletcher, Jim Prefontaine, Diana Hanlan, Loreena Davis, Vicki Fedak and Wayne Manishen. Seven names on the list and that's correct, it would be five minutes with no additional questions. All in favour of suspension of the rules? Contrary? Carried. Those names have been added and we'll hear them at the end of our delegations. I'd like to now call up Mr. Garth Steek who is in opposition to Item 5 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 17th, 2018 regarding an audit of the effectiveness of current systems and processes in relation to the Sterling Lyon / William Clement Parkway Study. Okay. Thank you Mr. Steek, good morning.

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, good morning. I wonder if I might have one minute. I haven't had the opportunity to see the amendment to the motion on this clause. It was not upstairs.

Madam Speaker: Okay, we'll provide that to you. Here is a…here's a copy right here. Marc? Thank you. Ten minutes on the clock. Welcome, you may begin.

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, good morning. Mr. Mayor, members of Council. Mr. McNeil, bureaucrats. The ordeal for the members of the Charleswood community has stretched on for the better part of four months. We are here today to address a request for an internal audit. I read the initial motion and frankly, after I'd read it, I don't believe it was written by Councillor Morantz. It quite simply is not reflective of his level of eloquence and articulateness. The motion was, frankly, just pithy phrases and gaudy admiration. So let me say this through you, Madam Speaker, to Councillor Morantz; you have said on numerous occasions, Councillor Morantz, that you wanted the truth…

Councillor Gerbasi: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The speaker should be addressing you, not the councillor. Not singling out the councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I was just going to make that reminder. Mr. Steek, all of your comments will be brought through the Chair.

Garth Steek: Certainly. Thank you. Madam Speaker, through you, Councillor Morantz had noted on a number of occasions that he wanted the truth. He stated he believed the truth was out there somewhere. We don't have to go to another galaxy to find the truth. The truth, Madam Speaker, is in this room. The motion that was brought forward initially is simply lacking in a request for accountability and truthfulness. The amended motion from Councillors Lukes and Councillor Morantz addresses that. But I would suggest it has one significant deficiency. It does not ask for an external audit and you are going to hear why that's so critical. The initial motion that came forward, frankly, was nothing more than a paper tiger. Madam Speaker, what we needed was a lion. The truth, Madam Speaker, is like a lion. It doesn't have to be defended. When it's unleashed, a lion will defend itself vigorously, courageously and in some instances, without mercy. From the outside this file has been an ethical disaster. Members of the Charleswood community have been subjected to condescension, arrogance, ruthlessness, recklessness and intimidation. But the good news is, is that because this whole matter has been delayed now for a number of months, a great deal of additional information has come to the floor. You all remember that when the letters went out to the Charleswood community on September 19th, for public meetings on October 2, 3, 4 and 5 of 2017, they basically said to the home owners, you can either sell or you can be expropriated. What's important to remember about that meeting, Madam Speaker, and I was mistaken on this earlier, I was under the mistaken impression that the Chair of Public Works and the Chair of Property and Development were at that meeting. They weren't. I'm not sure why, but they were not. Nevertheless, what is important to note is that the Office of Public Engagement was there. And what distinguished that meeting? Well, it's astonishing to think that the bureaucrats called for a public meeting and then the public was told that they could not be heard, that they could not record what was going on. You talk about intimidation tactics. It's also important to notice that the Office of Public Engagement was there. So, as this thing moved along, on the first, when the roof blew off of it, WSP was asked by the media what happened and why? The CAO's Office, the Public Engagement Office and the Mayor's Office said they're not going to be speaking. Why not? Now I think that is startling because of the fact that we kept hearing that nobody knew what was going on on this file. Why would we not have let those people speak publicly? Maybe because of the fact that they were going to tell you they had been authorized to do what they did. Soon Mr. Suderman resigned.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Steek, the motion before us is calling for an audit, if you could please speak specifically to that.

Garth Steek: I assure you that I am going to.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, point of order. I appreciate his insights. He is telling me things that we need to know.

Madam Speaker: Again, if you could speak to the specific motion in front of us, the call for an audit. Thank you.

Garth Steek: The call for the audit is critical because of the amount of stonewalling that's been going on here. The CAO has been asked repetitively to answer questions about this file and refuses to do so. On November the 30th, he was simply asked why appraisals were done in 2015 on these properties, refused to answer. But the good news was that because the citizens of Charleswood were vigilant and there were requests for information, information came to the fore. And suddenly the clouds started to part where we couldn't figure out why nobody knew anything. So in the briefing note that became public, from the former head of Public Works, Mr. Deane, Mr. Deane said in that briefing note, to the CAO, "I informed the Department of Public Engagement on the first, that we needed materials." It's important that we recognize that. Why? Because the Department of Public Engagement reports directly to the CAO. So I'm suggesting that in 2016, the CAO already knew about route four. Furthermore, the CAO then suspended any public meetings because of the fact he said, "We didn't think we should be having this conversation the night before Christmas with those constituents." So the Christmas gift came a little bit later. In that memo, Mr. Deane says we have to bring stability to the area. We have to let…we have to let our constituents know what's happening. He acted in the…like the essence of a good public servant. He was forthright. He talked to his superiors. What was astonishing is that in the response…and this is a quote from the CAO, "I cannot recall if I actually got the attachments. And even if I had, in my role, I never would have looked at them all." Furthermore, he says, "It's kind of unfortunate that we proceed to allow people to have building permits when we are in the processing stages of a project, but that's just our reality." It's unfortunate. It's a disgrace. People were investing in their homes and here we knew full well that we were taking their properties and we didn't acknowledge it. The CAO, Madam Speaker, through you, said there should have been red flags on this file. Take a look at that memo of the 16th. What different shade of red does the CAO want? The file was radioactive. Through you, Madam Speaker, to Councillor Morantz, you said you wanted the truth. It should be mandatory for everybody on this council to watch that interview with Mr. Deane on the 22nd. Mr. Deane says, "I want to be clear

that any authorization to change the alignment was done so at the direction of the CAO's Office." I want to be clear that any authorization that changed the alignment was done at the direction of the CAO's Office. Why an external audit? The City Auditor's tied up right now in that mess on the statement of claim. Supposedly, that's coming back in February, Madam Speaker. Can I get a two minute extension? Thank you.

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

Garth Steek: On that audit, Madam Speaker, Councillor Orlikow and the CAO both said they would welcome an external audit. This file will not mark serious in that one. Furthermore, what happens when there is an internal audit? Well, it goes from the Auditor back to the Audit Committee, for those of you in the audience that sounds great, it's going to the Audit Committee. There is just one problem; the Audit Committee is the Executive Policy Committee. So it's the same old partners, same old dance. We've seen constant, constant stonewalling on this file. What makes you think it won't continue if it's internal? It has to be external. Furthermore, Madam Speaker, justice must not only be done, it must be seen to be done. The arrogance, the condescendence, the ruthlessness, the intimidation, endless. What's the message it sends to the electorate? What's the message it's sent to the citizens? Finally, in closing, Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Morantz, Councillor Morantz, thank you. Thank you Councillor Lukes for bringing forward this amendment. It shows leadership. It shows courage. But I would urge you to do one thing more. Bring a further amendment asking for an external audit. You will stand tall on it. Let's see if your colleagues on EPC have the courage to support you because, very frankly, if you don't get an external audit on this thing, I think our greatest fear is, is like a ghost ship this thing will lurch into the night and never be seen again.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Steek. That concludes your presentation today. Are there any questions for our delegation? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to get maybe further clarification on this. At one point, Mr. Steek mentioned that the public meeting could not be recorded. Is this an addition? I mean, Councillor Steek's has been a councillor for many years in the past. Has this occurred in the past as well? Is this part of standard process or is this new to City Hall?

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Schreyer, I have never been in a public meeting where the bureaucrats refused to have it recorded. The only reason it was recorded was that the citizens of Charleswood objected so vehemently that the bureaucrats then went out and got a legal opinion and guess what the legal opinion was? Of course you can record it. This is a public meeting, just like this is. How arrogant to suggest that it couldn't be recorded. What were they hiding? You know what, Councillor Lukes summed it up very nicely today in the paper. If you've got nothing to hide, don't be afraid of an external audit.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Would a motion to call for an external audit in (inaudible) be a contradiction to the…or necessary given the motion brought forward by Councillors Lukes and Morantz today?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Steek.

Garth Steek: Through you, Madam Speaker, to Councillor Schreyer, Councillor Schreyer I believe that would be totally appropriate. There is strong evidence that we have not been able to get any forthright answers from the administration. The administration here, the CAO, is part and parcel of the four statutory officers. We constantly hear about openness, transparency and accountability. One thing I heard was you know what, will there be a time delay to get this done? We'd have to go to an RFP and it would be too expensive. Really? What price is democracy? Let me tell you what galvanized this issue for me, when I was here at the second Executive Policy Committee meeting, a woman by the name of Mrs. Robinson was here with her 98 year old father. Mr. Robinson was a Second World War veteran. She introduced me to him and she said we came down here because we got one of these letters and we were intimidated by it. We're frightened and we don't know what's going to happen. Mr. Robinson, who was a Second World War veteran, he was willing to fight for the democratic institutions that we hold dear. But yet, the bureaucracy was willing to take his property without due process. And furthermore, we can't even let him ride on the bus for free on November the 11th.

Madam Speaker: Are there any further questions for our delegation? Okay, seeing none, thank you for your time, Mr. Steek.

Garth Steek: Madam Speaker, it was a pleasure. I only wish I could stay to hear this debate. I am looking forward to seeing who will stand up and show leadership on this file and support an external audit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Garth Steek: Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Next we'll be hearing from Mr. Jonathan Parker, if you could please come forward. He is in support of Item 14 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 8th, 2018, regarding the sale of the City-owned property Vimy Arena, 255 Hamilton Avenue. Welcome. And you have ten minutes, sir.

Jonathan Parker: Okay. Morning, my name is Jonathan Parker. I am a grateful alcoholic and drug addict. I am the luckiest guy alive. I've had the opportunity to live two lives; one as a struggling addict on his death bed, and one as a contributing member of society. Today I have been sober for six-and-a-half years. I still struggle with many things. Some of them include food, relationships, intimacy, instant gratification, anxiety, depression, self-worth, self-love, self-confidence. I work on all these defects of character every single day. You see, for us, it's progress, not perfection. I grew up in St. James on Lyle Street in Deer Lodge. I grew up in a very loving home and my parents worked very hard to provide me everything they could for my brother and I. We grew up playing sports and we were involved in many activities in our community. I excelled at hockey and I could swing a golf club pretty good, too. I was labelled a "can't miss" first round draft pick in the NHL. I didn't dream of becoming an addict. I dreamed of playing in the NHL. See, I'm your kid. I'm everyone in this room's kid in some capacity. Addiction doesn't discriminate and this could happen to absolutely anyone. If anyone in here believes that growing up in a home like I did will prevent addiction, they need a stark reality check. I got blackout drunk for the first time at 14 years old and that's the day my addict switch flicked. I was born an addict and that day, it was released into the world forever. When I was 18 years old, I found my first true love, cocaine. When I drank I used cocaine. And if I couldn't find it, I was looking for it or anything else that would alter my mood. Those drugs included methamphetamine, MDMA and crack cocaine. Cocaine controlled my life. It fuelled my ego. As my addiction escalated, it began to affect everything in my life. My parents in particular, my mother, had multiple breakdowns and couldn't figure out what was wrong with me. My brother considered me dead if I didn't get sober. My employers trust was fading. Every partner I ever had had left me and my friends were dwindling by the day. My addiction was out to kill me and it almost succeeded. In July of 2011 as I finished my last bender fuelled by cocaine and booze, I called my mom to come pick me up so she could nurse me back to health as she always did. That day, she never showed up. If mom was done, I was done. I was finally ready to admit complete defeat. On July 20th, 2011, I walked through the front doors of Edgewood. It is located in a residential neighbourhood in BC. I think about Edgewood often. The green space, the trails, the community we often walked through. I volunteered at Tourism Nanaimo and at a seniors home. I visualized how perfect Vimy is for a treatment centre, in fact, better than Edgewood. I picture how serene, peaceful and inviting it is. I picture the recovering addicts who are there on their own accord helping our community. See treatment centres belong in residential communities and the community and the patients thrive. The facility I attended costs $36,000, likely $50,000 today. Who in here has $50,000 to send a loved one to treatment? My parents sure didn't and they had to make arrangements to get me there. They put their lives on hold to try to save me and I'm forever grateful for this. The proposed facility costs nothing if you can't afford it, nothing. Treatment taught me how to live as I have a living problem and I used drugs and alcohol in order to get through it and bury my feelings and emotions. I grew up as a hockey player in a dressing room full of guys that go to war on a daily basis. We didn't talk about our feelings or emotions. Treatment allowed me to be vulnerable, open and trusting. Treatment taught me how to be sober and do my best to contribute to society. I stand here today as proof that long-term residential treatment saves lives and I wouldn't trade my best day high for my worst day sober. The biggest epidemic facing our society right now is inactivity and a four season facility would be much more beneficial to the residents of this community than an addiction centre. Shawn Dobson, great news. Our community has more than enough facilities that can help with that epidemic. The issue is that people aren't using them. Getting active and using these facilities are a choice. Monica P provided a very detailed list of these places with travel times via bike at the EPC meeting. Recreation is declining as our lives are run by cell phones, tablets, computers, video games and social media. You know what we don't have in our community? Treatment centre to tackle the drug epidemic. We need to get proactive on that epidemic that is taking a minimum of three lives per day. This week I've heard of three people from our community losing their battle with addiction, one just yesterday at the courts of St. James. I'm sure that most in this room heard about it. It's tragic. Our city is in chaos. Take a drive down to Vimy and see the needles, bottles, used condoms, drug deals and other drug paraphernalia and realize that that derelict building is part of the problem and now has an opportunity to be part of the solution. We are never getting funding from the City of Winnipeg to build anything there ever again. I also have a tough time believing that the organizations that have shown interests in this facility will ever generate millions of dollars in the funding either to bring that building up to code. So if this vote doesn't pass, Vimy will continue to sit there vacant for years and eventually it will become so decrepit that one day one of our children will get seriously injured or potentially killed at it. The drugs will continue to flow to that property and eventually we'll find people that have overdosed and died there. That is what the opposition is fighting for. This is a small world, so I can assure you that it will be someone that someone in this room knows. When that happens, that same person that says I support recovery, just not at this location will be down at Vimy with a shovel in the ground screaming for more treatment centres. The opposition has yet to come up with a consistent and valid

reason of why this facility shouldn't be there, because there isn't one. They have said we're going to lose green space. It's been shown countless times that we're not losing any. In fact, we may gain green space. They say we're going to lose recreational space. I can't wrap my head around this as we aren't losing anything as there's nothing there today other than a drug den. So how do you lose something you don't have? The trails, the toboggan hill, the tennis courts and the creek remain the same. In fact, they will be enhanced as the men that occupy the facility would be the first to care for them in years. The opposition says that this is all about recreation yet they will advocate for an organization that has nothing to do with recreation. See this isn't about green space. And this isn't about recreation. This is about, and I wish they had the guts to say it, not in my backyard. These are the same people that have been nowhere to be found until a treatment centre was mentioned. They were happy having a drug den I just described earlier in the community for generations. Does anyone else find it odd that no one cared about this property until now? I sure do. I have an 18 month old daughter, the second love of my life, a much healthier life. I would bring my daughter to that treatment centre without any fear of anything happening to her. When she is older, she will play in that area and toboggan there and I will have zero fear of it. My daughter would learn more in that treatment centre about love, acceptance, compassion, self-love, self-worth than anywhere outside those walls. We all would because that's what treatment is. Our community needs to fear me, seven years ago, driving around a 3,000 pound missile with 40 ounces of liquor in me and an eight ball of cocaine in my blood, not an addict trying to get help. Our community needs to fear their children trying drugs and having their switch flicked just like mine did at 14 years old. Drugs are more deadly today than ever and they will only get worse. The amount of people in our community that have reached out to me personally about this and have said the facts that have changed their mind is staggering. The original petition that was circulating our community was pathetic and full of lies and fear mongering co-signed by our city councillor. It even went as far as saying that the Oakes were trying to profit off their son's death. What is wrong with people? I personally would have signed this petition if I didn't know any better. I am happy that our community supports this project more than it opposes it. All you have to do is go into the platform that controls our life, social media and you will see the public opinion is on our side. We live in a digital world and our community and our city has voted and they voted yes. City Council, this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to say we support recovery in our communities. You have a responsibility to support recovery in our communities and put Winnipeg on the map for recovery. We are nowhere near the map when it comes to recovery. We're lucky to have someone like Councillor Eadie here today that has a recovery centre in his ward and knows what a benefit it can be to the residents and neighbourhood in general. City Council, put aside all the politics for a moment and vote for life. Say yes to recovery. Transfer the property for a dollar as a human life is priceless and we're losing them day by day to this epidemic that will only get worse. In closing, I'd like to thank the following people; I'd like to thank Councillor Allard who called me the day after I wrote my letter to everyone in this room and more. You've taken this on and are a champion of recovery for our city and we'll forever be grateful. I'd like to thank Councillor Gillingham for his leadership, for being a champion recovery, family in Winnipeg. I would like to thank all of the councillors and Mayor Bowman who have already unanimously pushed this project this far. You've already said yes to recovery and we are grateful. I'd like to thank Councillor Lukes for her passion in this project and supporting recovery in our community. Finally, I would like to thank Ann, Scott and Darcy Oake for their passion and drive to get a treatment facility that anyone can attend regardless of their financial status. I'd like to thank them for standing tall and strong while they continue to take countless blows for trying to save lives in our city. You are truly incredible people and I am honoured that I was able to meet you in November. I love you and the recovery community loves you. God bless.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Parker. We will take questions in a few moments if you would just like to stay on the floor. Next, I'd like to call forward Mr. Darcy Oake also in support of the same item. There will be five minutes on the clock, following that we will take questions on this item for our delegations. Welcome, Mr. Oake.

Darcy Oake: Before I begin, I would just like to say, regardless of the motion to suspend the rules and add seven more speakers, we are going to be respectful of Council and stick with our two originally planned speakers only. I'm Darcy Oake. I am here as a sibling who lost his big brother, a son who watched my parents lose their eldest and as a representative of a younger generation of Winnipeggers. I have seen what addiction does to a family. Seven a.m., March 29th, 2011, I received a phone call that is replayed in my head daily if not hourly ever since. I answered the phone. It was my mom. All I could hear was uncontrollable sobbing on the other end. She didn't need to say a word. All I asked was, is he still alive? Nothing else needed to be said. Throughout that day, we learned the horrendous details of my brother's heroin overdose, something I would not wish on any person or any family. We grew up in Linden Woods in a loving family. We were privileged children. We went to good schools. I've never seen my parents fight. We were raised with strong morals and to treat others how we would want to be treated. It makes no logical sense that someone growing up in the family I just described could be plagued with addiction, but it happened. And on the night of March 28th, 2011, my brother Bruce died alone with a needle in his arm in a bathroom stall. I cannot emphasize enough that it happened to my family, it can happen to anyone. Addiction is a family disease. One person uses, but the entire family suffers. Addiction is what Bruce had but it is not who he was. He was so much more than his addiction. Addiction is not a moral failing. It's a disease and one that's ripping through our city. Addiction only ends in one of three ways; by death, in jail or in treatment getting help and unfortunately for my family, it ended in death. We've started this movement in an attempt to prevent what happened to my family from happening to anybody else. Let me say this, no one chooses to become an

addict in the same way that no one chooses to get cancer or no one chooses to be physically disabled. We are proposing a free, long-term treatment program where addicts are not required to come up with an exorbitant amount of money to better themselves and can stay for as long as necessary and we have first-hand experience in the success of this format. Ten people a month are dying from addiction and that number only reflects the people that are dying. What about the rest of the people who are out there struggling? It's been mentioned that there is going to be a motion to delay this for 60 days. If ten people a month are dying and we delay this for two more months that will only equal 20 more deaths and countless others out there left to fend for themselves. Delaying this will do nothing but prolong the fundamental issue. Every year an addict stays sober it can save society a hundred thousand dollars. The savings come from the health care system, the justice system, social assistance, the list goes on and on. I'd like to take a moment to address a few facts. We've followed the process exactly how it was outlined to us and have been completely transparent. We walked through the front doors of both levels of government and asked for help and have followed their guidance to a T. Do people honestly think that we struck some sort of secret deal so we could set up a treatment centre while no one was looking? The facility will be no threat to neighbourhood safety. The men will be there by their own free will. The facility will be monitored 24 hours, with lights on, curfews and regular drug testing. Every minute of the day is accounted for. The property values of the surrounding homes will not go down and we have figures that I can provide that show homes adjacent to recovery centres in Canada do not lose their value. We are not affecting a single inch of the green space, we are only talking about the physical building. None of the land will change. Now, it is true that we are proposing a men's only facility. It's proven that segregating men and women in long-terms treatment is more successful than if they are together. AFM segregates genders so does 210 as well as Destiny House. Men and women living together in extremely vulnerable states soon become each over's crutch and they no longer need the program, they just need each other. We can't be all things to all people. We're going to do this right and then look at adding a women's facility or partnering with an existing women's facility. In the meantime, the Bruce Oake Foundation has paid for no less than seven women to go through treatment and we will continue to do so. But essentially what I have heard from the opposition is that if we can't help men and women at the same time then we shouldn't help anyone at all. In closing, I would just like to say that no matter what the outcome is today, we will not stop in getting people treatment. Regardless of today's outcome, my family and I have committed our lives to making sure what happened to my brother does not happen to anyone else. So please, I ask everyone to vote from the heart. We have an opportunity here to save lives and be part of the solution which will benefit each and every one of us. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Oake. Mr. Parker, if you could both please come forward. We'll now take any questions for our delegations. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I thank those who have spoke on what is, I believe not talked about as much as it should be. And I have a couple of what I think are really important questions to a couple of really important issues. Mr. Parker did say...I want to make sure that it's clear, Mr. Parker said that we need more drug rehabilitation facilities and units in the City of Winnipeg. I just want to clarify for the record that Mr. Parker believes that.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Parker.

Jonathan Parker: Do I just speak to the Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Jonathan Parker: Through the Speaker to Councillor Schreyer, I do believe that we need many more, yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay. But Mr. Parker, so is this a once in a lifetime. I hope to God this is…we have more opportunities to create more drug facilities…drug rehabilitation facilities in the City of Winnipeg. Does Mr. Parker agree?

Jonathan Parker: I'm sorry, can you clarify?

Councillor Schreyer: That…that you said this is a...Mr. Parker said this is a once in a lifetime opportunity. I'm hoping we have greater opportunity in the future for the City to be involved with creating more drug rehabilitation units in the city of Winnipeg. Would Mr. Parker agree?

Jonathan Parker: Through the speaker to Mr. Schreyer, I would agree absolutely. But this is a once in a lifetime opportunity because we have a family that stepped up and is going to fund it.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay. I have a question for Mr. Oake as well. I guess the question is, we are here today because of concerns over process that have led us to this. The Oake family did not ask for this one in particular, but they surely want to do this for which we are all grateful. What I'm asking for is, if they believe that this conflict...and this could have

been alleviated by a more proactive approach by the City of Winnipeg, by which we could've had a list or a process by which we had zoning understandings and a list of appropriate sites from the City of Winnipeg before we got to this point.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Oake.

Darcy Oake: I'm not a hundred percent clear on what the question is, but I think fundamentally we have nothing but respect and we're grateful for the City for allowing us this opportunity to do this. We followed their guidance to a T and that's really all I can say on that matter. We are just like any other family in this city. We have knocked on the door and asked what do we do and we did exactly what they told us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That was your final…

Councillor Schreyer: I didn't mean to impugn the motivations of the Oake family whatsoever in terms of what they did. I think it's great.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. We'll move on to Mayor Bowman.

Mayor Bowman: Jonathan, Darcy, thanks very much for having the strength and the courage to come here and share your story with us. For those that haven't been as directly impacted by addictions in one's family, it continues to be an education for me the further down this path, in this role, for me personally, and I want to thank you. And as a dad of two boys, Jonathan, your words were extremely powerful. I'm wondering if one or both of you can just comment on the stigmatization of those that are suffering from addictions. I've argued publicly that if this was a hospital we were talking about, I think we'd have unanimity and I think there is a difference because we're dealing with a health issue that relates to drug addictions. And I'm just wondering if you can speak about the issue of the stigmatization.

Darcy Oake: Absolutely. There is an enormous stigma associated with addiction and it results in people not wanting to talk about the issue. The best way that I can put it is, is dealing with the death of a loved one in any capacity, not only from addiction is like living with a brick in your pocket. You just get used to carrying that weight around and every so often you put your hand in your pocket and you remember that that brick is there. And from what happened to my family, it changed my whole perspective on seeing homeless people on the street. These are people's sons, daughters, brothers, fathers, mothers, we are all human and we're all in this together and just because someone else was dealt a terrible hand or has a disease, we shouldn't look down upon them and we should reach out with open arms and open hearts and give them the help that they deserve.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. I appreciate your comments on what we anticipate is going to be a motion to delay this further. I will not be supporting any delay. I'm prepared to vote for this today and I'm encouraging all of my council colleagues to do the same. The…I guess my question for you is, is what would be your thoughts on the issue of delaying further?

Darcy Oake: I think delaying it further will only prolong the issue at hand and that's addiction and it needs to be dealt with and it's getting worse and worse every day. People are dying by the day, ten a month and delaying it for two months will only equal 20 more deaths. So I don't see the reason or the purpose to delay this any further. We've been completely transparent in our actions and all we are trying to do is get people help to prevent what happened to my family from happening to anybody else. I think delaying it only prolongs the issue and it will not get dealt with and it needs to get dealt with immediately.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, did you have your hand up? Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Dobson: Yes, this one is for Jonathan Parker. Now, I respect your struggle with addiction, but what does this have to do with the necessity of having the drug rehabilitation centre at that particular location? Could it be anywhere in the city is what I'm trying to say.

Jonathan Parker: Through the Speaker to Councillor Dobson, as stated in my speech and I'll say it again, Vimy is the perfect property for that. I would walk out Edgewood into an open green space with trails. We would often walk through a community and it's about serenity, tranquility, being able to stand out in that green space, being able to go for nice walks with a group of people. That is what recovery is all about and that location is perfect.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Dobson: Yes. Your statement in regards to bottles and needles and a drug den, I don't believe they are true. I personally have been down to the Vimy Arena many times and residents have been down there as well and we have not seen that. So where are you getting all this proof for this?

Jonathan Parker: Through the Speaker to Councillor Dobson, I do believe that Pastor Janke spoke very well about it last week at EPC. It backs directly onto the property right on the Assiniboine Curling Club.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Mr. Parker…Madam Speaker, through you to Jonathan, could you elaborate a little bit on what that speaker said. Not everybody may be aware of what was presented at that delegation. I am aware of it. I would like you to share with the group.

Jonathan Parker: Okay. Through the speaker to Councillor Allard, this is all new for me.

Councillor Allard: I still don't get it.

Jonathan Parker: Okay, alright. I can't quote her directly but she talked about needles. I believe she talked about used condoms, she talked about parties, she talked about a woman getting assaulted by a group of people. She talked about people speeding through the parking lot. She talked about needles, she talked about broken bottles, she talked about used condoms and I actually even believe she mentioned that...and I don't know if this is on record or not but potentially an abandoned baby as well as a dead person.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. And thank you very much for sharing your personal stories with us. It's very, very moving. And the difficulty of getting these treatment beds available and facilities available for people, it is very difficult and to get the funding and to get the momentum. And I guess that was sort of my question is, your family, Mr. Oake…through you the Speaker to Mr. Oake, is making this happen and there's almost…to me, it almost seems miraculous that all this is coming together to fund something like this and to make it happen. How difficult is it to make something like this happen? How…you talked about it being a once in a lifetime chance and I believe that and I will be supporting that, but I'm just wondering if you could explain that.

Darcy Oake: It started off as what appeared to be an extremely overwhelming process and the longer we're on this journey for, the more and more people come out showing support and it does not seem out of reach at this point. We get e-mails and phone calls daily of people asking if it's open and if they can come check their child in right now. And the more media attention this gets and the more this process happens, the more and more people reach out and show their support. So this doesn't seem out of the realm of possibility and it really feels like we have the support of this city and we're close, we're really close and I pray that it happens because the city needs it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker through you to the gentlemen, thank you both for your presentation. Either one of you that want to take this question, I'd appreciate it. The question would be, what, in your experience and understanding, is the importance or the role of the broader community in…in successful treatment recovery?

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

Jonathan Parker: Through councillor to...sorry, through Speaker to Councillor Gillingham, I believe the question was what does the broader community have to...what part?

Councillor Gillingham: What is the role of the community, broader community in successful recovery and treatment?

Jonathan Parker: Yeah you know what, the place I went to, just to give an example, we could…we had multiple places we volunteered at. We were accepted. When we walked through the community people asked us how we were doing. There was no fear associated with us. They wanted us to...they wanted us to succeed because one of the sad things about that is...and it's good but it's sad at the same token is, is people would leave our province go to treatment centres get so welcomed by the community and they'd have opportunities to volunteer and they'd fall in love with that community and then smart, bright people are leaving our city. So in our community, if we have people that accept us and accept the people that are in recovery and give them opportunities to prove what they have the potential to do because most

alcoholics and drug addicts are pretty bright people and they are motivated and if they put 10 percent of the effort they do into recovery that they did into using drugs and cheating, lying and stealing, they're going to be extremely, extremely amazing people for our community.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Just a question for Mr. Oake, just briefly, you touched on an issue that came up in the hearing last week, that it's a male only facility and it sounds like there are efforts being made to put women through Tamarack I think it is, or....and the (inaudible) facility, as I understand it, is male only. And it's not perhaps ideal, but there are reasons for it. I just wonder if you can...people in my ward, I feel, have been very supportive of this project. That is a question that I have been asked so. And you've answered it to some extent, if you can just speak to it.

Darcy Oake: Yeah, and it's a very, very valid question and I can understand the concern with that and fundamentally...

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

Darcy Oake: When men and women are together in a vulnerable state and they are supposed to be focused and working on the program and they link up together, they soon become each other's crutches and they lean on each other and they share information and go back and forth and no longer need the program. They know better. All they need is each other. And when that happens, that is...it has a massive affect and impact on the program and the program does not get worked the way it should whereas if you are in a male only facility or a female only facility. It dilutes the process and it adds another level of issues and complications. People…I've seen people get into relationships in co-ed treatment centres and end up not working the program and getting kicked out. And it's very sad when if they are segregated, they're focused on the program, you're not concerned about the opposite sex or about a relationship or about anything else other than bettering yourself and working the program. So men and women together just dilutes the 12 steps and dilutes the treatment and you're not fully focused as much as you could be.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: To either of you, are you aware of the tremendous community support that's out there in the community of St. James? I know personally that there has been a petition from Crestview resident, Kat Degner that has over 6,000 signatures. I posted a poster of Jonathan and some volunteers flyering the neighbourhood and I got 3.4 thousand positive reactions on Facebook. I've never seen so much support. My question is, are you aware of the level of community support for this, in particular, in the community of St. James? Because I am certainly aware and I think Jonathan is too and I wanted to see if you could answer that question.

Darcy Oake: I appreciate that very much and I think to a level we are aware of the support but I also am sort of sorry to say that I think the vocal minority has had the loudest voice in a lot of this, but we've just sort of sat back and just tried to clarify misinformation. So we are aware of the support and I am extremely grateful for it. On that note, if what you said…

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

Darcy Oake: On that note as well, I made a video when the misinformation was being spread and I put it up on Facebook and that got I think 70,000 views in a few days. So I'm seeing those numbers and hearing that from you and hearing the support of the community means the world to my family and I can't thank you enough.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, are you also aware that Councillor Dobson sent an e-mail…sent a letter in the community, urging people to oppose this facility and are you aware that I have not seen so much support come out of that letter asking people to oppose? I want...you don't get access to our e-mail accounts, but I have certainly seen tremendous support coming from that letter urging people to oppose a much needed facility in Winnipeg.

Darcy Oake: I appreciate that as well and I think right now, the job of...we lose the battle when us as a family or as a foundation say, we are right and you are wrong. Our job right now as a family and as a foundation is to be teachers and to spread the information, share the information. This is not going to turn the area into the walking dead if you will. This is a benefit to the community and again, the support has been amazing so thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: And this question can go to either one of you gentlemen. You know, I don't know if you are aware that Winnipeg has one of the highest poverty rates, so my question I was going to ask to you is, how can you see the people that can't afford get access to this facility? So I know that you talked about your own experience and you had to

travel outside of the province. How can having a recovery centre here maybe benefit the community that maybe can't afford to go away to get this kind of treatment?

Darcy Oake: That's the biggest problem with treatment is you either have to pay an exorbitant amount of money in order to access it and people who are at the bottom of the barrel addicts, just don't have the money. And the people going to this facility will be able to go there by a combination of social assistance and fundraising are not required to pay anything, that's something this city doesn't have. And as you've said, we have one of the highest poverty rates and it's...it needs to be addressed. And a lot of addicts are living on the street.

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

Darcy Oake: A lot of addicts are living on the street and have nowhere to go and don't have the money to seek the correct treatment or get to the correct treatment so to open up a facility that has the front door open for anybody who needs the help and wants the help to go there regardless of cost is something that this city desperately needs and something we don't have. And I think it needs to be done ASAP as opposed to dancing around different issues whether it's policy, green space or things that we have addressed, it needs to happen.

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

Councillor Dobson: Yes. I have...some of the comments that I've made…by one or both of you, the vocal minority of…in the area, there is over a thousand people that have signed a petition against it. I don't consider that a minority for the area. But my main question is, the actual building, there's a tennis court right across from it, we have a group that virtually plays tennis from when they can in the spring right to the fall and they are there every single morning and they have not witnessed any of the drugs and stuff that have gone out there. So isn't it...is it true or not true that you are trying to portray a negative image of this facility in order to acquire the land?

Jonathan Parker: Through the Speaker to Councillor Dobson, multiple people in our community have told us this. And the people that go and play tennis there, I have friends that play tennis and when they go there they have to dance around the broken bottles. So am I trying to portray a negative image of this facility? No, I'm talking about the truth. I'm talking about when I go and ask someone that I know that still uses and they tell me that that's where they go and buy drugs, it's pretty obvious. And then to the other point, the 1100 signatures or over a thousand signatures, I just mentioned the document that went out. So public support…

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

Jonathan Parker: Public support is on Facebook as Matt Allard said, which is, we live in a digital world. It's overwhelming for this facility.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you for your time today. Next, I'll call up two delegations in opposition to the sale of the Vimy Arena. First up, we have Gérald Danais together with Gregory Hammond. Again, I will call up Gérald Danais and Gregory Hammond. Are they present here today? Good morning and welcome to City Hall. Are you presenting together?

Gérald Danais: Yes, just getting some water. Good morning, Madam Speaker, good morning Mayor Bowman and Council members. My name is Gérald Danais and I am a member of the Crestview Community. Integrity: steadfast adherence to strict moral and ethical code, a leader of great integrity. City councillor: a person who is professionally involved in politics and entrusted with the best interests of a community. Community: a social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, share government and often have a common cultural and historical heritage. Citizen: an inhabitant of a particular town or city. Taxpayer: a taxpayer is a person subject to a tax on income. I'd like to introduce Greg Hammond, President of Friends of Sturgeon Creek. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr…

Gregory Hammond: Hello. Thank you, Gérald. Hello, Councillors and Mayor. Thank you for allowing Gérald and I to share time today and to speak against this motion before you. We are both members of the FriendsofSturgeonCreek.com which is an organization dedicated to preserving park land and recreational space and for healthy living activities. I cannot imagine the challenges that you face as elected public officials, but I suggest that we can find some common ground to make the decisions that will benefit the public. Likewise, our group, FriendsofSturgeonCreek.com, wishes for good decisions based upon full information and feedback from the public. We have spoken in committees of Council to provide you with information about why we are opposed to this motion. I will summarize that our main objection to this motion is the transferring of the parks and recreational land from the public

PR2 zoning, parks and recreational active, to private use is unacceptable. This zoning protects development along Sturgeon Creek and in the park land and recreational space. This land at 255 Hamilton is in the centre, the heart of several community facilities, including the Sturgeon Creek Parkway, the Assiniboine Memorial Curling Club, tennis courts and toboggan hills. The Vimy Arena is in the centre of the land at the 255 Hamilton site and is a site that could be repurposed for community needs. Instead approval of the proposal would result in a large 32,000 square foot facility which will require room for expansion according to the business plan and a loss of public access to this space. Additionally, the public consultation process that was supposed to occur with the decommissioning of the arena never occurred. No funds were provided for this consultation although it turns out that they were available. We just weren't told about it. The committee will also lose because there are no funds for community revitalization from the $1 sale of the property. And promises for next year's budget are subject to a new Council's decision. We also have many unmet community needs so this is important for our local area. We wish to assure due diligence on this motion especially where we have unanswered questions. Decisions entail risks so we have done a short risk assessment of some of the risks that you will need to bear as decision makers. What are the risks to city and Council? Let's look at three. The first is public alienation resulting from lack of transparency in the processes to date. Lack of information sharing by public officials, ignoring City Council policies, shortcuts in process as noted by the Fairness Commissioner, closed meeting with a special interest group and full council before the vote and these are some examples. This follows other recent examples where information wasn't shared on land deals. Risks here are likely at least moderate. The second is financial and operational risks. The proposed arrangements that would follow a vote in support of this motion are complex. But they need to be scrutinized because their failure or lack of sustainability would impact on the land and recreational use in the surrounding community and all taxpayers in the future. For expediency, it appears that the City has circumvented many of its normal processes to transfer land to the Province. Then the Province, which has an unknown partnership between two departments, Departments of Health and Family Services, delegates the land oversight to the board of a Crown Corporation, Manitoba Housing, which then leases the land to a new foundation with no operational experience which then contracts with an organization from Alberta to transplant their model to Winnipeg. What could possibly go wrong with this picture? On the financial side, we have heard that this facility has a laudable goal that will take in all who need service regardless of the ability to pay. Now, this is a $14 million facility plus the need for a million dollars operational cost to be funded annually. Has there been an objective financial review of the business and operational plan by the City or by the Province? If so, they have not been made apparent. Sometimes when things appear to be too good to be true they are. What if the model doesn't transplant to Manitoba? The risks here are likely in the high category. And thirdly, political and governance risks. Although the Province may have made a request for City land, the Province didn't choose park land and recreational space to offer for private development, it was the City. So the City is seen as the lead and maybe that's the way the City wants this, but it could backfire. For example, is this to be known as a City Council that gave away City park land for a dollar? Where is the Province in sharing the political risk? It's been silent. Is there an agreement between the City and the Province? And why has no more information on this been shared? We've seen other areas of agreements change unilaterally such as for ambulance fees. What is the nature of the agreement between the City and Province and who is accountable for the proposal if this vote is passed? Risks are at least likely moderate in this area. Additionally, we have several observations and objections to the processes that were followed to get to this vote. The main ones are how previous council policies and processes have been ignored or shortcuts have been taken. Firstly, on the City's website, there is a document, 'Policies for Riverbank Parkways', and that include creeks. In this document the "approaches" to Riverbank Acquisition and Development Council Control Section 1(1) and (2), respectively, say, it states, "No rezoning of riverbank land that will increase the density of intensity of use where development is now permitted or introduce incompatible uses." Section 2 states, "Prohibit the sale of any riverbank portion of any City-owned or Winnipeg Hydro lands fronting on rivers which would preclude the development of the riverbank and notable park plans of the city." We maintain that such a development would interfere with the Sturgeon Creek Parkway. This site should not be sold according to that policy. Secondly, in 2013 the minutes of City Council on the next steps for disposition of arenas, City Council recommended that lands be sold for commercial value and then proceeds be returned to the community. We do not think that the appraisal of the land met City criteria and we do not believe that the building cost was included. Consequently, we believe that the appraised value is likely substantially understated. This would impact on the funds to be reinvested into the community. Also, there was a report on the state of the Vimy Arena that was provided to the Province but it has not been shared with the public. We think that this building could be repurposed for community uses. And thirdly, in the report of the Independent Fairness Commissioner report on compliance, there are numerous exceptions versus the recommended criteria especially in the appraisal process. There is also no use of the risk and complexity tool for transaction in excess for $250,000. In summary, this is an important decision, basically a forever decision for park land and the site for recreational activities and for public access for both current and future residents. Are you fully informed to make decisions and prepared to take the risks? And what is the rush? The motion to be passed would allow four years for the facility to be built. A hasty decision will have substantial risks and long lasting impacts on the community. Lastly, what about the possibility of a win/win solution? I am a Rotarian for over 25 years with the Winnipeg West Rotary Club. We take pride in assisting communities, working with communities both locally and internationally. We do it in a way that aims for win/win solutions to oppressing problems. We are guided by a code of ethics and the Rotary four-way test for things we think, say and do. The four component questions of the four-way test are: is it the truth, is it fair, will it build

good will and friendships, will it be beneficial to all concerned? When we apply that test it's usually possible to get a win/win solution to even the most difficult problems such as polio eradication, and world literacy issues or even world peace issues. As I look at the proposed motion before you, none of the elements of the four-way test have been met. Passing this motion is certainly not a win for green space or the environment. It's not a win for recreational activities and healthy living for the public. It's not a win for over a thousand residents in the area who have voiced their opposition. A true win/win would find alternate sites for the proponent…

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

Gregory Hammond: That does not impact adversary on park land and recreational space. I urge you to vote against this proposal to come up with a better one using principals from Council's 2010 document that encourages an open and transparent process and continued public access to this site. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. At this time we will take any questions for our delegations in opposition. Councillor Allard. Pardon me? Or there is one more speaker, sorry. I'll just ask you to stand down for a moment and I'll call forward Ms Kim Riddell and then we will have all the delegations come forward again for questions. Welcome, Ms Riddell. There will be five minutes on the clock for you.

Kim Riddell: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Your Worship and members of City Council. My name is Kim Riddell and I don't support the sale of Vimy Arena and the surrounding green space. I am here today representing myself. We've heard from the Bruce Oake Foundation that it wants to establish a 50 bed centre offering long-term treatment and recovery at no cost. As one member said here last week, in a world of addiction recovery, that's a game changer because most addicts do not have the money to go to a private facility and most want a shot at recovery. He said we are leaving a generation of addicts out there to die. So Madam Speaker, through you to the Council, I want to translate that. The foundation wants to establish a gold standard 50 bed centre for men who are addicts and this will be a game changer for men. And despite their desperate cries for help, however, we will leave a generation of women addicts out there to die because this centre is just for men. That's right. No women will be allowed to access treatment and not one single woman's life will be saved if this is built. And I am not going to mince words here, the proposed project discriminates against women who are addicts. And make no mistake, addictions are equally devastating to women and to men. It would be one thing if the foundation was financing this through entirely through private donations, but as soon as the City is asked to hand over a public asset worth anywhere from $1 million to $5 million, things change. You have to treat everyone equally. You have to respect human rights. Over the weekend, I visited the Canadian Museum for Human Rights. In gallery after gallery, I was struck by the fact that people rarely seem to recognize they are ever doing wrong at the time and I think that's what happened here. Madam Speaker, through you to the Council, I believe that the foundation and the City of Winnipeg appear to have a blind spot. No one seemed to have noticed that women are being left out of this proposal. But, Madam Speaker, through you to the Council, now Council knows it doesn't matter why we're being left out and it doesn't matter what the excuse is. Discrimination is discrimination is discrimination. And how do I know that these are excuses? Because there are successful programs in Winnipeg that not only treat men and women such as St. Norbert Behavioural Health Foundation, there are actually successful co-ed programs such as Tamarack. And separating women from men is like trying to stop sexual harassment by banning women from working with men. It's just wrong. It's wrong to punish women for men's behaviour and it does no good to say that the foundation is building a men's centre first and will work towards building a women's centre next. Because again, Madam Speaker, through you to the Council, let me translate; they're going to spend millions of dollars providing free, long-term treatment to men right now, and they will put off helping women until later if they get to it at all. And make no mistake, any promise to help women in the future is all talk and no action because no one will be accountable for keeping that promise. It's not enforceable and there's no one who will be publicly accountable. So here is another way to look at things. What if an organization had come to City Council with the same proposal, a 50 bed long-term recovery centre for addicts at no cost, but they said they would allow no First Nations, no Métis, no Jews, no Muslims, no gays. Madam Speaker, through you to the Council, if Council votes in favour of this proposal, that's exactly what will be supported through public funds because women are all of these things and more. Women's rights are human rights. So now Council knows that a vote for this proposal is a vote to look the other way while more women with addictions die every day, every week, every month, every year. And again, Madam Speaker, through you to the Council, I would like Council to remember that actions speak louder than words because Council members today don't even have to say no. They can simply press pause and say as soon as. I will vote for this proposal as soon as the centre provides equal access to women on the day it opens. Twenty-five beds for men, 25 beds for women. May I request an extension?

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

Kim Riddell: Madam Speaker, through you to the Council, I am asking Council to negotiate a better deal for women. Each member can be a decision maker without being a deal breaker. Madam Speaker, through you to the Council, in

closing, I would like to leave Council with this: addiction doesn't discriminate so neither should you. Thank you for your consideration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms Riddell. We will now take questions for our delegations if I can ask you all to come forward. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I think Allard was ahead of me. In any event, question for Ms Riddell. You did hear Mr. Oake say earlier that...you're making some pretty strong statements about indifference to women turning inaction. You did hear him say that seven…six or seven, I can't remember exactly, six or seven women have been funded by the Bruce Oake Foundation to go through treatment at Tamarack already. That means nothing to you then or…that to me looks like action not inaction.

Kim Riddell: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes, I did hear what the Oakes Foundation had said, that they have put seven women through. And to me that simply proves the point of what I have been saying. It shouldn't be the case that women who are addicts have to rely on luck and chance, that they have the good fortune to belong to a family who can afford to pay for their treatment or that they will find someone who will be a benefactor to them. Seven women who have been supported is not nearly the same as 25 beds that are going to be permanently available if Council were to follow what I was suggesting. There is a world of difference between ad hoc treatment and being, as I said, at the mercy of luck and chance and then having something that's devoted and dedicated, specifically for women.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: You listed some facilities that are co-ed, for lack of a better term, you would agree with me that there are some facilities in the city of Winnipeg that are not and in fact, the Calgary facility that has been built that, you likened it to discriminating against any number of other groups, the Calgary facility, the mayor who is Muslim, there is a Calgary facility that is male only. That's the model these folks are following. So I think you would agree with me not all the facilities are co-ed and that some of the facilities including the one that's being modeled here, are for reasons explained by the Oakes, operating as male only or female only facilities.

Madam Speaker: Ms Riddell.

Kim Riddell: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Mayes, I am here today not to discuss what's happening in other centres or other cities. What I am asking today of Council is that they follow what I have suggested in providing an equal number of spaces to women. As I indicated earlier, to me, there is no difference in terms of the reasons that you might take for suggesting that you can only have men in a facility. For example, I'm not saying that if you have a 50 bed facility and 25 beds are dedicated to women, that they have to have all of the sleeping quarters together or that they even have to have all of their programming together. I am quite sure that there are ways that this could be organized, for example, if you wanted to have completely separate programs where they would simply be different wings or different areas of the same building. For example, I understand that you can build a duplex where you have two families who live completely separate lives but they are side by side. What I am asking for is equality for women. That doesn't mean it has to be right in the same program. What it means is that as a city, as soon as there is public funding that's going towards this, what should be happening is that there are equal spaces for women and equal spaces for men. Because the key difference with this particular facility, as I understand it, is that it is going to be a long-term residential treatment facility that will be at no cost. That will not be available to women unless it becomes part of this proposal.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Well, I guess you'd agree though that we are faced here with a proposal that does not claim to be perfect, but it claims to be based on an existing model that works. And you would agree that you've heard Mr. Oake on behalf of the foundation indicate that there has been action taken already, the funded women that you have admitted you heard, and that the intent is to get something up and running as soon as possible, and once that is up and running and successful, it will be expanded. So I guess are you saying that we should delay until we have a perfect proposal, because that's not coming. So and…you've heard the commitment from the Oakes. Are you saying you don't think that's a sincere commitment?

Madam Speaker: Ms Riddell.

Kim Riddell: Madam Speaker through you to Councillor Mayes, I, too am not looking for something that's perfect. I am, however, looking for something that is equal, for men and for women. I am not looking for something that's perfect and I don't think that what I am asking for is even hard. I do recall hearing a presentation last week that indicated that there has been a lot of work that has been done by an architectural firm on a pro bono basis for the proposed recovery centre.

So, to me, when I hear that, I think this can't be difficult to simply say, instead of having it all in one facility, we'll have an area for women. And again, nothing has been built yet. The ground hasn't...the property hasn't even transferred hands at this point so I really don't understand, what is the resistance to including women in this same proposal? I am not suggesting that it be delayed for years and years. But I will point out, however, that if in fact this goes ahead with a men only, 50-bed facility, it will be years and years and years before women...before women are...there is an expansion for women, if it happens at all. Because again, as I have heard, in listening to these proposals, I am on the understanding that this has been in the works by the foundation for a lot of years and I would gather that it would take an equal number of years to have an expansion that would take place. So again, what I'm saying is that I do not understand. I honestly don't understand why this seems to be so hard. Simply say, for example, we didn't think of this to begin with, you have raised a good point, we're going to just delay this for as long as the foundation requires to come back with a proposal that deals with men and women equally.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for Dr. Greg Hammond. My understanding is you were a Director of Public Health for the Province before you retired and I'm just wondering if you understand that we have simply been asked by the Province of Manitoba to transfer the land to Manitoba...I think it's Manitoba Housing. I'm just wondering if you are aware of that.

Gregory Hammond: I read from the documentation provided at some of the early meetings that the Province made a request to the City for the land. What I do not understand and you have not explained is why has the City put forward this particular piece of land for this issue. Our issue is not with an addiction recovery centre. It is the piece of land that is the subject of the motion here today that is the key issue. Why has the City only put forward this one option for land? City, park land, riverbank land and it has already been designated by PR2 that it's not for development for recreational facilities...for rehabilitation facilities, for health or dental work or for housing. That's how it's zoned. So why would the City even offer that up? I don't understand that. On the issue of addictions, it's a very large issue. I'm not here today in any capacity other than as FriendsofSturgeonCreek.com. I think there are many complex issues. If the City wishes to get into that issue, it probably needs multiple partnerships and a true overall perspective of what is the need. Because what happens when the next time they come back to City Council and want free land? This has already set a precedent. What are you going to decide when they want another facility? Is it also going to be on park land?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. Again, Dr. Hammond, my understanding and I would have expected that you would have taken the Hippocratic Oath and I note in the Hippocratic Oath, it reads, "I will give respect to my teachers. I will practice medicine with conscience and dignity. The health and life of my patients will be my first consideration. I will hold in confidence my patients that all that my patients confide in me. I will maintain the honour and noble traditions of the medical profession. My colleagues will be my brothers and sisters. I will not permit consideration of race, religion, nationality, party politics or social standing to intervene between my duty and my patient. I will maintain the utmost respect of human life. Even under threat, I will not use my knowledge contrary to these laws of humanity. These promises I make freely and upon my honour." How can you come in here in good conscience and make the arguments you're making when they appear to directly contravene the Hippocratic Oath that I presume you once took?

Gregory Hammond: May I remind you Mr. Mayor, through the Speaker…

Madam Speaker: Is there a move…Councillor Lukes moves extension. All in…and we have many speakers on the list. Extension for five minutes, Councillor Lukes. All in favour? Contrary? Two minutes? All in favour? Contrary? There weren't speakers on the list last time, there's four on the list now.

Gregory Hammond: Through Madam Speaker, again, I am here representing FriendsofSturgeonCreek.com. The issue before Council is the vote on a motion for a land transfer. That is what is up for a motion. Being very clear, this land is transferring park land to be developed for private use. This is sacred land in the sense that this has not been done before. This is according to Council Policy, City land, on park land, on riverbanks should not even be sold. So the question comes back to the City, why was this land offered? What were the other options? We are not here to discuss issues related to...sorry rehabilitation services.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, could we please ask the question, the answer.

Councillor Dobson: I object Madam Speaker. The question here today is about zoning. It's not about a person's profession.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Dobson, I believe I heard that he was just getting into the answer. Rehabilitation services, you were just getting into answering the Mayor's question, if you could please do so.

Gregory Hammond: The Mayor's question was a digression from the topic for the vote today. The question that the Mayor would like answered requires a broad perspective of many health professionals and if you are going to be getting into the area of rehabilitation services, it takes a lot of people to do that. I haven't seen any analysis here which talks about the need. What is the need of the City for this? Where does this proposal fit within the community needs? Is this going to have an impact?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Gregory Hammond: Is the impact going to be substantive enough that it will make a difference? Those are the kinds of questions that the City could have done as part of background planning, if they wish this to go through to its proposed outcome in favour of the foundation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Dobson moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor, third question.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. It really is a simple question. Dr. Hammond is someone who I understand has a long…a long career of medical practice. When I read the Hippocratic Oath, and again, I am not a doctor, it speaks of humanity, it speaks of putting the health and safety of patients first and foremost and I simply do not see that in the presentation here today. In fact, it's quite the contrary. And I just…once again would ask the doctor if he can please reconcile the presentation here today that appears to directly contradict the Hippocratic Oath that you so took.

Gregory Hammond: Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Gregory Hammond: Council. Contrary to the comments by the Mayor, there is a long-term view for health which looks at determinants of health. And the social determinants of health include everything from your diet, to exercise, to nutrition, to your community, and the social determinants of health are very broad. From the perspective of social determinants of health, recreational space is very important, so is park land, that's why parks are protected. If we didn't have park land, we wouldn't be able to have some of the beautiful amenities that we have that lead to a sense of community and to healthy living. We have many epidemics. We have epidemics of diabetes. We have epidemics of obesity. By getting rid of park land, we will be affecting those other health issues as well. So I'm trying to take the long-term view that talks about healthy living through overall determinants of health.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker, this question is for Dr. Hammond. Are you aware that...I understand your organization is called Save Sturgeon Creek, are you aware that no green space will be impacted by this proposal?

Gregory Hammond: Through Madam Speaker, to Councillors…

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

Gregory Hammond: The perspective on the lack of impact on green space, it's slightly different than what you are alluding to. By having it in the centre of the facility that is bounded by the Sturgeon Creek Parkway, the Vimy Arena, the tennis courts and toboggan hills, it is no longer accessible to the public. And in the 2013 documents and 2010 documents of City Council policy that look at how these arenas are to be transitioned, one of the key things is that the public access to those sites should be maintained and that the process should engage the public. We have not heard from any of the councillors other than yourself about this issue. We've not had any of the technical staff from the department in the City come and explain the process to us. So the whole issue related to your point is, is I think it can be said that we are not worrying about that at this time.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: So if I could clarify, the organization is called Save Sturgeon Creek. Are you aware that Sturgeon Creek in this proposal goes forward does not need saving? In fact the only impacted property is a vacant arena and a parking lot and that the green space will still be available to the public as has been stated many times including at a public meeting that I held with Mr. Oake.

Gregory Hammond: Yeah, our group's called FriendsofSturgeonCreek.com and we're saying because it's in the heart of this area that's to be transferred, 255 Hamilton, this particular site, it's larger and it needs to grow. According to the business plan, this isn't big enough. According to business plan, this will expand. That will impact on the surrounding activities. So it will impact on the community. It will impact on the access to the space around it. And so it will have a direct impact plus it's not able to be a positive force for the community. There could be something there. Like the duck pond in Assiniboine Park where it's a meeting place and a venue for the public to use washrooms, to keep warm and to have activities at that site. We are look for something to enhance and regenerate, revitalize our community. That's what we're looking for.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Just a third question.

Madam Speaker: The time is up. Are you moving extension? Councillor Dobson moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Final question.

Councillor Allard: So, final question. If you read the report, it is crystal clear to me that no green space is impacted. So in…are you able to answer yes or no to the question that…at least acknowledge that no green space is being impacted if this proposal goes forward today.

Gregory Hammond: Well, we have not seen the architectural plans. Have you?

Councillor Allard: The report is crystal clear. There's a drawing around the land.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Hammond, please answer the question.

Councillor Allard: Yes or no.

Gregory Hammond: It's not the physical site. It's the other ancillary activities.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer and then Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Schreyer: Does the doctor wish to see more drug treatment facilities in the city? Does he believe we need more?

Gregory Hammond: I think, with due diligence that question could be answered. Have you seen any reports on what the community needs? This is a very complex issue. We are here to speak today though that if we disperse and get rid of or sell our park land and riverbank space, that is gone forever. This is a big decision. So the two issues are not mutually incompatible. Again, there could be a win/win where facilities for rehabilitation services could occur, but why at this site?

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Does the doctor believe that this doesn't have to happen again, this terrible divisive debate impugning people's motivations doesn't have to happen again like this if the City were to have a better process, a proactive and progressive process by which we establish appropriate facility, City-owned land, beforehand?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Hammond.

Gregory Hammond: Through the Speaker to the group, I believe the City in its intention, if you go back to documents from 2010 and 2013, they lay out a clear process of engagement of the public. We found just recently that there was money set aside in the 2014 budget to have an engagement so that there is a process.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Is the doctor saying that the City didn't follow its own process?

Gregory Hammond: I am saying that the City did not follow its own process.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Dobson: Yes, thank you. I think this question will be for the other gentleman. Why are the residents so concerned about the loss of the parking lot at the Vimy Arena?

Gérald Danais: Thank you for the question, Madam Speaker. Why are the residents concerned about the loss of the parking lot?

Councillor Dobson: Yeah.

Gérald Danais: Well, the Vimy Arena and parking lot go hand-in-hand with the area and the land that's being considered is actually zoned parks and recreational and the parking lot is an access point for the kayakers that want to unload their kayaks off of their vehicles, toboggan hill, this is how we access it. The Assiniboine Memorial Curling Club if you go there tonight, you'll see the parking lot is full. The trails, the tennis courts, the path that goes under the bridge, the activities that are played on the parking lot such as hockey and bike riding and so many other recreational activities that you'd only need to go down to Vimy Arena on any given summer day or milder winter day and you'll see the answer for yourself. I can tell you that I would see much activity. We also do not have access to washroom facilities so community members need to park their cars in the lot so they can get their kids and themselves into a car to drive to a washroom facility. And we also use our cars for warm up because there is no shelter.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Second question, Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Dobson: What uses do you see for the Vimy Arena if it were refurbished or revitalized?

Gérald Danais: Well, the City would like to see...

Madam Speaker: That will conclude our question period. That concludes our question period. The time is up.

Councillor Dobson: We can't do any more extensions?

Madam Speaker: You have to move an extension.

Councillor Dobson: Can I move for an extension the please?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Dobson moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Continue.

Gérald Danais: The community would like to see it revitalized for a multi-use facility. The surrounding area has served as a recreational hub for years and the piece that's missing is the indoor facility. It really doesn't have to be a skating rink, it could be a multi-use. Multi-use means that many segments of our community would actually be provided with services. Keep in mind that we also have 3,000 brand new homes that are built just...that are about to be built just one kilometre away to the north of Vimy Arena and that they also will need recreational facilities. Here is what our community would like to see happen with the revitalization of the Vimy Arena. We'd like to see a multi-use complex for seniors, families and sports teams. We are open to economical solutions that provide indoor and outdoor recreational services for our community. This doesn't have to be an expensive project. It could be used for indoor soccer, floor hockey, tennis, a public library, computer lab and nature-related activities. One very important use would actually be washroom facilities for warm up and cool down facilities for those using the surrounding green space, tennis courts, trails, creek and kayaking, toboggan hills, snowshoeing, hills, and other sports which is how we used Vimy Arena before it was closed. We could use it for those purposes as well. In essence, it's a very simple equation, every other ward in the city has access to a recreational building like the Vimy Arena in their immediate area, why are we being penalized? Why don't we have the same access to washroom and shelter facilities that go hand-in-hand with summer and winter recreation? Thank you for the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question Councillor Dobson, six seconds on the clock.

Councillor Dobson: Can I move an extension before I ask my question?

Madam Speaker: You can now. Councillor Dobson moves...Councillor Schreyer moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Dobson: Okay, how do you feel about the motion to provide St. Charles Ward with 25,000 that had been previously set aside for consultation and the amount that's…they're going to try to allocate for the Sturgeon Creek area?

Gérald Danais: Thank you for your question, Madam Speaker. First and foremost, we'd like to keep the Vimy Arena. We want it revitalized. We don't want it sold. But that said let's talk about the actual compensation. That $25,000 was set aside for consultation with the community back in 2013. The fact the money is still there proves consultation with the community was supposed to happen, but did not happen. Keep in mind, 2018 is an election year, this offer is in line with the offer Mayor Sam Katz and Councillor Grant Nordman made in 2013. Something is…something better is coming, we are told, multiplex. In reality, we were let down. The community was promised something in the future and now we are here today fighting to keep the Vimy Arena. There's no actual commitment on behalf of Council that will guarantee that these funds will be made available. We don't even know who will be on Council or how that budget will be allocated in 2019. In reality, 4 to $5 million seems to be a more accurate figure for this asset as opposed to $1.43 million. That has been indicated to the public. This means the Vimy Arena itself is an asset worth 4 or $5 million plus the value of the land which has been assessed at $1.43 million. Replacement costs of the current Vimy Arena would be at least 4 to $5 million. I don't believe that this is financially responsible for the City of Winnipeg to give away an asset that will cost millions to replace. The offer is basically an offer of $25,000…

Councillor Dobson: Extension of time.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Dobson moves extension. There is one more speaker after Councillor Dobson that's interested. All in favour? Contrary? Lost…contrary? That concludes our question period. Question and answer period…question and answer period. Appreciate your time. Thank you. Yes?

Councillor Dobson: I would also like to suspend the rules to allow questions of the additional delegates.

Madam Speaker: The request is put forward, so all in favour requires two-thirds vote of Council which would be how many members? Ten members since we have some missing today. So all in favour of asking questions of the six additional delegates that we will be hearing from later on today? There's six because Mr. Hammond just spoke. All in favour of hearing questions after the five minute presentations? All in favour? Contrary? Motion is lost.

Councillor Dobson: Madam Speaker, could I suspend the rules so that our other elected official who is here to speak, the Honourable Steven Fletcher, to give him an additional five minutes?

Madam Speaker: I think we have already…we've already talked about that. We have already discussed that. There are six individuals and you are asking for one of those individuals…

Councillor Dobson: I am asking that because he is an elected official for the area and…

Madam Speaker: Okay. Okay, so the motion put forward by Councillor Dobson is to give the Honourable Steven Fletcher ten minutes instead of the five minute allocation. All in favour? Contrary? Need to speak up. Nay? Your motion is lost, Councillor Dobson. Moving on now, I would like to call Mr. Murray Gibson forward in support of Item No. 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks dated January 9th, 2018 regarding smoking on outdoor patios. Mr. Gibson is in support of this item. He'll have ten minutes on the clock.

Murray Gibson: Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, members of City Council, I'm here today to speak for the motion...or, for the by-law that is being proposed to ban smoking on patios outdoors. Surprisingly, I didn't come here to tell you how bad smoking is for the health of the smoker or how bad it is for the health of the people who don't smoke. The reason I didn't do that is because you already know that. I think anyone who has had their ear open to this issue over the last number of years will know that that's the case. Several decades ago, many of us started smoking were woefully ignorant. They did not know what the problem would be, what it would do to their health. What it would do, perhaps, to their family members health or the health of those around them. That is not the reality today. So if we choose to ignore the carnage that is caused by the tobacco industry, this is willful ignorance, not woeful ignorance and it carries with us…with it, a certain complicity. So I'm here first of all to say thank you. Thank you for not choosing to ignore this issue. We are learning that in many ways today there is not a lot of public tolerance for doing nothing when a wrong needs to be righted. This was wrong and it needs to be righted. Thank you for recognizing that the economic benefit of a few does not trump the health of many. The world will be richer, not poorer when the selling of commercial tobacco and the smoking of it are eliminated. Do I believe this is possible? In April of this year, Health Canada will release its new tobacco control strategy. It calls for smoking rights to be under 5% by the year 2035. In 2000, our smoking rates in Manitoba were 25.7%. Fifteen years later in 2015, at the last survey, it showed that they were at 14.8%. If we do the same thing in the next 15 years, our smoking rates in this province will be under 4%. I believe we can do it. I also would want to say to those who may be relying on tobacco sales or tobacco users to be your main customers, it's time to write a new business policy. Fifteen years ago, I was standing in this same spot, making a presentation to City Council and urging them to ban smoking in all indoor public places. Someone sitting up in the gallery decided to shout out, "You are nothing but a bunch of nicotine Nazis. You are ruining my life. All I want to do is take my bicycle, ride down to the cafe,

have a cup of coffee and a cigarette. You are ruining my life." At the time, we heard of all the dire predictions of the things that were going to happen. Businesses were going to go bankrupt. Did it materialize? Absolutely not. I'm not…I am not sure that I have ever had the opportunity to personally thank the members of City Council for taking a stand in 2003. Some felt there was a wasted effort because the Province in 2004 banned smoking in all indoor public places. Manitoba became the first province in Canada to declare its intentions to have smoke free public places indoors. Believe me, it probably never would have happened, had City Council not taken that stand in 2003. The Premier of the Province at that time said no, he would not support it. I spoke with the official opposition at that time, and the best that they could tell me was they were concerned of what this was going to do to their business and the business of people that they knew. I'm proud to be a Winnipegger. Because in 2003, City Council started something that has been one of the best things to happen for public health in this province and it moved across Canada. So I'm here today to say thank you to the City Council for taking that stand. Today, I would like to thank a couple of people in particular; I want to thank Councillor Mike Pagtakhan, for championing this by-law through the standing policy committee. Thank you. I want to say thank you to Councillor Jenny Gerbasi who came to both of those standing committee meetings and voiced her concerns and the fact that she, too, would like to see this go forward as a former nurse. I want to say thank you to every one of you on City Council who will help to move this forward. But before I am finished today, I want to remind you of one little thing that's often said, it's said the devil is in the details. What we have before us is something very broad. I read with interest that it listed a number of types of products that could not be used if there were no smoking areas in outdoor areas that would be covered by this by-law. One it didn't name; by the summer of this year, we will face the legalization of marijuana. I was at the Province speaking at one of their hearings when the issue of e-cigarettes came forward. We were behind the eight ball because we hadn't moved to try to do something proactively. So I'm asking for one little thing today. I'm asking that when you put through this by-law, you actually name marijuana as one of the things that cannot be smoked in these areas. As I saw it, it wasn't there when I first saw it. I would like us to take a particular stand on this. Whatever the Federal Government comes up with, you at City Council, our provincial governments can go further than that. They can't do less but they can go further. I'm asking you to name it particularly and prevent what might happen in July of this year when it comes to where marijuana is going to be smoked. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Gibson. Next, we'll hear from Ms Kyra Gawalko. She's from the Manitoba Division of the Canadian Cancer Society, also in support of the same item.

Kyra Gawalko: Good morning. As mentioned my name is Kyra Gawalko and I'm speaking to you on behalf of the Canadian Cancer Society. Winnipeg has the opportunity to fall in line with the rest of Canada and do what countless other cities have done for years, prohibit smoking in outdoor patios. Taking this action and moving forward with these recommendations will reduce the risk of cancer for Winnipeggers. Policies like these are necessary as our province faces 920 new cases of lung cancer and 680 Manitobans will lose their battle to this disease, this year alone. We support the actions being recommended and applaud City Council for making the prevention of cancer and the health of their residents a priority. However, to be fully effective and to achieve your goals to make Winnipeg a healthier city, the Canadian Cancer Society would ask Council to consider a smoke-free buffer zone around patios as well as other additions to the smoking by-law that prevent exposure to second-hand smoke. There will be some today who do not support the proposed recommendations, saying that it is unfair to treat all establishments the same. But it cannot be stated enough that tobacco use is the leading cause of preventable death and disease. The World Health Organization states that there is no safe level of exposure to second-hand smoke even outdoors and every year more than a thousand Canadians who do not smoke die from exposure to second-hand smoke. When someone chooses to smoke, they're making a personal choice. The choice to fill their lungs with cancer-causing smoke and that's their choice to make. But when someone smokes in public, they are extending their unhealthy choice to others and exposing unwilling people to risk. Research that has been conducted in Ontario found that smoke can travel up to nine meters away from the individual smoking. For these reasons, a buffer zone around patios is critically important. Without a buffer zone, patrons and staff are likely to continue to be unfairly exposed to harmful chemicals while they eat and work. All workers in Winnipeg deserve a safe work space free from exposure to second-hand smoke. Parents and young families in this city have a right and should have the expectation that they can take their kids out to a patio and enjoy a meal without exposing them to smoke. Prohibiting smoking on patios is commendable and a much needed step that we certainly hope moves forward today. It is clear from the research conducted by administration that public support for smoke-free patios is strong. We believe this public sentiment and hold true throughout the community. We hope that by going through this process, councillors will consider other outdoor spaces in which Winnipeg may be ready for a healthier change. In many other Canadian cities, all forms of smoking are banned from city parks, sports fields, skate parks, public festivals and events. We will continue to advocate for similar protections for Winnipeggers. We look forward to the two year review of this new policy and hope that buffer zones and additional smoke-free outdoor spaces will be assessed as part of that review. We ask that the recommendations being reviewed today be altered to broaden the scope of the two year review to consider not only the effectiveness of the smoke-free patio ban, but also to consider all ways that the smoking by-law may be expanded and improved. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for our delegations? Seeing none, we thank you for your time. We will now move into the additional delegations. I'll call forward the Honourable Steven Fletcher who is in opposition to the sale of the Vimy land. If you could please come forward. Yes?

Councillor Orlikow: Just for the gallery's sake, will we be breaking for lunch after the 7th delegation?

Madam Speaker: I think it's after…

Councillor Orlikow: Just so they can go have lunch themselves.

Madam Speaker: After MLA Steven Fletcher's presentation, we will be breaking for lunch.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay. Sure, thank you.

Councillor Allard: Point of information, so the Honourable member knows that many of his e-mails are being flagged as malicious and we are not getting many of his attachments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Is there a specific spot for...Mr. Clerk, is that the correct spot that the microphone will be on? Welcome, Mr. Fletcher, and you have five minutes on the clock.

Honourable Steven Fletcher: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The...I have the material that should be distributed, I have 16 copies in front of me and the material on my right, in the binder here is over 2,000 pages. That's been e-mailed. I don't think...yes. I don't think it was in anyone's interest that I photocopy the 2,000 pages for each councillor, but you will have access to it and there is access online. Yeah, and the next one. Madam Speaker, first of all, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to be here. I particularly enjoyed the fact that I am here with the Mayor. The Mayor and I went to the same high school. I was a year behind. The Mayor may not even have noticed me. Well, and I don't blame him because in high school, anyone that's behind you might as well be dead, so I...but I think our high school teachers would be very proud of what Mayor Brian Bowman has accomplished in his life. And all of you, if you guys went to Shaftesbury. Anyway, I also want to acknowledge the previous speakers, very heartfelt presentations. And of course, we all empathize with the challenges that those people face. The letter that I have provided, along with the attachments, asks fundamental questions about governance, questions that need to be answered before City Council moves forward. Before you make a decision on this, process has not been followed. The transparency has not been fulfilled. The fact that this project does not fulfil the original commitments City Council made to the residents of the area cannot just be brushed away. Proceeds were supposed to go to the community, fair market value and we've heard today, it's not 1.4 million, fair market value is upwards to over $5 million. So how can any fiscal responsibility be demonstrated by giving the land away for $1? And shame on the Province for offering only $1. The facility is worth much more to the...it's priceless for the community. But more than that, part of the 2013 decision was any revenue from the proceeds would be invested into the community. So you can understand why the community is upset. One dollar does not go very far. Vague commitments are not helpful when solid commitments in writing haven't been followed for the past. The $1 lease for 99 years, really, does that sound like a responsible thing to do? What about the taxation? Are you going to get any revenue from that land? You don't now because that's a park and recreation space. In regards to the larger issues, which the Oake family has brought much attention to, it is...those issues need to be dealt with, but it has to be done in a way that looks at the whole spectrum. Does the Province of Manitoba have a plan to deal with drug addiction, the opioid crisis? When we're told we have to...we were asked to vote with our hearts, I'm asking City Council to vote with your head. You have to…

Madam Speaker: Thank you. If you could please wrap up.

Honourable Steven Fletcher: Can I ask for a few additional minutes?

Madam Speaker: That request was already put forward previously.

Honourable Steven Fletcher: So where does that leave us?

Madam Speaker: Ten seconds.

Honourable Steven Fletcher: Ladies and gentlemen, the elected representatives of the area reflect the will of the people. If we want to do a Facebook faceoff with the number of followers, I can give you hundreds of thousands of people who would agree with the position that there needs to be a larger thought out plan by the Province. The City should not get involved or be asked to get involved in things that don't fall within its jurisdiction. It's outrageous.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Honourable Steven Fletcher for your presentation. With that, seeing the hour, Council will now recess until 1:30 for lunch. We will reconvene at 1:30 in the chamber. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
January 25, 2018, at 1:38 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon, I would like to call…reconvene our Council meeting of January 25th, 2018. We are still hearing from delegations. The item is…a few delegations that are opposed to the sale of the City-owned property, Vimy Arena, 255 Hamilton Avenue. I would like to call forward Mr. Wayne Manishen. Following that, we'll hear from Mr. Jim Prefontaine. Put five minutes on the clock. No questions. Welcome, sir.

Wayne Manishen: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Your Worship, members of Council. I am a physician who is sort of conflicted by this whole issue. On the one hand, I think as the Mayor has quoted from the Hippocratic Oath, that it's in our interests to support patients and their needs and their service delivery in whatever way we can. At the same time, being a parent of a special needs child with autism and recognizing that this condition is the most common neurological condition in North America, and 1 in 68 children are born with that, 1 in 42 boys. And having my son attend a very successful program two blocks away from the Vimy Arena at the Equal Opportunities West Program which has 150 young adults in this diagnosis and been given a vocational as well as program...day program activities, I feel that there has been a process issue not unlike what we heard earlier about the Sterling Lyon expressway road proposal. The Director of Equal Opportunities West has informed me that in May of 2017, she approached City Hall to find out the status of the Vimy Arena. Left messages with a Mr. Mark Pittet and did not receive a return call from the Planning Department. She did receive a call from Dave Chapelle who advised her that any surplus property would be listed on the website and this was in the spring of 2017. Subsequent to that, she was quite surprised to learn that this property was offered to the Oake Foundation. Now, I also am a bit conflicted because I have a relative who passed away from a substance overdose, suicide issue, so I support the need for inpatient treatment for this growing problem. But as was pointed out earlier, I don't think anybody has done a proper needs assessment of what is available in Manitoba and what the wait times are. So I did a bit of phoning myself. Just around the corner from here is a place called the River Point Program which is a short-term treatment facility, 28 days or longer, actually. They have 35 inpatient...short-term beds, ten transitional beds and 25 apartment unit beds for longer stay patients. The wait time there is about two weeks from assessment, another two weeks to get into a spot. In the summer time, they're less busy and they actually close beds. We also have a 70 bed facility called the Aurora Facility in Gimli, which is a non-profit but self-funded facility which there is assistance, I'm told, for people that need services there. I admire this council for spending a fair bit of time, probably more than the Health Department of the Province has spent on this subject, in this day alone, compared to all of the needs that are really unmet in this province, in terms of planning. But I still feel there has been a process issue on the disposition of the Vimy land and facility. The Equal Opportunities West Special Needs Program is interested in refurbishing that and refurbishing the facility, leasing it from the City, and allowing some of our young adults with special needs to actually work there, doing gardening, perhaps running a cafeteria, supporting the community and sharing the facility with people in the community at that site. So the question then comes down to how do you achieve what you are after here, to improve access for people with special needs in terms of employment and vocational training? The Province has asked the Equal Opportunities West Facility to expand and they have been interested in doing so but have been essentially stonewalled by the administration at City Hall to find out the status of the Vimy project. At the same time, I have a great deal of empathy for Mr. Oake and family who have gone through a lot of trauma. So what's the best answer? Well, why not wait for a proper assessment of the available land that could be used for the addictions facility. And I'll give you one example; you have an underperforming real estate asset, John Blumberg Golf Course, West End, lots of green space, plenty of room, underused, losing money. Why not take 60 days to think about other options and maybe we can have a win/win for both groups. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Dr. Manishen. Next, I'll call forward Mr. Jim Prefontaine, following that, Ms Diana Hanlan.

Jim Prefontaine: Hi.

Madam Speaker: Welcome.

Jim Prefontaine: Jim Prefontaine. So do I hand these out or does somebody else? Because I can go around. Okay, thanks. Ready to go?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Jim Prefontaine: Okay, I have a question on the corporation of this building. The corporation is registered as a non-profit organization. It is also registered again as a profit organization. I'd like to know more information about this. There is a whole bunch of people asking how can they do this? Not sure. I'm not an accountant, would like information. I do renovations. I was here before. We were talking about the assets funding needs report, 2015. And I went through it, I itemized everything, I've looked at it. A lot of it is aged. That's what they say. A lot of it can be reused and a lot of it is being used right now. This building is not ready for it to be taken down. It's over $4 million. I can put 500,000 in this building. I can put outside rink if the City allows me to, I can use this building for the community. You are cutting off a group of people that enjoy this park space. It seems very sad to me. I've talked to a lot of people about this that are in the trades. We've looked at the electrical, we've looked at every individual aspect of this and some of them say no problem, I'll help you get it going. They don't have a problem with that. It seems that blinders are on. You are looking at a building that we can use and the community can use. Equal Opportunities wants a chance, a chance to get in this building. They have over 200...well, roughly 200 people, some of them work outside. They have a request from the Minister…Minister of Health…Regional Health Authority that they can get another hundred that is needed in our area and that's Crestview alone. That doesn't count the ones they pick up. They have a transport system. That area, supposedly you are cutting back on the bus service, not sure if that's going through, but they can use that building. They're just down the street. All right, Vimy Arena. I see an opportunity for the City Council to help two separate needed organizations. Both have great heart and determination to help others. Equal Opportunities West, who was once leading this Vimy Arena push, now sits back out of the public eyes. Equal Opportunities have handed over the reins to Friends of Sturgeon Creek. EOW have never used the participants in any meeting at City Hall as a means to an end. They have never paraded anyone around here and they could fill this place. They are not willing to use the hundreds of participants with special needs to be displayed or used in a paper. They need this building to expand their program that is growing and in demand. They want to renovate the building and keep it in the community for all of the residents to use and enjoy. The building requires minor repair. It is a huge mistake to take a perfectly good building down that is worth over $4 million. And that's not the assessed value now. I haven't seen that. This is based on 2015. This land and building should be assessed at today's values to get a true figure of the tax dollars being given away. The Vimy Arena can be saved for an additional $500,000 put into upgrades, keeping the property still in the hands of the residents of St. James and Winnipeg. The community help, EOW workers and residents of Winnipeg, we should have a little...we should have little problems helping save the recreational site. I can fix this building and revitalize the community centre. The whole Vimy Arena soap opera, City of Winnipeg, provincial handling of things is an eye opener for me. I'm not a politician, but it is very sad and there is a disgusting side here to this whole story. First the sad and disgusting part, at the beginning of this whole debate, Equal Opportunities was a front runner in trying to get answers from the City. When in May of 2017, they were not told that a decision was already made. Decisions made without input from the residents of St. James. A press release at that time started the inquiries and public meetings. Equal Opportunities West started to receive threats. I'm going to down play these threats because some of the kids might watch this. Now, I call them kids but they are from 18 up and they don't get the funding of other people. Only kids get the funding in this. So that's the big issue. The threats were both phone calls and later, e-mails to one of the websites. The police were called and phone numbers turned over to them. The staff was threatened once again, but this time special need participants were also mentioned. At this time a decision was made and the website was taken down. The building was on lockdown once again. I remember both lockdowns. The days are very clear and I look on the staff's faces and some of the participants. They hear everything that goes around and they pass it to the next one. They are in fear. I took time off…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Prefontaine, that concludes your presentation. You had five minutes. Do you want to take a few seconds?

Jim Prefontaine: I won't get an extension?

Madam Speaker: No. Can you take a few minutes to...or a few seconds to wrap-up?

Jim Prefontaine: Okay. I took off work and checked in for another special needs participant to see at a different location. He quit his job shortly after this event and I wonder if it was related or if he was threatened in any way so a decision from Equal Opportunities West was to let others take the lead as a special needs participant safety comes first. Since that time, one of the most vocal speakers at the first two meetings at the residence...and with the residents of St. James Assiniboia area has not spoken about the Vimy Arena. I have heard that she was also threatened. A new organization, Friends of Sturgeon Creek, have also had their share of problems, amage to their vehicles, personal property and being followed. Last night, I got an e-mail.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Prefontaine. That concludes the time for your presentation. Next, we'll hear from Ms Diana Hanlan. Following that, Ms Loreena Davis. Welcome. There is five minutes on the clock.

Diana Hanlan: Madam Speaker, Mayor Bowman and Councillors. My name is Diana Hanlan. I live in the Crestview area. I'm hoping you will vote to save Vimy Arena for our children to give them the chance to enjoy the sport of their

choice. This is an important part of our community and you can make this happen and make thousands of people in this area very happy. The kids will forever be grateful. Near the arena there are apartments, townhouses, homes, three elementary schools, two high schools in a half mile radius and a daycare centre. We are looking at the ward changing in the near future. We are also going to be getting bigger. There is a proposal for 3,000 homes going to be built north of Saskatchewan Avenue. All of this should be taken in consideration for our community. We so deeply need our Vimy Arena facilities up and running for our children. I would like you all to look back at your childhood or in the future of your children and grandchildren. I'm sure they were all in sports of some kind or another. How can you say no to our kids' happiness? The kids engaged in sports, it brings the parents together and family ties are created. This is a very important part of our children's lives. The children in the community did fundraising and were able to help some of the other kids get hockey equipment so they could play and have fun. No one was ever left out, they all played. There isn't a parent around who wouldn't do what's best for their children, so you can't blame them for fighting to keep their children active, healthy and out of trouble. The area is zoned parks and recreation. The land and area is already there, belongs to the community so we should make good use of it since it only makes sense that it would save the taxpayers a lot of money. When I was walking and talking with the neighbours in the area, I came across someone that was very knowledgeable about the Vimy Arena. He said that there was nothing wrong with the arena at that time. With the ice-making machine as well…the ice-making machine was taken out and was given either to Seven Oaks or another arena. So what was really going…what was really wrong with the Vimy Arena? Why was it closed when thousands were still using Vimy Arena? Why did they not renovate Vimy Arena as stated? Why was the community not consulted? We have a lot of unanswered questions so how can we expect the logic of all this when the community have no answers to their questions? The process of closing the Vimy Arena without consulting the community for their options, where is the transparency here? This is not in the best interest of our children. A lot of the hockey parents take their children to Stonewall, Warren and Seven Oaks because there's not enough ice time around this area. Youth may not be aware. Some of our neighbours of our community have been threatened, bullied and vandalized to their property. We are nice people who just want the Vimy Arena for the use of our families. This is our community and we only want what's best for our kids. This is not the best interest for the children. Does this mean that the children in this area doesn't matter? There are children you are talking about. There's lots of children in our area. Please don't make the mistake and let our children be victims on the street. Vote for saving the Vimy Arena. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms Hanlan. Next is Ms Loreena Davis followed by Ms Vicki Fedak.

Loreena Davis: Good afternoon, Madam Speaker, Mayor and Councillors. Today, No. 14 on the Council meeting, you will be asked to vote on the sale of our parks and recreation land at 255 Hamilton Avenue. I implore you to oppose the sale of the land. I ask all of you to keep an open mind. Listen to what we have to say and remember that what we are voting on today or what you're voting on today, is to sell or give away our parks and recreation land. Any parks and recreation land should not be sold or given away. Parks and recreation lands are set aside for the residents of the area for the specific purpose of recreational use. They are valuable to our community. Councillor Lukes wrote on her website, "Parks are the jewel in our community. They are where we can escape from daily grind of life in the city. Parks are not only critical to our health and wellbeing, they contribute to a healthy environment and act as a hub for our community." This particular piece of land that we are talking about is part of a whole piece of land that is unique. There are not very many areas in the city where you have recreational buildings right next to a green space like the Sturgeon Creek. I've looked at the map and we have very few that are together like that. Councillors have suggested that a different area could be used for recreation, but this is the valuable piece of land that was given to our community. It cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Its location, location, location, it's a one of a kind. Once it is sold, it is given away and lost forever. If the City can sell and give away our parks and recreation land, it can also do it to your community, your parks and recreational land as well. All councillors should oppose the selling or giving away of our parks and recreational land. I presented in front of some of you at the Planning and Development meeting on January 8th and you voted to give away our parks and recreational land at that meeting for a once in a lifetime opportunity were the words used. Do you actually think that if you do not give away our parks and land that the foundation will no longer exist? That they will drop their work that they have been doing for seven years? Why did the City and the Province not do full research on the best possible location for the foundation? Also, I found out after the last meeting that there was money set aside for the City to have consultation with the area residents to determine the best use of the land. This money is still sitting there. We trusted our elected officials to have our best interests in mind. We were failed. Sorry. We have not had a public consultation on the use of this land. Either way, according to the Oxford Dictionary, 'Consult' means, "To seek information or advice from". Consultation is where the residents and the City can have a dialogue, a chance to share ideas, a place to plan for the future generations. Councillor Pagtakhan talked about the consultation that they have done with the Arlington Bridge and you talked about telephone surveys, online surveys, face-to-face community meetings, open houses and dialogue. That's what we're asking for for this particular site. The residents of our community want to have a public input. Residents of St. Vital are undergoing public consultation for the Canoe Club land. The Grant's and Park residents have had an opportunity to have input into the revitalization of the Grant Park recreational area. I look at that Grant Park campus research and feasibility study and there are drawings in there and the area that are to be renewed and it's so exciting and I would love to take part in something like that for our site. Are the residents of St.

Charles not worthy of this same process? The area is constantly used and I know that's been talked about so I'm going to skip over that. We've heard how it's important to have active living and healthy living and community involvement and family activity. And people said here, oh, well we'll never get the money. Other communities have had millions of dollars spent on recreational revitalization. The Sherbrook Pool was important enough to spend money on. Toboggan slides at St. Vital, Transcona Aquatic Park and the recreational lands in south Winnipeg that will be getting money for the next six years and I think they are all worthy. And so then I ask, are we not worthy then as well? I know it might take time to get that money or to have the open consultation, but the money was set aside for open consultation in 2014…in 2014…and we could be somewhere so much further than this derelict building that everybody says is so horrible. I'm just going to wind it up. All I ask in the end…just get to my very end here…that there shouldn't be double standards. All the councillors on their websites have mentioned how wonderful parks and rec is to their communities. They're jewels in their communities. They revitalize their communities and I would ask that you give us the same consideration for our parks and rec land. That's all I'm asking. Say no to the sale of the Vimy Arena. Be forethinkers for our future generations. We need your assistance to revitalize our park and recreational area just like you've done for some of your own. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms Davis. The final delegation on this item is Ms Vicki Fedak. Welcome.

Vicki Fedak: Welcome…or, sorry. Madam Speaker, Your Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors and guests, good afternoon. Our deepest sympathy goes out to the Oake family and others in their loss. My name is Vicki. My husband and I have lived on Vimy Road for over 45 years. We raised our children there, my daughter's son, grandchildren and niece all live two minutes north, south and west of us. We also have family in the Salvation Army Golden West Lodge. As you can see, our family has deep roots in the Crestview area. Just let me tell you a little bit about Crestview. It is not an affluent neighbourhood and currently has an abundance of seniors living there. As we are an affordable housing community, we have many, many new young families moving into the neighbourhood. Families use the area around Sturgeon Creek where the proposed site is that you have chosen. Families toboggan on the hills and ice skate on the creek and in the spring and summer months, families and children fish, ride bikes, play tennis and walk. Now, we have numerous young families moving into our area. I believe it would be beneficial to reopen the Vimy Arena or alternatively, create a shared sports recreational centre. This could also be done in combination with a seniors centre. I know there is currently a senior's centre at Deer Lodge but speaking for myself and others, Deer Lodge is not user friendly. Parking is almost impossible. In the past, the Province was looking for another seniors centre site, but to my knowledge, nothing has happened. A shared sportsplex with seniors would be a welcome addition. It would keep our young people active all year round and increase the activity in seniors. Keeping young people busy and active also helps keep them off the streets. I am very concerned about the lack of transparency shown from the City and Province to the residents of Crestview. Even our councillor was not informed until late fall. When the Province showed interest in buying this property in the spring of 2017 or sooner, the City had a responsibility to meet with the residents of Crestview to find out if there were other alternatives. When the property was initially designated as surplus, the intention was to finish...sorry…an arena and Seven Oaks and then to redevelop our Vimy Arena parks and rec site for our young people. Now, the City and Province are attempting to bypass or go around City by-laws in order to rezone our property. Also, the City committed to dropping the price from 1.4 million to $1 in less than 30 seconds. This process showed a lack of respect to us. At the last meeting, Scott Gillingham proposed an amendment to the 2019 budget, which passed, to make available 1.4 million to St. James for recreational use. In the budget for 2019, there would possibly be money in the amount of 1.4 available. I very much doubt it. In 2017, Councillor Gillingham, Chair of Council's Finance Committee, told one hearing that funds forecast in past budgets were removed due to changes in provincial, municipal funding agreements. At this time, the City blamed the Province saying it was the Province who cut recreational spending. There is an election in October and perhaps not all of you will be around to ensure these funds are made available to us in the 2019 budget. So between a pending election this year and the provincial municipal funding the City depends on, our chances will be minimal at best to receive any money from the City. Added to this, the recent redrawing of the electrical map, which basically eliminates our St. Charles ward, what area would receive the monies then? Whenever I put the news on, I consistently hear Mayor Bowman respectfully say there is no money in the City coffers. I doubt this will change in the 2019 budget. How can the City afford to give the land away for $1 in 2018, then propose to give us 1.4 million in 2019? They are taking away a parks and rec zoning and giving false hope that money will be available in a pre-2019 forecasted budget. We have not had a residents meeting with our mayor and St. James councillors and perhaps this should have happened when they decided in 2016 to sell the property. Before the land is sold for $1, we need a meeting in our area to include our mayor, Councillors Dobson and Gillingham and MLA Steven Fletcher, Scott Fielding and Scott Johnson. Why is this being rushed through in three Council meetings in three weeks? When a major decision has to be made in business, it is usually discussed with pros and cons and options being presented. I am sure in a city this size the Province and City have other areas of land that can be developed that are not zoned parks and rec. The Province was given the property known as Shriners Hospital...can I just finish?

Madam Speaker: Just wrap it up, yes, thank you.

Vicki Fedak: Okay, Shriner's Hospital, which is already zoned hospital and recreation. Finally in closing, I reiterate, we want the Province and City to take a second look at their own available land. We want our parks and rec space. We want the Vimy Arena, 255 Hamilton, and surrounding area to remain parks and rec. We are asking for your consideration in helping us to keep the aforementioned land and property zoned parks and rec in Crestview for further development for people young and old in our area. Thank you all for listening to my concerns.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms Davis. That concludes our delegations for today's meeting. We'll now move into reports of the Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor, the report dated January 10th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 10, 2018

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 7 and would pull Report 7, please.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy, No. 1? Okay, I'll call the question on Items 2 through 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Citizen Member Appointments – Transcona Historical Museum Board

Councillor Gilroy: Sorry, I meant January 17th, but thank you very much for all the work that they've done. But sorry, I thought we were on...

Madam Speaker: It's not your opportunity to speak Councillor Gilroy, thank you. Mr. Clerk, you introduced Item 1. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the item? Okay, right, Councillor Schreyer, you wish to speak?

Councillor Schreyer: I'm actually glad that coincidentally, serendipitously it was called to speak on. It was a great mistake done by Councillor Gilroy. In the absence of Councillor Wyatt, having been there at community committee, when it comes to the citizen member appointments to the Transcona Historical Museum Board, I just wish to say…take this opportunity since it's been called, that it was due process and I'm pleased that I was able at that community committee to support, along with Councillor Browaty, these appointments to…from the Transcona area. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 7.

Item 7 – Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I pulled this report down just to provide an opportunity to thank members of our public service and members of our community who have been working diligently with us on our journey to reconciliation. One of the...you know, we are dealing with some pretty serious topics today, of course, addictions is one of those topics that governments across Canada and citizens are trying to do their best to deal with. Responding to the calls to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is another significant challenge and opportunity for our country. And Winnipeggers should be very proud of the work that's been led by this council and our public service and so many grassroots organizations across Winnipeg. The report before us provides a very impressive list of action items that have been undertaken by our Indigenous Relations Division and I want to commend and thank the Public Service and notably, our staff that work in Indigenous Relations Division, for the energy and the passion that they've put forward and demonstrated in this report on moving us forward in terms of responding to the calls to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. My Indigenous Advisory Circle includes Senator Murray Sinclair and I remember the day that he and the other commissioners brought forward the Truth and Reconciliation Commission final report, like it was yesterday. It was difficult to listen to, but action is certainly what it compelled, I believe, all Canadians to follow through on and I'll just point out in this report, there is a number...I'm not going to read all of them. I did read them at the Executive Policy Committee meeting last week. But some of the highlights include as of November 2017, almost 4,000 employees of the City of Winnipeg have undertaken the mandatory reconciliation training. This is 4,000 Winnipeggers who are now being better informed, many of us included, myself included, about the painful legacy of residential schools. And other activities that are listed in this report include work of...with respect to cemeteries, with regards to archives, as well as Oshki Annishinabe Nigaaniwak and the good work that's happening with that group. The final thing

I'll conclude on is, is just to highlight Winnipeg's first ever Indigenous Accord. This is an accord that was initiated by a working group of the Indigenous Advisory Circle, with the advice of Cindy Blackstock who is a member of the Indigenous Advisory Circle, along with my council colleagues, Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Gerbasi who were at every meeting and are doing great work. But Cindy Blackstock recommended that we started with a visioning exercise with children and so we assembled school children at the Millennium Library in the Carol Shields Auditorium to create a visioning statement for the kind of Winnipeg they want to grow up in. The kind of Winnipeg they will one day lead. And that began a lengthy process that resulted in Winnipeg's first ever Indigenous Accord. Many, if not all of my council colleagues signed the accord and I want to thank each and every one of you for doing so and providing your leadership and putting your stamp of approval on this. We follow other cities including Thomson who should be commended for taking the leadership in Manitoba as well as the City of Edmonton. And now the efforts are really...one of the things that I'm doing to support these efforts is to continue to encourage Winnipeggers, not-for-profit groups, for-profit and other levels of government to join us in our journey to reconciliation to undertake signing and becoming a partner to the Indigenous Accord, which among other things, compels signatories to report annually on what action are you actually taking to move the ball forward. I won't talk about Youth United because I suspect Councillor Mayes may wish to speak about it, another very positive effort that he has helped to spearhead and I'm not going to take away his thunder. But I just want to again thank everybody involved and encourage all those listening if you haven't signed the Indigenous Accord to date, and that will include each and every news outlet that is here and is covering, we would invite you and every not-for-profit, every business, all those listening to our deliberations today, join us in our journey to reconciliation. Let's demonstrate to Canada that Winnipeg is up to the task of responding in a positive way of building bridges in our community and responding to the calls to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: I hope one day to say I talked more about the Youth United program than about gravel lanes during my years here. So this is an opportunity to say, it's not in the report because it's not directly delivered by our staff but we do run a very good program, well, we fund a very good program that the U of Winnipeg runs. Very good partnership, the kind of thing the Mayor talked about in his platform, building partnerships with the universities, that's the Youth United Winnipeg program, completed its first summer in 17. Second year, the pilot project is in 18. I would hope that we continue to fund that into the future. I'm certainly meeting with some MPs to talk about whether this can be studied, copied, plagiarized in other cities that would be quite a tribute I think. It's a program that mixes suburban youth with inner-city youth four days a week working with communities; Spence Neighbourhood Group, Graffiti Gallery, Ranch, social programs that where people spend four days a week. The fifth day of the week though is the connection here which is all the students are together at U of Winnipeg and they're studying the Truth and Reconciliation calls to action. So it's…there was a letter just this week from Dr. Annette Trimbee, President of U of Winnipeg, to the Federal Minister of Labour as the feds have announced some new summer youth corp type funding to say, look, this is a model you may want to look at that we are doing, and we're taking the lead on in Winnipeg. So it's a project I am proud of and I want to thank the Mayor. I've said before, I started writing about this and talked about this in the early 90s. So forgive me if I…now that it's actually operating, forgive me if I kind of celebrate it, but I mean, it was two years into the Mayor's mandate we got this approved. So I want to thank the Mayor for his support for this project and hopefully it will be here for years to come. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now moving on to the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated January 17th, 2018, Mr. Mayor. Noting that we will be pulling Item 5 for sure as we have an amending motion.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED JANUARY 17, 2018

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 6. I would like to pull Report 3 as well, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, one? Yeah, okay, great. So I will call the question on Item 2, 4 and 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk. So noted. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Winnipeg Private Refugee Sponsorship Assurance Program

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the item? Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I rise in support of this motion. It's very, very exciting that something that...the private sponsored...sponsorship fund is really an insurance fund and what it does for those who privately sponsor people to come here to Canada, it insures there is a little bit of money there if somebody gets ill in the family or there is a death that the money is there to take care of those families when they are here and it's something that was started by a previous council. That's something that I've really championed here and really, really support. And now we're going to be giving it in the hands of the Winnipeg Foundation which will maybe even generate more funding. So I think this is a really, really good news story and I'm very, very proud of the work that this fund has done and what it's done to help people here in Winnipeg. Thanks.

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

Mayor Bowman: I'll just briefly…briefly make some comments. Firstly, I want to echo Councillor Gilroy's support for the Winnipeg Private Refugee Sponsorship Assurance Program. I also want to commend her work and those members of the Citizens Equity Committee. You know, Winnipeg and other cities across Canada welcomed thousands of Syrian refugees over the last little while and it really highlighted to Canadians, I think, what many of us love most about Winnipeg and Canada, and that's the fact that we are a welcoming, inclusive community. That work is ongoing and long after, hopefully, the Syrian refugee crisis abates, we will continue to welcome newcomers to Winnipeg. That diversity is what makes our community stronger and a richer place for all of us, and I want to continue to speak out as loud as possible to the fact that Winnipeg is a place we want all of our citizens to be proud to call home. And that means ensuring when individuals and their families move to Winnipeg, that they are given as many opportunities as possible to transition into life here, which I can only imagine for many is incredibly difficult, especially when you're talking about new languages, new foods, certainly new environment this time of the year for many. And everything and anything that we can do, we should be looking at. And, of course, the Private Refugee Sponsorship Assurance Program is assisting with that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Negotiations between the City of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Senior Officers Association

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I'd ask that we refer this matter back to EPC. I was asked earlier today by the public service to seek the direction of Council to refer it back. There are...I was told non-material errors in the report for documents that should have been included and given that, I would ask that we refer it back to Executive Policy Committee so we ensure the most up-to-date information is possible for this council's consideration at the next Council meeting.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 5 – Audit of the Effectiveness of Current Systems and Processes in Relation to the Sterling Lyon / William Clement Parkway Study

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll first wait to hear from my council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We have an amending motion. Councillor Lukes, this is your opportunity to introduce Motion 2.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Morantz,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 5 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee date January 17, 2018 be amended as follows:

- *Amend Recommendation 1 by adding the following wording at the end thereof:*

  ", with a particular focus on the accountability of elected and non-elected City officials that were either directly or indirectly involved in this study from its inception to the present time."

- *Delete Recommendation 2;*

- *Add following new Recommendations and renumber the remaining Recommendation accordingly:*

  "2. That the City Auditor / Chief Performance Officer conduct an audit of the file on the William R. Clement Parkway and the surrounding study area also referred to as the "Extension of the Sterling Lyon Parkway", "Expansion of Wilkes" or "East/West Alignment" with a chronological timeline, identifying authorizations and knowledge of and direction for planning and engagement of Public Service members, external consultants and elected officials.

  3. That the City Auditor / Chief Performance Officer conduct an audit of the capital expenditures with timeline, authorization of, and size and scope of the William R Clement Parkway file and study area referred to as the "Extension of the Sterling Lyon Parkway", "Expansion of Wilkes" or "East/West Alignment"

  4. That the City Auditor / Chief Performance Officer conduct an audit of the scope and execution of work performed by WSP/MMM starting November 25th, 2014, until current, focusing on who provided direction to WSP/MMM from the Public service.

  5. That the City Auditor / Chief Performance Officer complete and report back to Council by May 1st, 2018 (90 days)."

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I'd like to thank Councillor Morantz for taking my call when I reached out to offer a refinement to his motion and I want to thank him for allowing some hours of trust so that we could work collaboratively to elaborate on his motion and incorporate my amendments in seeking more accountability. We work under a governance model that is not really designed to encourage collaboration, a governance model that hasn't been updated in 20 years. But Councillor Morantz and I worked through barriers and we have come to what I believe is a comprehensive motion to address accountability and seek answers to questions. And I am encouraging all members of Council to support this. I'm not going to say much on this. A lot has been said publicly. I believe the mismanagement, lack of oversight, lack of adherence to process and restriction to information on this file reflects directly on poor political and administrative leadership. Four senior transportation engineers with over half a century of engineering experience who worked on this file have left the City in a year where we are doing record road construction. The departure of these engineers is a catastrophic loss that will reverberate throughout the system and ultimately cost us in the end. This audit is one tool we can use to seek accountability but for the record, I and others will continue filing access to information requests, seek external legal advice and investigate through other avenues. In closing, I want to note that I am disappointed to have…in having to call a second audit of administrative processes under this Council. To me, this clearly points to a serious problem that must be addressed. I want to thank Councillor Morantz again for working on this and hopefully we can have some accountability. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support this motion and I just want to commend my Council colleagues, Councillors Lukes and Morantz for their efforts in working collaboratively. I think at the end of the day, you know, I've heard my two Council colleagues and others over the last several weeks, months on this particular matter and what has been clear from both of them and others is that they really want...we want an understanding of what truly transpired, what needs to be changed, if anything, what recommendations may be and so the call for an audit and specifically, the motion that's before us, I think is comprehensive. I think it will get to...allow us to discover the answers that are needed to be discovered so that we can identify what, if anything, went wrong, how it went wrong, what can be improved, what needs to change. And so I think what's important here is that we see a collective effort between the two councillors and, you know, I invite everyone to support, accordingly, that we do see a collective effort to really…and understanding to improve things for the future for the citizens of Winnipeg. So I will be supporting this motion. I thank Councillor Morantz for his work and Councillor Lukes for her work on this as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Morantz followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to start by saying that my interest, first and foremost have always been with the homeowners of Charleswood and with getting to the bottom of what went wrong with the internal and pop up consultation process, relating to the Sterling Lyon Parkway. Madam Speaker, when I first learned of option four in October of last year, I could not understand how this initiative went forward to a special meeting of impacted property owners with the 4th option alignment never having been seen before by those residents, never having been

posted on the City website, and never having been reduced to a storyboard during the public consultation meetings on this project. Clearly, there has been a breakdown in process and I can say, Madam Speaker, that as a city, we clearly could have and should have done a far better job. Madam Speaker, I also believe it is true that actions speak louder than words. When this matter came to light, I immediately began working with the community. I arranged meetings for the community association, with the CAO, the Mayor's Office, and the Mayor, the Director of Property, Planning and Development. Motions I brought forward were immediately tabled and debated by various committees. Within two short months of this happening at December Council, my motion calling for this whole area and road to be re-planned with consideration to the character of existing developed areas, was passed and unanimously by this council. Today, just over three months have passed, lightning speed in politics. We have before us a comprehensive audit motion initiated by myself and amended today with the very valuable and collaborative support of my colleague, Councillor Lukes, and I thank her very much for that valued input. Madam Speaker, I believe our citizens expect their city councillors to work together in collaboration and that is when we get the best results. Among other things, the motion asks the Auditor to focus on accountability from elected and nonelected officials. It calls for the Auditor to conduct an audit of the effectiveness of systems in place for communicating material information to decision makers and with specific attention being given to this matter. It also calls for the Auditor to examine capital expenditures in this matter. As part of the motion, we are asking the Auditor to complete his work no later than May 1st, and I'm doing so with the belief that all of Council will support this motion today. I say to my colleagues sincerely, you never want to have an issue like this erupt and impact residents in the wards you represent. Speaking from experience, I can say that and particularly as seriously as this has impacted some of the residents in my ward. At EPC last fall, I said that I would do everything I could to get to the bottom of this and today, I am making good on that pledge by calling this audit and co-sponsoring it with my colleague, Councillor Lukes. I will now yield the floor to my colleagues for further comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Morantz. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. The process…or how we got here today is very important to figure out what happened, wrong there is no middle ground. Councillor Morantz has tried his best to weather the storm and figure out a way to dig deep and making sure that he says he is there for his residents of Charleswood, which is true, but he is also there for the residents of Winnipeg because no one should have this happen in any neighbourhood. This, to me, was a failure in something. What it was, I'm not too sure but again, we need to be looking at the processes. I know there is a lack of communication with the neighbours. How did that happen? How did the new idea get in there without actually being on the storyboards? There's many questions that should be explained and I believe this audit, again, will help us do...at least that part, will help us look at some of the processes that we went through. We also had an issue previously where Councillor Allard just got elected and all of a sudden he is out there, battling it out to see about what plan we wanted to get forward for Building Canada funding, but all of a sudden, Councillor Allard finds out that there it's a massive amount of expropriations are required to do this plan. How did we get there? After we had weeks, months of debates and all of a sudden we go whoa, what's that? And we had to actually...to Councillor Allard's credit he said, I can't go with that plan. Again, that was a shorter period of time but again, we shouldn't have got that far. So you'll see...so again...this audit here, I believe, is very important, to look at the processes and how we can make sure this doesn't happen again. But that's not the only thing we have to do. And I just want to say to my colleagues, I am proud of the way we are going forward. What we are going forward, you will see another motion today that talks about when we look at these kind of projects, we have to look at the totality of a project, not just the road, not just some houses, how does it fit into the whole sphere of Winnipeg? So again, we need to be looking at some of these larger projects especially something like this or Marion even the Kenaston widening. It has to be taken in the context of not only the road itself...and nothing evil to engineers out there, but engineers do what they think is right the best way possible. That's the way they do it. Well, the city is not a road. The city is people. People who have put many, many years into their homes, into their communities, so again, we have to look at a different lenses. And I think what's going to be happening going forward in changes in our process which I'm sure will come out of this audit so we don't have that happen again, the way that we're going to start doing these plans is not going to be held in isolation of one department, one department, one department. All departments need to be working together to make sure, oh look at that, there is expropriations that are probably going to be required. Okay, so now this is a land use planning model, so it's going to be very important. Or look at that, we have no water in this area so we're not sure what will be the land use for the area. Again, that must be incorporated as well into...so it's not just a road. And I think that's what we're looking at now. We understand it's not just a road. It's a road that impacts land use, water drainage, recreational space, it impacts all of Winnipeg. So in our planning going forward and again, the motion will be coming forward shortly, which actually is…some of the good that's coming out of this bad is that we will be looking at planning in a much more holistic manner. And again, I will be advocating for the Planning Department that they take the lead on these projects. Again, we'll have…our CAO will have that battle going on and certainly himself. But again, having a lead department…again, the Planning Department is sequestered sometimes by different departments to help them out but again, we don't have a leadership role in there. We are doing what one department asks us…them to do. But again, by changing the format and the lens that we look at these major projects we can get a much bigger…much better, sorry, accurate picture of the impact it has, not just on traffic, not just on that home over there but how it connects with the City of Winnipeg, how does

it connect with land use. So all those things need to be brought in together. So there will be a motion that's coming forward today, on that notice of motions, to have...to look at that. Again, we can't have neighbourhoods...and I strongly feel for what's going on for those Charleswood…people in Charleswood…I've had the same problem on Kenaston for quite a long time when they're saying, you say you're going to expropriate me, but that was like eight years ago. So again, they are having troubles selling their houses because who wants to buy a house that's going to be expropriated? So again, the City has a fund that helps those people who want to sell at market value, we can start doing that and we have done a number of homes along Kenaston. So again, I believe that was definitely something went wrong horribly on this one and I agree with Councillor Morantz, we need some answers on what…and Councillor Lukes. And we need some solutions. You are not going to go out there and just start blaming people and try to throw people under the bus. What we are here to do is find solutions to problems. So I think we are on that path. We're on that path of this…we're looking at some process problems. There must have been some in here because that was…that should not have happened and but…we're also going to look on how we do planning in general. So again, I do categorically apologize to those people in that neighbourhood, this should not have happened and as a city councillor I do that, not as a ward resident. But again, we are going to make changes and we are making changes on how we go forward with these plans. I think it's very, very important so I'm looking forward to supporting Councillor Lukes and Councillor Morantz today. I'm looking forward to the audit coming back and we will go from there. We'll get the audit back, I'm sure there will be some more work to do after that and we'll follow that through. But I also look forward to working...or having the CAO work on how do we…how do we better plan these projects from not just from the engineering standpoint but from a liveability standpoint. So again that's what Winnipeg is. So again, I stress...I do thank Councillor Morantz for, you know, working on this and having to...unfortunately had to. But he stayed in there and worked with the residents. I have heard many of those conversations on how he has been trying to find ways to work with the residents and I think he's done an admirable job. But we still do need some answers on the process. But we also need some answers on how can we do things better. And I think the next motion coming forward from Councillor Morantz and myself with support from the department will put us on that path forward. So again, I'm going to be supporting this motion and I actually...I'm very looking forward to the results.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise...I'll be supporting the motion from EPC once it's amended. If it's not amended, I won't be supporting it and I'd like to thank Councillor Lukes for working diligently with the councillor for the area as well, to come up with what I think is a better resolve in terms of trying to discover where the problems are, Madam Speaker. And, of course, you can accuse me of maybe not having an open mind but I mean, I have seen some of the documents that have been released in the media and things, Madam Speaker, and it has raised a number of concerns for me. But first, I'd just like to start off by...you know, I have to say, that this whole consideration that somehow there has to be an external auditor, you know, Madam Speaker, I trust in the audit, people that we have, Madam Speaker, we appointed somebody. They are and do carry themselves. They are not biased. They examine things according to the way they have been asked to look at it, and they are looking at…they're looking...going to be looking at it from a perspective that is...it's basically neutral, looking for where are the problems, what has happened here, and you know, I have confidence that our auditors can do that. And you know, although I wish if the Auditor does see something that is really difficult and might need to talk to somebody who no longer, for example, works for the City or needs to get some important information to follow up on, that our auditor would feel the need to utilize what I call...and the Auditor does and the City of Winnipeg Charter have subpoena power if, upon his investigations that that's what he might have to do. Anyway, I just leave that there. Again, I support the look at this. But Madam Speaker, yes, this is...you know, this is a major infrastructure problem, Madam Speaker. And it's all happening in the context of our next huge major infrastructure projects that we need to deal with, in order for the City of Winnipeg to grow. And the City of Winnipeg does need to grow. It is growing, but there are a number of major infrastructure projects that need to be done. And I know that in the last civic election, in my area of town, we talked about...and I said that I would support Chief Peguis Trail and I know that the councillor from Charleswood-Tuxedo who ended up winning talked about supporting and getting the William Clement Parkway extension done. And they all involved very difficult decisions, Madam Speaker, as we know and as we experienced in the past with the stage two rapid transit that goes from stage one all the way down to the University of Manitoba. And in that process, I have to say that we had a City administrator that made sure that things went across properly. There was at least four or five options that were explored for the path for stage two rapid transit. There was a very in-depth study. They came up with...we had a number of options to choose from and, for example, Madam Speaker, they had an option of...it was like say number two and then there was A and B. We ended up with going one of the either A or B, which was...there was going...it was determined that they were needing to go through Parker land, Madam Speaker. Now what I'm hearing here in this William Clement Parkway extension…and I think that what I'm reading from the e-mails, Madam Speaker, is there is a big push from people who are in non-EPC. And I think our administration over the years and because of the way we are governed, and it is a governance problem, I totally agree with Councillor Lukes, is that we get these positions where you are in a bigger, better, decision-making place. And I see that from my perspective, that the William Clement Parkway extension was being pushed to move faster than any other major projects. Councillor Pagtakhan's Arlington Bridge, which I also agree needs to be done. We

have those projects. There is a number of options. We look at it. There is ideas that we may be able…need to expropriate here or expropriate there but ultimately, Madam Speaker, no matter which option you use on the William Clement Parkway extension, people will be losing their homes. They will be having an effect on their neighbourhood and their homes, whether you go Wilkes or you go option two and then slightly change the angle and our City administration, whoever the consultants, whatever, it should've been on the board because I think it's just the…its option two with two slightly different angles, with different angles. That's all it is, Madam Speaker. And they should've been above board and put it on the board so that the public could generally see it. And they could make decisions. But then, make a functional study. Then there is these various options. Bring us the option. What is the path? Let City Council vote on it. That's what we did with the stage two rapid transit, Madam Speaker. I know that the two councillors who it's affecting, they voted against that option, Madam Speaker, but all the options were on the table. We had information on them so that Council could make a decision that's good for Winnipeg. What I'm hearing here and having a hard time, like I don't trust...and I'm hearing and I don't…I hope it's not the truth, we need to see all the options before the alignment is decided for the William Clement Parkway extension. I don't see how we can say you are taking option four, if you want to call it that, off the table. I think you need to go back to thing, look at...do the study, what effect are you going to have on the people who live along Wilkes. Okay? That needs to be done. And we have to look at it…from a whole City of Winnipeg perspective is, we are looking at what is the most cost...best way to deal with paying for this and moving ahead and balance all that, Madam Speaker and it's very difficult. It's not easy. I acknowledge that, Councillor Morantz. I've had a number of things pop up in my civic, political career here, and they are difficult, I agree. But ultimately, we need to be considerate of a proper process and that's what this audit is going to get at and I respect and I thank Councillor Morantz for seconding Councillor Lukes work here because I think this is the responsible thing to do and we can move ahead. But I hope that we haven't decided, somehow, that when this does come to Council for a vote, it will be in the Transportation Master Plan. That's where we had to realign and decide the alignment for rapid transit. I expect the same thing for the William Clement Parkway extension before any proceed going on there and it would be the same for Chief Peguis Trail, as a matter of fact. I just want to say that this is the kind of thing we have to do and so I am supporting the motion as long as the amendment passes and from what I hear, it's going to pass. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll try to be brief. I just want to commend Councillor Morantz for all his work on this file over the past couple of months Councillor Lukes for raising some concerns with that original motion. I think this gives the public more confidence if we are all moving together in support of this amended motion that we are really trying to get to the bottom of this. I actually echo some of what Councillor Eadie is saying as well. My concern had been, I didn't want to be told sometime a year from now or half a year from now, oh well there has been so much time and effort spent on this file that we're now…this has vaulted to the top of our transportation list, this jumps over Arlington Bridge, this jumps over Kenaston or anything else. It should be considered on its merits like the widening with St. Mary's Road or Bishop Grandin, any of the other projects out there. The fact that this may have been in some way mishandled and caused a lot of grief out there doesn't mean it somehow it changes its consideration on the merits. To the credit of Mr. Wardrop and Mr. Berezowsky of our staff, they met with me when I raised these concerns and were very explicit, got back to me very quickly and said no, this doesn't change their rank order or the priority of this project in any sense. That's up to Council to ultimately to decide. So like Councillor Eadie, I think I have some concerns that all the time spent on this maybe starts to make it look like a higher priority than it would have been otherwise, but I have been reassured that isn't the case. So glad to see Councillor Lukes working with Councillor Morantz who, of course, has suffered greatly on this file and I'm sure he will be glad to see this review come back in a fairly quick timeframe of 90 days and we'll get some answers. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that it took this conflict and arguably the most empowered area of the city, for us to hear expressions and terminology of positivity of solution in terms of how we are going to change process. And as Councillor Eadie mentioned, it's not just about Sterling Lyon William Clement Parkway, this can be applied in other ways. Councillor Eadie said it could be applied in terms of the Chief Peguis Trail. That's very relevant because we're talking about the process at City Hall. I also want to mention some expressions...positive expressions of solution that Councillor Orlikow has mentioned as well. And how they applied...how they can apply otherwise, not just to Sterling Lyon William Clement Parkway and not just to the Chief Peguis Trail, but other issues that we're dealing with at City Hall including today. Madam Speaker, I believe that what we are doing today regarding William Clement Parkway can be applied as well in terms of the conflict of process that we had regarding Vimy and the proposed rehabilitation centre. Madam Speaker, this is a great what I heard right now. This is fantastic. This is the type of expression of positive resolution that I wish to hear again, once my motion regarding a greater process for a list of future appropriate sites for drug rehab facilities in Winnipeg comes to Council. Because, Madam Speaker, we heard some great things on this one, on this issue. And Councillor Orlikow did say, he talked about how the administrative departments need to talk with each other and I would say as well as Council. He talked about a

holistic approach and consultation. Madam Speaker, things that we are missing, I believe, in terms of the choice, this shotgun vote choice of Vimy as the rehabilitation centre. He said…used the terms, the way we do the plans, Madam Speaker, this is paramount for Winnipeg if we are going to be proactive and reactive not just on the Sterling Lyon Parkway, but how we deal with if we're going to be progressive and proactive on future sites for rehabilitation centres for the city, talked about land use area. His term, changing the format Councillor Orlikow said, Madam Speaker, so we have a more accurate picture and I would say in terms of our potential as a city, in terms of how we do our part in dealing with future rehabilitation sites because that has to do with planning, Madam Speaker and consultation. Just as we hear these great words as it applies to Sterling Lyon Parkway, it has to apply to drug rehabilitation centres as well. We can be just as proactive and progressive on that if not more so, Madam Speaker. Talked about finding solutions Madam Speaker, we need a new process for finding solutions, not just for the Sterling Lyon Parkway but as well for future drug rehabilitation centres in this city. So as Councillor Orlikow said, we're looking forward to results, so am I. So Councillor Eadie said we need to look at all the options. Madam Speaker, when it comes to drug rehabilitation centres in Winnipeg, we need to look at all the options. My understanding is, Madam Speaker, we didn't. But this is great news. Great expressions of positive solution that I've heard on the William Lyon…William Clem…Sterling Lyon William Clement Parkway and we need to use this positivity, this solution-oriented discussion when it comes to the way we're doing other things. Madam Speaker, we are here to assist Winnipeggers, we're here to assist the Province and as Steven Fletcher says, we are here to assist the Province in plans as well, including how we use this type of attitude towards a greater process of consultation, positive planning, progressive and proactive. Not just in terms of this, Madam Speaker but in terms of how we choose appropriate sites for a rehabilitation centre as well. I'm so glad to hear this attitude, this expression, I want to hear it again when it comes to the motion for Winnipeg being proactive. I'm finding a list of appropriate sites for drug rehabilitation centres in our city and help the Province with their plans. Thank you.

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

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And I rise to support the motion, moved by Councillor Lukes and seconded by Councillor Morantz and just you know, reading through the motion, there's a couple of great words and great points I just wanted to identify. On the point number two, that the audit would identify authorizations and knowledge of and direction for planning and engagement, I think that's an excellent point. And on point number four, relative to folks, you know, who provided direction to the consultants from the Public Service, I think those are really...kind of zeroes in in terms of the issue at hand. I really want to compliment Councillor Morantz who has really been steadfast in supporting his residents. Even myself, I couldn't fathom why...looking at all the…there's 11 studies, Madam Speaker, that are occurring right now within the City of Winnipeg, it's on our City of Winnipeg website and looking through them, I'd say they are fairly good, they're fairly detailed but they're a little bit different in their approach in each of those studies, but they carry fundamentally the same approach. But, you know, this is it, right. We have as part of the project managements and asset management, Madam Speaker, we have a very consistent and a very rigorous process. I'm not sure if that process also applies here. You know, and if it does, then perhaps I'd like to know where it went off the rails on the Sterling Parkway extension with the boards, those story boards, Madam Speaker, with that fourth option not being, you know, transparent and apparent on the City website. I was just looking at the Route 90 study and there is a plethora of stuff. The project documents are quite...there is quite a number of them, Madam Speaker, and quite detailed. So you know, we would expect to see that same consistency across all the different studies that are on the website. Obviously, there was a breakdown here, Madam Speaker, and like Councillor Morantz and Councillor Lukes, I'm very curious as to how this happened. Again, I want to thank the mover and seconder for this motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Pagtakhan. Seeing no further speakers…Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to rise and support this motion. I want to commend my colleagues, Councillor Morantz and Councillor Lukes for coming together with I think what is a motion that I hope...I hope could be an anonymous vote to Council today in terms of looking into...

Councillor Gerbasi: Unanimous.

Councillor Allard: What did I say? Anonymous? Well, okay, that's not going to…that's not going to work. Okay, thank you for the correction. So unanimous, thank you, support. I can share a bit of what happened in terms of the Marion Street functional design. It was a very different process from the one that Councillor Morantz lived through. In my case, I was briefed by administration in terms of what was coming down the pipe. I did attend the meetings with impacted property owners. It was a much bigger project and so there were many more impacted property owners. I spent two weeks with residents hearing their feedback, and in the end as the project developed I became convinced that the project was too big, like killing a fly with a sledge hammer and clearly did not have support from the neighbouring community. And so, I can see from what Councillor Morantz has lived that my experience was quite different in terms of process, in terms of what happened, in terms of briefings with Public Works Committee. And feel that I was...I went into the situation where my eyes were wide open to what was being proposed and in the end, I did oppose, based on I think

new information, the cost that was escalating, every time I was able to ask an administrator where that cost was at. And also, the feedback from the community was clear after we finally went to this final proposed functional design. So I think there was many differences in terms of my own experience and Councillor Morantz's experience. All that being said, I think there is a lot of questions now from Councillor Morantz's community in particular, and also from Council in terms of governance in general, and I think this is a good thing that we should, I hope, unanimously support not anonymously support, today and I hope that we are able to do that today. So thank you very much to Councillor Lukes and Councillor Morantz for bringing this motion forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Lukes, your opportunity to close on Motion 2.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I hope we have a unanimous vote on this. You know, I reflect back on what has occurred in previous councils and what we've been doing just after we started. We've had multiple audits in the past all seeking accountability and looking to improve systems and process. Audits looking at planning, Public Works, real estate, land sales and more, all resulting in hundreds of recommendations on how to improve process. We have a $600,000 plus Office of Communications, Public Engagement. We have a $1.5 million senior management team in theory looking at in being in charge of systems and process and making this city operate administratively. You know, this audit will come back with answers of some kind. But I think we really, really have to realize that we have to look at even something bigger and that is how we are governed and how we make decisions and how we receive information. So I'm hoping everyone will support this today. I hope that everyone thinks about the bigger picture about governance and how we operate, because it's…it is, it's embarrassing to have to be calling audit after audit after audit, seeking accountability. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Lukes, thank you. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Bowman: I'll be a little more positive, Madam Speaker. I want to thank all members of Council for their contributions to what we have before us right now. Of course, most notably the local councillor and our current chair, IRPW, Councillor Marty Morantz. I think someone mentioned in conversation earlier today, no good deed goes unpunished. That is certainly the case for Councillor Morantz, who, upon learning of what was being communicated to the residents, I think responded in a very professional and respectful way. And I think he's done an outstanding job responding to comments and very public criticisms of him even in the last week by another member of Council. And despite that, still kept an open door and worked collaboratively on what I think is a stronger motion for consideration by all members of Council. So I'm more than happy to support it. I hope it will help us improve our oversight and our governance and then, of course, the delivery of the services that we and Winnipeggers enjoy from our professional public service, so that hopefully we're able to make improvements going forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on the amending Motion No. 2. Call for recorded vote. All in favour of Motion 2, the amendment, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: The vote is unanimous, Motion 2 passes. Now on to the main item, Item 5 as amended. All in favour? Contrary? The main item of the audit, we're going to vote on it as amended. All in favour? Okay, call for recorded vote. All in favour of Item 5 as amended?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: The vote is unanimous. Item 5 as amended passes. That brings our EPC reports to a close.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: We'll now move on to any motions we have. Motion No. 1 is moved by Councillor Gerbasi, seconded by Councillor Gilroy. It's regarding acknowledgment at meetings of Traditional Indigenous and Métis Lands. This will be a notice of motion so it will appear on our February Council agenda. Also have Motion 3, moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan regarding announcements during the election period. This is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. We will now move into by-laws under Executive Policy Committee for second and third readings. Mr. Mayor.

Motion No. 1
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.*

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Pagtakhan,

WHEREAS there is no current prohibition against sitting members of Council making announcements during the City election period pertaining to funding approvals for projects;

AND WHEREAS during the 2014 election period concern was raised regarding certain funding announcements made by the Mayor and Councillors;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council recommend that the Mayor and Councillors refrain from making any funding announcements pertaining to expenditures from Land Dedication Reserve, Community Incentive Grants and Per Capita grants in the sixty (60) day period prior to the 2018 civic election.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READING

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the By-law No. 133/2017 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Noted.

Clerk: By-law No. 133/2017.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 133/2017 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. Mr. Mayor, by-laws under EPC for all three readings.

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 7/2018, By-law 8/2018.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 7/2018, By-law No. 8/2018.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, on the second reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-laws numbered 7/2018 and 8/2018 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 7/2018 and 8/2018.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, on the suspension and third reading.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 7/2018 and 8/2018 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 will now have Question Period for the Mayor, 30 minutes on the clock, starting with you, Councillor Eadie.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, we have read in the news about the economic concerns that we have and the meetings that happened between the Mayor and the Premier and the local government person in terms of what NAFTA. will have in effect, but Madam Speaker, the economy of Winnipeg is essential and it is a portfolio of the Mayor, and recently, we received an e-mail, Madam Speaker, that's very concerning in that when Bell bought out MTS, they talked about growing the Winnipeg and Manitoba economy, but we are reading now, Madam Speaker, where they're actually reducing a number of positions, jobs, good career jobs for Winnipeggers and really reducing their economic growth, and I'm just wondering, Madam Speaker, if the Mayor has any opinion on this matter of a promise made to grow economy through Bell purchasing MTS verses they are actually reducing and consolidating more so than they said they would.

Mayor Bowman: Through you Madam Speaker, I thank my council colleague for the question. Bell MTS is an organization that does employ many, many Winnipeggers. I have been working diligently to support their investment strategy in terms of technology and will continue to have dialogue with them to support job growth in Winnipeg and if Councillor Eadie or any member of Council or the public have suggestions on how we can more effectively work with Bell MTS to support their operations here and of course increasing employment opportunities for Winnipeggers, I would encourage that dialogue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Eadie, second question.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I did refer to the meeting that happened with the Premier and I was wondering if the Mayor could give us a short…how did the meeting go and did we achieve some stuff for the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I just ask for clarity on which meeting he is referring to.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Just to clarify and this will be the follow-up of my last question, is just there was a meeting referred to between the Premier, the Mayor and I can't remember who the other people were, there were discussions about NAFTA, infrastructure and one other item I can't remember. It was in the newspaper, it was a media release.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I believe…thank you for the clarity. The meeting that I believe Councillor Eadie is referring to is a meeting that took place, if my memory is correct, last week, with Minister Carr as well as Minister Heather Stefanson. The discussion that we had regarding NAFTA was primarily with respect to my efforts to lead the Big City Mayors caucus, these are the largest 21 cities in Canada, in our efforts to have dialogue with counterparts in the United States. More recently, I was in the twin cities area. This is in addition to other trips that I've made south of the border to meet with law makers, to meet with decision makers to continue to articulate to U.S. decision makers the benefits of an open and free trade with Canada, and this is being done in collaboration with Global Affairs in Ottawa whom I've recently met with in Ottawa, as well as with Provincial and local stakeholders. The nature of the discussion that we had did not focus on Bell MTS.

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

Councillor Eadie: Actually, I will do just one follow up then. I am confused. I think Minister Stefanson and somebody else was in a meeting and there was some dialogue as well about infrastructure. I'm just wondering how that went as well, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, the meeting that I had with Minister Carr and Minister Stefanson did also include discussions of infrastructure. We continue to advocate for provincial support and ultimately Federal support of our unanimously supported Accelerated Regional Roads Program. Yesterday, I had the honour of joining Minister Carr and our IRPW Chair, Councillor Marty Morantz, in announcing 150 road projects across Winnipeg that will take place this summer, representing 117 lane kilometres of road repair. This is the number one priority of Winnipeggers and this council should be very proud of the fact that after this construction season is over, we will have been responsible for

supporting the road repairs of 530 lane kilometres across Winnipeg. That will take you from Winnipeg to Regina or from Regina to Winnipeg. But it's a lot of roads and the Accelerated Regional Roads Program is something that this council has unanimously supported and I continue to advocate for, and so in our meeting, I continued to have positive dialogue with Minister Stefanson and Minister Carr. The point person at the legislature, from a cabinet…for the Provincial cabinet is Minister Jeff Wharton. He's the Minister of Municipal Relations, and I do appreciate the ongoing positive and constructive dialogue that we're having with him and with his office, and that also helped facilitate some of the positive dialogue that we had last week with Minister Stefanson and Minister Carr.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is more of an "are you aware" question through you to the Mayor. It's specific to the first question that Councillor Eadie raised to the Mayor and I appreciate him raising that. Mr. Mayor, are you aware that Mr. David Sauer who is in attendance today, he represented a lot of Winnipeg workers, does a lot of good work to represent a lot of men and women who are employed in the City of Winnipeg, met with several of us recently or not that long ago. I was one of the ones that he met with, and we talked about…Mr. Mayor, we talked about big companies like Bell MTS moving into Winnipeg, and the question the discussion was around, Mr. Mayor, through you, Madam Speaker, to the Mayor, whether or not when someone like a Bell comes in, do they consider Winnipeg as a place to not reduce staff but to increase staff? And so reached out to Dayna Spiring of Economic Development Winnipeg and asked her what Economic Development Winnipeg does and I can assure you through her comments that Economic Development Winnipeg intentionally speaks to groups like Bell when they take over a company like MTS, to promote Winnipeg as a great place to have more employees come, affordable cost of living, a great and vibrant city that's really on the upswing and so, I know that our partners like Economic Development Winnipeg do make the effort to promote Winnipeg as a place for companies to invest, to grow, to put down roots and to even move headquarters to, so I didn't know if the Mayor…I believe the Mayor is aware of that but I wanted to ask that "are you aware" question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: A short answer is yes, I am aware and thank my council colleague for the question. Economic Development Winnipeg under the leadership of Dayna Spiring has been doing phenomenal work. They are tireless advocates for job creation in Winnipeg, and we really can't thank them enough for their leadership. They've taken their efforts to another level under Dayna Spiring's leadership and a big part of my job is reaching out to decision makers that are looking at relocating and are looking at expanding their footprint and their job footprint here in Winnipeg. My first trip was to Montreal and that was a trip where we met with many organizations that are looking to Winnipeg, and we continue to travel both, you know, actually travel but also just have dialogue over the phone with many organizations, large and small, to look for opportunities where we can continue to support job creation, and so I want to thank our Finance Chair for his efforts as well. His ward includes of course the airport campus, a huge economic driver in our region, in the capital region, and, of course, Councillor Lukes who helps out with the partnership of the capital region behalf of this council, and so a lot of efforts going on for job creation and always looking for opportunities with different businesses, some of which are already here, some of which are looking to relocate here, for where we can continue to remind them that Winnipeg is, in fact, open for business and then make good at building that relationship going forward, and a big part of my job is really just building those relationships so that decision makers know that this council and this city is ready to welcome them.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. Madam Speaker, it has been reported that the head of the UFFW is being paid in part by the City. It's my understanding that it was supposed to be something flagged by administrators during negotiations. The last contract was March 2014. Can the Mayor tell us when the next round of negotiations is starting and what is being done to address the union leader being paid his salary and possible pension by the City?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Well firstly, Madam Speaker, the current arrangement in my view is not one that I support. I've been pretty public with that saying I don't like it and I'd like it scrapped. The chief, City's chief, new chief negotiator, Robert Kirby, I'm sure, can answer the Councillor's question on specific timing of the next collective agreement. It is some time from now, and in the meantime, I know there is ongoing review and due diligence that is happening by our Public Service in relation to this specific contract which, I will remind those watching, was struck before this council was elected.

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

Councillor Lukes: Could the Mayor tell us when the Executive Policy Committee plans to start the process to lay out steps in a governance review that we've funded in the budget?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I will have to undertake to get back to Councillor Lukes on that question. I don't have that answer at this time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions?

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

Madam Speaker: Okay, seeing none we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Orlikow on the report dated January 8th, 2018, knowing we'll be pulling Item 14.

Councillor Orlikow: Don't assume, don't assume.

Madam Speaker: As there is an amending motion or two.

Councillor Orlikow: That's fair, fair enough. Do my part first, right?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you Madam Chair. I'll move...I will introduce report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 13.

Madam Speaker: Nine, 10, 14, any others? Okay, I'll call the question on Items 1 through 8, 11 through 13. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 9 – North District Police Station

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry, just a point of, I don't know what it's called, procedure I guess. When is the notice of motion? Is that after this or prior? I am hearing after.

Madam Speaker: Yes, after. Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce item...or pardon me, we are on P and D. Long day already. Councillor Orlikow, to introduce Item 9.

Councillor Orlikow: Let's get there right now. This is a…No. 9. Thank you, I will just wait to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. I think you had your hand up.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm just rising, Madam Speaker. I will not be voting in favour of the recommendation that came through this committee as well as endorsed by EPC, Madam Speaker. I appreciate that things are moving along quite differently than they were previously, Madam Speaker. I don't want to say much about it. I did send an e-mail to my colleagues on Council. I believe that…my concern, Madam Speaker, is I don't want to just accept this as information. I mean, if we all believed that we shouldn't be taking away parks and recreation space for basically what is a response operation in the Winnipeg Police Service, if they do proceed to build here, they are building a...what I would call a police station compound, Madam Speaker, and it will take up acreage. I mean, some serious acreage will have to be given up. And I don't want to debate the need for a secure safe place for officers to park when they are off-duty and getting out but ultimately, if you look at the East District Station as well as the West District Station, Madam Speaker, what you will see is there is basically a compound and it does take away parks and recreation space. And recreation, Madam Speaker, is so essential to dealing with the epidemic, we have heard a lot of discussion about addictions, but you know...and a lot of crime, Madam Speaker, results out of trying to feed those addictions, Madam

Speaker. And really, if recreation is being delivered by good groups, groups that are doing it in a way...in a fashion that are talking about living a healthy, safe life without indulging or getting addicted which is, you know, it's a difficult thing, if you want to build hope in young people's look to the future, you can build hope through helping them through recreation, leisure experiences, guidance in that way to try to keep them away and you know, technically, where the old exhibition grounds lies, there is definitely a real need for us to provide better recreation services at an affordable, affordable...and they are not driving, Madam Speaker, you know, we regionalized hockey nowadays so now you have to drive to get to hockey, you have to drive to do the soccer as you have eloquently have spoken about, Madam Speaker, in the past. And so, when we look at this, it's really essential that we make a statement here. In terms of us taking a, what is a City of Winnipeg response service to crime and they do some proactive things and I think that's good, but ultimately, the Winnipeg Police Service, given the kind of calls for service that they are getting through 911 which continue to go up and are staying consistent through the winter even, and maybe we should be having snowshoeing happening over there in the Nomads field in the winter, get somebody out there, let's get some kids out there, get healthy, stay healthy. There's other epidemics as we heard, diabetes and all kinds of things, especially in the Indigenous community, Madam Speaker. I have to say, diabetes is rampant. It's bad. Health, this is what you need. Determinants, we have to deal with those Madam Speaker. So I'm asking people to say no, Council members to say no to the recommendation here because I believe that we need to ensure that we find somewhere else to put a response mechanism than on parks and recreation land. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Orlikow do you wish to close? We'll call the question on Item 9. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Gerbasi, Gillingham, Gilroy, Mayes, Morantz, Orlikow, Pagtakhan

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie, Lukes, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 9, Nays 5.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Item 9 passes. We are now on to Item No. 10, Mr. Clerk.

Item 10 – Disposition of City Owned Lots for Affordable Non-Profit Housing or Mixed Use Development that Includes Affordable Housing as a Pilot Project – William Whyte Neighbourhood

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a pilot project that looks at taking some housing that we've usually acquired through taxes…tax in arrears, I guess we'll call it, and instead of just putting it into the open market, looking at the discount option. So hopefully, that will entice non-profit groups to purchase these lots and to provide affordable housing in the area. I just want to state, I think this project is noble in regards that we do have a housing shortage going on especially the affordable housing area. Hopefully, this will generate some interest to get these lots purchased and new buildings put onto them if they need be or renovated. And I also want to stress that this is a pilot project. I believe that this pilot project's successful. It should be looked at city-wide as an opportunity to put affordable housing throughout the City of Winnipeg. So like I said, it is a pilot project. We have some interest. There are some that would say we should reduce the price even more, provide some other incentives and we are looking at other options to support affordable housing throughout...you know, with the leadership of Councillor Gerbasi and Councillor Gilroy, we're looking at other options as well to be able to support affordable housing on regional corridors, through TIFFs and other mechanisms, so we are busy at that model. This is one of many projects that we are trying to look at. And some councillors may not remember, it wasn't too many years ago, if we brought up the idea, just a concept, of the City of Winnipeg helping out with affordable housing, we would've gotten nowhere. That was not a City responsibility. So we'll hear a little bit probably today later on. And so therefore, the City should not be involved in affordable housing. Again, that was previous, so I am pleased that I believe that the new...this council here understands that housing is critical and we do have a role to play in it and this is a small, small area that we can play in this one area. But again, I believe there's other opportunities that we will look at. Because one of the biggest rights out there for people of course is safety but families need homes. They need a place to live. There's far too many people that don't have a home, that are living from week to week on a couch or come to the city…living conditions with too many families living in one room in one apartment or one house. There is too much of that going on and that has a huge issue for the City of Winnipeg. So

again, you may want to say that housing is Provincial responsibility so make the Province do it, but again, we work for all of Winnipeggers of all types. I'm not one to get into this drawing a line between Federal, Provincial and Municipal responsibilities. We need to be working together and I think this, again, would be a token for us in one area where the City could say okay, we're going to try to incentivize people to be able to purchase some lots and use them for housing and we also are going to be using a local housing group to try to make sure that we get the neighbourhood context correctly and is vetted properly. So I have…I'm not sure if this discount will be enough but again, let's see how it works out.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, I stood down Madam Speaker. I thought it would be good to talk about a good news story. Thank you, Councillor Orlikow, a great presentation. And Madam Speaker, there was interest and that's why I also stood the report down. There was interest from the media. You know, this is an effort, Madam Speaker, that we're going try. It's a pilot project. Nothing is necessarily going to be perfect or what have you, Madam Speaker, so I am actually in support of trying out this pilot project and one of the most critical things I think that is very important here, Madam Speaker, is that it has been indicated and this particular neighbourhood, William Whyte, is a neighbourhood in which it does receive money through...I can't remember the program. I think Councillor Orlikow mentioned it, but it is one of the five communities that have been identified as requiring housing plans and a need to provide more affordable options and really, for neighbourhood revitalization. Because you know...actually, I believe that William Whyte, let's be clear, we do hear some sad news stories quite often from the area. But I have to say, in the past studies, from the Social Planning Council and looking at poverty, the William Whyte neighbourhood Madam Speaker, looks like it's starting to do better, it's starting to turn around. But really it needs that revitalization help. Affordable housing is still needed because really, how much rent can you pay if you're working for 14 and $15 an hour, Madam Speaker? It's very difficult. And so, you have some single family affordable housing options that are coming up here, I think, with 17 properties identified as vacant lots. There are…they have identified four vacant spaces along Selkirk Avenue and Madam Speaker, I have to say, I have been trying to move forward along some of our City-owned vacant lots, options that are going to bring economic prosperity as well as, you know, places to live and investment in the community to make it a better place, Madam Speaker, on Selkirk Avenue. And there's been a number of issues and we have the Business Improvement Zone who is a stakeholder. North End Committee Renewal Corp is the organization that assists these neighbourhoods with their housing plans, trying to move them forward. And in Recommendation 1, you'll note that North End Community Renewal Corp will be looking through every proposal including, I'm hoping, in the multi-family opportunities and in what they are saying are four spaces. There has been...one of those spaces, Madam Speaker, that was identified for something else but as I understand this process, things will be looked at because ultimately, there is a great affordable housing project happening right now. It's called the Merchants Corner, Madam Speaker. But the Merchants Corner, Madam Speaker, had to get a zero parking barriers. Now, people who are poor, most don't own cars but some do because in today's society, in this city, I'm sorry to say it, you can't ride a bike and take the bus everywhere if you've kids, you need a car. That's the reality, because you have to drive them to do things. So some of them do, they find a way. They're not the greatest cars in the world, but some of them find a way for motor vehicles. And so, there's all kinds of parking issues that have to be dealt with. So I hope when looking at that neighbourhood revitalization and those plans that those things will be considered. And I know that...actually there's…would point out that there is one initiative that we moved forward in P and D and the City have helped to motivate that through in which one of our large City lots was sold to a combination private and not-for-profit endeavour to build some housing for people who, basically I guess, are dealing with addictions as well. And it's safe housing, a good place to live. Selkirk Avenue is a great place. So anyway, I'm really encouraged by this. The recommendations on the existing properties, a little confused...I'm going to support it. I don't know how that's going to work out. We're putting this into the CAO and our housing peoples perspective will look into this, Madam Speaker. Looking at renovating, we own a number of properties with existing buildings, looking at renovating and making a multi-family or a couple of families. I know where two of those locations are, but then it mentions about selling it at…on the open market which, I don't know how that's going to necessarily lead to affordable housing in that, you know, there might be a competition to purchase it because we do have some infill happening from the private sector there but for the most part, Madam Speaker, the biggest problem has been is when a private investor buys it, they just sit on it and wait for the value to go up. And that doesn't work, that's not a good thing. So that's what's really great about this pilot and it would have to be applied across the whole city because, Madam Speaker, affordable housing is needed across the city and I thank Councillor Orlikow for acknowledging that, Councillor Gerbasi, Councillor Gilroy, we all know that. We've all been working at housing issues and I'm glad that this looks at the City trying to get more involved in providing that affordable housing. Thank you.

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

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think that in this case, I will say a few words in the language of Molière, as Mr. Allard says. But I think that here in Winnipeg, we could also say in the language of Molgat. I will simply say that I think we're doing a good thing here. I have to consider the words expressed by Councillor Orlikow when he said... He spoke of the responsibility of the municipal and provincial governments, but I would also add that there is a problem of sharing of responsibility of the governments, both provincial and federal, particularly insofar as affordable housing is concerned. And I must say here, Madam Speaker, that we must always be mindful of the conflict, or at least of the concept, of the issue, that is the sharing of responsibilities between our civic government here in Winnipeg and the federal government. We must admit, Madam Speaker, that in recent decades there has absolutely been a real reduction of the financial support provided by the federal government for affordable housing for all Canadians, which includes, of course, the residents of Manitoba. We must also consider the issue of the pressure that it puts on our municipal government here, on the City of Winnipeg. So we are doing a good thing here, as we have the resources. In this case, it's a good thing. We must always consider that in the history of our nation, of our country, this specific issue has been addressed through federal funding. I say this as we must also keep in mind that last month, during the last Council meeting held here in December, that this City Council called upon the Province to restore its contribution of 10 million dollars in funding for public transportation here in Winnipeg. I voted in favour of the motion, but I said, Madam Speaker, that historically, the provincial government's problem is that the federal government has shirked its responsibility to contribute, its financial responsibility for public things like transportation and, Madam Speaker, affordable housing. So we see that across the country, as here in Winnipeg, especially in Winnipeg, that we feel these pressures. I must also say, Madam Speaker, that we must be mindful of keeping a real perspective, a realistic perspective. We have to be realistic here; we're not here just to... Just for photo ops. Historically, in the lifetime of most people here in these chambers, there was a government, decades ago, that created almost a thousand units of housing per year in Winnipeg, for two terms of government, Madam Speaker. That's important. They really did it, and it's something we should keep in mind to maintain a realistic perspective about what we're doing here. It's a good thing, but we have to understand our role, our contribution, in a historical context. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I rise in support of the pilot project. This is really a great example of what we...what the City can do to break down the barriers of poverty and getting affordable housing here in the city. I'll be anxious to see some of the results because I do think it can be used in other parts of the city. And I do want to thank Councillor Orlikow and Councillor Gerbasi who sit on the Housing Steering Committee with me. I know that a lot of work went on…went into this. This is exciting. And I'm a firm believer that every level of government has a responsibility to play in poverty reduction and this is one example of where the City is doing that so thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you Madam Speaker. Just very briefly, I just wanted to comment, this is an area where many people have worked very hard for many years. The Housing Steering Committee brought this motion forward initially, and it's great to see it here. I want to thank the Public Service for bringing it forward as well. Recently, the Government of Canada brought forward a national housing strategy with a significant investment that will be coming down over the next ten years, to support affordable housing across the country to support funding for people to be able to afford to rent subsidies, as well as fixing existing social housing and building new housing. So all of those things...and as a city, we do have a role to play in it and one of the ways this is a really good example of one of the things that's very appropriate for a municipality to do is to provide land and provide what we do have in our existing services. Existing ways that we can support some of those efforts and there will be more coming. The Housing Committee is working very hard and I'm hoping at our next meeting we will actually see something coming forward for your consideration that we have been working on for quite some time, to expand something new in terms of doing more affordable housing. We have been really successful with our downtown tax increment financing programs in terms of getting people living downtown. There has been a part of that that is about affordability and that's a key part of that. So thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Orlikow to close.

Councillor Orlikow: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. Again, I just want to point out, again, I think this is actually a very good motion prior to our next debate. Because what we are doing is we are taking a public asset. This isn't someone's home. This isn't my land. This is the City of Winnipeg's land. This is everybody's land. And we are deciding to discount that land for the public good. We are taking a public asset, we are discounting it for the public good. Again, some of the fiscal hots out there might say, no, land is a commodity. You sell it for what it's valued at and that's how we run a business. I'm not running a business. I'm running a government. I'm running...what we are trying to do here, provide

services to all Winnipeggers regardless of their ability to pay. That's what we do. Business doesn't worry about the 20 percent of people that will pay. They'll worry about that, and that's their model and that's good. It's called capitalism. The governments, we fill in the rest. So what we're talking about here is people that can't pay or the program that again, if you pay full market value for this land, you can only maybe do two lots. Again, the idea here is again, we are doing something that's outside, some would say, again, some of my more fiscal or more…not politically the conservatives, would say, you don't touch housing, that's not yours. That's all provincial. Some people will say the next debate, don't touch health care, that's not yours. Again, that's fine, that's your opinion, but what we are saying here is we're going to take a public good and a public asset, and we are going to discount it so the public good, which is affordable housing, can materialize so people have a place to live. To me, I'm very proud of the motion, it works, it exemplifies what governments are, we are there to provide services. We're not there to get into turf wars. We're there to provide service for all of Winnipeggers. So to use this public asset for public good in this manner is very appropriate.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 10. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 14.

Item 14 – Sale of City-owned Property – Vimy Arena – 255 Hamilton Avenue

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow to introduce the item.

Councillor Orlikow: I'll just get a little more organized here.

Madam Speaker: And then we'll have Councillor Dobson introduce Motion 5 following by Councillor Gillingham to introduce Motion 7.

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, thank you very much, Madam Chair. So we've been engaged in this file, I think, personally around October when we heard that the government was interested in this piece…parcel of land. They made the offer in October. But I just want to go back in history just a little bit because there seems to be some confusion about the process or maybe not confusion. But however, back in 2013...and it was a hard debate. I think it got unanimous support at the time because we went through the debate about how to do our arena strategy. We had a lot of arenas including Vimy that required quite a bit of investment to keep it as an arena but we also had the fact that the department, the Canadian Services Department also didn't see another need for the building. So they shopped it around like we do when we declare land surplus and in 2013 we declared the Vimy Arena surplus. That's what we did. Again, some people have spoken today in the last quite a few weeks which is absolutely their right. They really wish we did not declare it surplus and they would like us to go back and either put an arena in or have a City-funded rec centre of some sort. Again, I completely understand that. But, we as Council, in the last council, did have a recreation…an arena strategy and we declared Vimy Arena surplus. That's what happened. So again, some people don't like that decision but that was the decision that Council made unanimously, I'm quite sure it was a unanimous decision, back in the day. We made that because we were trying to have two sheets of ice so they could be economically more viable and in the case of the Vimy Arena, it actually says in the motion, that went to support the Seven Oaks Arena project which is fantastic, fantastic project. But when we supported that project, the Seven Oaks Arena project, we also supported declaring Vimy surplus to be sold. It wasn't...and again...I just want to be stress, I've heard people say, well we were promised it would go back to an arena or we were promised it would be this or that. That is not what it says. Again, it says that we have declared it surplus and that's what the motion says. Surplus means surplus to the City's needs. We don't…the City does not believe that we need it for recreational services, a library, a fire hall or anything else. So that's where we…that's how this motion came forward. So in there, there's some comments about consulting. There is money in there to consulting. If you read the motion, the money is in there to consult with the money from the sale of the arena. That's when the consulting comes in, once we sell the arena, we have money and we will consult with you. That was it. But again, there is nothing to consult with if we didn't sell the arena so we didn't consult yet because we hadn't sold anything yet. It was in the disposition strategy, was in the process of being put onto the market, again...then we got the governance offer and in the report that you'll see…in the Vimy report, it says that. The disposition strategy stopped. And that's fine. So I just want to clear that up a little bit. Now, there's other concerns about…that this is some back-ended deal, something nefarious went on. No. It's in our offer, in our by-laws, in our offers to City…offer to purchase City-owned property, in Number B, "The department may act on unsolicited offers for City-owned property in the case where a utility company or a government agency or body is seeking to acquire the property. The agreed place should reflect a valuation completed by an accredited appraiser." That is our policy. Nothing untoward there, nothing hidden, that is the policy. Again, governance, public good to public good that's why that's in there. So again, we're not hiding anything. So again, there has been some concern...I'm going to go quickly through, so I'll have some time at the end, but I just wanted to get some of these facts out and people can debate me if I'm wrong, if they believe I'm wrong. The appraisal, people are saying, oh, the building…the arena is great, if someone wants to buy the arena and repurpose it for that purpose, sure. We don't have any in that proposal. What we have today in front of us is a proposal to take the site...when we say we're going to market the site, it was for the highest and best use. The highest and best use of this site is not an arena. The

highest and best use of this site is some other thing without the arena on it. So again, they did market it and that's why they only marketed the land. The arena itself, the City doesn't see a viable alternative for it and since 2013, no one has really come forward with a viable alternative for it, again, but here we are today. So again, I hope that answers some of the thing about the appraisal, I can return to that later on. So other questions have been, why this location. Well this is a location the Province through, whatever means, were that, they want this site. How do I acquire this site? This is how you can do it, through this process, which is part of our by-laws. They are allowed to do that and that's what came forward. But in this process we've heard, we want it to be a rec centre, we want it to be a seniors centre, we want it to be an arena again, I've heard roller rink, I've heard a number of ideas. Again, all valid, but again, what's in front of us is a government offer and that's what we're entertaining today for a public good in my opinion, I think it's a very good public good. So have we ever done that before where we sold our land to the government for $1? Yeah. Just drive down Main Street. That nice big park that we have there, the provincial park, that was supposed to be this huge high rise but in the day when I was even here, it's one of the prouder moments I have, we said, you know what, we need more park space there. So we did sell it to the Province, that land for $1 which they created this beautiful park. So again, we can do this. Sometimes it's both ways. Actually, in that case we actually increased the park downtown into some pretty valuable land so there is some precedent going on there. So that's that and that's that part, the history part. And that should be it for me but I'm looking forward to hearing some of the opinions from my colleagues. I think I…it's been a four month plus...about a four month process now so we have plenty of opportunity to hear from everybody numerous times. I think I've heard from some of these glorious people, good on them for coming out so often, I know it's dear to them, both sides, three times, hours upon hours of listening to people. But I have gone through it and I just want to say, some of the accusations that have been made about, you know, deals behind the scenes, we're breaking process, we're not doing things, are completely, in my opinion, unfounded. I've looked…every concern that someone has raised about we're doing something nefarious has been brought up with the department and have been answered to my satisfaction a hundred percent. We are not. Again, it's easy to say that because you don't…maybe you like the outcome that's potentially pending. We have…the department has done nothing more than follow the by-laws that this council has established including how we appraise the land, including how we do the sale of the land to government to government, we are still going through that process. We have...the department has…should be commended because there has been so many accusations put on the department that somehow they are breaking the process. Our Real Estate Division, we have the intimate…the Fairness Commissioner reports that go with it. There's a few little process things, some people are going to blow those out, but again we looked at the report, we examined it, it's our first one, just sometimes we should've put it in an e-mail, not a phone call and that's fair. So we're going to shore that up, but nothing material was done wrong and that's what it says in the report. So again, I'm going to get to some more details later, but the facts of the matter are quite simply, the process has been done above board. Yes...and if the process has been done above board. The second thing is the appraisal was done the way that we are supposed to do appraisals. And if anybody talked to John Kiernan, I know Mr. Dobson has, I know Councillor Lukes has, I know I have about that. To me, it's satisfactory of how they did that. So today, we're going to hear…some people will say, you know what, I want it to remain a rec centre or I'm there…I'm okay if it goes to employment equities, another group. Again, you can't have it both ways. You know, what we're trying to do here is we have a plan here to do a public good, which is an opioid treatment centre that is desperately needed in the City of Winnipeg. That is what was in front of us today. Again, if you don't think that's important, that's fine. But again, the land has been declared surplus. It was. So again, the idea that we're going to reinvest back into it again, that's not on the table right now to do a new arena. We have…what's going to happen, in my opinion, is if this motion fails today, we're going to…the land will go up for sale as part of our strategy. The land will go up to sale to whoever. But it's not going to go up and we're not going to go forward and say, oh we're not going to put the land up for sale because we want to do a new rec centre there. That was never a part of the plan. The plan is there in the 2013. The disposition strategy is quite clear, the land we put up for sale. Right now we have one, the land is being put up for sale for $1, for public good to one proponent and I am pleased with that proponent. I am pleased for the work they are going to do and I, a person of Winnipeg, am pleased that we are going to do public good to public good.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Dobson, your opportunity to introduce Motion 5. It's a referral motion with instruction so it is debatable.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Dobson,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS the Winnipeg Public Service has advised that the appraised value of $1.43 million for the Vimy Arena was essentially based on the value of the land as the building had no value;

AND WHEREAS the current Asset Report lists virtually all equipment, including lights, water heaters, washroom fixtures a new chiller and brine system as "aged" and needs to be replaced;

AND WHEREAS replacing aged equipment may not necessarily be required and are purposely used to inflate the asset's immediate needs, affecting the actual appraisal value;

AND WHEREAS giving away this facility would be a disservice to the citizens of Winnipeg whose tax dollars paid for it, especially when there is possibility that it could be repurposed as a year round recreational facility;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That Item 14 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 8, 2018 be referred back to the Standing Policy Committee to allow the Winnipeg Public Service to report back to Council within 60 days with the following information:

1. *A new Asset Assessment of the Vimy Arena based on the premise that the building would be repurposed as a year round recreational facility and not an indoor ice rink and that existing equipment that does not need to be replaced would be maintained.*

2. *A new appraisal of the property based on the new Asset Assessment.*

3. *Clarification that the current appraisal was based on the value of the land only.*

Councillor Dobson: Thank you very much. I put this motion forward that says, "Whereas the Winnipeg Public Service has advised that the appraised value of 1.43 million for the Vimy Arena was essentially based on the value of the land as the building had no value. And whereas the current asset report lists virtually all equipment; lights, water, heaters, washroom fixtures, new chiller, brine system, has aged and needs to be replaced. And whereas replacing aged equipment may not be necessary...or may not be necessary...or necessarily be required and are purposely used to inflate the asset's immediate needs affecting the actual appraisal value. And whereas giving away this facility would be a disservice to the citizens of Winnipeg whose tax dollars paid for it, especially when there is a possibility that it could be repurposed as a year round recreation facility. Therefore, be it resolved that Item 14 of the report of Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 8th, 2018 be referred back to the Standing Policy Committee to allow the Winnipeg Public Service to report back to Council within 60 days with the following information: A new asset assessment of the Vimy Arena based on the premise that the building would be repurposed as a year round recreation facility and not an indoor ice rink and that existing equipment that does not have to be replaced would be maintained. A new...number two, a new appraisal of the property based on the new assessment…asset assessment and clarification that the current appraisal was based on the value of the land only." The purpose of this is to do our due diligence, find out what the actual value of the piece of property irregardless of what anybody else is saying here. That is an asset that has a value. We have had organizations willing to lease or buy the Vimy Arena. If the building were worthless or derelict as it's being portrayed here, that would not be the case. This motion is there to determine if the arena has value and get a clearer picture of the actual repairs needed to bring this building up to a level for use other than an ice rink. This would also give us a clearer picture on the value of the building and land if we kept it for recreational use within the community. Now, I'm not saying that we have to provide funding for the recreation use. We've had groups that are willing to lease it. It would be their responsibility. There's no cost to the City here or very little. And as I've said before it's basically doing our due diligence. If we're going to give it away, don't you think we should actually find out how much the building is actually worth? And shouldn't you ask...everyone here should be asking these questions? What's the rush to push this sale through without any public consultation? It's still a steady building regardless if it's surplus. Why can't we have consultations with the citizens in St. James and Crestview in the Vimy Arena area? And why couldn't we revitalize this area for community? I know we declared it surplus in 2013, but if…if we were to lease it to a recreation facility or recreation group, there wouldn't be any cost. And, of course, has the City...or did the City look into other locations for the drug treatment centre? And ask yourself why the Manitoba Government...or why hasn't the Manitoba Government looked into their own available properties to donate? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Dobson. Councillor Gillingham to introduce amending Motion 7.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That Recommendation 6 of Item No. 14 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 8, 2018 be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"6. That the City of Winnipeg Public Service include a reversionary clause in the land sale agreement with Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation ("MHRC") for 255 Hamilton Avenue (the "Property") that includes the following elements, and if such elements are not complied with the Property shall revert back to the City:

A. That MHRC and/or the proponent of the addictions treatment and recovery center (the "Proponent") submit a complete application to the City of Winnipeg for all necessary planning, subdivision and rezoning approvals required to permit the use of the Property for an addictions treatment and recovery center and that such necessary planning, subdivision and rezoning approvals be obtained from the City of Winnipeg within two years after the sale of the Property from the City to MHRC.

B. That MHRC enter into a Ground Lease Agreement ("Agreement") with the Proponent within four years after the sale of the Property from the City of Winnipeg to MHRC that requires the exclusive use of the Property as an addictions treatment and recovery center, and such Agreement shall be terminated if Recommendation 6C is not satisfied.

C. That MHRC and/or the proponent be required to build an addictions treatment and recovery center and obtain an unconditional occupancy permit therefor within four years after the sale of the Property from the City of Winnipeg to MHRC;

D. That MHRC and/or the Proponent provide a letter of credit in an amount sufficient to restore the land to its original condition in the event that construction for an addictions treatment and recovery center is initiated but not completed."

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just, I guess, a point of clarity, is this…do I introduce my amendment here or do I speak to Councillor Dobson's motion as well?

Madam Speaker: You can speak to that motion and the main item if you wish.

Councillor Gillingham: All at once? Okay, all right. Or I could speak again, separately, right?

Madam Speaker: Our practice is normally that we do it at once.

Councillor Gillingham: I will try to do it all at once here then. First of all, thank you very much, Madam Speaker, I will...maybe I'll speak to Councillor Dobson's motion…I will not be supporting his motion. Simply put, I appreciate the clarity…very good clarity, I believe, that Councillor Orlikow offered today and I think almost all of what he said was really, in many way, anticipated Councillor Dobson's motion and answered it to my satisfaction, certainly. Madam Speaker, I spoke at length about this matter at Executive Policy Committee meeting, and so I don't want to repeat all of the statements, but I do want to make a couple of comments and have them on record. We do have an important decision before us. First of all, I want to thank our mayor for his leadership on this and his unwavering commitment and Councillor Allard has also been very public in his support. And I want to thank my council colleagues, my EPC colleagues, last meeting that supported the amendment that I offered. Today, I'm offering further clarity in just a moment. The St. James community has spoke at length about their need for recreation amenities, our need for recreation amenities, I'm in the area as well, a councillor in the adjacent ward. But as Councillor Orlikow clearly articulated, once again, in 2013, the council previous to this council declared this property to be surplus and it was done upon a strategic analysis of recreation services, specifically, arenas. And it was made clear even again today that there's really no indication that that motion...or that decision be rescinded. And to my knowledge, no councillor currently has reached out to a majority of this chamber with a clear call convincing rationale to rescind Council's 2013 decision to declare 255 Hamilton surplus to the needs of the City. Further to that, since the property was declared surplus five years ago to my knowledge, no councillor, no individual, no group from the community has come forward with plans and identified funding in place to redevelop the Vimy Arena site for recreation purposes. However, and as I stated last at the Executive Policy Committee meeting, I'm restating today, in 2013 when you read the report that Council voted on and unanimously adopted a promise was made to the community that the proceeds from the eventual sale of the Vimy Arena property would be reinvested into recreation amenities in this area. And the report before us indicates that the appraised value, an independently appraise…an independent appraisal I might add, of the land is $1.4 million and I do note there is a call today for a new appraisal. The appraisal we have before us is dated November 16th, I believe, 2017. It's fresh, it's a fresh appraisal, it's a new appraisal and the appraisal is done in such a way as to identify the value of the land for its highest and best use as Councillor Orlikow so clearly articulated and reminded us once again. The Province of Manitoba has offered the City of Winnipeg $1 for the property. And so of course to accept the recommendations before us to transfer the land to the Province for $1 would in theory leave the community potentially $1.4 million short in recreation amenity funding that they were promised. And as the area councillor, I stated before and I'll…as an area councillor, I've stated before and I will say it again that that shortfall is concerning. But it's also clear that the St. James community, and we have heard it over and over again, indeed all of Winnipeg is in need…desperate need of treatment and recovery centres for those with addictions. Families are being devastated, lives are being destroyed, people are...their potential is being stripped by the insidious, relentless dragon of addiction. And those families, the sons and

the daughters, need us to act. And there's also a cost for addiction that is born by the broader public. On a daily basis, the City of Winnipeg emergency services personnel are called to respond to individuals in crisis due to their addictions. And this is where, I know Councillor Orlikow raised the idea that maybe some that are more fiscally hawkish would look at this, you know, through a monetary lens. Well, I invite…I believe that I lean towards that side of the ledger. And so I would invite us to look at that. I received today, off bon request, from the Fire Paramedic Services some statistics. I'd like to share a few of them with you. The following stats are, and I read from their e-mail, the following statistics are on overdose and poisoning calls, so they're together. For context, it's important to note that the Winnipeg Fire and Paramedic Service tracks the calls but does not differentiate as to which drug was the cause so that's the kind of the disclaimer when I give these statistics. But let me just...I won't give you all the years, but let me give you 2013. So here's the stats for overdose and poisoning in Winnipeg in 2013: there were 1,269 calls that the Fire and Paramedics responded to. I didn't even ask the Police for their calls for service, this is just Fire and Paramedics, 2013, 1,269. In 2017, 1,932 calls. That's approximately, in six years, a 34 percent increase on overdose and poisoning calls. The following stats of patients that receive Narcan, I'll say it that way, the 2013 numbers are, 307 patients in 2013, received Narcan. In 2017, 732 patients. In five years, a 58 percent increase in the number of men and women on our streets, boys and girls that are being injected with Narcan to save their lives because of a drug overdose. I would argue respectfully that this is a crisis that we must respond to. And I'm one of those who thinks that most levels of government have their responsibilities and they should stay within their lines, but there are moments and I believe this is one of them where we work together and the lines of responsibility can...we can cross the line to assist one another and I'm willing to do that. These stats indicate there was a financial cost to the taxpayer of Winnipeg, for men and women battling addiction. So I would argue that this is a good decision from that perspective as well. It's costing families. It's costing lives. And it's costing the taxpayers. That brings us to the decision before us and in my mind, Madam Speaker and colleagues, as I said before, I don't believe this is an either or decision. I believe that we have the opportunity to try to find a way to make a decision that will deliver recreation amenities to the community, will protect the green space of the community and will provide the opportunity for much needed treatment and recovery centre to be established. I believe we can do that and I've heard a couple of times from some of the delegations that they want...you know, try to find a win/win. I believe that the motion that I put forward is an effort to find a win/win. And so I introduced a motion at Executive Policy Committee. It's now before us and I want to read the resolution of that motion and then also the...introduce and read the amending portion of the motion. I want to read it into the record. Be it resolved that the sale of the Vimy Arena shown as subject property…subject to City property on the attached miscellaneous plan 14441-2 in favour of Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation for the purpose price of $1 be approved. And condition 2, that the policy entitled 'Offers to Purchase City-Owned Property' approved by Council on December 6th, 2006 be waived in this instance. And here's where I believe we can have a win/win. That a $1.4 million commitment from the Land Operating Reserve for investment in the development of recreational amenities within the Assiniboia Community Committee area per the intention of, and I'll skip ahead, the decision of February 22nd, 2013, adopted by Council on February 27th, 2013, be referred to the 2019 budget review process. Number 3, that a portion of the $1.4 million be used in consultation with the Public Service to enhance the trails, lighting, security and greenspace along Sturgeon Creek in the area of 255 Hamilton. Number 4, that per the intention of recommendation 9 of Item 9 of the report of Executive Policy Committee adopted by Council on February 27th, 2013, that a public consultation process be implemented within the proximity of 255 Hamilton subsequent to the approval of $1.4 million in the 2019 budget to seek community input on the development of recreation amenities with the remainder of the $1.4 million. Number 5, that the public consultation be funded through…from the commitment reserve out of $50,000 set aside in the 2014 budget per the intention of the 2013 report. Skipping ahead. The amending motion today, Madam Speaker, that I have before us with the seconds that I have left, it really captures the recommendations I've received, just finalized today, sorry for the late notice on it, but finalized today from the Legal Department in Property and Development Department who have reviewed and have suggested the following edits to strengthen this motion. I want to draw my colleagues attention to the motion we have before us, Motion 7. That the City of Winnipeg Public Service include a reversionary clause in the land sale agreement with Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation ("MHRC") for 255 Hamilton Avenue (the "Property") that includes the following elements, and I do want you to note this please…

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

Councillor Gillingham: Please note this is an addition: and if such elements are not complied with the Property shall revert back to the City: A. That MHRC and/or the proponent of the addictions treatment and recovery center submit a complete application to the City of Winnipeg for all necessary planning, subdivision and rezoning approvals required to permit the use of the Property for an addictions treatment and recovery center and that such necessary planning, subdivision and rezoning approvals be obtained from the City of Winnipeg within two years after the sale of the Property from the City to MHRC. B. That MHRC enter into a Ground Lease Agreement ("Agreement") with the Proponent within four years after the sale of the Property from the City of Winnipeg to MHRC that requires the exclusive use of the Property as an addictions treatment and recovery center, and such Agreement shall be terminated if 6C is not satisfied. C. That MHRC and/or the proponent be required to build an addictions treatment centre and recovery center and obtain an unconditional occupancy permit therefore within four years after the sale of the Property from the City of Winnipeg to

MHRC; and D. That MHRC and/or the Proponent provide a letter of credit in the amount sufficient to restore the land to its original condition in the event that construction for an addictions treatment centre and recovery center is initiated but not completed." Madam Speaker, every effort has been made through this motion to have a win/win, to ensure that the needs and the protection of the citizens of Winnipeg, specifically in the area around the Vimy Arena, are protected and are advocated for. And I appreciate the efforts of our departments and the support of my council colleagues and I'm asking that every councillor in the room to support this motion today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So this debate has been hard, so hard on so many people. First, I'd like to speak to those who have struggled or the many thousands of Winnipeggers who still struggle this very day from drug addiction. To those who have overcome it, I salute your strength and courage. Some of you turn to things…some of you turn things around in your lives all by yourselves, some needed help, some needed lots of help and there is no shame in that. We live in a society and I want to believe we live in a compassionate society. I know that I have needed help with many things as a child, as a young man and now as a father, husband and as an elected official. When we are struggling and especially when we're struggling with something as terrible and powerful as drug addiction, most of us need help. There is a drug addiction that is wracking our city. It's destroying careers, families and people's very lives, Winnipeggers dying every three days from drug addiction. There's a tendency throughout society to refer to the drugs and intoxicants of our youth, those that were around in the older generations day as weaker, less dangerous, less potent. This has most commonly been applied to marijuana. Well today in 2018, even the "harder drugs" that emerged into the mainstream and were around in the youths of some of the younger members of this council, like cocaine, ecstasy and others are today being cut with opioids like fentanyl. People with casual drug habits, people who once may not have become addicted are today overdosing, becoming addicted and dying before their lives ever truly had a chance to start. Just yesterday, a man in the Courts of St. James, overdosed in the morning and then fell to his death from a 15 storey balcony later that same day and perished. People are dying. People are dying every other day, sometimes every day in our city. We have a duty not just as elected officials who are entrusted with the well-being of this city and its people, but a moral duty as people, as neighbours, as citizens to act. The Oakes' are here today. They lost their son and their brother to drugs, to opioids. Their family have taken the grief and they have chosen to use it to take action. Not everyone has the power to act for themselves, not to mention for others. They are taking altruistic action to make sure this doesn't happen to anyone else. We in this chamber also have the power to act. We must act. Their family approached Mayor Bowman, thank you Mayor Bowman for your leadership, asked if the City could help. The City lacks money, lacks resources, but one thing we do have, in some cases, is property and land. There is a vacant, abandoned building, in a picturesque riverside setting, the Crestview neighbourhood of St. James, that building, according to droves of people who live around it, is at present, a hub of illicit activity, drug taking, drug dealing and dangerous behaviour. The building has been surplus since 2013. The City is currently spending taxpayer dollars to maintain this building. What can be done with this building? What should we do with it? Administration has indicated the property may be worth around 1.4 million, but let's unpack that. Is there a way to…how do we value this asset? Can it be made liquid? Should we sell it to a developer and carve off some of the park around it to build a condominium or apartment or row of houses? That is the only way this asset would ever yield the money that's being…that it's being valued at, at highest and best uses, Councillor Orlikow put it earlier today. But there is another way we can profit from it. We can get the 50 men who are currently drawing upon Police, Fire, EMS and other resources constantly out of that cycle. We can remove a blighted nest of criminal, illicit activity from the heart of a beautiful, residential community and green space and increase the property values there. We can have that $1.4 million go towards saving the lives of fellow citizens rather than going into the City's general revenues. And lastly, we'll see the 1.4 million recreational investment in the area referred to 2019 budget by Councillor Gillingham, which has been, I think, the major objection raised by some in the community, now addressed. Money that would have been never materialized from a politically and administratively complicated land sale through a developer of this building, I think the conversations would have been very similar if we were talking about a condominium project. We can save the lives of a young man, probably many, who live there in the Crestview area, like one of so many residents of St. James, including the incredible Jonathan Parker, who we heard from today. Leslie Bower, Kat Degner, who have come forward, they're local residents and people who are proud to have their own community play a key role in tackling the drug epidemic that is festering in our community and sometimes in their very own homes. The next process, what about process? Here is the process and how we came here today as I understand it; the Oakes have a dream and a vision. They asked Mayor Bowman if the City could help. The Mayor told them he may be able to help by providing land, however, this is Health and Manitoba Government jurisdiction. In order to determine whether this was a realistic idea, they approached the Province to see if they would be interested in partnering. They were. Mayor Bowman then informed the councillor for St. Charles in the area. Almost immediately, that councillor was in front of TV cameras grandstanding against it. Taking what I assume he thought was the politically easy road, except perhaps that was a miscalculation. My office and other councillors offices as well have been getting correspondence for weeks from people across Winnipeg and from many in the heart of Crestview, St. Charles, St. James begging for this to move forward. I admit that before this, I didn't fully understand how much it would resonate yet after coming out in favour and setting the record straight about the misinformation that had been disseminated, in some cases flat out lies, that

were being peddled by some, people all over the city from all walks of life started coming forward with their stories. I sent out an e-mail and I found out that one of my high schoolmates, his mother doesn't know if he is alive or dead because of addictions. There are stories of people that they have lost, people that they have saved and people struggling still. Some of those people who came forward were at my own family…were my own family, childhood friends and neighbours. Speaking of my neighbours, I have a shelter for people in active addiction, in some cases, a few blocks from my own home in St. Boniface. I supported the centre before it became operational. These are not people who are in recovery. Some of these people are addicted to and taking drugs this very day. Just two weeks ago, one of them set fire to their bedroom in the midst of meth-induced psychosis. These are my neighbours in St. Boniface. The only complaint I or my neighbours have received is that we don't have more of these types of facilities. The Bruce Oake Centre alone will not solve the drug crisis in Winnipeg. We need expanded social services. We need public education about the stigma of addictions. We need reforms in justice, health care and tackling poverty. These changes, while needed, are not on the agenda of today's Council meeting. However, what is on the agenda is the one thing that we can do right now. I'm almost done.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Allard: So we have a choice today, not a political choice, not an ideological choice, but a moral choice. We cannot delay. People are dying. Delay will mean more death. Please vote yes today to provide the vacant arena site for a dollar to the province of Manitoba so we can build the first of what I hope are many facilities like the Bruce Oake Recovery Centre. And I will be supporting Councillor Gillingham's amendments which I think are addressing the...some members of the community to come forward with concerns. And I can't think of a better champion to find a place for the 1.4 million in the 2019 budget. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity then Councillor Mayes, Councillor Gerbasi.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, thank you Madam Speaker. Difficult to follow my council colleague's comments there. We are facing a national opioid crisis. It's ripping families apart and ending lives in communities across Canada. I have been working diligently on a national effort amongst the big city mayors. We are continuing to call for the Federal Government to create a national strategy. We are also trying to work collaboratively with our provincial counterparts in provinces across Canada. In the meantime, I've met with many families who have lost loved ones to opioids, including the opportunity to meet with Scott, Ann, and Darcy Oake. In every single one of these meetings, every meeting, what I have been told is that there is a desperate and urgent need for more treatment facilities in the City of Winnipeg, every meeting. And my colleagues across Canada, other mayors, are saying the same thing and they're watching what's going on in Winnipeg right now, today. We have the opportunity to do something incredibly positive today for our community. We've learned from our first responders, with the most recent statistics that we have seen. And keep in mind these are individuals that we are losing ten individuals per month to overdoses. Councillor Allard just referenced this, that is approximately one person every three days. I remember playing hockey at Vimy when I was a kid. It's a beautiful…it was a great rink then and it's in a beautiful community. And we have listened and I respect the views of individuals from the community who have voiced their thoughts on this, on both sides of the discussion and the debate. Some have had concerns which I believe have been fully addressed by Councillor Gillingham. And I want to thank him for his leadership and stewardship as our Finance Chair and as an area councillor to diligently provide leadership for those in the community that are looking to ensure monies stay within the area while also doing our duty as councillors, as all members of Council to look out for the best interests of the city as a while. We have heard every conceivable argument against proceeding. Every week, there's been new misinformation, new arguments to find creative ways to blur, to confuse and to muddle this debate. A debate that is, at its very heart, very simple. Councillor Orlikow, I think articulated very well, questions of process. We have the ability to make a decision today to transfer land to another level of government for one dollar. And the simple question is, does this council want to proceed with that or not for the purposes that we are discussing today? Delay, let's be clear, delay is politics, pure and simple. That is the only reason for delay. The administration…administrative report has been public for some time. We have had numerous days of debate and deliberations. Further delay in addition to most importantly providing more time for less treatment facility means we're going to lose people. I don't want to be part of that. I don't want to do anything that is going to do anything to aggravate anyone's ability to seek treatment for themselves. Further delay will allow greater time for the demonization of those afflicted by addictions. It will allow additional time for opponents to further stigmatize and demonize not only individuals who are affected by addictions, but those that are trying to do something to help, specifically the Oake family and the proponents that are coming forward to this council, to the Provincial Government with a solution to a problem that no level of government or combination of governments have been able to adequately address. I respect the fact that a member of the legislative assembly, Steven Fletcher, has spoken today and has argued forcefully for this not to occur in his ward. I do remember Steven when we were in high school. And I'm going to talk about the Steven that I knew then and not the Steven that I saw today. I'm going to be diplomatic today. And the Steven that I knew in high school was kind and was generous and cared about people. And I think he still does and I think all of us do as well. I don't believe we build a better Winnipeg by tearing each other down. We do it by finding good people who are trying to come up with

solutions and try supporting them. The strength that we've seen demonstrated on this floor is really difficult to comprehend. And it's been really something to witness today and in previous days. The strength of individuals that have fortunately for all of us been able battle addictions, it's remarkable. We want to make sure that we have more individuals like that in our community in the days and weeks and years to come. The decision we have today is simple. Do we want to help or do we not want to help? I got involved in politics because I wanted to help our community. I wanted to help people in our community. And I think that's why all of us are here today. I think that's why all of us signed up for sometimes the un-glamourous job of making difficult decisions and being accountable to the citizens that we serve. My son was doing a project last night, he interviewed me, and one of the questions was why did you run for mayor? And it was really that simple, I want to help people. This is not a difficult issue. This is not a difficult question that we have to answer today. We have a vacant surplus property. We have a request from another level of government who is responsible for health, we should be voting to proceed with this. We should not be delaying. I for one will not be part of any delay. We should proceed. We should get on with helping the...

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

Mayor Bowman: I will wrap up quickly. I simply ask my council colleagues to do the right thing. Let's not delay. Let's provide our support to transfer this land to the Provincial Government so they can work with the Oake family and all those that are supporting their efforts. Let's do the right thing and let's honour the memories of Bruce Oake and those that are working diligently to protect so many in our community that are seeking treatment. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have four points I want to make. The first one is entitled, 'What does this Scott Oake guy have against hockey?' Because that's what seems to be part of the…I just remember Scott Oake and Mark Walston, they said that the young guys breaking into CBC to replace Don Whitman, so that was many years ago. But we've had these presentations today, and Councillor Orlikow very eloquently and accurately outlined the decision that was made by the previous Council in 2013 about the arena strategy. And I was proud to be part of that strategy. I think I was known as the arena's critic in 2012 when I wasn't on EPC. So when I got on EPC, I wanted to do something about the arenas. And we did go ahead on that council and get two new arenas built in conjunction with a whole lot of partners. So 2013, a decision was made to close Vimy. Bur really, you have to go even further back to the council before that. I'm looking now at the April 2010 Council agenda, the City's role in the provision of arenas. So that 2010 agenda item contains a 2007 report about all 15 City arenas. And in that, there is quite a long analysis of the 15 different City owned and operated arenas. The one with the worst facility condition index, and if you look at it, they've got the worst ones that are in bright red so it kind of jumps out at you, the worst one is Vimy of the 15. Now, I haven't been there, I haven't…unlike the Mayor, I haven't played hockey there, but I do know this report was prepared 10 years ago. I mean, the Mayor was in private practice. Eadie was a school trustee. I was a school trustee in Brandon. So I don't think there's anyone who in this group has somehow fudged the data from 2010 or 2007 to somehow make the case that Vimy was not in great shape. We heard people say, I could fix it up and we'll have the gang go down there and replace some light bulbs, I'm paraphrasing, perhaps unkindly. But it…the numbers from 2010 indicate that it's 2 million to bring it up to an acceptable level of maintenance. It's 5 million to bring it to, in 2010 dollars or 2007 dollars, to bring it to an acceptable…a new status. So the idea that somehow we are arbitrarily or perhaps in some biased fashioning in St. James closing this arena that's still in Cracker Jack shape, I have to reject. It's not numbers we've generated. It's numbers from the staff that go back as far as 2007. Again, millions of dollars would be required to bring the arena up to the acceptable condition. Why are we so against St. James then you ask? Well, if you look at the map, the St. James Assiniboia area is actually pretty well served in terms of indoor ice and this is an old map before the MTS complex went in in Headingly. There is Allard Arena, there's St. James Civic Centre. In fact, if you look at the grid that's in the report that's been here and no one's ever argued with it in the last 6 years that I've been here, if you look at the grid, St. James actually has the most sheets of ice per citizen of any of the areas. So I really don't think there is some attempt here to undermine the recreational quality of life in St. James. We had speakers say, well, look, other wards are getting City money, you've got your toboggan slides at St. Vital Park. Well yes, I put my ward money into the projects in my ward in conjunction with Rochelle Squires who is the local MLA. We put the money that was designated for the ward into facilities in the ward. Councillor Dobson has had the same amount of money. He represents 32,000 people. I have 54. My colleague to my left has 68. Councillor Dobson has put that money, same amount of money, wherever he thought best. I don't second guess him, but if people from or…from the Vimy area are saying, well, we are somehow discriminated against, we're not getting the nice new stuff. Well, that ward got the same allocation as the rest of us. So just wanted to be clear, there is no bias here somehow against St. James and the recreational needs of St. James. Third point I wanted to make was made by one speaker that indicated there is discrimination here, there's bias. That came up last week at EPC. I asked some people and they said, why don't you ask Scott Oake? Why is it only for men? So I did. I went over to him this morning, I said, why is it only for men? He made three good points which were, that is often the model used in these treatment facilities. I'm not an expert in this, but obviously this is not some random idea that's come out of the hat for the Scott Oake group here. This is a model to segregate by gender that is used in some facilities.

Number two, the operator in Calgary who is coming in here, their model is to have men only. So that is the model that we are being offered. And number three, as he pointed out, they have funded 6 or 7 women to go through in Tamarack. So there's no attempt here to be relegating women to second class status. I understand the speaker who spoke against it, but I also understood the woman who came up here who had to poster board with a lot of dead children on it. People who had died of overdoses, people…the children…and that woman spoke very eloquently and one thing she didn't say when she implored us to go ahead, she didn't say, well, wait until it is 25/25 or wait until there is a facility for women. That would be better, yes. But sometimes we have to make decisions that aren't about perfect choices. So my vote today will be to go ahead with this project and I take it from the Oakes and what they've said publicly that that would like to have another facility for women in due course. I don't know when that will be. Maybe I will be around, maybe I won't. But I have to go with their representation that that's something they want to address. The fourth point I wanted to make is this is a vote that shows the value of civic politics. It is a very democratic process. It will be a close vote I suspect. Those watching might question that, but it is important to note that it takes 11...it's an 11 hard vote. You need 11 votes to go forward with this. There are only 14 of us in this room who can vote. So this…everybody has a pretty strong card to play here. So what would I say to those who are sitting on the fence? I would say, if this were my ward and someone came and said, you're going to have to take one for this team. We're going to put this facility in your ward. I'd say, well I, you know, I guess that is okay. But I want the money for the park because that's what we get in our wards. We get the money if we sell the parks. When Glenlee Community Centre building sold, I got to keep the money in my ward. If I was told, no, you are getting a dollar, I think I would be very upset. But through some efforts of Councillor Gillingham, we are going to have the opportunity to put $1.4 million back into the St. James area. How it will be spent, I have no idea. That will be up to the councillors for the area and for the residents of the area. They will set those priorities. I will vote for that if I'm here in the next budget. I would say...I am not here to fault Councillor Dobson for anything he has done. He is, I think, a democratically elected representative doing the best he can. He has…he has…you know, I've gone to him with community incentive grant ideas that required waiver of criteria here; the World War I Memorial Project, the Habitat Project, he was on board right away. He was along board for more than me on that World War I thing if memory serves. So I think he is not simply caring about his ward, he has tried to do some good work on other projects throughout this city. He has a lot of community incentive grant money in the bank. If he comes forward saying, you know, I want to build ten more tennis courts at Vimy but you're going…it's going to…you're going to have to wave the criteria, I am all for that. I think he can identify the needs of his ward better than I ever could. And I think if he wants to spend more of that recreational money he has, then I would certainly be supportive of that. So I guess would say this, I think I'm going to need a brief extension Madam Speaker, I guess the issue comes down to...MLA Fletcher said, you're voting for a good cause and against another good cause and there is some truth in that. Having park land, having green space, having recreational facilities is certainly a good cause. Having an addictions treatment centre...

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

Councillor Mayes: Having an addictions treatment centre is clearly another good cause. We have to make that hard choice today, the 14 of us. So I would say this is a democratic moment. This is perhaps a historic moment. I would say for those considering delay or those voting against, when I first got here, we…Madam Speaker, you and I, and Councillor Gerbasi sat on the IRPW panel with Councillor Vandal and we had a vote about rapid transit that all of us voted for actually, and the reporter said to him afterwards, you seem to be in a hurry. Why are you in a hurry to do this? And Councillor Vandal said, yeah, I am in a hurry. I'm in a hurry because we should have started this 40 years ago. So yeah, I am in a hurry to get this done. And there is an element of this today, I think. It may seem like we are in a hurry, well, we don't have these facilities, but we certainly have the problem. So I would just say to those considering delay or considering voting against, you know, this isn't…no one's trying to disserve the people of St. James. No one is trying to disrespect Councillor Dobson here. It's a chance to really make a difference with your individual vote. So I would just say, I agree with the Mayor, it's not the time for delay. It's the time for action. So let's go forward with this project. And there is money set aside...or will be set aside in the budget to help with the recreational needs of St. James. So, let's…MLA Fletcher said, let's show some leadership. Let's vote for the facility. Let's move forward from there. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gerbasi: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to share a quote from you that I heard from a mother who was speaking on the radio a little while ago. Somebody who had their child going through addiction and I believe had lost their child. And she said, "A parent is only as happy as their least happy child." And on a personal note, as a mother, I know that feeling in your gut, the sleepless nights, the terror, the worry, the waiting for a spot in a treatment facility. My family was lucky. We were able to get help for one of my children and short-term treatment was eventually available, and eventually worked and my family is fine. My family was spared. And we dodged a bullet that many families haven't dodged. And many families have not been so lucky. In the process of hearing the people we have been hearing over the last few months, one of my constituents got in touch with me, Arlene, and she came and spoke to some of the committees. She is part of a group of families who have lost 25 children in Winnipeg over periods of time.

And she came and very, very bravely, she was the one with the poster that Councillor Mayes just referred to and she came and very courageously and it was very difficult for her, spoke to us. So we have an addiction epidemic. As Canada does, and the world does, but Canada does and Winnipeg does and people are overdosing in record numbers. And the long-term treatment is absolutely, desperately needed. These are the facts. In many cases, it is the only answer for survival. It is the only thing that's going to work in many cases. And I'd also like to comment on the stigmatization of drug addicts. It's real and they are treated as other. It is us and them in some people's minds, and that's wrong. They are…drug addicts are not other, they are us. They are our children, our friends, our neighbours, our families. And I want to acknowledge the Oake family and thank them. We heard today that they've been…they have been working on this issue, establishing their foundation for many years. We've heard they have been helping people already accessing treatment. That's pretty amazing. And now they are creating an opportunity for Winnipeg to have a long-term treatment facility. Something that seems impossible, is very difficult. In fact, I would say this effort is nothing short of miraculous. Think about how hard it must be in the midst of the grief, impossible grief, to work so hard and to make something happen to help others and find a way to deal with that grief. This is a Winnipeg thing. I think of Jocelyn House. Jocelyn Hutton was a young woman who I actually went to school with and she died of cancer as a young girl. And you may have heard of Jocelyn House. Jocelyn House is a hospice that has been in existence for decades. And because of that family and that effort of creating that house, countless people have been able to die in dignity in comfort and peace and have a safe, comfortable place to go through that last stage of their life. And that is because of one family reaching out to others who are also suffering and helping others as a way, perhaps, of helping them through their grief, but think of all the good that that has done in our city for decades. I also think of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights, the Asper family, a dream that seemed impossible and it is really impossible. That was…but what an inspiration that one family can reach out and with the community and with the support that comes from that, do something that changes our city forever and our country and our world. And Winnipeggers are showing support for the Oake Foundation in droves and for all the right reasons. And it makes me proud to be a Winnipegger. Regarding…you know, and…regarding the location. I think processes were followed properly, that was made very clear. The land was declared surplus. It's the building footprint. You know, we've gone through all the arguments. The amending motion allows for money to go back into the community. The recreation space is not being lost. And there is funding for public consultation, as is appropriate, for what happens with the money from the sale of the land. And that is in there, so all of those things are taken care of. I want to say, I'm very impressed with the level of debate and thoughtfulness of my colleagues on Council. The Mayor has shown leadership right from the beginning and he has been a punching bag for…in many cases on this, being accused of all sorts of nefarious plots very inappropriately. We are all doing this for the same reason. We want to help people. We want to do something good. That's why we are all here. So I resent that, the fact that people have been so hard on that. Perhaps that came from a place of misunderstanding, but that's exactly where it came from. It is wrong. Councillor Gillingham…Councillor Allard, who took this on like a dog with a bone and really raised the profile of this issue. Councillor Orlikow who handled this, very clearly dealt with this at the Property Committee very diligently and has made a clear case. Cindy, Brian, every one of you who is here today, you all have a chance to say yes to this. And I think when you look at the…finally, I wanted to mention, when you look at the processes here, if anyone has ever seen other levels of government, have you ever watched parliament? Have you ever watched the legislature? Do they spend…how many hours would it have been, maybe 30 hours? Close to that of listening to the public. Three different standing committees and Council listening to delegations for hours and hours and hours on both sides, hearing them talking, and questions back and forth. If anyone says that's not a transparent process, I don't know what is. So, you know, it is something that I am fully willing to support. Again, a delay…it was kind of funny, Councillor Mayes talked about the delay in the rapid transit. I remember people saying, you are rushing this. I just had to laugh as well. I mean, yeah, 40 years later. It's time to act. We have an epidemic. People are dying every day…yesterday in St. James, it's a nightmare. This is hope for our future. This is hope for our children. It's the beginning, we need more than one treatment facility. But this family and this foundation is trying to do something good. Let's do what we can to help them. And I also agree with…Mayor Bowman talked about the national strategy on the opioid crisis that mayors are working on across the country. Well, what can we do as a municipality? We don't run the health care system. This is something we can do. Let's do it today. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, everybody.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Councillor Morantz

Councillor Morantz: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm really grateful for the opportunity to be able to speak to this matter. I haven't really spoken about it really at all in any of the meetings since it came up partially because it's sort of a…hits home for me in a way. I share a terrible kinship, really, with Scott Oake in that we are in a group of parents that have lost children under unfortunate circumstances. I don't really like talking about it but I can't help but thinking about it. So much has been made about the value of the land. I can see people asking that question. But one of the points that I have not heard made, and I want to get into this and my view on this is, really, what is the value of people when they have the opportunity to lead happy, productive lives and the cost to society and to their families when they don't? And I think if you wanted to look at this as a mathematical question…mathematical question, I think, there is no doubt in my mind that when people lead happy, productive lives, when they are employed, when they are happy, when their families are happy, they are far more productive and as a society that's what we want to encourage. I understand this all too

well. When Nathan turned two and a half he was diagnosed with autism. And we really…we didn't know what to do. We would ask the doctors, well, what is the treatment? And there really was no recommendation. We found out about through digging and research about something called applied behavioural analysis, which is early behavioural intervention. But there was no government program for it. We had to hire a psychologist at great expense to set up a program…a treatment program for him. Through that, I got involved in advocacy through a group called the Manitoba Families for Effective Autism Treatment. And I found out that that group was lobbying the Provincial Government and there were similar groups like this all over North America lobbying governments and insurance companies to fund this therapy. And the argument of these organizations was that there were studies done by psychologists that had been replicated at different universities in North America that showed that fundamentally applying this therapy had very good outcomes for people with autism and that if you could raise the level of functioning of someone with autism to a place where they could be more productive in society, the value in that to society was far better than doing nothing. And I think the arguments are parallel in this case. And as a result of that advocacy, MFEAT was successful in getting the Provincial Government to fund this program so that families would no longer have to break the bank to fund it themselves. And this history is very well known. If you contact the St. Amant Centre today, you will find out that they have a very well-funded, robust program for children with autism called Applied Behavioural Analysis Early Behavioural Intervention which is funded by the Provincial Government. There's lots of therapies out there, Madam Speaker, that don't get funded but why did this one get funded? It got funded because the evidence was there to prove that if you raise the level of functioning of children with autism at an early age, they will go on to lead happier, more productive lives. Their likelihood of gainful employment will be better and the stress and pressure that their families endure will be much, much less. And I think the arguments are parallel here. I think if you look at a 50 bed facility, I don't know how many people will come in and out of that facility, but there are success rates. Those people will go on to lead happy and productive lives where they are employed and being productive members of society. That number, whatever it might be, makes this value of land really look minimal, frankly. And I think coming from a fiscal conservative, I can say that I certainly initially asked that question, why don't we get the 1.4 million for the land? Isn't that our responsibility? We're, you know…this is a municipal asset. But when you really think about it, when you look at the big picture as my colleague, Councillor Lukes likes to say, I always appreciate when she says that, and I have been looking at the big picture on this a lot. And I think the big picture really is that the value to society, to people being happy and leading productive lives is far greater than the value of this piece of land. And as municipal elected officials, we have very few tools at our disposal to assist in furthering social goals and social needs. And I remember making that argument during the U pass argument that debate I mean, that really, we had an opportunity as a city council to make sure that students can get to university who might not otherwise be able to afford it. And I see this kind of in the same way. So Madam Speaker, of course I'm going to be supporting the sale of this land. I want people to lead happy and productive lives. I want to alleviate the stress of people who have addiction issues. The stress not only on themselves, but I want to help alieve that stress on their families because those families, when they are enduring that stress are not being productive either. So I think, you know, if you were to really run the math on it, if that's really what's important to people. The people who are hung up on the value of the land, if that's the issue that this turns on, I think the math of helping people be productive is…far outweighs the value of the land. And certainly, I want to say to the Oake family, I understand what drives families to advocacy when tragedy befalls them. And I think when you look at how most important issues of a social nature are driven forward, it comes from people who are personally affected by whatever that particular issue is. And I thank those people every day for adding value to our lives and helping us see a different perspective. And so, with that, I certainly will be supporting the sale of this land. And I would like to see this centre up and running at the earliest opportunity. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes followed by Councillor Schreyer, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Schreyer, Councillor Lukes is first. Yeah.

Councillor Lukes: Sorry. I will keep this brief. I spoke at EPC, Madam Speaker, and I just wanted to share this on the record and for anyone that's listening that didn't listen at EPC. So in my role as city councillor, I represent the community of St. Norbert…St. Norbert proper, where I have lived with my family for 16 years. About 5500 people live in St. Norbert. The Behavioural Health Foundation, located in the heart of St. Norbert, is a private addiction treatment rehab facility that specializes in the treatment of mental health, substance, drug and alcohol abuse. The BHF, as we call it, is a private organization funded through grants, the Province and private donors, private donors who have been moved to give millions over the years. The BHF is now entering its 47th year of operation in the heart of this community. I don't know and I must do the research on this, of a treatment facility that has been operating longer in the City of Winnipeg, 47 years in St. Norbert. And I want to share a bit about the BHF with you, with Council members and to the greater community who's watching, what it's like living in a community with an addiction treatment centre located physically in the heart, in the geographic centre. The BHF has 120 beds. They are facilities to accommodate adults and children. As of last week or so, there were 44 adults and 15 children on the waiting list. The BHF refers to its people in the program as clients. Clients attend the BHF and reside there on a voluntary basis. Many clients come through the court system are Indigenous and they reside at the BHF Foundation. They come from all walks of life. Clients can stay as long as they feel necessary. The average stay is four months but many clients stay one to two years. There is a school program, a continuing education program and a daycare. There are many sweat lodges located behind the building on the banks of

the Red to accommodate traditional teachings and holistic treatment. The BHF opens their sweat lodges to anyone who wants to do a sweat. They own 6 transitional houses in the community where following treatment, individuals and families can transition back into society. The woman who runs this organization is Jean Douche, an angel. We call her an angel because of her dedication to the BHF. She runs a tight ship. As a former client and now the Executive Director for I believe almost two decades, she has set up an amazing outreach program that clients can participate in if they choose. Prior to being elected, I sat on many organizations in St. Norbert; business, heritage, arts and community. And for a small community, we have a lot of organizations that's not-for-profits. Every single organization I volunteered on partnered with the BHF, clients through their volunteer program. Clients helped the Pembina Active Living 55+ group set up their picnics and parties. They helped the heritage organizations with their grounds maintenance, mowing, trimming and security patrol. Clients help the farmers market at every single market doing crowd control, security, set up, take down, sound systems, site maintenance. Clients help the community centre and the Business Improvement Zone deliver flyers to homes in the community. I've worked with clients on multiple occasions and had great laughs and good times. Physically, the building and grounds are mere metres from École Noël-Ritchot, the K to 8 school. The children from the school and the children whose parents are in treatment share the playground. The play structures were funded in part by the Behavioural Health Foundation, 50 metres to the north is the St. Norbert Community Centre with outdoor skating rinks, soccer fields, baseball fields and tennis courts. And then there's the farmers market where thousands of people converge 6 months out of the year. Quite frankly, if the BHF shut down, it would be a huge loss for our community. The site has been providing healing and care since 1904. And its care and treatment is work, again, provided by angels. I have experienced very closely also the torment and evil nature of addiction with a loved family member. And until you have been there, and walked in those shoes or beside someone in those shoes, it's virtually impossible to understand. And today, you know, we've heard very, very compelling, emotional statements from Mr. Oake and Mr. Parker. And we've heard those statements for five or ten minutes, but imagine living with that, that feeling 365 days a year, 24 hours a day. And it only really does end in three ways as they have mentioned. It ends in death or incarceration or in treatment. The citizens of South Winnipeg - St. Norbert Ward have reached out to me and identified their support to see this move forward. I'm in support of the motion today. I'm not very happy about the Legal Department showing up at the last minute with changes, but that's another topic, again, more dysfunction. But I'm very grateful for the work that the Oakes family is doing, the inspiration they're doing and the education they are really giving the city at large through this very difficult and challenging conversation many people are having but needs to be talked about and brought to the forefront in an everyday manner. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I feel in a way at a loss for words. But so many things have already been expressed that are so important to this issue. I feel that all the stories that have been talked about in terms of the pain...more than pain, the death that has occurred because of substance abuse and the fear of...justifiable fear of the proliferation and the increase of overdoses in recent years. All of these things…I believe that all these stories, everybody owns. So it's important that we all listen. It's important that we all remind ourselves and it happens to be on this issue, we get to speak about it here at City Hall, right here in City Council. It is not often that we do this. Just part of my concern, I guess. Now, different things to mention, I only get six minutes, but just in terms of…one thing was mentioned in context in terms of, you know, where we are on the spectrum of fiscal conservativism. Bear in mind, just to offer my consistency of my patter of perspective, Madam Speaker, I'll put out there that I am the most fiscally conservative member of this Council. I don't really think about it like that. But I'll say why, I took a hit because I was only one of two councillors that voted in the first budget. I did so because I said we couldn't afford the bus rapid transit at this time until we figure out how we're going to do it on a long-term solution. I took a hit from that from supporters of mine that it was a fiscally conservative vote only two of us took. And also Madam Speaker, when it comes to fiscal conservatism, who in this chamber has talked about construction inflation and how it is eating away at our potential as a City budget to take on our future financial challenges? Nobody, Madam Speaker, we all know that. Ask everybody. What is more fiscally conservative than talking about my fears that construction inflation…about construction inflation and the impact it is having right now and the impact it will have for the next decade on our City budget. Now Madam Speaker, given that, considering the fact that I've got the lowest personal expenditures when it comes to ward allowance or tied for last, well, Madam Speaker, that's my record on fiscal conservativism. So bear that in mind, Madam Speaker, when it comes to my perspective on this. We all have to account, Madam Speaker, for process and for the bottom line. And I understand councillors have said, but nothing is more important than life itself, all right. Madam Speaker, I don't dispute that. But process is still important. And Madam Speaker, so when it comes to a few things that consistent with my voting pattern this entire term, I have to ask a couple of questions, because I am a fiscal conservative, no doubt. But I am a progressive politician and I represent one of the poorer neighbourhoods of the city. And as a progressive, Madam Speaker, get this, please just think about this, it's just one point that I need to account for. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, when it comes to…I'm a little leery about process at City Hall. The last few years has not allayed my concerns. And I am a fiscal conservative, obviously, very much so. But I'm also not a photo op city councillor. When is the last time anybody's seen a photo op of me? It's not easy to get a photo op but, when's the last time anyone saw one? I also put out…bought the rap to the East Kildonan Herald this week. Well, no photo op, it's my banner. But content and

accountability is what I am here for. Madam Speaker, some very important things was said today. And they are all relevant, they're all very important. Madam Speaker, what I don't understand is we are foregoing $1.4 million from this. And we are doing so for the benefit of those that suffer from addiction and for their families and for society, but Madam Speaker, are we saying that the Provincial Government would have refused to do this? Had they had to pay the $1.4 million instead of the City of Winnipeg, because we're paying for it and here is the proof; if we are not paying for the 1.4 million why is it, in the last minute, as a metaphor, but if we can't say last minute motion in this case, when can we use the term, of an amendment so that 1.4 million comes from other City revenue to that community. So the City is paying for what the Provincial Government is supposed to, and what is the difference Madam Speaker? I am a fiscal conservative, Madam Speaker, but I am a progressive politician in my mind and I'll explain how. The Provincial Government is in a much better position to pay. And also, Madam Speaker, they have got, in my mind, a fairer system of taxation. Look what we've done Madam Speaker to raise our taxes in this city. We've increased the frontage levy, Madam Speaker, so that the poorest neighbourhoods in the city are paying the same rate for frontage tax as some of the richest neighbourhoods in the city based on how wide their yard is and that's where we're getting our money. They say we're going to get the money from a certain venue, but Madam Speaker, budgets are all fungible. It all goes into a pot and then it's spent. So Madam Speaker, excuse me, I don't want to be negative about this, but it looks like the City paying for it and then paying the community the 1.4 million. Madam Speaker, in my mind…bear this in mind, look at my pattern, I call that photo op politics. And I am not really into it. Look at my last three years and I don't think you'll find the contradiction to everything I've said so far. So the Province should have paid because they have a fair system of taxation. The City is paying for it and in a more unfair system of taxation that I don't agree with. But Madam Speaker, it's important that we do these things. And Madam Speaker, in the process that we have come about here, well I have to say, Madam Speaker, for the thousands of people that would voice their support of this rehab treatment centre, am I supposed to assume that they would be against a different venue? I don't make that assumption at all, because they want a treatment centre, Madam Speaker, and so do I. And so does Councillor Dobson. And so do the people of St. James. We know we need more, Madam Speaker, and maybe this debate has brought it out and given the process that we've gone through just on that issue alone of the 1.4 million, well you know, the Oake family, this is wonderful what they are doing. And they didn't deserve this process imputing their motives. But nobody did, including those that are opposed to this venue as the ultimate solution which is not obvious to me.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, we lose twice, fiscally. And I am fiscal conservative, and we lose twice because not only could the Province have paid for it, we could have saved the money but Madam Speaker, we'll now lose twice because we pay for it, it's not like it's free, we pay for it. We just said, the amendment comes in, otherwise why are we bringing up in the amendment? And it comes through at the expense of the City taxation system which I think is unfair. I think the provincial system of taxation is fair. So the strategy is weird, otherwise we wouldn't have had the last minute amendment because this is our process, this is what it comes to. We say this comes from 2010 or 2013, but then why this last minute amendment if we already had a functional process? Okay, Madam Speaker, we are doing this in the last three months. I don't know about what happened in 2013 or 2010. It's got nothing to do with the decision I have to make and think about in the last two months. But we are masking the fact that we have not been proactive on this. We've said some wonderful things today and I'm not saying that anybody doesn't deny it. We all agree with what we've said and heard today. But Madam Speaker, this isn't glamourous, as the Mayor said. We have to make our decisions and we have to count them. I feel very centred with my voting pattern over this term. But I am a progressive politician, Madam Speaker, as well as being very fiscally conservative and very progressive. And on that basis, I don't think that this is the process and this is the result we had from the best process. And Madam Speaker, I want to say that, I brought forward a notice of motion to deal with this that we'll be dealing with Council in the next term…in the next month, Madam Speaker to alleviate this unfortunate conflict that I believe should not have happened and doesn't need to. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I rise...my first comment is, I really had no intention to really speak about what my decision was going to be in that I don't want to get in the middle of a…of a….what really is, I think, a battle of communities here, in one community. There are residents who support it. There are residents who are opposed to it. Actually Madam Speaker, I think that maybe Councillor Morantz is lucky that he didn't get into one of those in Charleswood in regards to the difficulty in making a decision when you know there is a need for addiction treatment centres, Madam Speaker. There is. There is no doubt about it. I've heard a lot of untruths related to running treatment centres and things like that. I'm not going to get into those, Madam Speaker. In the Mynarski Ward along the riverbank, in a wonderful place, at the beginning of Magnus where it starts out at Red River, Madam Speaker, there is a facility called the River Point Centre, Madam Speaker, who went into consultations to repurpose what was a senior's home, originally run by a particular group. a not-for-profit group, that was to help seniors well, frankly of the Jewish faith, Madam Speaker. It doesn't matter. It's a senior's home, high care centre. Many of my friends' parents were in there. But

they couldn't afford to keep running it, Madam Speaker, but there it was. It was a facility owned by the Province of Manitoba. And they moved ahead and repurposed it. I didn't rail against it because there is a need for it. It's not a problem, Madam Speaker. They're actually a great neighbour in that neighbourhood. They are helping people at the same time that they are being good neighbours as well, Madam Speaker. That's not a problem. For me, that's not an issue at all. And you know, it was in its…it is a building. It's re-utilized, repurposed and maybe it even had riverbank issues that they had to fix. I think they did have a bit of a stabilization problem, which we hear is the problem over at the Shriners…former Shriners Hospital. So Madam Speaker, I understand the need and I would not oppose one in my ward unless, Madam Speaker…Madam Speaker, there's addiction epidemic in the City of Winnipeg, in other major cities across North America where people have lost hope. They get hooked on heroin, on these different drugs. There are whole cities in the United States, 60% of the people are addicted, loss of hope. We have to deal with this problem from a basis. And you know, I'm not going to...I appreciate anybody who is trying to help resolve the problem. We, I know…probably a lot of us around the table here continue to support TJ's gifts, fundraising in which a family, Karin Weib's still alive today, tries to make sure that youth don't get addicted in the first place at the beginning. This is where we're failing, Madam Speaker and this is what…I'm going to…I just want to go and just say that one of the things that really bothered me about the City of Winnipeg and its budgeting and its trend since I ran in 1998, Madam Speaker, there has been a trend from people who continue to push...and elected officials on this very council in the past who believe that the City of Winnipeg shouldn't be trying to provide affordable recreation services to the public that live in our neighbourhoods. This has been going on and I ran...I don't agree with the arena policy which was actually passed before I got elected in 2010. And then things moved along, sheets of ice, we regionalized hockey. We're getting away from hockey rinks in more local areas. That's what's happening, Madam Speaker. And okay, so it moved along and it's happening, that's fine. So if you don't want to do ice skating, it costs fair amount of money to run a plant like that, but you know...why are we divesting ourselves of recreation facilities? We shouldn't be doing that. We should be continuing to support that kind of thing when we go…and if you don't want hockey...Councillor Pagtakhan wants to see an expression of interest. He wants to hear from people about the old Ex arena. Because there is a recreation…there are people who want to utilize that building for recreation. So if the City isn't going to run it, we can at least still own it and let people run it like the West Kildonan Memorial Community Center's hockey rink, community run. In Councillor Mayes ward, the St. Vital Arena I think it is, community run. City still owns the property I believe, but that's okay. We are trying to make sure that affordable recreation services are provided, because that's the basis. We need to keep people away from addictions first. And if you were delivering recreation programs and things in the right way and teaching young people to avoid addictions, that's important. So here I'm being asked today…and I appreciate that the Mayor wants to contribute to helping resolve the outcomes of the problem...this is not getting to the root cause of addictions. There are families who struggle in addiction. Nobody has to tell me, Madam Speaker, about addictions. I can tell you that I run into friends that I went to high school with, they are so addicted, I'm amazed they're still alive today, Madam Speaker. I have friends who died. I have family members who are addicted to alcohol. I am addicted to cigarettes. Addictions are an awful thing. I get it. But Madam Speaker, I see this…this is a problem moving forward. And on principle, I can't say that I want to get rid of recreation space. And what should have happened with this, is we should've went to the community because it's a PR2...to the community and asked them about what should we do with this now that we're not having hockey in it. We didn't do that. We need to do that with old Exhibition Arena. Any decommissioned…there is an arena in Transcona. I don't know what's happening with it. But it was decommissioned because of a sheet of ice at the East Transcona Community Centre. So this was the hockey idea, but when we are trying to divest and save money, our budgets…we have been reducing recreation dollars forever. It's a core service, Madam Speaker. It's a core service. And I can't be supporting the disposal of this stuff for less...

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

Councillor Eadie: The disposal of this, unless we know that there isn't an ability…there are other properties that the Province that can be repurposed. Just because they don't want to say, restore or ensure that the riverbank, that Shriner's Hospital isn't going to fall into the river...we also need to take responsibility of that for our city. So does the Province. Let's like…anyway, Madam Speaker, I'm just saddened that I had to be in here. And I also just want to conclude, I seconded the motion for referral for 60 days. But Madam Speaker, I have to say, I supported Councillor Dobson, this is one of the most difficult things. I am not attacking anybody on this issue. People come up, they do what they do. I'm not going to criticize anybody because this is a difficult issue to deal with. But I moved the…I seconded a motion that I have to say, we can't stall. We need to make the decision today because what I'm concerned about…I'm not concerned about my ward. I am concerned about when Winnipeggers, who we should all be together, are fighting with each other and we got to make our decision today because what's happening in Crestview is caustic. It's not good. Pitting people against people, it's just not good, Madam Speaker. And so, I just want you to know that I will be voting...opposing the sale of the Vimy Arena. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Gilroy: I rise in support of the sale for a dollar for Vimy Arena and also the amending motion that Councillor Gillingham has put forward. I think Steven Fletcher said for us to speak with our mind and not our heart. But you know what, today I'm going to do both. So when I speak with my mind I hear what Councillor Orlikow had to say regarding the process. I think that was very eloquent and well put. I also heard a lot of what Councillor Gillingham had to say regarding the Fire and Paramedics, how many calls that they get. I know just from dealing with my own ward, I know that we are trying to deal with the major calls that come from Police Services, Ambulance, Fire, Paramedics, the countless hours of volunteers picking up needles on our streets to help deal with the epidemic. I also need to speak though with my heart because I think this touches all of us. And I think that you have heard in this debate whether...whatever side that you are on, people are very, very passionate about this issue. And as a mother, I have to say, that I would want a facility treatment in the city in which I live. I think that that is important. And I don't think that we have enough facilities. I've had the pleasure of with working with many different organizations that serve many people in addictions and they tell me, we need more treatment facilities. We need long-term treatment facilities and we need affordable treatment facilities. And that's what we're lacking here in the City of Winnipeg and that's what this does. This is about the health and well-being of our city. This is more than park space. And I believe that's an important debate. And I do believe Councillor Eadie, you have some merit to that. But today, what's in front of me, we talk a lot about process here at City Hall. We've been talking about process before any of us came on here at City Hall. We're going to be talking about process years after any of us leave at City Hall. This is never going to be something that we're going to fix. But the process that's here before us today allowed people come and speak to not just Council, they came and spoke at EPC and they came and spoke at the Standing Policy Committee and they had their voice. And I think that that's important because no matter what side of the debate that you are on, you should be able to have your voice heard. And I think that that's what happened here today. So I just want to thank everybody regardless of what side of the debate that you are on. This has been a very hard issue for everybody. But this is something that I really believe that we need to do for the health and well-being of our city. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Pagtakhan.

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, I had the opportunity, Madam Speaker, to attend a seminar that was organized by the Oake family that all councillors were invited to a couple of months ago. And when I went to that seminar that…where the Oake family presented their plans for this treatment centre, I was blown away. I thought wow, this is an incredible opportunity for the City of Winnipeg. We have a tremendous opportunity here Madam Speaker, where the constellations are aligning, there's a meeting of the minds and we have surplus property that's been sitting vacant for a couple of years that's made way for a twin sheet of ice, Madam Speaker, in your area, the Seven Oaks area. We have a recreation and parks strategic plan coming out, Madam Speaker. There's going to be lots of opportunity to look at all areas of the City of Winnipeg for recreation amenities and needs. And the citizens of Winnipeg will have a chance to weigh in on that. But here, Madam Speaker, like I said, there is a huge opportunity for the citizens of Winnipeg to meet a huge need. I really want to thank members of the Oake family for speaking. There was many heartfelt remarks and comments and stories and I really, fully appreciate that as well as I'm sure all members of Council. So I rise today, Madam Speaker, to support the main clause, support the motion moved by Councillor Gillingham and Orlikow. And I want to thank both those councillors for the work that they've done to make, I think, really good provisions here to protect the community, to provide investments into the community for enhanced recreation. And so those are really good things on balance. And you know, wanted to thank all my council colleagues, I want to thank the Mayor for his leadership on this file as well and to all the comments that are made. Thanks so much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Pagtakhan. Councillor Gillingham, your opportunity to close on Motion 7.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, I believe it's time today to make this decision. And I want to thank all of my colleagues who I've heard today. I was sitting, listening and I don't recall in our term…in the...coming up on four years we've been here, I don't recall a time when the…speaker after speaker, councillor after councillor has spoken so eloquently and I would argue so powerfully. I couldn't help but think, you know, we make a lot of important decisions around here. We do. I know we…all of us do our utmost and do our best. It seems though on a day like today that most of the other decisions we make are akin to, you know, how much money are we going to spend on concrete, dump trucks and paper clips, all important, but this truly is a matter of life and death. It really is, that's not an exaggeration, it's not hyperbole, it really is. And that's been born out time and time again. I do want to thank my colleagues who were really personal about their own families journeys. It takes a lot just to stand publicly and say that. So I acknowledge my council colleagues, Morantz especially, and Gerbasi as well for their comments. Thank you for that. I think it's clear that the motion that's before us, Motion No. 7, that a sincere effort has been made as I've said before to have a win-win, that the needs of the community are recognized and can be accommodated through the 2019 budget process. Obviously, if I have the privilege of being back here next year, that will be something I will absolutely, unreservedly be advocating for. That the value of the property, the $1.43 million be taken from land operating reserve and go into the recreation amenities in the area. That is to fulfill a commitment that the previous council made. It's an effort by this council to fulfill a commitment that was made by individuals who are no longer here…some who are no

longer here. And also with that, not only the $1.43 million would be advocated for and invested…reinvested into the community for recreation amenities, but also it would be part and parcel with a public consultation process. That public consultation process was also promised in the report that Council you voted on and adopted in 2013. This motion that's before us is an effort also to ensure that there is a public consultation process, that the members of the community are heard and can express what the recreation priorities would be to be reinvested in recreation amenities in the community. I think it's been clearly pointed out that green space will be protected. When I spoke at EPC, I talked about this motion and talked about the fact over the last several years, no less than $23 million has been invested in the Sturgeon Creek area on bridges and on culverts and on paths. I personally have used those recreational paths. They are beautiful paths that the public uses. Those paths, the access to those pathways, the access to the green space, the serenity of Sturgeon Creek would not be in any way diminished should this process move forward. This, I believe…and I will close with this, this moment at Council, this is one of those ones in the term that seems different. I believe that there is a lot in the future years that all of us around this council chamber will not remember. A lot of things we've said, we'll go, did I say that, really, and have to look at Hansard. A lot of decisions we made that are important but not life changing. I truly believe that this council will look back on this moment, I really believe this, in this term of office and forever as long as we are alive and have our capacities, we'll remember this moment. Because I think it will be a life changer for a lot of people or could be a life changer for a lot of families and for a lot of individuals. And I think I dare say that that this moment is the reason that many of us, I would say all of us, ran for elected office to make a difference. And I think here we have the opportunity to truly make a difference, not only in St. James but in the City of Winnipeg and it will extend, I believe, to hope for people in the province of Manitoba. So I implore all of my colleagues to support the motion that is before you that I put forward and that we have to vote on today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Dobson, your opportunity to close on Motion 5.

Councillor Dobson: Thank you very much. I haven't said it yet today so I think I should. First and foremost, I would like to commend the Oake family for spearheading such a noble cause. There is no question that an addictions recovery centre would benefit Winnipeg and I would be hard-pressed to find anybody who would disagree with that statement. But building an addictions recovery centre is not the issue and never has been. And it's unfortunate that many Winnipeggers believe that it is. This is not about supporting the centre or not supporting it. This is about the location. This is about putting a recovery centre on parks and recreation land. Land that was zoned PR2 many years ago for the benefit of the community. And zoning is important in that it only allows such things as arenas, recreation centres, libraries built on that land, otherwise, it is to remain as a green space for all to enjoy. And that is very significant. This is park land. Land set aside many years ago for the betterment of residents in the area. If the City has decided not to use this as an indoor rink, then other recreation uses for the land and building should have been explored. To sell this property is wrong. To sell it for a dollar is irresponsible. The Vimy Arena has been on that land since 1972 until it was declared surplus in 2013 and closed in 2015 to transfer funding to the Seven Oaks Arena that opened that same year. I keep hearing that the process was fine, but I somewhat disagree with that. I will give you a little chronological list of events as I see them. City administration sat on the file until the summer of 2016 when the City indicated that Vimy Arena would be going up for sale shortly, but it didn't. In the fall of 2016, a recreation group offered to lease and/or purchase the building. Nothing happened there. And then in April of 2017, the following year, the CAO offered up the property to the Province. In May of 2017, just the very…very next month, as I heard in delegation here today, Equal Opportunities made inquiries about the property and they were basically stonewalled by administration. In August…August 22nd of 2017, on request of the Province, the City did a building condition report of the Vimy Arena. And in late August of 2017, I spoke to Equal Opportunities West at their office and they told me of their frustration of not getting information from the City about leasing the Vimy Arena. So in early September, I contacted the department on behalf of Equal Opportunities West and they ignored my request and would not give me a response. On October 27th of 2017, Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation declared their interest in the building. And understand this, this has been six months since it was been offered up and I still don't know about most of this information. I…let me see…as I understand this, the CAO offered up our Vimy Arena without consulting any of the residents and it had been six months. Then on October 29th, I was finally informed. On November 1st, I was incensed at what I appeared to be backroom dealing because I felt I should've been notified that a piece of property in my ward should have been...I should have been notified, but I wasn't. And it took six months for all this to happen. So at that point, I felt it was important to protect my residents and I immediately went to the press to inform my residents as to what has transpired behind our backs. And then on November 24th, 2017, the City had an appraisal done on the Vimy Arena and we didn't find out about this until we got the administrative report. This was all done behind us. On December 21st, the Province provided the City with an offer to purchase the Vimy Arena for a dollar. And at this point, I'd like to point out that my residents to date have responded admirably by getting the word out. Together we have spent countless hours to ensure our community as a whole is aware. And to date, there have been a thousand or more signatures from local residents in opposition to losing this parks and recreation land and the recreation facility. This isn't Facebook, this is actual signatures. And I must thank each and every one for their dedication in protecting this valuable park land. The sad point is, this was so unnecessary. None of this, none of this aggravation for either party had to happen. We just had to be open and transparent way back in April. I am trying not to over read stuff. So I'm going to try to keep it as short as possible. The current asset report lists virtually all the equipment has aged

and it has to be replaced with new, including a new chiller, brine system, not needed if it were a four season recreation centre. The reason I am trying to identify all these things is because I don't think the asset report actually takes into the fact that the building still has lots of life in it. Most of the houses in the city are older than that arena. I think we have a lot more life and if we identify some of the stuff that that would actually affect the appraisal value dramatically. I believe we should put this whole process on hold for 60 days so that we can have another asset report done with consideration of this building not being an indoor rink, because we've already got two indoor rinks, but also so that aged equipment is accurately reflected and not replaced with new. And so that we could also get another appraisal done to find out how much the building is actually worth, not necessarily to the City but actually to the community if we were to convert it. I personally think we shouldn't vote for the sale of the Vimy Arena. I think there's still too many questions out there. I think we should extend it for 60 days.

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

Councillor Dobson: This property, it's in Crestview. It really belongs to the Crestview people and the people in the St. James community. Both sides can win. I really feel that we should help the Oake Foundation find a more suitable property in a space that is not zoned for recreation and we should do that right away. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Dobson. Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to close?

Councillor Orlikow: I do at bat, thank you very much. Let me get organized here a bit. First of all, I just want to mention for sure that what we are talking about today, hasn't really been touched on, if we decide today that we don't want to do this, you're pretty well saying the Ralph policy that we have, that we all voted for unanimously back in the day, is really not material. The whole point of the Ralph policy is not only the building, but it's also the operation of the building. So the idea is to disinvest ourselves of some of these assets that are, they say crisis mode and to take that money, as we did in this case, to Seven Oaks Arena, which we've already done, we moved it to Seven Oaks Arena and that's including the operations, again, and is including the sale of, so these two go together. So because some of the new councillors may not know…and Councillor Schreyer, if you want to go through the documents I have…they're all there; 2010, 2013, they talk about, well…it's there, in the documents. So you know, I just point out, more than happy to show where this information is. But we have a...we do have a crisis in the regard that we have so many arenas, and our costs are going up so high to maintain these arenas that we can't afford them all. They're just not productive anymore. So we need to be figuring out a way to move on. So some options today I've heard is, well why don't we just put in millions of dollars because we know it's either between $2 million to deal with the asbestos and some other issues and then we'd reprogram it again. Again, that's actually quite contrary to the Ralph policy because we're going to have to put in operating money…even if we lease it for a dollar, we have one building right now where we have childcare, we spent $500,000 this year putting a new roof on it for them because the building really should be disinvested, but it isn't. So again, that is really what's in front of us today. Councillor Eadie, Councillor Sharma, myself and all councillors, we unanimously agree to go this path. Councillor Eadie was very clear in his answer how excited he was that we're going to have the new sheets of ice opening up in the north and I think we all were very excited. So that vote in 2013 was unanimous. And it says, right clearly in there, I'll let you go ahead and read it, we will be selling this property. It says that. So again, maybe people didn't read it. Maybe they hoped something different. Maybe they changed their mind. But again, we have already done it. We've already moved those resources to another location. And now we're going to say, oh, by the way, I don't really care about that idea anymore, I want you to actually find me more money to put back in this arena which Community Services has been very clear to me, they have no interest in. It is still by Community Services model…it's still surplus for them. So that's it. So again, we know we're going to ask today, which I've been hearing, please reinvest back into the building and put new programming back in there. Community Services…and again, I understand why the local community would want that, the Community Services has said it is surplus. Councillor Eadie, would you like me to wait for you? Okay, thank you. I can…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow has the floor, let's respect that. Thank you.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. So again, it is a question about our Ralph policy. Do we want to have the…how are we going to be investing. We talk about the budgets…Councillor Schreyer talked about budgets. I totally understand when he talks about budgets, and he said, I'm being consistent. Well, that's why I kind of pointed out the last William Whyte motion where we're actually not…what are we doing there? We're not taking the full value. We're doing housing, which really is a provincial responsibility. I don't see much difference between that motion and the Vimy one. Which we are doing, we are taking another level of government's responsibility and instead of asking for full price, we're going to give a significant discount for the public good. So again, I do see some contrary view on that. Again, maybe Councillor Schreyer doesn't, but I do. So as we move on, we have now the twin sheets of arena, they opened up in 2015. We've now invested in there. We've now put the resources in there, including the staffing resources. And now we…some councillors want to go back in the past and change it which is totally their right. I don't disagree with that. But again, it's a little disingenuous with now I got it and now I don't want the other side of it. This is not easy. We all know

that closing down any facility is brutal, brutal. But again, this is really where we are at now. It is our first shut down of two arenas that we have to deal with. Roland Michener, also that's another issue there and then we also have the old Ex and then we also have the Vimy. Those are the three sites that we have to deal with. Roland Michener, we are going to be trying…we have been trying to sell it but we can't. It's a very poor property. But again, it wasn't being converted to anything else. It's going to be sold and this property as well. Part of the disposition strategy, if this fails today, which will happen, because the disposition strategy says so, we are going to be marketing this land to the open market. It's not that we're going to be putting in a recreational centre. It's not going to be building a library. No, we are going to put it up for sale. Maybe some group will come by, they've had five, six years to come by to buy up the Vimy Arena. Maybe they will, but they've had a lot of years to come by and no one's come by. In 2010, there was actually an EOI to discuss the ideas about new arenas but also, anybody have any ideas to refurbish the old ones. Nothing came out of that. So here we are today making the decision. Do we believe that we as the City of Winnipeg have a responsibility to the people of Winnipeg to help deal with this opioid crisis? Some people are trying to say it's either that or recreation. Again, as I explained maybe it's not in your backyard, but we did open a huge park downtown. We have a dog park downtown. We have…we do have parks that we do convert over. I think councillor Mayes has one he's looking at converting a land into a park. That can happen. But on this particular site, which is another issue, is that people are saying, well why here? I guess the best one I ever heard in the delegations is, why not here? Why not here? Oh, go to Shriners or maybe there's some other property out there, that's not what's being asked from us. The Province has asked us for this property. And that is, through the process, and that is allowable. If you want to change that policy, by all means, come to Council and say I want to get rid of this government to government policy in our development agreements. Sure, you can do that. But that's…right now that's in our books. So again, we can say, I didn't understand page 42 of the second line so therefore I can't vote for this. Or you know what, I believe recreation overrides everything or I'm a fiscal conservative, whatever you want to say. But you really are risking the fact that the Oakes Foundation will not set up. I am personally not willing to take that risk today. Should we just kick it down the line and hope that they feel it's okay to come back later on? Maybe they will, maybe they won't. To me, that risk is far too great, far too great. The Oake Foundation is going to be taking all their money, they're going to be putting it in there. We're going to contribute a little bit, for sure, and I think we should. But do you really believe you want to take that risk and say, hey you know what, Oake Foundation, great for you, but this time we don't like the spot or whatever. Come back later on. Again, that's a risk you're willing to take, I'm not.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. We'll now vote on the referral motion first, that's Motion 5. That was moved by Councillor Dobson. Referral motion for 60 days with instruction. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour of the referral motion, please rise. It doesn't make sense to do it that way in this case. Yeah. We will vote on the referral motion. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Dobson and Schreyer

Nays

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 5 is lost. Now, we'll vote on Motion 7 that was moved by Councillor Gillingham, seconded by Councillor Orlikow, the amending Motion 7. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie and Schreyer

Madam Speaker: Motion 7 passes. Now, I'll call the vote on the main item, as amended. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Eadie and Schreyer

Madam Speaker: Item 14, Sale of City-owned property – Vimy Arena passes. We're moving on to the notice of motion. Before we do that, I would like to call the Deputy Speaker up to the microphone, please. Thank you. Call for a five minute recess. Let's do that. Thank you.

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

Madam Deputy Speaker: For the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Orlikow, would you introduce your notice of motion?

Moved by Councillor Orlikow,
Seconded by Councillor Morantz,

WHEREAS "OurWinnipeg" is Council's Development Plan that sets out long-term plans and policies respecting its purposes including: its physical, social, environmental and economic objectives; sustainable land uses and development; and measures for implementing the plan.

AND WHEREAS "Complete Communities Direction Strategy, a companion document to OurWinnipeg, is based on an urban structure that provides a vision for growth and development of the city;

AND WHEREAS the "OurWinnipeg" document is presently under review and will identify areas of priority growth within the urban structure based on best use and efficient integration of land use, required transportation network, and water and waste requirements;

AND WHEREAS integrated planning recognizes existing land uses, communities and embed community consultations into land use guidelines;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) be directed to report back in 90 days with a process recommendation for Council consideration that addresses the following:

A. That the OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities and the Transportation Master Plan be the tools to ensure infrastructure planning and investment aligns with land use.

B. That prior to inclusion in the five (5) year capital budget, all infrastructure development projects shall demonstrate prioritization and alignment with approved OurWinnipeg priorities.

C. That all projects in the current five (5) capital budget shall be confirmed through the lens established within the current OurWinnipeg plan.

Councillor Orlikow: I made mention of this notice of motion before. I'm more than happy to vote on it today. It's just really, it's directing the CAO, giving him 90 days to really look on how we do our planning, more of our macro-planning. Looking at larger infrastructure projects and how they impact both land use and how they impact transportation. We are a fair bit into a new realm with the OurWinnipeg that's going through right now. OurWinnipeg is actually going to maybe change a few things going forward especially in the regards of where the areas that we feel that the city has the best benefit of growing. That may have an impact both on the water works and it may also have an impact on our transportation modelling. But again, we want our plans to be driven through OurWinnipeg lens which is the four books there rather than it's kind of one plan over here, one plan over here. So putting it under the OurWinnipeg umbrella will allow the…will allow us to focus, and unfortunately our limited resources, in the area that gives us the most bang for our buck back. But again, I look forward to hearing the report back from our CAO in about 90 days.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Are there any other speakers on this item? Seeing none, did you have anything further to add, Councillor Orlikow? I'll call the question then. All those in favour? Any opposed? That's carried. Thank you. Next we have motions. There is Motion 6 which is an automatic referral moved by Councillor Schreyer and Dobson. Oh, sorry, it's a notice of motion, apologies. So that goes to the next Council meeting. Question period…by-laws, sorry. Takes me a minute to get used to this here, by-laws. Councillor Orlikow moves the following by-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
MOTIONS

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
Seconded by Councillor Dobon,

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.*

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

Councillor Orlikow: Okay Madam Chair. I'm still trying to catch up and shake my head a bit. Okay, proceedings. (inaudible) I'm panicking now. No Pagtakhan, that's me. All right, and that's the first by-law, yeah. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time; By-laws No. 2/2018, By-laws No. 3/2018 and By-laws 4/2018.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 2/2018, By-law No. 3/2018, By-law No. 4/2018.

Councillor Orlikow: I move that By-laws No. 2/2018 to 4/2018, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried,

Clerk: By-laws No. 2/2018 to 4/2018, both inclusive.

Councillor Orlikow: I move that the rules be suspended and By-laws No. 2/2018 to 4/2018, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried. Okay, question period for the Chair of PP&D. Councillor Eadie.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I guess I didn't count the minutes properly, but Madam Speaker, the Notice of Motion that just passed. You know, there's already a proper methodology Madam Speaker. In the past when we voted on the Stage 2 Rapid Transit, Mr. Wardrop was smart enough to know that we needed to amend the Transportation Master Plan before we went ahead and started doing a full budget, and so we voted on the proper route Madam Speaker, and so this motion that's moving ahead here, you know, it's interesting in that, you know, we're going to hear about process, but the process is already there as long as you follow it Madam Speaker, and so I'm wondering if Councillor Orlikow does remember that we did do it a proper way when we voted on the Stage 2 Rapid Transit Corridor, and how that might have an effect on land use, da da da da da…change the Transportation Master Plan before we moved ahead and put together a budget. Does he remember that?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: I do remember the process, so thank you very much.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Anything further? And I would note, given the time, we are almost at 6:00 o'clock, we do require a motion to continue and finish up the agenda. So I'm going to call a question on that. All those in favour? Any opposed? I think that's carried. Thank you. Question period, any further questions for Councillor Orlikow? Okay, the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Pagtakhan.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED JANUARY 9, 2018**

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. It's my pleasure to move the report of January 9th, 2018. I'd like to stand down Item No. 4 and move Items 1, 2, 3 and 5.

Madam Speaker: Okay, are there any other items that anyone wishes to stand down? Okay, so then we move Items 1, 2, 3 and 5. Oh, Item 2, okay. So 1, 3 and 5. All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried. Item 2.

Item 2 – Facility Renaming – Rita Richard Recreation Centre

Madam Deputy Speaker: Councillor Pagtakhan, did you wish to introduce the motion?

Councillor Pagtakhan: I'll just wait for Council to respond.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Okay, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Deputy Speaker. I just want to rise…this is actually, well, it's not good news in that Ms Richard has passed away a little over a year or more ago. But I just wanted to let the public know, anybody who's still watching, to know about Rita Richard. Rita Richard grew up in the north Point Douglas area. She was very involved at the community centre. She was involved, Madam Speaker, with lots of recreation services that were being provided to the community, Madam Speaker, back in the days when we used to fund it appropriately. And so in that involvement in her life, she was very involved in the community centre, and then low and behold, she became older, Madam Speaker, and being committed to the community in which she lives and committed to the youth and the people of north Point Douglas and beyond even, she proceeded to work many hours. She ended up running the Norquay Community Centre. And she spent more than, you know, the obligatory eight hours. She actually spent day and night trying to help kids and make sure that they could experience a life of well-being, one in which they were appreciated, one in which they got involved in activities. And so this motion here, there is a, what they call the Beaconsfield Satellite Building. It's over by Beaconsfield whereas Norquay Community Centre is closer to the…to Grandville. And this particular building provides a number of activities for youth, through Graffiti Arts Program, through other programs. They provide recreational type activities for the youth to keep them involved and it's a good place. It's a good place for everybody. It's a good place for your parents they know their kids are going to be having a good experience. And so, it is most appropriate that we rename this Beaconsville Satellite Building to the Rita Richard Recreation Building Centre, can't remember. Anyway, pardon me. So just acknowledging her life's good work and this was inspired by Dennis, her

partner for many years, and he too being very committed to the north Point Douglas and the Norquay Community Centre. So it's with great appreciation that we as Council will pass this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, very much, Councillor Eadie. Did you wish to close Councillor Pagtakhan?

Councillor Pagtakhan: Yes, I just want to thank Councillor Eadie for, you know, for championing this initiative. It's a great story of Ms Rita Richard and you know, to remember her name and the work that she did with her incredible community service. So I want to thank Councillor Eadie and Mr. Richard for coming out to lobby for this.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Okay, I'll call the question. All those in favour? Any opposed? It's carried. Okay, now we go to Item 4.

Item 4 – Smoking on Outdoor Patios

Councillor Pagtakhan: Thank you, very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. I wanted to thank you as the seconder of the motion that came forth to Council this round and to also recognizing all the different speakers that came. Mr. Murray Gibson and of course, you, Madam Deputy Speaker, back in 2003 when we were passing a by-law to ban smoking…indoor smoking. You were the Chair of Protection and Community Services and we went through a couple days of public hearings. It was very long days and we made some great decisions. And it was a very momentous day that day. And so here we are again spearheading this smoking in outdoor patios. What's good about that, Madam Speaker, is that this includes all kinds of personal smoking devices including the provision for cannabis in here. And I've actually been liaising with Mr. Winston Yee and Director of Community Services to ensure that the word 'cannabis' is actually defined within the by-law and that it specifically mentions that product, so that there isn't any confusion with respect to smoking on outdoor patios, that it is fully banned. I really want to acknowledge the work of the department and the incredible community engagement that took place with community groups, stakeholders, both online, social media and telephone surveys as well. And what's interesting Madam Deputy Speaker is that 76% of Winnipeggers who responded support a ban on outdoor patios. We actually built in…the department built in a further provision asking would they support…how did they feel about banning outdoor patio smoke on bars…sort of patios for bars and clubs, and almost 60%...58% of Winnipeggers support a ban on patios for bars and clubs as well. So this by-law that's coming forth on April 1st, 2018, it will come forward to us here in Council before that. And it's also asking for a review after two years, after the implementation of the by-law, Madam Deputy Speaker. And also, this includes an exemption for Indigenous-led ceremonies, so overall, a really good thing. I want to acknowledge the support of Mr. Murray Gibson who was here many years ago and he was here again today to really fight for this cause. And to all the proponents who spoke in favour of the issue.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The hour is late. But I rise...I'm actually not going to be voting for this particular motion because, well, Madam Deputy Speaker, let me speak to some of the issues around here. Just to begin, nobody should start smoking cigarettes. It's not good for you. It's not healthy. Anybody who's already addicted to it knows that they need to quit. Nothing in this particular motion here is going to be the thing that convinces addicted smokers from quitting smoking, let's be clear. I support actually, and totally understand the need for that patio experience for non-smokers to be one where they don't have to be assaulted by other people's cigarette smoke. You're out there, the kind of patios where you're enjoying the outdoors. The scenery is all great. It's the kind of thing you want to do. It's what people appreciate. And that kind of operation is…it's not 365 days a year, Madam Speaker, not. But on the other hand, we have bar patios, some are patios, some are just spaces out in a back lane fenced off for people's safety, but ultimately that's what they are, Madam Speaker. I like to go to the Royal George Hotel in Transcona. A friend of mine owns it, he doesn't smoke. But he's providing a service in a bar where many people, probably the majority are smokers, and there's a patio that they go there, there's no liquor served out there. There's no food served into there. Yeah, can you go out there and have a cigarette and take your beer with you. But there's no waitress going out there serving you beer. There's nobody out there serving you food. It was created so that people wouldn't have to go out and stand around on the front sidewalk, on Regent Avenue, or stand out in the parking lot where people actually could be in danger. If you are leaving your beer inside the hotel, who knows. I don't know if you heard from a young woman, I got a call from and I never really thought about it, but you know, when you are at a bar, and you want to go out for a cigarette, you end up leaving your beer on the table or your drink, whatever you are drinking. When you have a patio where you can take your drink out, you can make sure it's safe. Who knows. We constantly hear about stories where women are sexually abused, treated totally inappropriately. And it does happen. I'm sorry to say, it does. So you know, for that woman, she is concerned about her safety and her security. Now she's going to have to what, go out in the back lane? What's going to happen there if she's the only one out there? Think about that. When we did this study, and yeah, that was a great survey, and I know that it was intentional not to go directly to certain places to find out what people think. But I assert that if you went into these bars, I'm not talking about a restaurant patio operation where food and drink are

part of it. I'm talking about maybe you should have went to the Royal George and maybe the people who don't smoke there could have cared less about those who go out onto the patio and smoke. Because you know what, the reason the people are at the bar, they have great bands at the Royal George Hotel, as an example, great bands. That's why they go, the entertainment, to dance, to socialize. Lots of them smoke though. The ones that don't smoke, they're not going out on the patio in -20. That's not what they're about. That's not what they're doing. So for me, what you are doing now is you're stigmatizing those people. I heard that in regards to people with other addictions. Just think about that. Think about that. Everybody who smokes knows they need to quit. They know that. But they're hooked on it. Now you are thinking to send them outside. And then there's people saying, send them 10 metres away. You know, for me, I just don't...like, we should have found out in the bars because I know on restaurant patios, I agree, people complain. I get it. I don't want to interrupt their experience as a smoker. I don't and I won't. That's fine. But this thing, you know, there should have been consideration given to these bar room patios which are not serving food, that's not their intention. And just so everybody knows, this issue, in terms of Royal Canadian Legions, you know, nobody talked about the precedence that set in Toronto. The legions are exempt in their outdoor patios. They're not exempt from the indoor smoking, that's fine. That's fine. They are exempt. Nobody considered that. There's no discussion about that. So I just leave it. So I am in support of banning smoking on restaurant patios, ones in which people want to experience that beautiful time, you know, in the summer, spring, hopefully into the fall, it's always great if you can get as far as you want. But really, the bar room patio was developed because we have smokers and for example, at the Northern Hotel, you need to be safe. It's dangerous, dangerous. It can be very dangerous around there. So for people to say that they want to expose those cigarette smokers and stigmatize them, make them look like you know, dirty, awful smokers, that doesn't convince somebody to quit smoking. People quit smoking because they're concerned about their health. That's what they do. So I just can't support this motion. I would have supported it if they were looking at some sort of consideration and so, you know, there was no consideration to what they did in Toronto for legions but, you know, it isn't just legions…those are the bar/legion things, whatever. Anyway, I'll just leave it at that. But I can't vote for it for that reason. You are actually stigmatizing people who are addicted to tobacco, making them look like slugs, drains on society. That's what you are doing. Put them outside. Put them outside.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I fully support this. I'll just tell you a little story. First of all, it's only where liquor and food are served, those patios where liquor and food served. So we asked at the committee level, are there other types of patios that aren't…that are out there that aren't liquor and food are served at. They don't believe there are. There could be and they'll address those case by case as they go forward. However, the idea of stigmatizing smokers, and that's what's being raised. Okay, sure. But let me tell you another story about a waiter who has to go out there, even if they're not serving drinks, even if they're not serving food, someone's going to have to go out there to change ashtrays. Someone is going to have to go out there to pick up the beer bottles and everything else left. That's what they have to do. They're not going to leave it out there. Somebody's…some employee is going to be told by their manager to head out there and clean up. Sure, the worker could go, you know what it's too much smoke, it's bad for my health, I don't want to do that. Again, it's not…anybody been in the restaurant business? That's not really an option. You know, yes, sir, that sounds great, then I guess you'll have the Sunday morning brunch shift for the next, ever. So again, you kind of laugh at that. Oh, that's not a big deal. You know, so they go out there at the restaurant, the waiter or the busboy or the busgirl, whoever, it won't be that bad of a deal for them. Well let me tell you, I've been in the restaurant…I was in the restaurant business for about 20 years. I was there in the glory days of smoking when it would be a haze that you couldn't see through. I was in the next glory days when they put up the partition wall and had people smoking on that side but not on that side. I don't know if I ever got to the non-smoking completely. But again, I do, and talking about stigmatized, I worry every day about the damage that I had occurred to me through second-hand smoke. Some of you may not realise that a while back I went to the hospital. And one of the most horrible experiences in my entire life, I thought I was having a heart attack. It was not that, but they also said to me as I was waiting there in the hallway room, oh look at, we actually see some things on your lungs that we would like to have a little more look at. My heart dropped. And all I could say to myself, that restaurant world. That is what happened. That and that second-hand smoke that I was inhaling all that time, there's no way, there's no way that didn't have an impact on me. So when I look at this, sure, I feel bad and hopefully we'll be able to find some place that is safe for people to have a cigarette. But I really…and I did the survey. It was a good survey where I stood up and I said, absolutely no to bars. It's because I worry about those workers. Those workers that have to go through, no choice of their own, but they have to go into that smoke haze to either clean up, to serve, to whatever. So I was very clear when I did the survey that it should be banned for health reasons. Not for the people who are smoking, but for those employees that have to serve or to clean up after them. So again, for all the workers out there, for all the people that are into that environment, we're protecting the worker, the employees that have to go do this. So I do hope that, yes, that we can find some areas where it would be appropriate for people to smoke in a safe environment. But it can't be a place where some employee has to go and clean up after them. So it doesn't matter if you serve booze or if you serve food, if you are going to take your liquor outside or your food outside, and you have to have an ashtray, someone's going to have to clean it up. That's the way it's going to be. So again, for those employees that would be responsible for doing that, I support this motion.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Are there any other speakers who wish to speak? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: I have an amendment that's very simple. I would hope it would be a friendly amendment. It's simply one word. Yeah, but he is talking about the...said. Well in the second one, to make sense of 1A, 1B would say, penal, because the first one says prohibitive use of personal smoking devices on outdoor patios where food and/or beverage services are permitted, therefore, B) penalties for smokers and patio owners/operators if smoking on said outdoor patios takes place. Because the point is Madam Speaker, it says, prohibit the use where food and beverages are served, but then why would you penalize those if it's not prohibited? It's only prohibited where liquor and food is served.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Okay, I'm afraid, that's not our process for making amendments and I don't think that's really materially changing the by-law in terms of the by-law as it's worded.

Councillor Schreyer: I feel obliged to put it up formally then if I may. I just…

Madam Deputy Speaker: I'll just confer with the Clerk's here.

Councillor Schreyer: It makes a difference, ma'am. Otherwise it says that we're penalizing patios where it's not prohibited. It's only prohibited…

Madam Deputy Speaker: If you add the word 'said' or not, you're still talking about patios.

Councillor Eadie: Point of order. This is actually not the by-law. The by-law is to be developed after this report is public.

Madam Deputy Speaker: That is the point I was trying to make, Councillor Schreyer, is that this is not the by-law. This is the motion which spells out our intent. So the wording of the by-law is not going to change if you change that word 'said' in this motion today. And I don't think it really changes anything anyway in terms of what's actually going to happen. So…and you don't have a motion in front of us to vote on at this time so I'm not sure how you wish to proceed.

Councillor Schreyer: That's fine, but may I speak to the motion?

Madam Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Schreyer: Is it my turn? Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. All right, it was the adamant suggestion by Councillor Pagtakhan as well, that I wait until spring when this policy will be developed. However, Madam Speaker, I can see how this could occur again, because it does occur to me, Madam Speaker, that's there's a notable difference. Prohibition and non-prohibition are two different things. Penalties, where there's a penalty or not, are two different things. As well as whether the patio is serving alcohol and or beverage or not is two different things. So to me it's very distinct and very obvious. As it says here, in terms of the intent, as I see it, or the potential interpretation, Madam Speaker…Madam Deputy Speaker, is that as the administration goes along to interpret this, it gives the impression from how I read it, and I'm not reading it incorrectly, maybe open to interpretation, I would suggest that my interpretation is primary, it's very logical, Madam Speaker. It says prohibit the use of personal smoking devices on outdoor patios where food and/or beverage services is permitted. But in B, it says penalties for both smokers and patio owners/operators if smoking on outdoor patios takes place. It doesn't say which outdoor patios, which implies to me all outdoor patios including those that are not specified in the sentence above which says, those where food and/or beverage service is permitted. And on that basis Madam Speaker, I won't be making an amendment, but to me it's very obvious that that if you interpret it correctly, not really open to interpretation, maybe the intent one may understand, except in the fact that it wasn't spelled out properly or written out properly because a word is missing. And on that basis Madam Speaker, you know, I hope therefore that the administration understands from the little conversation that's taken place on this so far, if that is true, Madam Speaker, that the administration could look into this bearing in mind that B is meant to correlate to A and thus the penalties are to correspond to A, where there is prohibition. Otherwise we're having penalties where it's not specified there's prohibition. I don't believe that's the intent and I hope that the administration understands that. B, is penalties regarding A, where there's prohibition. The prohibition is only where food and/or beverage service is permitted. To some might say well, where will there be a patio where food and/or beverage service is not permitted? Well, I don't want to prejudge that, Madam Speaker. The owners are in a position to make that decision for themselves given 1A. And that's fine with me to the extent that we're going to do this. I just wish there's an understanding that there's a huge difference between penalizing somebody for doing something where it's not specified, you know, what that is or where. I know that sounds a little confusing, Madam Speaker, we could completely forego this whole conversation by adding the word 'said', but we'll wait till spring time. I hope that's understood by the administration and by this council. Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much Councillor Schreyer. Is there any further speakers on this? Councillor Pagtakhan, oh, sorry, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The Public Service, for those watching, were directed to conduct a cross jurisdictional review of legislation across major Canadian cities that…with regards to smoking on outdoor patios and bars as well as to engage in public and stakeholder consultation. I want to echo Councillor Pagtakhan's comments. I think public service did a great job. I want to commend Councillor Pagtakhan and members of Council involved in this process at the committee stage and many industry stakeholders who did participate in this. I think the consultation gave us some invaluable information. And the results of both the telephone survey and the online public survey showed that three out of four Winnipeggers support the banning of smoking producing materials and devices on outdoor patios where food and beverages are served. As Councillor Orlikow, very eloquently stated, there are public health risks related to the exposure to second-hand smoke in the workplace. That was the most common reason given for supporting the ban. I had a short stint as a bartender, many years ago, and I just remember coming home from that job and having to put my clothes outside to air out for the night, because of the smoke. Now it wasn't on a patio but I don't think it would be very, you know, too terribly different if it's on an outdoor patio or inside. The cross jurisdictional scan of 10 major Canadian cities indicated all municipal or provincial legislation are both prohibited smoking on restaurants and patio, bar patios, sorry, and based on these findings that the Public Service is recommending that the City ban smoking in the manner described in the administrative report. I fully support it. For me, it's common sense that we catch up to other major Canadian cities and I would urge all members of Council to support this administrative report.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you, very much, Mr. Mayor. Any other speakers on this item? Councillor Pagtakhan. Okay, all those in favour? Any opposed? You wish to be recorded, Councillor Eadie? Anyone else? Councillor Schreyer, you wish to be recorded in opposition? Okay. Okay, now we have no motions, no by-laws, question period for the Chair of Community Service…Protection, Community Services and Parks. Any questions? Seeing none. We now move to the report of Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated January 9th and we have one item, Item 1. Councillor Morantz:

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS DATED JANUARY 9, 2018

Councillor Morantz: I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item 1.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Any objections? All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS MOTIONS

Madam Deputy Speaker: Okay, next we have Motion 4 which I believe is automatic referral so that will be referred back to the standing committee. No…by-laws, we have Councillor Morantz. By-laws? One by-law.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Pagtakhan,
Seconded by Councillor Morantz,

WHEREAS there is a need for more on street parking options in the East Exchange District;

AND WHEREAS on November 14, 2017 the report to Council on the Bannatyne Avenue angled parking pilot reported that the findings to date have shown a positive response;

AND WHEREAS Rupert Avenue from Main Street & Lily Street, and Pacific Avenue from Main Street & Lily Street in the East Exchange District are possible options for back-in-angled parking;

AND WHEREAS relocating the current Winnipeg Transit staging area on Pacific Avenue, from Main Street & Lily Street to Princess Avenue and/or James Avenue in the West Exchange creates an opportunity for back-in-angled parking on Pacific Avenue from Main Street and Lily Street;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service study the feasibility and implications of a back-in-angled parking solution for Rupert Avenue and Pacific Avenue, from Main Street & Lily Street.

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

Councillor Morantz: I'll move that By-law No. 6/2018 be read for a first time.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 6/2018.

Councillor Morantz: I'll move that By-law 6/2018 be read for a second time.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Any contrary? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 6/2018.

Councillor Morantz: I'll move that the rule be suspended and By-law 6/2018 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next, we have the report of…question period, sorry. We don't want to miss that. Any questions for Councillor Morantz? Seeing none, Standing Committee on Finance. And we have report No. 1.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED DECEMBER 7, 2017

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I introduce report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Okay, all those in favour? Any opposed? Carried. Okay, we have no motions, we have no by-laws, question period. Seeing none, we now move to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. There's no report, no motions, no by-laws. Question period for Councillor Mayes. Any questions? Seeing none, we move to the report on Innovation. No report, no motions, no by-laws. Question period. Seeing none, Councillor Eadie moves adjournment. All those in favour? Any opposed? Carried. Thank you…roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 6:27 p.m.