# COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
# Thursday, April 26, 2018

**The Council met at 9:33 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 Eadie.

## ROLL CALL

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

## INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Madam Clerk. I'd like to now recognize our page for today's meeting. Welcome Anna Kozak who attends Oak Park High School and she resides in the Charleswood-Tuxedo Ward. Thank you very much for joining us and for serving Council today. Mr. Mayor, on to you for your morning announcements.

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you, Madam Speaker and good morning to you and to my council colleagues and all those that are here in attendance and are watching the proceedings today. As a nation, Madam Speaker, we are still reeling from two tragedies that occurred this month, which have been tremendously difficult. The Humboldt tragedy has gripped our nation because we are all a person or two away from a family involved in competitive hockey. As a parent, it's an extremely difficult thing to imagine. I am truly heartbroken for those directly involved. And just this week, another tragedy hit Toronto, as a cowardly act took the lives of ten unsuspecting pedestrians at the corner of Yonge Street and Finch Avenue. Canada continues to mourn the loss of life under such tragic circumstances as we continue to try and move forward, it is heartwarming and it's inspiring, Madam Speaker, to see the outpouring of support from coast to coast to coast. And, it is a good reminder of just how close knit our communities and our nation is. With that, I would like to ask for a moment of silence, please.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Please rise for a moment of silence.

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you. Madam Speaker, I was happy to attend the Annual Civic Retirees Luncheon this month. Councillor John Orlikow was an outstanding emcee. Councillor Jeff Browaty was also in attendance where we honoured our civic retirees and recognize their invaluable contributions to public service. The thoughtful, professional, hardworking and compassionate work done by our civic employees contributes to the Winnipeg we all love and we are grateful for the work our retirees contribute towards...as well as the work our current civic employees continue to provide. They're all…they've all been part of the work of making Winnipeg a safer, healthier, more mobile, more beautiful and more prosperous community for us and for our kids. Madam Speaker, earlier this month I was ecstatic to be part of an event which welcomed the world renowned, world class gaming and interactive entertainment company, Ubisoft, to Winnipeg. Ubisoft is truly one of the world's premier gaming and interactive entertainment companies and it is an incredible honour to be part...to be in the position to welcome Ubisoft to Winnipeg's information and communications technology industry. It's great to know that a company like Ubisoft has recognized the potential in Winnipeg that Winnipeggers know all too well, and I'm glad to have been able to be a part of the team that attracted them to Winnipeg. This is a $35 million investment creating 100 jobs, and is an incredibly important vote of confidence in the positive momentum that this council should take great pride in leading in our community. Madam Speaker, continuing with the theme of momentum I'm thrilled with the results as I'm sure all of my council colleagues are, with the results of the Jets first round of the playoffs and the turnout to the Winnipeg whiteout street parties. Winnipeg has been busting with excitement and for the first time in 31 years, the Jets have finally made the second round of the playoffs and showed the nation, in fact, showed all of North America, how passionate our fans are. We are, as of today, Canada's team. And we invite all Canadians to join a Jets nation as we cheer for Canada's team, now in the second round of the NHL playoffs. With the Winnipeg whiteout street parties, Winnipeggers have showed up on masse in white and screamed until there were no voices left to scream with and I can attest to that myself. I'm very excited to see what Canada's team will bring in the second round of the playoffs but one thing is for certain, Winnipeggers will be behind our team every step of the way. Thank you very much Madam Speaker, merci and megwich.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gilroy, your morning announcement.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Each year April marks Sexual Assault Awareness Month in Manitoba. I rise in honour of all the survivors across our city and province with the clear message; sexual assault is never caused by what a person is wearing, are where they were or how they knew the offender or how much they had to drink. The onus of sexual assault is always on the perpetrator. We know that Winnipeg and Manitoba has one of the highest rates of sexual assaults in Canada. We also know that sexual assault is one of the most under-reported crimes in the country. We know that reporting to police can be intimidating process. And working to change this and better to support survivors, the Winnipeg Police Services and RCMP recently announced the introduction of third-party reporting. This tool allows survivors of sexual assault to anonymously report their experience to community agencies here in Winnipeg; Klinic Community Health Centre, Ka Ni Kanichihk and Sage House. Rural agencies are also being trained. These agencies can then pass along the anonymous report to the police. This will assist police services across the city and province in identifying perpetrators or trends that may have otherwise have gone unreported. Most importantly, this has put choice back in the hands of survivors while they receive the critical support they need and deserve. As co-chair of the Winnipeg Safe City's Initiative, I commend these strong partnerships and the clear recognition that we as a community need to do better. Today, the Winnipeg sign will be lit in purple in recognition of sexual assault awareness month. Let us continue to work together to change attitudes, raise awareness and support survivors and build healthier communities that are safe for everyone. Thank you

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Mayes, your morning remarks.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will try to be brief, two youth-related items in my capacity as School Board Liaison and Liaison for Youth Opportunities. Number one, as people may have seen in today's media, it's the launch of the second year of the Youth United Program. This is a program City of Winnipeg funds and it's delivered by U of Winnipeg out of its new Merchant's Corner Campus which Councillor Eadie has been a supporter of. Merchant's Corner Campus up on Selkirk Avenue. Really, the…I don't need to say too much other than what's in the headline on the story is putting reconciliation into action and giving suburban youth a chance to experience...well, to work with the youth from the North End. It's...as the article says, it's a unique project for Canada. It's being delivered part of our partnership with the U of Winnipeg. I'm very proud to have been part of that. The Mayor and I were at the launch last year and this is year two of the two-year pilot project. And I think it's been a success thus far and you will see 20 young people out in the community this year working at various agencies; Graffiti Gallery to John Howard Society, to Spence Neighbourhood Association. And the fifth day of the week they are in class, studying the calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission so it really is about studying and experiencing firsthand reconciliation. As I have said here before, I have published on this, I've been talking about this, I ran on this, dating all the way back to 1991, and I want to thank the Mayor. It was the second year of his term that we actually managed to make this a reality and get the funding. So I'm mentioned in the article which is very generous but I want to go out of my way to thank the Mayor because I don't think this would be happening without his support for this reconciliation initiative. The second item I just want to speak to, it's taken two years, but some very good work with the Josh Watt, Executive Director at the Manitoba School Board's Association and the Canadian Mental Health Association. We, the city, are going to be, through my office are funding a new award for a youth. The School Board Association has a number of awards. They didn't have anything related to mental health. This will be an award...annual award for schools or students or teachers, people in the education system who are doing something to increase awareness of mental health issues to continue that dialogue. There will be one for the school boards outside of Winnipeg, one for school boards inside Winnipeg. I'm very proud that we were able to do that. It's named for a former classmate of mine who I grew up with, who had some mental health challenges who took his own life. I feel I'm lucky enough to be with you fine people here today while my old friend is no longer with us. So it's something I very much wanted to do to mark mental health issues and I'm very proud that we are able to work with the school boards to make the Mark Dykoff Memorial Award a reality. So I'm very pleased that we've got that committed to and look forward to handing that out sometime later this year. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. We now have a leave of absence motion before us; moved by Councillor Browaty, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. Madam Clerk, would you read it into the record, please.

## MOTIONS

**Moved by Councillor Browaty,**
**Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,**

*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 Dobson moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on March 22nd, 2018, be taken as read and confirmed.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now move into delegations, if I could call up Mr. Chris Lorenc. He is the President of the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association. He is in opposition to Item 4 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated April 17th, 2018. It's regarding the "Buy Local" Procurement Procedure. Following that, we'll hear from Mr. Mark Badger, if you could please come forward and join us on the bench here. Welcome, Mr. Lorenc, wonderful to see you.

**DELEGATIONS**

**Chris Lorenc:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Mr. Mayor, members of Council, I'm pleased to be here to speak to the clause. Excuse me. Before I start, I wanted to express industry thanks and appreciation to the Mayor and in particular Councillors Morantz and Gillingham for expediting the flow of work. It's out much earlier this year. It's very much appreciated. We also appreciate that the City has followed-up and released its Status of Infrastructure Report and Capital Asset Management Plan. We think there is a jurisdiction not far from this address that should follow the City's lead. We're also happy to have consistently supported the City's ask for an allocation of funds from the New Building Canada Fund for regional streets, and we certainly hope that the announcement with dollars is forthcoming soon. And on a personal note, I wanted to thank Councillor Gerbasi for your years of service. It's a very impressive legacy of public service that you are leaving and you are a role model for many to follow. So thank you. With respect to the item that I am appearing upon on this morning, it is with respect to "Buy Local" Procurement and I'm happy to say that I'm not here this morning to speak to the merits of what is proposed. There has been some discussion that has occurred since notice of this motion was released, the morning, I believe, of April 17th. I have seen a resolution which amends what is before you in the agenda to refer the matter to the public service to include consultation with industries and stakeholders, some of which are identified not as an all-inclusive list for the purposes of considering the policy. Now, I understand that there has been some considerable attention and pressure applied with respect to the language of that referral. I am assured, I am advised, I rely upon the assurances that the language of the referral is broad enough so that when the stakeholders are assembled, the opportunity exists to consider the merits of the proposal, in addition to any options which may flow from the consideration of those merits. The language in the referral is not as explicit as that, but I am advised that that is the intention and the spirit behind the amendment. And I accept that that is the intention and purpose and know that that will be the discussions that, once convened, will consider as well. So, you are aware that when the policy was tabled for consideration, our association, which first learned of that through comments that have been made publicly, communicated with all members of Council, it's interesting that in this particular set of circumstance, the policy that you are being asked to adopt was not appended so we really don't know what that policy might look like. You have all received communication from the Manitoba Employers Council, which represents some 24,000 employers in this city that have expressed concern and have asked this council to refer the matter for consideration. You have received communication from the Manitoba Business Council, which represents the largest employers across this province who have asked you to refer this matter for consideration. You have received a letter for Merit Contractors Association asking you the same. I think in the weight of and in the face of that kind of reaction from the community, that the policy is intended to benefit, you would do well to heed its advice and ensure that the spirit and intent of the referral motion is as has been explained to me, which is wide open. You will have the opportunity to consider the options and the merits and come back to Council with a series of recommendations flowing from that consultation with a policy that you will be able to read, digest, consider, and then decide upon. So a little bit of a different presentation than I had anticipated when I registered. I do wish to thank the Mayor for being open to the referral and I do thank the authors of the referral for clarifying for me that it is a wide open discussion for the purposes of considering the merits and the options. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Lorenc. We do...we will take any questions for the delegation at this time. Are there any questions for Mr. Lorenc? Seeing none, appreciate your presence at Council today.

**Chris Lorenc:** Thank you very much and good morning.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next we'll hear from Mr. Mark Badger, is he here today? Welcome. Mr. Badger is the Executive Vice-President of Canada Fibres Limited. He is in support of Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. The report dated April 16th, 2018 and it's regarding the award of contract for processing and marketing of recyclable materials. Mr. Badger, just before you begin, do you know the rules of engagement around the fact that you are only speaking to the RFP?

**Mark Badger:** I do.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Thank you. Proceed.

**Mark Badger:** Well, thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council members, on behalf of all of us at Canada Fibres. We sincerely appreciate your consideration here this morning. During this very, very brief deputation here, we'll attempt to let you get to know us a little bit better and we'll also attempt to articulate the reasons why we believe that we can provide an unparalleled response to your very well delineated request for proposals. First, a brief snapshot of our corporate evolution. Canada Fibres was born in 1990. It was born as a buyer and seller of recycled paper. In 1998 we went on to commence our first material recovery facility operation and today, we have 14 material recovery facilities serving 16 municipalities. We own seven of those 14 material recovery facilities and we like to believe that we invest very, very heavily in the advancement of technologies within those facilities to adapt to ever changing packaging and market requirements. At one of our MRFs, we are recognized as being one of the largest in North America and the most technologically advanced.

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Badger, I would just like to remind you, you are speaking to the value of your company and not the criteria in the RFP. Would you like to continue and speak to the criteria in the RFP as posted?

**Mark Badger:** So…yeah, allow me to cut right to the chase then. Winnipeg's RFP made it clear that proponents must base their proposals on meeting end market specifications which was very sound, particularly in light of changing markets. There's been abundant conjecture about the impact of China's program National Sort and previous forums so allow us to focus here today on the relevant facts, just the facts. As you may know, Council members, China curbed the import of contaminated, recovered or recycled materials in mid-2017, later 2017 and that sent many municipalities into a tizzy about the materials that they were recycling because of China's enormous purchasing power. What's relevant in this particular situation, so that we don't get caught up in the tizzy are three things. Number one, we proposed a system for Winnipeg that is advanced in terms of its capabilities to deliver leading purity levels. That's a bold statement for us to make but it's a statement that we are comfortable with because the technology that we are proposing is technology that we successfully use in other facilities within our group, to produce those purity levels. That's number one. Number two, what's relevant in this situation is that we noted in our RFP that we have secured a domestic customer for Winnipeg's paper. You may know that paper is one of the largest recovered materials for your city. And so we have a domestic market for the paper materials and are not subject to changing international markets for that particular commodity. As you may appreciate, we've got 28 years in the business, 28 years in the business with many end markets for all types of materials in our proposal. We've included a letter from the folks intending to buy our paper, as well as many of our other end market customers across the world. It's our belief that Winnipeg is pursuing a new approach to recycling at a perfect, perfect point in time, because of end-markets pursuit of increasing purity. We believe that your timing really couldn't be better. This is precisely the period of time where municipalities need to be pursuing the advancement of their MRF technologically and also in terms of the workforce practices that they pursue. It's not all about the equipment. While technology and equipment is important in a material recovery facility, more important than that are the employees, the training of those employees, the engagement of those employees and continuous improvement programs and the offering of opportunities for career advancement. We're all about that at Canada Fibres and given the opportunity, we'll certainly be all about that here in Winnipeg. As you may appreciate, we work hard to provide very attractive compensation. We intend to do that here in Winnipeg. We intend to do that because we have to recruit, maintain and motivate the workforce that nothing is more important than that. We intend to do it here in Winnipeg. Finally, your RFP called for commissioning within 16 months. That's a tight period of time. That's a tight period of time, but this is not new ground for us. We are confident, we are confident that we can commission within 16 months. We have, as I said during the outset, done six design build operate projects, one of them is a very large one, it's four times the size of what's intended here for Winnipeg. We commissioned it in 22 months. Some of the same people that worked on that will be supporting local, local management in terms of the commissioning of this project. As you may appreciate, we've already begun recruiting for local people to help us with this project, and we're certainly well along in terms of the important bits and pieces to get ready for commissioning, should we be awarded the project. I'll just say in conclusion on this particular subject, we're really looking forward to working with the City of Winnipeg on the aspects of commissioning. Allow me to summarize, allow us to summarize, some of the things that we have come to understand through staff presentations at previous public forums. Canada Fibres provided a bid, a bid that we believe will result…

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Badger, back to the RFP, please. This is not the time to hear about your bid.

**Mark Badger:** It's not the time to hear about…

**Madam Speaker:** You were getting into your bid. That's how I heard it. So back to the speaking to the criteria of the RFP, please.

**Mark Badger:** Okay, okay, thank you. So, the RFP requested information that allowed Winnipeg to assess the technical capabilities of the proponent. As we understand it, we scored highest on that dimension. The RFP called for proponents to delineate how much the services that they would provide would cost. As we understand it, we provided pricing that would allow Winnipeg to save millions of dollars. The bid called for technologies and approaches to labour that would allow us to...would allow Winnipeg to have materials that would meet end-market specifications. We believe our bid did just that. The RFP called for references, called for references from other municipalities and end-markets. We believe our bid was solidly backed by references from other municipalities and end-markets. The RFP called for a MRF, being a material recovery facility that would be flexible enough to respond to changing trends with respect to materials and changing end-market conditions. We believe we have done that. We've made a proposal based upon systems and approaches to labour that work for us in other situations. Allow me to close by simply saying, we look forward to the opportunity to serve the Winnipeg we very much respect your democratic process and we very much appreciate the opportunity to address you here today. And sorry for straying from what I should have.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Are there any questions for our delegation, for Mr. Badger? Councillor Schreyer, again, your opportunity to speak to...ask any questions regarding the RFP.

**Councillor Schreyer:** You will have to rule on this, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure exactly how we want to define the relationship between the topic and my question. Having said that, Madam Speaker, my concern is when it comes down to it, in Toronto, it's understood that Canada Fibre paid minimum wage. What will be the difference here to seek or assure that that won't be the case here as better wages have been established here over the past few years.

**Madam Speaker:** That's not an appropriate question Councillor Schreyer. Do you have any questions that deal specifically with the criteria in the RFP? Okay. Seeing none, then we will move on. Thank you for your presence here today. I'll now call Mr. Gord Delbridge. I'm not sure if he is here today or if he has a representative that would like to come forward? No, okay. So Mr. Delbridge was registered but we'll move on from that. I do not see him. I'll now call forward Ms Paulina Leung, Vice-President, Corporate Strategy and Business Development with Emterra Environmental. Ms Leung is in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment, the report dated April 16th, 2018 regarding the award of contract for processing and marketing of recyclable materials. Welcome. The Clerk, yeah. Welcome and we'll have five minutes on the clock for you.

**Paulina Leung:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And please remind me if I…

**Councillor Eadie:** Point of order, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Yes.

**Councillor Eadie:** She is in opposition. Does she not get ten minutes? The previous speaker was in favour.

**Madam Speaker:** Yeah, she wasn't registered as the first speaker in opposition. Mr. Delbridge was scheduled for ten minutes. Just a moment.

**Councillor Eadie:** I move to suspend the rules as Mr. Delbridge is not here to speak, to allow this speaker ten minutes.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Ms Leung, are you interested in having more than five minutes for your presentation?

**Paulina Leung:** Yes, thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Councillor Eadie, you will suspend the rules then?

**Councillor Eadie:** I would like to suspend the rules to allow as the first registered responders.

**Madam Speaker:** Right, okay. So...

**Councillor Mayes:** Are questions allowed then as they would have been with Mr. Delbridge?

**Madam Speaker:** Yes, questions are allowed. So Councillor Eadie has moved ten minutes to hear the presentation from Ms Leung. All in favour? Contrary. Carried.

**Paulina Leung:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And please remind me if I stray from the criteria of the RFP. So hopefully you will get the few slides that I have shared with you today and you will notice that some of the information, the slide

deck looks a little bit different but I am not providing new information, I'm here to talk about the criteria of the RFP. So the two areas of the RFP criteria to bring your attention to is curbside contamination, impurity standards and this is related to ultimately the most important thing that we are all here is, taxpayer and taxpayer accountability. So the first issue is curbside contamination. And this is defined as really, well, how dirty are the things in your cart? The other RFP criteria is purity standards and that's what the end markets expect to get when they buy the commodities from a supplier like the City of Winnipeg. So the contractor's job under this RFP is to close that gap, is to take materials that are from the curb, regardless of how contaminated they are, and process it to a standard that end markets will buy. So going to slide number three; so RFP criteria number one; curb side contamination. Irrefutable, the RFP says, on average, the contamination is 14 percent. As the contractor, and we do have two sources of information, one of which is included in the package, shows that contamination in the carts ranges from 19.4 percent to 26.6 percent. So a simple average is 23 percent. My second source of information is the audits that are done every day in our MRF. And we don't do these audits, the department staff does these audits. They are done 16 to 17 times a month. A truck is randomly selected and it's put through the same process to ensure consistency and reliability of the information. Through those audits in 2017, they range from 16.1 percent contamination to 36 percent contamination and on average, that's about 25.5 percent. And the data is the data. Now, I can't fake the numbers. The numbers don't even come from us. What I urge is if you would like to see that information, it's a spreadsheet. I'm sure the department can provide that to you. And I have to remind us all, we are not saying that residents are doing a bad job sorting, it's simply because end market conditions are changing and those conditions tell us, something that was recyclable or acceptable yesterday, may not be today nor tomorrow. So going to the next slide, four; so what does that mean in terms of this RFP criteria? Well, E92.1 allows for the City to address contamination up to a certain level. There is a cap. So if we look at that cap, in 2017 there were ten months in which contamination was over 14 percent and also over 20 percent. That means the cap was exceeded ten times. And from the way we read the RFP and the criteria for contamination that means it's…that level of contamination is outside of the provisions of the RFP. And that's disconcerting because that's an unknown. It's an unknown cost. What is the cost going to be when that cap is exceeded ten times out of the year? So RFP criteria number two, slide five; I like this slide because it's so intuitive. If you were to ask yourself, did you put any of those things in your blue cart over the last month? You just contaminated your blue cart. Things like mayonnaise jar that has mayonnaise in it, peanut butter jar that has peanut butter in it, you know your sushi tray that's black on the bottom, black plastics, did you know that's actually not acceptable? And even the department said that in an interview with one of the local media last week. And the City of Toronto has been very adamant in trying to educate residents that that's not recyclable. But when you take a look at the audit data that we have, that's actually counted as recyclable. And I think that's why there is a misunderstanding between, you know, what we're seeing as a contamination level and what was presented as an RFP criteria. Other examples, I think we would all say dirt, floor sweepings, if some were to ask you, is that recyclable? I think we would all say no, that's not recyclable. But that's another classification issue where, you know, we don't consider that to be recyclable but in the data is considered as a recyclable. So going to the next slide, purity is really important because it goes to the RFP criteria of end market specifications. And China certainly sets the mark on what the end-market is because they are the biggest buyer, they're a market maker and everybody follows. And quite frankly, we'd all have to be under a rock if we haven't heard of China National Sort. So I'm not going to spend too much time on this. So going to the next slide, why is purity important? It's important because the purity level now is pretty much Dove soap pure. It can only be 0.5 contamination in that final product. China consumes 70 percent of the world's recyclables. Seventy percent of the city's recyclables used to be sold to China. That revenue equates to about $4 million a year in revenue for the city. Quite frankly, purity is a big deal. Your end market is a big deal. That means cities across Canada are spending more and more on processing. Region appeal, City of Toronto, City of Montreal, the precedence has been set. So using that scale, what is the tax increase that's going to be put through if these RFP criterias are going to be breached?

**Councillor Gillingham:** Madam Speaker, is this specific to the RFP? It seems…the speaker seems to have strayed somewhat.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Again, a reminder to speak to the criteria in the RFP or we'll have to cut these delegations short. Thank you.

**Paulina Leung:** So going to the next slide then this refers specifically to RFPs. At the last couple of committees, it was said that no less than three times quality is specified. I went back and counted, it's actually seven times and each of those seven times, it refers to a guideline of two percent. Bidders are directed to process materials to a two percent contamination. So it's going to be...the plant is designed for two percent and if that spec changes after the contract is awarded, the contractor has every right to go back and negotiate something different because a spec is ultimately different after award. We have been on contracts every single week and during this time municipalities are not advising what spec to be processed. They are telling bidders to let them know because there is so much risk right now and so much change. The standard now for RFPs of this type is to have the bidders tell you what is the quality that you're going to meet that allows you then as the municipality to hold the contractor accountable for what they promised they would do. So going to the next slide, nine; this is the clause in the RFP, E10.1 and it provides a contractor, rightly, to ask for more money when the work…scope of work changes. And I do not disagree that the contractor has to process the

materials to whatever the end market spec is. That is the work. But there is a cost to that work. And this clause allows the contractor to do that work and to also ask for more money and rightfully so. So finally slide ten. This is the only slide that I didn't change over the last few weeks. We still believe that the RFP should be reviewed, cancelled and reissued to reflect what's happened now. The RFP was written 24 months ago. Many things have changed. And finally, I'd like to thank Council for allowing me to present to you over the last few weeks. Now, this is a democratic process that we are very, you know, thankful to be a part of and as part of the democratic process, you know, everything is also on the public record. I am confident in what I'm saying and you can go back in time, in the future when things do change, and listen to the public record and we can be here and discuss the RFP again. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank You, Ms Leung. Are there any Questions? Councillor Eadie Followed By Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank You, Madam Speaker. Through you to the delegation, my question is related to the...in the RFP, the dollar value, I believe, was given a 50 percent weight for the overall decision on which bid to accept, Madam Speaker. And my question is, how is that given that the finance part is given a 50 percent weight? What effect does that have in regard to the number of issues you brought up in regards to processing and so on?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank You, Councillor Eadie. Ms Leung. Would you like him to restate?

**Paulina Leung:** Sorry. Could you repeat that question, Councillor Eadie?

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, in the RFP there is a whole bunch of things but ultimately, weight is given, I believe it's 50 percent to the actual dollar value of the bid. My question is, given that there is a 50 percent weight to the dollar value, what effect does that have in regards to the other RFP items which were given less of a weight, for example the purity and so on and processing?

**Paulina Leung:** Through you, Madam Speaker. There wasn't a specific weighting on meeting purity...sorry, I should back that up. There wasn't a specific score to meeting purity but it said in general, very broad terms, meet the end-market spec, meet what the RFP says and the RFP kept referring back to a two percent spec. So it's indirectly telling bidders that purity is related to the preferred guideline in the RFP which directs two percent.

**Madam Speaker:** Any further question, Councillor Eadie? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes followed by Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you. We have heard a number of versions of this presentation now. As to the RFP, you have indicated concern about the taxpayers. Can you clarify that the bid put forward by Emterra was not a low dollar bid in this process under the RFP?

**Paulina Leung:** Through you Madam Speaker, correct. If you're to look at just the processing fee, yes it's not the cheapest but there's two parts to these types of contracts which is very different than a typical construction contract. Typical construction contracts, you pay a price for the service or for the product. For this type of contract, there's also a back end. There is also the revenue the City gets back for the recycling. So it's very important that when you take a look at cost, you take a look at both parts, the plus which is the revenue which is a function of how well the contractor does, the end market specifications they meet, the price they get paid, as well as the cost for providing the service. So when you net those two things, that is the true cost. And, refer back to Councillor Eadie's question, the financial evaluation only measured one part. It measured just the cost of providing the service not the net cost of the program.

**Madam Speaker:** Second question, Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** So the answer was no, it wasn't a low bid for taxpayers. Second question is related to that, you indicate revenue, there is no change in format with the revenues, your firm has been doing this work for the City for a number of years. I'll ask you the same question I asked you at EPC, hopefully we'll get the same answer, there has been no change in how the revenue is distributed under the RFP as compared to what you have been doing the last number of years, is that correct?

**Paulina Leung:** Through you, Madam Speaker. Am I allowed to speak about another contract, actually?

**Madam Speaker:** You need to answer the question that's put forward and if you are not sure we can move on.

**Paulina Leung:** I think the question is asking me to compare revenue share formulas of the current contract and I don't think that's part of the RFP criteria that I'm here to talk about.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Mayes, anything further? No. Councillor Lukes on to you for your questions.

**Councillor Lukes:** Thank you. Thank you, Ms Leung. I just have a question of clarification here. In your slide three, you are saying data from the audit departments average 25 percent. Yet, the City of Winnipeg department…Water and Waste Department said it's been 13 percent, it hovers around 13 percent. Thirteen percent is the 2017 rate and they indicate they don't have any reports that they could share on contamination. So I guess the question is, where did you get this rate again, that you average it at 25 percent? And I think you said you share...you have reports that can be accessed on the contamination rate.

**Paulina Leung:** Through you, Madam Speaker, so that slide refers to two sets of data. The first one is from the Beverage Recycling Association. So that's a 2017 report that's provided to the City, so I'm sure that the department has access to that. The second set of data, those spreadsheets are created by City staff who come to our plant and they do audits every single day and that's the source information that I'm using. So as I said before, the numbers are the numbers. Unless I hit, you know, a cell wrong or added a wrong cell but I would have, you know, have to have done a very blatant typo. So I hope I answered that question.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Lukes, anything further? Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is it the understanding of Ms Leung that the matrix weighting of the RFP criteria changed with two weeks left before the bid, due to the volatility of the market, the global market at the very time of the RFP or the months leading up to it?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Ms. Leung.

**Paulina Leung:** Through you, Madam Speaker. So, I was wrong in the RFP clause, the addendum foreclosing date and that was a topic of discussion through the last few committee meetings. So Councillor Mayes, I admit that I was wrong on that day but also, I contend that you were wrong on that day. Addendum four actually closed on January the 12th and the question period ended on January the 11th. So given the order of that, I can't assume that the criteria...the changes in addendum four had to reflect changes in the market criteria because there is no way us bidders could have responded since the closing period ended the day before that addendum came out. So did I…?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question, Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Madam Speaker, is she saying that the criteria changed after the bidding was completed?

**Madam Speaker:** Ms Leung.

**Paulina Leung:** Through you, Madam Speaker, there could...the criteria in addendum four changed after the question period for bidders closed the day before.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Final question, Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Given the clauses that Ms Leung brought us here, slide nine, number two, purity standards, due to...do we know that the winning bid will be the lowest cost company? I don't see that given clause nine, it may not be the case with Ms Leung. I would like to expand on slide nine, whether in fact the winning bid would be the lowest cost company.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, Ms Leung.

**Paulina Leung:** Through you, Madam Speaker, I am obviously not privy to the actual prices bid, but the department is very competent to say the price on the price sheet was the lowest. But as I had said before, a contract of this nature has two financial elements; the cost of the service and also the revenues that will be generated. And we're supposed to maximize that revenue. That is our job. But E10.1 says, "In the maximization of revenue for the City, you can come back to the City and ask for more money if your buyer of your commodity changes those specifications."

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes, onto you.

**Councillor Mayes:** Point of clarification arising out of Councillor Schreyer's question. You will remember…can you confirm that the evidence that was given by City staff at EPC, when asked about the change in weighting, they indicated that the change...the weighting was changed in the RFP, however, it had no impact on the actual winning bid. Had the weighting stayed the same it's a moot point. Had the weighting stayed the same, the winning bid still would have been Canada Fibres. You were in the room, you heard that evidence, I believe at EPC. Can you confirm that that's the

evidence from the City staff that the change in the weighting of the criteria in the RFP had no impact on the ultimate winning…selection of the winning bid?

**Paulina Leung:** Through you, Madam Speaker, yes that is what was said, but the evaluation criteria does not require the proponents to meet...it requires the proponent to meet a spec that has more contaminants in it. Seven times in the RFP, it directs respondents to look at the two percent contamination.

**Madam Speaker:** Second question, Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** The figure used at Water and Waste by this spokeswoman for Emterra was 21 percent. I remember this because we had made clear that 13 plus eight is 21, that number seems to have vanished to be replaced by a higher asserted number now for the alleged contamination of 25 percent. Can you explain what happened to your figure of the 21 percent?

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

**Paulina Leung:** Through you, Madam Speaker, Councillor Mayes, I…my math is bad that time. And if I said 21 percent, well, then I actually made the picture seem rosier. Because when you look at this data...

**Madam Speaker:** Ms Leung, again, your comments will come through the Chair, not directly to Councillor Mayes.

**Paulina Leung:** Oh, sorry. As I said, the information is the information. Feel free to check the sources out. One of the sources of information of the report is provided in the package that I handed out.

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor, you have a question?

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you. Thanks very much for your presentation today. I'm just wondering in the interest of openness and transparency if you can disclose which members of Council your representatives from Emterra have communicated with regarding this matter.

**Madam Speaker:** Unfortunately, I can't take that question. The questions have to be specific to the RFP criteria. Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Schreyer was on the list. However, you have not spoken. Councillor Allard, go ahead. Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Yes. I wanted to know if any lobbying has been done on the RFP process, with any members of Council.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, that again, I'm getting a nod from the Clerk that is not an appropriate question. The questions will be directed specifically to the criteria of the RFP at this time. Seeing no further questions, Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Being one that was not lobbied by Emterra, but received my information of while in the standing committee...well, sitting in the standing committee that's where I received my information, by those on all sides of this, I wanted to ask the question in regards to Councillor Mayes' questioning regarding the idea that the...

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer, that ends our question period at this time. Thank you. Thank you for your presentation today. Next, I will call forward Mr. Barb Tomasi. I think there's...is that Ms Barb Tomasi? Okay. She is in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. The report dated April 6th, 2018 regarding Criteria and Weighting for the Eastern Corridor Study. We'll put ten minutes on the clock. Thank you, Ms Tomasi. That's ten minutes on the clock for you. Welcome.

**Barb Tomasi:** Good morning. Madam Speaker, I'll gladly receive your direction. This is the first time I have done anything like this. May I take a moment to comment on Councillor Mayes' two items this morning? My condolences regarding your good friend that passed. On the Truth and Reconciliation item, may I ask, you noted the North End. Is that where the...

**Madam Speaker:** Ms Tomasi, I appreciate that, we need to get into your item. This is not an opportunity to ask questions of council members so if we can move on to your item. Thank you.

**Barb Tomasi:** I am against the recommendation of receiving the Eastern Corridor Study. I'd like to note though, my highest regard for Winnipeg Transit and my admiration for my Councillor Eadie's use of transit. I highly encourage all councillors to get to know transit. Now, the reason I'm against or at least delaying the Eastern Corridor Study, I think the

higher priority at this time is safety and the social equity of the North End. I encourage access to post-secondary education and also promoting our children in the North End getting schooling to enable them to go to post-secondary education so...

**Councillor Morantz:** Madam Speaker, greatest respect and I appreciate it's your first time here. As I understand it when someone is in delegation they need to speak to the details of the report. This report is all about the weighting criteria of public services decided to use in assessing different options for rights-of-way within the eastern...potential eastern corridor. So I just would mention that.

**Madam Speaker:** Are you familiar with the report?

**Barb Tomasi:** Yes.

**Madam Speaker:** Have you read it? So it's being recommended to be received as information today. Do you have anything specific to say regarding the report that you read?

**Barb Tomasi:** Can I say what I sort of think is askew in the report? Yes. I'm noting that social equity is the fifth of six criteria. May I show what my one, two, three, four, five, six would be?

**Madam Speaker:** Yes.

**Barb Tomasi:** Okay. I'm going to say that the environmental impact is a given. So I don't even give it a number. I'm going to decrease six to five. Number one…number one would be social equity. I think Transcona is very well off. Everything in that neighbourhood, example their housing, is at a lower price than let's say Tuxedo and yet they get a good bang for their buck. I'm not worried about Transcona. Fort Rouge and Fort Garry are the first rapid transit system I believe. You know what, a lovely neighbourhood. And I love that rapid transit going through that neighbourhood. I mean, the walkway's there, I walk there. I go to the Bridge Drive-In. No problem. Number two, I would say, city building. Help the North End be part of the city and in a good way. Number three, performance. I have a number 15 bus, so that goes down Mountain. Another bus goes down Selkirk. There is at least ten streets between those two major avenues. There is no bus there. The number 97 is lovely thanks to you who rerouted it to include a child welfare office on Jarvis. So again, another example of transit being great. There is also an 88 by where Alecia's used to be, but that means there is no bus from Mountain down to Leila. So what happens at Inkster? And that's probably 20 streets between Mountain and Leila. Transcona on the other hand has a 44, a 47, a 43, a 45. If you need to get to downtown to work, you can be downtown in 20 minutes and not wait. And my...I believe I'm at the third; so social equity, city building, third would be performance. I sometimes can finish a whole cup of coffee waiting for a bus. If you miss one, you are waiting 25 minutes. At rush hour, which is usually around 7:30 in the morning, you might wait 12. Waiting 25 minutes in negative 40° temperatures, not fun. I can only run so fast after a bus. So that's one, two, three, number four, connectivity. That 15, it ain't connecting with much. It's a lovely bus. It goes from the North End all the way to the airport, but again, if you miss one in the North End, your chances of connecting to a second bus downtown again entails a wait. And my fifth thing would be cost. If you do it well, pay a little more on the front end, you reap the benefits at the end. So I think that's everything for me.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Ms Tomasi. Are there any questions for our delegation? Okay, seeing none, Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know it's difficult to try to keep within the parameters of how one perceives the specific theme of a motion to which one is to speak. However, sometimes people are motivated by the general priorities and how it applies. In this case, Madam Speaker, I simply want to ask the question because it seems like Barb Tomasi is alluding to this throughout the whole time. When we look at the criteria of these things and how it applies to the reality of our transit system, would Barb Tomasi consider the idea that more buses would be favourable to a specific bus corridor?

**Barb Tomasi:** I think that would be a secondary issue for me. The first issue would be the buses are fine as they are. Safety is my priority. I have noted that the area between Selkirk Avenue when I'm travelling either on a 15, 16 or 18, the area from Selkirk Avenue and Mountain going through to downtown, extremely dangerous as a passenger. I would really like for there to be walk through security people or transit police like they have in New York City, to come and walk on the buses to make sure that all passengers are safe. So to speak to more buses, you know what, we've got a very good GPS system on the buses. I think buses should be able to speak to each other so that if one bus has ten people on it that want to connect to let's say 33, once that 15 gets to McPhillips, why can't that GPS system send a message to that driver, hold it Mr., we've got ten people two seconds away. Don't rush. I don't think we need more buses, we just need to optimize our service.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you Ms Tomasi. Councillor Schreyer, second question.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Is Ms. Tomasi aware that at least a couple of years ago, Council passed a motion brought forth by Councillor Allard, to allow for, I believe by Councillor Allard, to allow for plain-clothed police officers to be part of the...

**Barb Tomasi:** If they are they haven't helped me and I have had a few very serious incidents there. If they were on the bus, I have to reprimand them for not assisting me because I make myself quite obvious when I am in distress.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer, again, questions that are relevant to this item, please.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Well, it's relevant certain to what she is talking about. I understand what you are saying, Madam Speaker, I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. That concludes our questions. Ms Tomasi, thank you for your presence and you have some specific questions for Councillor Mayes, feel free to connect with him offline. Thank you. Okay, that concludes our delegations for today. Mr. Mayor on to the Executive Policy Committee, the report dated April 11th, 2018.

**REPORT OF THE**
**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**DATED APRIL 11, 2018**

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 and 2.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated April 17th, 2018.

**REPORT OF THE**
**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**DATED APRIL 17, 2018**

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 5, however, I would like to pull Item 4.

**Madam Speaker:** Right, we'll pull Item 4. There is an amending motion. I'll call the question on Items 1 through 3 and Item 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, Item 4.

**Item 4 – "Buy Local" Procurement Procedure**

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor to introduce the item and the amending Motion No. 1.

**Motion No. 1**
**Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,**
**Seconded by Councillor Gillingham,**

*WHEREAS City Council is considering a report by the Executive Policy Committee directing the Public Service to develop a buy local procurement procedure for City contracts valued at less than $100,000.00;*

*AND WHEREAS a buy local procurement procedure is one of several initiatives that the City of Winnipeg could consider to support the efforts of its local businesses to better participate in the City's procurement processes;*

*And WHEREAS various external stakeholder groups have indicated interest in working with the City to develop the buy local procurement procedure as well as suggest other initiatives that the City can consider to support its local businesses to better participate in the City's procurement processes;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation 1 of Item 4 of the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated April 17, 2018 be deleted and replaced with the following:*

*"1. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to consult with stakeholders including but not limited to the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, the Manitoba Heavy Construction Association and Manitoba Business Council on options to amend the Materials Management Policy to implement a buy local procurement procedure for City contracts valued at less than $100,000.00, and other ways that the City can better support local businesses to participate in the City's procurement processes.*

*2. That the Public Service report back to Council in 90 days with a recommendation on the aforementioned buy local procurement procedure and recommendations on other ways that the City of Winnipeg can better support local businesses to participate in the City procurement processes."*

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I...as I…I made a...I delivered my fourth annual State of the City Address about a month ago and in the State of the City Address, I indicated and I'll just read it as follows, "That we need to look at what we can do to support local jobs and businesses within existing trade and procurement rules. The City of Winnipeg's an incredibly important local buyer of the 21,000 suppliers to the City of Winnipeg. Almost half are located in Manitoba." In 2016, the City of Winnipeg made almost $600 million in local purchases, Madam Speaker. Local business competed and earned these contracts, but I think more can be done to support local businesses. So and again, this is from my State of the City last month, "So later this spring, I will bring forward a motion tasking the public service to develop a new "Buy Local" procurement policy for civic contracts valued at less than $100 thousand and with Council's approval, we will be better positioned to support local businesses." That was a month ago, Madam Speaker, and then of course I made good on that and introduced the motion more recently. The reason for bringing this forward, of course is that local businesses are a critical part of our local economy. They are our neighbours, they are our employers, and they are an important part of our identity as Winnipeggers. I'm committed to doing what we can at the City to see our local businesses succeed. This council should be proud that we have lowered business taxes in each year of this council's mandate and I'm committed to continuing to work towards eliminating it entirely. We can do more to support our local businesses while respecting existing trade agreements and procurement rules. The "Buy Local" procurement procedure for City contracts is an important way that we can better support our local businesses. Since I tabled this motion, there have been important questions on how the "Buy Local" procurement procedure will be rolled out and I want to thank all those that have contributed to the dialogue including my council colleague, Councillor Scott Gillingham. The motion tasks our public service to develop the details of this new procedure, but we also recognize the need to consult and work with external stakeholders in the process. That is why I would like to introduce the motion or the amendment to the motion that is before you, on the "Buy Local" procedure to have our public service work with key stakeholders like the Winnipeg Chamber and the Heavy Construction Association to develop this procedure and to look at ways that the City can better support and assist our local businesses succeed, Madam Speaker. But make no mistake about it, the intent is to better support local businesses in every and all means possible here at the City of Winnipeg. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I'm going to be actually...I'm going to support the amending motion to have consultation, Madam Speaker, definitely, because that has been one of the main points of this council and of our current mayor, Madam Speaker, that proper stakeholder consultation should happen. And one presentation does not necessarily help and, you know, help us discuss and debate some of the issues, Madam Speaker. But I was really...I like the motion actually because Madam Speaker it does, in talking about contracts up to $100,000, it is actually acknowledging some of the limitations in trade agreements from province to province, from country to country, and various other trade agreements that we now have to live by, Madam Speaker. And so, in consideration of treating local in that way, I think is important. And business, of course, have people who labour and who work and so it's…I think it's a good motion, Madam Speaker. And with the...I note that only those three players, won't be the only ones that discussion happens with. I think there are other organizations that are related to people who work for businesses who have some...probably would have some interesting commentary, stakeholder discussion to be provided as well, Madam Speaker. So I will be supporting the motion and I think it's good.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to make a brief comment on this, given how in one way it parallels yet in another way it's rather distinct or opposite from...equal and opposite from what we did a couple of years ago regarding fair trade practices in the City of Winnipeg regarding the City's procurement practices. The concern was that we were in a position to encourage fair trade procurement and at the same time, maintain the following free trade or our trade agreements. And on that basis, as it is feasible for fair trade, international fair trade, I'm sure this is feasible to

some degree as we try to accommodate a local procurement as well. I guess my concern will be, as we go forward, the use of the term…giving a specific monetary unit, this is $100,000. So I just…we'll see how this goes and find out, $100,000 for one off, it tends not to be one off because we tend to make regular procurements. So is it $100,000 per year? Because when we buy something, we tend to buy again and again. And, of course, some of these things might be one off or considered one off when it comes to maybe machinery that lasts a decade. But having said that, Madam Speaker, I think it's good in principle. Interesting how it relates to sort of the equal and opposite, that meaning international fair trade practices that we have officially implemented in the last year, and I look forward to seeing how this evolves. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Gillingham.

**Councillor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I want to thank the Mayor for his...certainly his dialogue and this amending motion and obviously you see by me seconding it, I'm certainly supporting this amendment. I, too, echo what the Mayor, you know, has said that I think it's important that the dialogue happen with the stakeholders and we have the opportunity...or give the public service the opportunity and the direction to have conversation with those that will be affected or have an opinion on this one way or another, and I appreciate that. I am certainly supportive of that and I look forward to the public service coming back to us within 90 days and we can consider you know, what input the stakeholders are given, what recommendations the public service is making as well so we're able to make an informed decision. So again, I want to thank the Mayor and certainly I'm supporting this amendment.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Dobson.

**Councillor Dobson:** Thank you very much. I have a concern...buying local is certainly good for Winnipeg of course. But does this mean we buy local regardless of increased costs? Winnipeg…Winnipeggers expect good value for their tax dollars. Buying local is definitely the right thing to do, but only if the costs or services are comparable. I hope the public service recognizes this and includes that in the report. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Dobson. Any further Speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

**Mayor Bowman:** Yes, I do Madam Speaker. That's a simple one that can be addressed of course. Local businesses will have to earn and compete in order to earn procurement from the City of Winnipeg as they do currently. The kinds of thing that I'm hoping as examples, for those that are watching these proceedings, the kinds of things that I'm hoping the public service will be able to further explore are ways in which we can better inform smaller local businesses about what procurement opportunities may be available. So for example, one thing I'm hoping that can be considered is more proactive and better disclosure of the procurement activities of the City of Winnipeg on a more regular basis so that we make it easier for local businesses to know where there may be procurement opportunities where they can step up and compete where they may not be at present. The other thing would be even, can we simplify the procurement procedures? The reason the $100,000 figure was used is because of trade rules and obviously we have to work within those trade rules to better support local businesses. But not all small businesses have dedicated personnel or resources to bid on RFPs. They are often under resourced. These are small businesses and anything that the public service and the City of Winnipeg can do to make it easier and simpler for those smaller contracts, for any potential third party to bid on it, will indirectly also make it easier for small businesses to compete for those contracts. So these are the kinds of things that I think can and I hope are explored by this to simply make it easier for local businesses to step up and take advantage of the procurement opportunities that the City of Winnipeg already supports. But I think there is a lot more we can do. And so, I appreciate all the comments and the support on this. I'm hopeful that my council colleagues will support the amendment and the motion as a whole. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on the amending Motion No. 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And now calling the question on Item 4, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into the notice of motion from our March 22nd, 2018 Council meeting regarding the rebate of elections contributions by-law. Mr. Mayor, to introduce the item. No. Any Speakers? Councillor Browaty.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**NOTICE OF MOTION**

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today in opposition to the motion. I do think the spirit of it is well intended. Again, there's a cost to taxpayers under the current scheme. It cost last election about $700,000 towards providing refunds to candidates...sorry, to people who contributed to election campaigns. My issue is though, again, we're doing this very much at the 11th hour. People will be able to register next week to run for mayor and coming up very soon in June or early July for Council. We posted...the City posted our rules and our election guides and that for this upcoming election back in January already. The people around this table, when it comes to election financing are also not necessarily objective. I've got a motion coming up suggesting that following the next election, we bring in an arm's length or independent group to come up with a review of election financing rules. I mean, perhaps candidates that are running should be allowed to start fundraising earlier. Perhaps, we should require that the re-use of electronic materials from previous campaigns count towards their spending limits. They do not today. So I've got a garage full of election signs. I can use those again today. I don't have to raise money for them and they don't count towards my spending limit. You can easily lighten up. I commend my colleague Councillor Mayes for bringing forward a motion that allows…that restricts, I mean, the time period that we can use our office budgets for giving grants for various programs and such. I think that was an appropriate move. There may be a couple exceptions...there may be a need for an exception for my colleague Councillor Wyatt because there are a couple of important things in his area that may need to move forward, we may need to make an exception for that one, by the way. Anyways, I digress. The point being here is, again, the spirit, I think, was good but again, this was just a poorly thought out last minute piece of legislation the Mayor tried to bring forward. And I'm going to vote against this today but again, I think we should have this conversation...we should look at the rules surrounding financing campaigns going forward to make elections accessible, to make them fair and to lower the cost to taxpayers if at all possible. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I will be voting against this particular notice of motion and I don't believe, Madam Speaker, that...I don't agree with the spirit, actually of the motion, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, at the municipal level and you know, it took me three times to get elected, Madam Speaker. I have now been elected for two terms. I don't necessarily want an advantage, Madam Speaker. To build it up like somehow that these rebates to people who donate to campaigns, are actually going to make it easier for myself to get re-elected, is one that is false. The reason I won the third time is I made enough connections, Madam Speaker, over running since 1998, Madam Speaker. For years, knocking on doors. The rebate is there because what that does is, it allows for areas of the city, Madam Speaker, where there isn't a lot of disposable income, Madam Speaker, not a lot of disposable income. Other areas of the city, Madam Speaker, lots of disposable income. They can just contribute to campaigns, Madam Speaker. So you know, we have to consider these things when we're making the democratic process and I mean all aspects of it. Fair and democratic for those who are poor and for those who are rich. It's supposed to be a balance, Madam Speaker. That's why there is a limit on how much an individual can contribute to a political campaign, Madam Speaker. At all three levels there is a limit, Madam Speaker. So the rebate which would have helped me as the non-incumbent back in '98, Madam Speaker, really would have helped me, absolutely, and I was not the incumbent. But some people run in areas where there isn't a lot of disposable income so this rebate is important. But I just want to measure the City...you know, so it's a onetime saving of $700,000. It's not an annual...there was...I read an article in the newspaper. This is a one-time saving, as I read it, $700,000 was rebated to donors. But if you gave $1,500 back you didn't get 75 percent of that $1,500 given to the mayoralty campaign. If you gave $750 to my campaign, Madam Speaker, you didn't get a full 75 percent of that 750. So this is a one-time way that we at a municipal level can do this because technically, the amounts that can be contributed to a political campaign is set by the Province, Madam Speaker. As a matter of fact, most of the financial rules related to civic campaigns...well, they have it a little easier, Madam Speaker, but municipal, the City campaigns, and the municipality campaigns, Madam Speaker, they're subject to those finance rules of the Province, and that Province does a number of things. So when I hear the comment that...and I'm glad it's corrected, Madam Speaker, because what is not happening is...I mean, in an indirect way you might be with the rebate. But at the other two levels, each campaign, a contributor gets a percentage off of their contribution to a political campaign. Then, both at the Province and the fed, the campaign itself gets anywhere from 60...well, 60 I think is the max. They get 60 percent of their allowable election expenditures back to the campaign, to the riding in which it was run, Madam Speaker. Then there is this whole thing about the per dollar vote. Now, I don't want to get into that, but so…but that's not what's happening at the City level. It's strictly we're giving a rebate to a contributor who may…probably doesn't have a lot of disposable income because the ones who have a lot of disposable income, they can get out there and they can support people to any degree they want, right? So, Madam Speaker, that's the reason that the rebate was put in place in the first place. Now, it might have been put in place and I believe it was Council itself that voted to do that back in...whichever campaign that was, Madam Speaker. But this is about having a city in which everybody can participate to the best of their ability. To say that $700,000 is somehow going to lower the price of bus fare with a one-time…a one-time 700,000, anybody who financially thinks that way, Madam Speaker, one-

time savings to pay for ongoing cost, they better go back to school, Madam Speaker. Go back to university, go back to college, read a book, okay, Madam Speaker. So, you know, if we went ahead with this, it would continue…what I believe is happening with Council, in that we are creating two cities…two-tier city. One in which the people who have less are having a harder and harder time participating and those who get...are being helped and they are growing and getting better and better and better, but at the...there's no balance, Madam Speaker. So, you know, money is one thing, right? But anyway, this rebate was put in place to encourage a fairer, democratic process, in which those who, you know, in 1998 when I ran, Madam Speaker, I didn't have a job. Nobody would hire a totally blind guy even though I had lots of skills. I ran my own business. Barely could keep it, but I'm telling you, Madam Speaker, to actually attack it this way is wrong and whoever came up with this idea that somehow there was some inequity, some bad thing done to the taxpayers, to people of Winnipeg, I say no. This is just...let's just shut it down and I note, I'll speak to the Governance report that comes up later, Madam Speaker, but, you know, this thing was just ridiculous, ridiculous. Why can't we at a municipality promote like they do at the provincial and federal level, bigger participation, Madam Speaker? Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Next is Councillor Dobson followed by Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Dobson:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. This motion we have before us is a huge concern for myself, and for Winnipeg for a number of reasons. The first one I think is obvious. Removing the rebates would reduce participation and the number of people contributing to election campaigns. It would also place more emphasis on who you know and less on your actual merit. And further, without rebates, wealthy donors would have a much greater chance of having the candidate they are supporting getting elected. Rebates, on the other hand, level the playing field and reduce the chance that a handful of wealthy donors can influence who wins the positions of the mayor and city councillors here in Winnipeg. And that should be of paramount importance to residents in our great city. The timing of this motion is also of great concern to me. Tinkering with our election process, namely rebates, just before the start of an election cycle, sounds to me like political opportunism and certainly not reasonable due process. Is it really about saving taxpayers' money? The cost is around $175,000 per year for the election cycle of four years, roughly 25 cents per person per year. If this council approves this, then I would think that all monies left over from the last election be frozen for the election cycle because those monies have indeed been subsidized. To do anything different would give incumbents an unfair advantage in this coming election and in my opinion, would not be ethical. To be truly open and transparent, I would ask that all councillors reveal to the press any surplus monies left over from the last election to better inform their constituents of their surplus dollars. And, at the end of the day, the citizens of our great city expect and deserve a fair election process and trust that there will not be any apparent or perceived political interference. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Schreyer followed by Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a really interesting issue and it's an important issue. An issue that I believe needs to be, I think, constantly discussed. If you look back at the history of the democratic process in this country and when tax rebates were brought in regarding election donations, it's really a fascinating history and debate. And it still is, Madam Speaker. But one thing I'd like to say is I believe it happens to be a new…maybe an unusual way to some people, maybe not, maybe ironic, but in the area I represent, I believe I could easily benefit from getting rid of donation...or rebates when it comes to donations for those that would campaign against me or run against me as a candidate. I think they would benefit from rebates and I think I could do well without them. I think it would be in my interest to get rid of tax rebates or donation rebates in this election. Well, Madam Speaker, I've only been elected for a term. Democracy means more to me than just last election or this one coming up. But it's a really important debate, Madam Speaker. One of the reasons it's a really important debate or discussion that we as citizens, as a society, we shouldn't let up on it, is the whole issue of tax deductions in the first place, Madam Speaker. This is just a tip of the iceberg in terms of how tax deductions are used and to what benefit or detriment that we have tax deductions or rebates in our society. It's a really big issue, Madam Speaker and I think we should talk more about it. The fact that we're bringing it up in this regard, Madam Speaker, regarding how donations are part of the democratic process in elections, well, there is a lot to be said about this, Madam Speaker. How tax rebates and tax deductions are used in general in society I think is a more important issue, more important debate, more important discussion. I think people know less about that than they do about how people get rebates for donating to our democratic elections. It's an important issue, Madam Speaker. But if we are willing to talk about this, I really hope for our society, we educate everybody on how tax deductions are employed, are used in our society, not just in terms of elections but society as a whole. What kind of loopholes do we have for tax deductions? What kind of advantages are there? I don't think we know about that enough, Madam Speaker. I think these things should be taught in high school. I think it's that important including this issue here. But not alone, Madam Speaker, not alone, this issue is very much in context, in terms of it being fully relevant, in terms of how tax deductions are used in our society. We don't know much about that, Madam Speaker, as a society. I was raised on this stuff personally, but happens to be, Madam Speaker, I don't think we talk enough about it, in fact, I don't talk enough about it, Madam Speaker. On that basis, as I said from the beginning, it's an important issue. I'm glad it was raised. If people want to talk about it more with me, they certainly can. And in fact, I feel obliged to continue on this issue, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm rising to first of all thank the Mayor for bringing this forward. I think we need to have much more discussions about our elections. We know generally that the participation rate of the citizens is dropping. We look at, you know, we have had ideas of bringing it down to 16 years old, getting some more youth in, some questions too. But we know that the engagement of our citizens is not where I think anybody wants it to be. I prefer somewhere around 75 percent. We start worrying a little more…I also am not supportive of mandatory voting they do in Australia and other places. I think it's your democratic right to vote or not vote. So…but, however, the Mayor brought forward an idea. When I first heard this idea I was like many of you today. I had very strong positions on it. And then...but again, all of us who are elected it's our job to go do some research and do what we can to see where we are at. So I tried to do some research across Canada and it was quite interesting. I talked to the Clerk and found out some of my assessments of what other provinces do is actually wrong. What I read was not correct. So quickly, I realized that maybe I am not right, maybe I am right. But I do believe that we do need do more analysis of this. We have to talk about ward sizes and per capita caps, it's very complicated. It's not as easy as just saying get rid of the subsidy. It's actually quite complicated I found. It's many layers that intertwine together. So again, I can't, with all due respect, support the Mayor's motion today. I do support the intent of the idea of talking about election financing, talking about how we can increase participation, talking about these issues. I don't think our council does that enough. Again, we have so many things to talk about but when we get into these things about democracy like this the conversation has to be much more holistic. So again, with all due reference, I can't support this motion today but I do look forward to carrying on to the conversation.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Gillingham.

**Councillor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise…I find myself maybe in a similar position to my colleague from River Heights-Fort Garry, and I do appreciate, certainly, the Mayor's commitment to his campaign and the spirit behind this. And this…what is before us may indeed be what needs to happen. My view is though is that I think we need to take a more comprehensive look as there may be other aspects of our current electoral process at the City of Winnipeg that also need to be amended, changed, analysed, whatever the case may be. However, I find myself maybe…I know we are going to be voting on a report from Governance in regards to election...establishing election finance commission. I don't know if I am there yet either. So I find myself maybe perhaps in the middle of the two…the two motions that we're voting on today. I do know that there is, you know, coming up, talking about that and it's...it will be referred to the next year's budget process. It will be good to discuss it there. I don't know that we need to go to an external party. I know our Clerks do an analysis of every election and bring forward recommendations and perhaps with instruction from this body or the next council, that will suffice. I'm just not sure. So I find myself somewhere in the middle today and be that as it may with respect, I...with the desire to have a more comprehensive look, therefore, I won't be supporting the motion that is before us today. But do need…do believe as Councillor Orlikow said, that a larger look needs to be taken at the entirety of the election process at City Hall to always try to be making improvements for the sake of our citizens and for the sake of democracy and for the sake of the process as well. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Just very briefly, I'm not supporting the motion but I do want to commend the Mayor for bringing something forward that was in his platform. I think sometimes we get criticized for only doing…changing our positions once we're elected or ignoring our own platforms or simply following the advice of the civil service and pursuing their priorities. I've probably made that complaint myself here a few times. While I don't support it, I do…I am pleased to see the Mayor bring forward something that was in his platform and it's free vote, that we're all able to vote as we see fit. So I appreciate that opportunity. Thanks.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Morantz.

**Councillor Morantz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that I seconded the motion I probably should say something. I also just want to reiterate the sentiments of Councillor Mayes. You know, Mayor Bowman was elected with a large plurality of the vote and in his campaign platform, it was clearly stated that one of the things that he wanted to do was to remove the subsidy. I recall around that time, by the way, I think it was Mr. Broadbeck who wrote in the Winnipeg Sun a strongly worded editorial calling for the end to the subsidy. I think that this motion coming forward is a healthy discussion and I will be supporting the motion. I think there are arguments both pro and con. The question really, is should someone who is paying taxes, their property taxes, should that money be used to subsidize election campaigns? Those monies may go to campaigns that that individual would never support in the first place and I think to be fair to taxpayers and what they do, there is an argument that they shouldn't be forced to subsidize campaigns for candidates that they would never support if they had the choice to. So I think that's one aspect of it. So I'm not really convinced that we

should have the vote subsidy and I will be supporting the motion. But largely because I think we need to be mindful and respectful of what the will of the voters were during the election, who elected Mayor Bowman with, as I said, a very large plurality and this was one of the campaign issues in his platform so I commend him for bringing it forward and I'm glad that we've opened up this discussion. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Morantz. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** I'm standing to speak. I won't be supporting this motion, but I am glad that it has been brought forward. I realize it was a campaign promise of the Mayor and I'm glad that this has come forward because I think that we do need to have discussion on this. We have one of the lowest turnouts. The municipal elections have one of the lowest turnouts, yet, I think we have some of the greatest impact on residents. I have actually had a lot of feedback from constituents on this motion because many of the constituents that I represent are new to Canada and they are new Canadians with the opportunity to vote, but like many, have financial struggles but do want to be part of the democratic process here in Winnipeg. So I think that we do need to…in Governance, we did have a discussion on it. We maybe could have discussed it further and put more thought into the motion. But I do think this is something that we really need to look at and have more comprehensive discussion on because it does impact, as Councillor Orlikow said, there's many, many layers to it. So while I'm supportive of the intent, the thought that's come forward, I think that we do need to do a lot more work on it. So I won't be supporting it. But I look forward to further discussions.
**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor, to close.

**Mayor Bowman:** I want to acknowledge and thank my council colleagues for some thoughtful comments on this. I appreciate the acknowledgment that this was a campaign commitment of mine and it was a very clear campaign commitment of mine that I, obviously, felt compelled to bring to this council chamber for a vote. And so obviously, I'll be supporting it and am hopeful that others will as well. But obviously mindful of the comments and the discussions I know some of us have had in recent weeks. This year...this year and throughout this term, this council should be very proud of some of the steps, very real results that this council has delivered to restore trust and faith in City Hall. One of the first things we did, just to remind my council colleagues, was to reduce the salary top ups to members of EPC, Speaker, Deputy Speaker, as well as my own salary and that's the gift that has given taxpayers I think in the range of about $400,000 that can be better used for other priorities of Winnipeggers. And I want to thank my council colleagues for supporting that. Of course, I also lost the severance vote and I was hoping that we could end that, but was not successful and like this vote, it was a campaign commitment that I felt compelled to bring forward for Council's consideration and members of Council in that vote, like this vote, will vote as they deem fit and as is their right. We are going to be looking at the cooling off period. We have brought in the Lobbyist Registry. We have our first Integrity Commissioner and I want to commend our commissioner, Sherri Walsh for her efforts, as well as a very robust open data and open government initiative. I certainly appreciate the comments of some of my colleagues who appreciate the intent is to honour one's commitment but also, to save tax dollars and put them into better use. I'm not going to cast the same...I'm not going to make similar accusations as some have made today, about the intent. One could argue that, of course, the intent of voting against this is to simply ensure that campaign war chests get those taxpayer dollars. And I'm going to refrain from going into any depth...I'm going to refrain from going into an exhaustive and passionate argument to counter that. At the end of the day, this is a campaign commitment, and I'm proud to bring it forward, and I think regardless of this vote, this council should be very proud of the progressive steps we've taken as a group. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, there is a call for recorded vote. All in favour of the notice of motion regarding the rebate of the elections by-law, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Bowman and Councillor Morantz

**Nays**

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

**City Clerk:** The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 2, Nays 13.

**Madam Speaker:** Notice of motion has been defeated. We will now move on to by-laws under Executive Policy Committee, Mr. Mayor.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the by-laws…the following by-laws be read a first time, By-law 27/2018, By-law 28/2018.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws No. 27/2018 and 28/2018.

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

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the By-laws No. 27/2018 and 28/2018 be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws No. 27/2018 and 28/2018.

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

**Mayor Bowman:** Thanks, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 27/2018 and 28/2018 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for the Mayor. Thirty minutes on the clock, please. Councillor Browaty.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Winnipeg's…Winnipeggers, myself very much included, are enjoying the terrific ride Winnipeg Jets are having in the race for the Stanley Cup. The Whiteout at Bell MTS Place, in the streets and throughout the city, has united Winnipeggers towards a common cause. The Whiteout Street Parties have been a tremendous success allowing fans to gather to watch the games with fellow fans. The parties have been growing every game and have been going off really smoothly actually. I'd like to thank all the City staff, Destination Winnipeg, Tourism Winnipeg, for all their work. There is, however, considerable cost for closing streets, rerouting transit, providing security and policing for these events. There is a public and tourism value to these images for Winnipeggers, as well as for people across Canada and the United States, seeing these images on TV. Can the Mayor tell Council what the cost for the parties have been to the City of Winnipeg so far, and what budgets are being used to pay for it?

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Bowman:** Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank my council colleague for the question. The Winnipeg Jets are obviously on a roll right now and I want to join fans and my council colleagues in commending them on an outstanding season and an incredible, you know, record-setting play-off run right now. The pride in our city is at new heights and that is being, in part, fueled by the support that our Winnipeg Jets are receiving from Winnipeggers and really, fans across the league and across Canada as Canada's team. The street party is something that, I think has been very good for Winnipeggers on two primary fronts. Firstly, it creates a proactive and safe venue where crowds can congregate to celebrate the Winnipeg Jets home games. We want to ensure that as we have thousands of fans descending upon downtown that our First Responders and others can proactively plan, in a way that protects public safety, but also does it in a fun way for our citizens. Secondly, of course we want to ensure that we're capitalizing on the attention that our city is receiving as one of eight teams in the Stanley Cup playoffs, as of late last night, as Canada's only team, the eyes of the nation and certainly of the league across North America, are increasingly on Winnipeg and that is an incredible opportunity for viewers across North America to see thousands of individuals on our streets in a safe and festive environment. And I would invite all council colleagues and all Winnipeggers to join in those celebrations, which when you're there, of course, you really feel the civic pride. In terms of the cost, the Economic Development Winnipeg has been coordinating and doing an outstanding job, and they had to do it a matter of days for the first street party. There will be a full disclosure of funds, and those will be made available by Economic Development Winnipeg. I'm

expecting that that will be disclosed very soon. And I would expect in the course of that disclosure, there will be funds coming out of my Civic Initiatives Funds to support that and I look forward to when Economic Development Winnipeg can release more details for the Councillor, but also for Winnipeggers who want to better understand how the costs of the street party are being addressed.

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

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Two weeks ago today, I sent an email to both Dayna Spiring and to your Chief of Staff, requesting information on what this is costing. We still haven't heard any numbers, and that's again, two weeks ago. Is there a limit to the amount we're spending? I recognize and I appreciate that there is a value towards tourism for this to happen. Does Tourism Winnipeg have a limit? Have you set a limit for your Civic Initiatives Fund, as to how much you're willing to contribute? Are there going to be asks of other civic departments, be it the Police, Public Works for street closures, for Winnipeg Transit for rerouting buses?

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Bowman:** I would ask the Councillor to, you know, follow up with Dayna Spiring. I'm not sure if he's done so, but like I said Economic Development Winnipeg will be providing clarity on some of the associated costs. But let's also not lose sight of the fact that, right now, Winnipeg is obviously receiving incredibly positive attention and advertising through, not just the street party, but of course through the play-offs that the Jets are affording our city, and civic pride is at new heights. You know, their brand this year was "Rise Together" and one of the beautiful things about the street party and the Jets play-off run, is the fact that this is an activity that brings people together. It doesn't matter what corner of the city you come from, it doesn't matter what your politics are, surely all Winnipeggers can unite behind our city and really demonstrate, not just their pride and appreciation for our team, but also for our city, and that's something that is being afforded right now, as a result of that, we're trying to amplify that through the street party. But we also want to make sure as we have thousands of individuals descending upon downtown, by the Winnipeg Police Service's estimate, in the last…the last home game, 36,000 individuals coming downtown, we want to make sure that our First Responders notably Police, can properly and proactively plan to protect public safety when you have only, you know, when you have eight cities right now that are receiving this amount of attention. We want to make sure that we're doing everything we can to mitigate threats to public safety and the street party, make no mistake about it, is accomplishing two very important objectives for the City and I'm very proud to support that.

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

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate Destination Winnipeg has a budget and it's a good use of their budget to spend it towards these street parties, at least in part. Will the Mayor though, tell us today, have they set a budget for Destination Winnipeg? What is it costing the City of Winnipeg, outside Destination Winnipeg, Tourism Winnipeg's funds for these street parties and have you set a budget? We're responsible for the City's budget.

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Bowman:** It's Economic Development Winnipeg, not Destination Winnipeg. And like I said, Economic Development Winnipeg is the lead on this initiative. My understanding is they will be providing disclosure and public disclosure for the Councillor's benefit and for Winnipegger's benefit on how the costs are being addressed. And as the Councillor knows full well, there has not been an ask of Council, in terms of the budget to date. I am being open and transparent that my Civic Initiatives Fund will be supporting the street parties and I would invite him to step up with some of his funds if he wants to contribute to the street party. You know, it's interesting how this is being used right now, and I welcome the questions on costing but at the same time, let's also be clear, this is an opportunity for the city to unite, for all Winnipeggers to come together. I noticed, of course, within moments of securing the first round, when all Winnipeggers were coming together in celebration and I was extremely proud of our team and our city, Councillor Browaty's first instincts were to tweet about Portage and Main, to try to use it to use score political points. Surely, we can appreciate the fact this is an opportunity for our city to come together, for us to all celebrate how proud we are, of not only our team, but also, our city. And I would encourage all members of Council to join me in applauding the Winnipeg Jets and all those fans who are wearing white at the games, the street parties and today and tomorrow especially inside the Bell MTS Place, but also throughout our community, in celebrating who we are as a community and I'm looking forward to doing that, and I would invite the Councillor to look to this as an opportunity to bring the community together rather than simply to score political points.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. On to you, Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Mayor and EPC are the Human Resource people who set the agenda for our City's administration in HR. And recently, I was sent a letter that was sent to the Mayor in regards to a number of the Union's president's representatives of them and a cordial letter that indicated, Madam Speaker, that they believe that right now, morale and different things are causing problems. But the arbitration process that seems to be growing and growing, costs both sides, the City and the labour unions and associations, costing them more money, Madam Speaker. So, Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Mayor is going to meet with them and try to set a new agenda, where morale and we can save money by not having to go to arbitration all time and pay those costs? Because I think if they work together, they should be able to resolve a number of the issues.

**Mayor Bowman:** Thank you. Yeah, in terms of the letter that the Councillor is referring to, is a letter sent to me. I'm, and I say this tongue in cheek, surprised he received a copy of the letter. It's almost like it was a letter intended for political discourse. But, you know, I have regular dialogue with the union leadership. You know, CUPE as an example, has been an incredible, positive partner in our reconciliation work. ATU has been a participant in the Transit Advisory Committee that's working on improvements to public safety with the leadership of our IRPW Chair. You know, there's ongoing work that's going on with each of our unions. I'm not sure why the letter was only signed by four of our unions, and not all. If the concerns that they were raising were felt across the various collective bargaining units, and I'm also unsure, well I'm advised that some of the claims may not, in fact be accurate. That being said, I would encourage all of the unions to direct their dialogue to the head of our Labour Relations, who's been doing excellent work at making some improvements to our collective bargaining outcomes. You know, certainly, with the leadership and the focus that Councillor Scott Gillingham has been placing the role as Council Liaison for Labour Relations. I'm not sure if those concerns were raised through you as well, Councillor Gillingham. But certainly, I'll keep an open mind to seeing what discussions I can have directly with some of those union leaders about what we can do to strengthen the relationship. But let's also not lose sight of the fact that we've negotiated settlements with our collective bargaining units that in recent years have been much more sustainable than in the past, and we've done it by negotiating at the negotiating table in good faith in a way that was agreed to by both parties and I think there's a lot of credit that is, that should be given to not only our labour relations team, but also to the union leadership for being able to negotiate in good faith. And we'll continue to look for opportunities to work collaboratively with them to address the concerns that they've raised in correspondence with me.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, excuse me, Madam Speaker. The letter indicated that there could be savings in money. Is the Mayor willing to charge our Winnipeg Public Service Senior Management to see if there are ways that we can save money, which is one of his platforms, Madam Speaker?

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Bowman:** I'm not sure I understand the question, but I'll do my best. I am interested in saving money. That's why I, very proudly, supported the collective agreement wins that this council has overseen. That's why I've brought in four balanced budgets. It's why I'm very proud to have worked with my council colleagues, two Finance Chairs, who've been doing outstanding work during this term. The lowest expenditure growth in the history of the City of Winnipeg this year at 1.2%, it's something that I wish Councillor Eadie had supported.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Final question, Madam Speaker. Can Mayor Bowman point out to me, which Mayor of the City of Winnipeg in the last 40 years didn't pass a balanced budget?

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Bowman:** As the Councillor well knows, the balance budget legislation has been in place for some time. Unlike other levels of government, we follow the balance budget legislation, we don't change the rules when it is convenient for us or politically expedient. Certainly with balancing the budget comes discipline and I'd like to know out of the last four budgets, which of those balanced budgets, Councillor Eadie supported.

**Councillor Eadie:** I'm asking (Inaudible), point of order, I'm not able to answer his questions.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions for the Mayor? Seeing none, let's move on. We have the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. There is no report, no motions, no by-laws. We'll have question period for the Chair. Questions for Councillor Gillingham? Councillor Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**
**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, Madam Speaker. The Chair of Finance, who's on EPC, would be responsible for Human Resource issues and I know that and myself, being a frugal person, Madam Speaker, but making sure that the needs of the citizens of Winnipeg are being met, that their ability to pay for things, Madam Speaker. Given Madam Speaker, the answer from the Mayor, Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the Chair of Finance if he would be willing to explore how savings could be made as a result of this letter that four of the Union Leaders sent to the Mayor.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Gillingham.

**Councillor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank my council colleague for the question. I'll have to review the letter again, but I could take that under advisement and get back to my colleague.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Browaty.
**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to the Chair of Finance. I understand my colleague, from social media, was recently at a conference in British Columbia regarding the pending legalization of marijuana. I was wondering if the member could share with Council, some of the discussions around the table about some of the expected costs that the municipal level of government are expected to have with this new legislation. Again, because I know we will hopefully have some form of revenue sharing with the high orders of government, but just, if he could let us know what he's seen in terms of actual costs the municipalities are likely to bare.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

**Councillor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you, I want to thank Councillor Browaty for his question. Yes, it was a very informative conference and Councillor Allard, who's the Chair of the Cannabis Committee that the Mayor has established along with he and I, along with Mr. Michael Legary and one of the Mayor's staff, Tricia Chestnut attended the conference. And let me say at the outset, I think that the discussion that Councillor Allard and I and the other staff, we wanted to compile some of the highlights of that conference and it's something that we can, you know, share with our council colleagues as well. It was informative, I guess I would say at the summary level, and I think I made this, mentioned this even on social media, is that from all the delegates that did speak from various jurisdictions: Denver, Seattle, Vancouver, Victoria, Calgary, the RCMP, there were representatives from, that spoke from Canada, from the federal government…from the Health Department and then someone I think from the BC Health as well. Those that spoke to the financial implications of the cannabis legislation, from their perspective, from the US, and then also from analysis that's been done in some of the jurisdictions here, each one came up with the same conclusion that there will be a cost to municipalities, was their experience, and was, for those that have experienced it, and for those that are forecasting it, in the analysis they've done, they've determined that there will be a cost to municipalities as well. I know that our, I understand our departments are doing of some of that work as well. I know that back in September of last year, I called for, at our Finance Committee, a report on the analysis to be done, to determine what costs, if any, would be incurred, or would be expect to occur, as a municipality and so we'll be looking forward to those results as well. Different, obviously different cities, especially in the US, it's a whole different jurisdiction, a whole different regime that is set up there in the US. But and I know that the Mayor has been, you know, working very diligently and in constant, or consistent anyways, dialogue with the Provincial Government and I know, he's stated publicly as well that there is a need for cost sharing discussions to happen when it comes to revenue, those cost sharing discussions need to happen with the Province, I think probably all of us around, I won't assume but I'll go as so far as to say I believe most, if not all of us around this chamber would echo that need as well. I know that the colleague to my left here, Councillor Gerbasi is the President of FCM. FCM has been very clear too on their position and worked very hard with the Federal Government to talk about the impact to municipalities on the new legislation that will be coming, we believe, not this summer, maybe this fall or sometime. So the analysis is being done, but the bottom line is from a financial perspective, it's been determined and it's projected from the delegates that I heard…we heard at that conference, that there will be costs to municipalities and so it's incumbent upon us to be ready for those.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further questions for the Chair? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED APRIL 16, 2018**

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will move Item No. 1.

**Madam Speaker:** Madam Clerk.

**Item 1 – Award of Contract for Processing and Marketing of Recyclable Materials**

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

**Councillor Mayes:** Yes, thanks. This is an interesting item in that I think we've all done our jobs. We have had two separate meetings now at the Water and Waste Committee. We had a long discussion at EPC and we can have as long a discussion as we choose to here. CUPE has done its job. Its member…its representative attended to speak on behalf of the members who are unionized at the existing Emterra plant. Canada Fibres did its job, it came and spoke about the advantages of its bill…or of its bid. Emterra came and spoke about its questions about with the process. It's worth noting that should the process be now defeated, Emterra would stand to benefit in that they operate the existing facility so I think that is worth noting. Our staff have certainly done their jobs on this. There have been a number of questions raised by a number of councillors. The staff have provided a great deal of detail. I want to thank Director Geer and Randy Park for their work on this item. We had what I called a quasi-council seminar in that all councillors were invited to attend. Many did, many asked questions. And I think ultimately we did our job at the committee and at EPC saying we've reviewed the RFP process and we stand by the recommendation. One rather odd provision that was included in the original submission was taken out, I think at Councillor Lukes' request and I think she was right on that. One item was added in which I will speak to later which was an amendment I moved to get a cross jurisdictional review of fair wage policies and I want to thank Mr. Delbridge from CUPE for bringing forward that idea. But ultimately there seem to have been maybe three items that were the focus of the debate. Number one; the claim that Canada Fibres as low bidder and it was the low bidder, it didn't win solely because of that. It won because of the scoring system used in the RFP. But in addition, it was the low bidder so it is the most taxpayer friendly one could argue in that…on that metric. It was alleged at first that Canada Fibres had done this, coming in low, because it was going to pay its workers very little, it was going to do this on the backs of the workers. Three difficulties with that, Canada Fibres pointed out there is nothing in their bid that indicates what it's going to pay the workers. B) The math…it could be a cheaper bid because it will be more efficient. It could be a cheaper bid because the building that will be constructed will be more efficient than some other buildings being proposed by other bidders. This isn't simply wage rates that we're looking at here, this isn't say a building cleaning contract, this is a much more complicated matter involving recycling sorting facilities. So there's a building factored into the cost as well. And thirdly, Canada Fibres appeared at committee at all levels saying, we don't intend to pay minimum wage, we intend to be comparable to what Emterra workers are currently being paid. And of course, nothing bars any bargaining agent, be it CUPE, Teamsters, UFCW, from going in and organizing those workers who will be there. There will be an award here for roughly ten years. So we had that issue, the issue of, is this being done on the backs of the workers. The second issue we had was, an allegation this won't be a state of the art facility. I think that was dealt with at committee level at some mind-numbing detail about optical sorting machines and the processes that will be used. I think that debate then came down to well, the RFP...and the wording has...the allegation is varied over time from the RFP says, to it suggests, to it is a guideline. The allegation seems to be, well, the RFP is calling for two percent contamination and the market is calling for 0.5 percent thus you, the City of Winnipeg, are heading into this naively. You are building a facility that will be out of date as soon as you open it. The staff were adamant that they have prepared an RFP that says you can have two percent if that's what the market demands but you have to meet the market standards. You need to get to 0.5 if that is what the market demands. Multiple questions as to what cost, what additional cost will that result. Answered many times by staff saying it doesn't increase the cost. There are things, changes of scope that could increase the cost. Should the Province suddenly mandate that we are on to recycled plastic bags or some other items, that may well indicate a change in scope and that would result in cost, but we don't know that and we have built flexibility into the RFP. So we're not building an out of date plant. We are not building to an out of date standard. The staff have been adamant on that and that is...that's the second issue. The third issue it seemed to be we are contracting with the bad boy of recycling, sorting in bringing in Canada Fibres. Just look at these stories from Toronto. We had a long debate about this. Yes, Toronto has contracted to pay an additional amount to Canada Fibres due to a change in scope, due to higher contamination rates than what were contracted for and it's a very big facility relative to what we're building and it's over an eight year arc that they are paying out the money. So just as if the change in scope changed here, we'd be paying Emterra, Canada Fibres, Joe's Sorting, anybody else, we will be paying Canada Fibres more if the scope changes. It doesn't mean that they somehow ran afoul of the auditor and we had a rather odd handout that we received at the committee level saying, look, the auditor was called in in Toronto, look, look at that. Well the front page says, the auditor investigated, there was no fraud as has been alleged. Now, an independent auditor was appointed, but that auditor was to look at the contamination levels, the quality levels, not to

investigate some rogue behaviour by Canada Fibres. So I'll probably have more to say after comments and questions. But in essence, I think this comes down to, do we trust the staff in what they have prepared? Really, it comes down to I suppose we have had a delegate here today say well, staff say it's 13 or 14 percent contamination. They are adamant on that. They have had multiple opportunities to change. They have said, no, by our criteria it's 13 or 14 percent contamination and then today we have someone saying, no it isn't, it's double that. As I have pointed out earlier we were told it was 21 percent by one of the corporate delegations, so I'm not sure saying, oh, my math was bad that day really convinces me that the figure is more like 25 percent not 13 percent. Ultimately, I think we are doing a responsible thing. We have had a lot of chance to debate. I think all questions have been brought forward and I would assert that the RFP you see before you should be approved. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Where to start, Madam Speaker? Madam Speaker, I think I will begin with this, so we're voting on a report that chose the bidder...successful bidder. We are not going to know the details of what the contract is, Madam Speaker, but what I wanted to point out is what is happening is, and the representative from Canada Fibre reiterated what happens with any company that we are dealing with even the people who collect and that is, Madam Speaker, that what we are voting to do, is award the successful bidder in terms of how its points are structured which means we are now setting forth, if we vote to do this, what is called a relationship…I think it's a ten year relationship with Canada Fibres. It's a relationship in which contracts and issues around them ebb and flow all the time and that is how Canada Fibre described it and I'm sure that that is how the other delegate that was here today would describe it as well, Madam Speaker. So first thing I want to talk about then is, we bid on the successful bidder for a collection and a new cart system back in 2011, implemented starting in 2012, Madam Speaker. And in there, one of the criteria, the most important one which we go by which is whose got the lowest dollar bid. That's the one that has the heaviest weight when we're considering who to go with, Madam Speaker. Now, we did that in the past and we asked in the past, we asked, you know, like, questions like well how can it be so much lower? And it was explained by the people entered into with the contract, Madam Speaker, and there was a reason why they believed that the price was lower. However, Madam Speaker, the reasons that that price was lower turned out to not be quite the reason why that bid was the lowest, Madam Speaker, in terms of money. So I just want to leave that out. I don't want to get into details. What's in the past is in the past. Madam Speaker, what I wanted to also say and I should...I thank the City's administration, everybody involved from the Director of Water and…Director of Water and Waste, Mr. Parks, the representative from solid waste materials management. A lot of people put a lot of time in and work. There is a lot of due diligence, too, Madam Speaker. I have to say I trust in what our administration...in their evaluations and things, right, but even they can't predict, Madam Speaker, what the future of that relationship is going to be, just based on a bid, according to the RFP, Madam Speaker. So I just want to point that out. That's a very important thing to remember. Now in the end, Madam Speaker, I'd like to also point out that they, Canada Fibre, will own the plant at the end of the ten years. Just like our previous contract, that company owns that property that the City of Winnipeg taxpayers paid for. Make no mistake, it's us who pay for those facilities. They are left with an asset, I don't know. So when you are concerned about workers...and I'm concerned about the workers and if things go wrong with the capital outlays and stuff, often what a company will do is they believe they have more flexibility in how they deal with human resources. And so, I have those concerns, but given that they end up owning the plant in the end, there was an argument that...you know, I feel for people, change is very difficult, Madam Speaker. But the former contractor will have an asset that can still be used to do business. And it is my hope that, and I believe that the previous contractor will be able to find other contracts, markets, to process and try to keep the employees that they have there. They are making better wages, Madam Speaker. So...and yes, the new plant, Madam Speaker, will have to hire new employees and there's concerns around that. Alls we can do is take Canada Fibre at their word that they're going to pay decent wages not minimum wage which I don't know who could live on other than my son working for 11.15 an hour, could live on…live and raise a family on that kind of money, Madam Speaker. So in looking at the contract though, I'm really concerned because of this weight on money. You know, I'm very troubled because you know, you see a bid, you want to believe everything but again, there's some assumptions in here that I'm concerned about, and frankly, as a City councillor, I'm not going to get answers because I'm not going to be the one who's the contract administrator who's going to be working with Canada Fibre to make sure things happen. But what I have to say is in this RFP criteria, you know, I think we should have requirements and they specify what their whole human resource policies are and treatment of their workers because I think that's essential. You know, the fair wage thing and so on, we don't have that. Toronto apparently has a fair wage and so you know, that ongoing relationship that Canada Fibre had, which was made public, that ongoing relationship meant that they ended up… they ended up meeting the fair wage agreements, right. But how that relationship goes I don't know. But I do have big concerns that we will, if things go totally wrong, there is provisions in the contract, Madam Speaker, that we will be going back to the taxpayers to cover those costs. That's where my biggest concern is. Again, our administration did due diligence following up, making sure we had the right contractor in. There were a number of bids and I always get concerned about, you know, how is it that somebody came in with such a low bid that...you know, substantially less than others. It's nice to say that you have the most modern and can build the most modern facility, Madam Speaker, but often those most modern and best facilities, they end up costing more money in the end because when you really want to

build them to last and to work, and to have all the provisions that I know our administration made sure that they were going to have, their costs, I don't know that are going to actually come in on what they are saying those costs will come in, Madam Speaker. So, you know, I had enough concerns I think. I just...without…without...it's very difficult. I should be voting for it because it won the bid and the administration did their work but I gotta…somehow, I got a feeling that we're going to end up…it's going…we're going to have to throw more taxpayer money into this because ultimately we would've had to do that with the previous contract we had.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie, if you could wrap up, please.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, thank you. With the previous contract that…nobody wants to move extension?

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

**Councillor Eadie:** I won't take it all. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I was just about to conclude. So I believe at this point, I can't in good conscience vote for it because we're going to establish a relationship, that's one, that I am not sure how that's going to go. And the other thing is I just...I...you know, when you have a price that's so much lower than the others, you know, I don't think they're going to find those savings so I think there's going to be problems. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have to say this is probably one of the most interesting files I have had the opportunity to work on. There's been many, but this has been very interesting. So today we're voting on a contract for around $113 million for a new recycling plant in probably the most unstable, uncertain market conditions the recycling industry, throughout the world, has ever experienced to date. We have learned that other cities across Canada, the United States and across the globe are having to invest in upgrades to their MRFs to meet the new contamination rates set by China. It's actually quite frightful to really see the power that China has to move world markets like this. The risk levels, the costs incurred to make these changes have impacted citizens and cities with millions of dollars of unplanned expenses. Councillor Mayes said it very eloquently. I want to thank him as Chair of the standing policy committee to allow members many hours of questions to the public service and delegations that have presented. And I want to thank the public service for holding special information sessions for councillors who are interested. Promises, commitments, guarantees and factual statements have been made by both the public service, delegations, the proponent who may be awarded this multimillion dollar recycling contract. All of this information is on the public record. I think that's very important. I have been asked by many, why not wait a year or two until the market uncertainty settles, until the province of Manitoba provides final confirmation on MMSM contract. But the public service has been constantly…has constantly told the committee they have considered all the variables, all the market conditions and they are confident that this RFP is doing the best to protect the taxpayers. So I will be supporting the public service's recommendations. I will be supporting this report, with much concern and planned future oversight because again, we are in such unstable market conditions. We've learned an awful lot about the proponent, about the industry, and about the RFP. So you know, we can't predict exactly what's going to happen in the future. We can only prepare the best we can. I'm going to have to trust the public service on this decision. They seem to have been very thorough. There are, you know, again, questions that come up but at some point we have to make a decision. And again, I want to thank Councillor Mayes and the committee members for being so patient and for asking such good questions because I do think we did really good work on this file and it's a huge investment that we are making and there's huge risk out there right now. So there is only so much we can do without, you know, without the globe that can predict the future, but I think we really did a good job on aiming to protect the taxpayers by the work we've done. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Just because Councillor Mayes loves when I speak about my history here. Absolutely right, I just want to correct when I used to do the recycling back in the day, before the City wiped me out, we actually had no…we'd have markets that just disappeared. So as my mom would lament as I had my garage full of newsprint, yes, sorry, fire code, but it was…I'm a 23-year-old boy and all of a sudden, the newsprint market just collapses. They just say, we're not doing it any more. Well, you still have to pick up all these goods. You can't take it to the dump because that's really bad so you have to store it somewhere. So the markets in those days, 15 years ago, they just disappeared. Glass was common. They would say, we'll take all glass but only if it's clear which is still a problem in today's markets. But one of the things I hope Councillor Mayes can enlighten me a bit about, I will be supporting this. We can talk about what's going to happen in the future. But I can guarantee you what's going to happen in the future, it's going to get tougher, guaranteed it's going to get tougher. China was…is still the main player in this one. We're going to have to start looking at more maybe domestic reusing of the products. We may have to look at alternatives than just recycling. But what I really want to hear about today as...you know, some of you may know and as you look...I'm not sure if anybody else

does and maybe it's just from my old background when I take a peak going down the back lane at some people's recycling bins, they are full of garbage. They are, they're absolutely. So again, the number of how much contamination there is, I'm pretty impressed that we are actually even at that low. You see people who are putting plastic bags, clothing, really soiled materials like you know, tomato cans full of still tomatoes. It's actually incredible how much…and I know we probably...all of us have it in our own households where we have to remind somebody. Maybe not as diligent as I am because I used to be that guy who would pick up that stinky can or that gross bag full of a diaper, we have to focus. I got plenty about doing the Olive Garden, picking up those cans once a week. Yeah, the heat really does something to them. So the question that I really wanted…maybe Councillor Mayes can elaborate on is we really need to be focusing on what we're doing as well. We need to be focusing on educating people on reduction. The Rs…which I actually went to JB Mitchell School recently about the plastic bags and now I think there's 7 Rs; rethink, repurpose, it was quite astounding but again, I go back to the basic, you know, let's even do three; reduce, reuse, recycle. And they are done in that order for a reason. So recycling…I remember when I was doing my recycling business and it was a for-profit business. A friend of mine said, all you want to do is profit from recycling. And I go, well, I am a business. I do. Because what we've got to focus on is reduction and repurposing and so we had our debate and he was absolutely right. He was right. So we need to be figuring out ways that we can educate people in the general public to first reduce what they are using and then if they can't reduce it, you know, don't buy as much packaging. Yes, use your cloth bags if you have them. Don't triple wrap everything. Try to reduce the amount of packaging we have. That's really…that's where it starts. But we also need to educate people...and I don't think people do it for any other reason than they just don't know. What actually has to go into the recycling box and what can't go in the recycling box. We're going to have to really...especially with the new markets now, we're going to have to double down on our efforts to try to educate the public that you know what, we can't take your recycling bag, I mean you plastic bag. We can't take your rigid plastic. We can't take a whole bunch of things that we see going in the bins. But again, I think with the work with the public service, they can identify the top three items that are in our waste stream…our recycling stream that shouldn't be. We're going to need to really double down our efforts so again, that contamination actually doesn't go in the bin in the first place. And that's where we really need to start on the user. I think that's really important. I have always been an advocate of the individual user accountability in this process and that's why I do like the fact that we have individualized bins rather than the depot system where you go down a neighbourhood and you dump it in to a bin, for example, Pan Am Pool. We have a local recycling program there. I guarantee the rate of contamination there is very high. I've seen it, people just dump everything into one bin. Again, they are not sorted properly and I have seen the stuff there. So we really need to...and that's why I'm raising today, definitely going to support the contract. I have read through it. The debate has been incredibly intensive and when we're spending this much money, it should be. So I do appreciate Councillor Mayes, his leadership on this file. These are some of the hard files that we have to go through but Councillor Mayes has done a really stupendous job, in my opinion on shepherding this through for us. So I super appreciate that. I got a lot of good information from both listening to the committee meetings and also at EPC. And when I've called Councillor Mayes about some questions about this, he has been very like that...he would give me…he would know the answer. So again, I have support in our public service that this is the best offer but again, I'd just like to know, you know, with the new changing markets, what does...how are we going to start to addressing stuff as reduction and keeping that stuff out of the recycling stream.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Seeing the hour, we need to recess for lunch at this time. There is a commitment for a councillor for a lunch hour event that they need to be at so we will continue this debate after the recess. Thank you. We'll reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of**
**Winnipeg City Council of**
**April 26, 2018, at 1:41 p.m.**

**Madam Speaker:** Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene the Council meeting of April 26th, 2018. We are on the Standing Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment Item No. 1. Councillor Schreyer, you are the next speaker.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. We were just in the process of...Council was deliberating on this one motion. I guess I will start off the way Councillor Orlikow started off, talking about his personal involvement in the industry and how things change and things take their toll. He mentioned how he was an active owner of a recycling company, one of those companies in the early stages, back...well, 20 years ago, I guess. Oh, half my life ago. I'll age myself and Councillor Orlikow, and this is true. Take these things into account. I wanted to mention as well how these things affected my family as well. My brother, my younger brother, Tobin, worked for a friendly competitor to Councillor Orlikow at the time and at the time was the weekly, the monthly, and the yearly salesperson. Basically every day, was the best salesperson that the blue box, that Planet Recycling had, for two years running. And he was great at it. I mean,

you know, we're pretty good at going door-to-door and it wasn't just the fact that he was good at going door-to-door, it was the industry he was involved with, how he felt about it, what he believed, and well, he was highly persuasive. He may have been the most persuasive door-to-door salesperson in recycling in that area in all of Winnipeg. At the time he had a great relationship with Jeff Golfman, who I think had a good relationship with Councillor Orlikow as well. My point being, Madam Speaker, as Councillor Orlikow made the point, yes, things change. There is volatility in the market. In the case…in that case, Madam Speaker, the same way my brother and Councillor Orlikow lost their jobs, due to that, it was for the sake of creating a form of stability in the market by the City taking over the entire industry and awarding, you know, large contracts in which we can take advantage of economies of scale, long term contracts, in which the amortization of capital can be recouped, and therefore, Madam Speaker, we do these things. My concern, in this case, is we're making a decision on the contract for recyclable goods right in what appears to be...and you don't have to take my word for it, Madam Speaker, sitting through the hours of the Standing Committee of Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment, we learned quite a bit from all of those that were involved, as well as the administration. It was a great education for us and anyone that was witness to these standing committee meetings, Madam Speaker. Now, of course, it was pointed out that Emterra would...it would be to their advantage for us to delay the contracting...I'm not concerned about what company is to what company's advantage. That's not my concern. My concern is to what advantage it is to the City of Winnipeg, to the taxpayers of Winnipeg, and to the workers of Winnipeg that would be involved in the industry. That's my primary concern, Madam Speaker. And I think we basically have an overlap of priorities. It's a degree in terms of priorities on this. I don't care what company would benefit from an extension of a year. My concern is, Madam Speaker, that we're making our decision in an era that is...in a year that is shown to be, unless someone can correct me, the most volatile year on the recycling…global recycling market in modern history. And to the extent that the RFP was re-jigged in the process, within the time of the bidding process itself, I don't know how usual that is, Madam Speaker, but I do believe it's chalked up to the changes in the market at this time. We've heard, during our education and deliberation process in which we had to make our decisions at the standing committee, you know, due to, of course, absolutely due to the...I only three minutes left? Okay, so the China Sword...and it was made…it was also stated, Madam Speaker, that it's larger than China, but as well, it was…point was made as well by the administration that this could all be over in six months, China might change their mind. In other words, Madam Speaker, we don't know at this time where we're at. We would have a better idea in another year from now, in another nine months from now. Madam Speaker, the changes that have taken place in the last nine months are so drastic and unpredictable that the effect it's had on international pricing is something that we don't know quite yet how to cope with. I would like to make the point that, just considering the fact that we say we don't know what Canada Fibres is going to pay its workers, that's true, it's not part of the RFP process so we don't know. We do know that they had to pay $1.3 million in fines in Toronto for not paying the proper amount to their workers. Also bear in mind, Madam Speaker, in this period of volatility as it applies to Canada and I believe to Canada Fibre itself in Toronto, they've just had to renegotiate an extra...virtually a hundred million dollars to the contract, post-contract signing, because such is the volatility of the market right now, Madam Speaker. So this is what we're dealing with and we're going to make a decision today. I don't think it's prudent. And I understand that we would benefit from one of your extension, that's what I believe, to take a more prudent look at what happens to the market at this time. And our workers would be protected is my understanding, Madam Speaker. Over the years with Emterra in recent years there has been a greater wage increase for the workers. Again, Madam Speaker, it's been stated we don't know what the workers will be paid here in Winnipeg with the new contract. Having said that, Madam Speaker, it didn't stop Councillor Mayes by bringing forth an amendment, which I supported, that we would look at what's going on in other cities regarding what we are terming "fair wage." So I don't….certainly don't want to stand in the way of a good amendment, I have done this before Madam Speaker, it's a good amendment and I was pleased to support that at standing committee. But, Madam Speaker, when it comes down to the whole package we are signing on today, it's too great, too much uncertainty, too much volatility right now, and it would be safer and prudent for us to wait. Madam Speaker, I would like to make the point, it was a concern maybe to at least one councillor, if not other people, it was a valid concern, over who was lobbied, Madam Speaker. These are concerns we should have for everything. Madam Speaker, that's why I made the point when we came out with our Lobbyist Registry, I made the point, it's a volunteer registry. If those are concerned...that who are concerned, Madam Speaker, over knowing...

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

**Councillor Schreyer:** Over knowing who is being lobbied, I'd like to know, too. Why not? My point in saying that…making the amendment which was successful in calling our Lobbyist Registry voluntary…our Lobbyist Registry, Madam Speaker, is to let Winnipeggers know, we don't have a real registry. But nonetheless, Madam Speaker, the concerns voiced by councillors and others in terms of who is lobbied is a valid point all the time. And on that basis, Madam Speaker, if councillors, you know, continue to wish who is lobbied, these are fair and excellent questions. If that were to continue at Council debates, I'd be more than happy to second the motion, the motion that we do make the Lobbyist Registry mandatory. I certainly have no problem with that, I think it would be an excellent idea. And, Madam Speaker, I will leave it at that. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes to close.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a very good debate. Very good points raised. I think councillor...some very generous comments from some of my colleagues. Thank you for that. Councillor Orlikow raised the issue about how do we promote greater awareness of reducing contamination, greater awareness of purity. I think our staff are at work at that. I don't have anything to add in any detail today. I know they are at work and that they have concerns. And there is a trade-off, you can…you could get a very low contamination rate by not putting in a whole lot of stuff that might otherwise be eligible but then your other rates suffer at the rate of what you are sending to the landfill starts to go back up again. And we've done very well deflecting away from things from the landfill over time. We've kind of stabilized, but in the last six or seven years, we've done very well at increasing the amount of material that is being recycled and composted with the yard and leaf waste. I think it sort of comes down to one or maybe two issues and I think Councillor Lukes touched on this. It is an uncertain market. However, would we be better served by waiting a year or two until the market stabilizes? Well, the trouble is we don't know if the market will stabilize in a year or two. If we knew all that perhaps all of us would be in better paid jobs somewhere in the private sector or in the financial industry. But we don't know when the market's going to stabilize. I think what we have done here is planned for a better, more modern facility, which is not to criticize Emterra who have run their facility for over a dozen years now and have modernized it at various times but we will be getting a new facility from this. I think we have to accept to some extent, it's a volatile market, but if we defeat this RFP process, the prices may get substantially higher in the future. We may be no further ahead, we may not have any more certainty in the market in the next couple of years. So the idea that defeating Canada Fibres now will somehow help us in the long run, I don't think you can prove that. There is an element of risk I guess in this or in many of the decisions we make, but we've tried to factor that in. We had a long discussion about risk at the committee level. So, I think this does strike a balance. I know councillor...I'm very re-assured to see Councillor Lukes supporting this because she had a lot of questions and we got a lot of feedback from the staff to clarify a lot of these concerns. Councillor Schreyer does touch on one that I don't think we spoke about earlier and he is right, there was a penalty on Canada Fibres for $1.3 million in Toronto for payments it was making, long discussion of that at the committee level. Mr. Badger, who I think is here, saying look, we…there was some question whether we legally had to pay that we went ahead and paid it. It's a lot of money but it's spread over hundreds of employees. There was a breach of the fair wage provisions. There were sorting materials that came from other municipalities, not just Toronto. So I think we sorted that out and at the end of the day, staff have said look, there was...the Toronto reps who were contacted, the solid waste management folks in Toronto gave us the thumbs up, gave a reference letter to Canada Fibres so it's not that we're somehow ignoring human rights or labour relations or even employment standards issues here. Those...Canada Fibres I think was forthcoming about what happened in Toronto. They've indicated they'll be paying roughly comparable to Emterra which is certainly above minimum wage here. So I think in the end, I'm glad to see Councillor Lukes is supportive because there's always…there's always an element of risk in these decisions, but I think we've done our due diligence, we have done our research and frankly, if you vote this down, thinking that you know, if we just wait a little while, the market will stabilize and we'll come out of this ahead, I have to say, if there is one thing I haven't seen in all of these debates in all of this material is something that confirms for me that the market's going to settle down in two years and if we just wait, we'll be further ahead. I think we've done...I think we've had a very thorough process here so pleased to support. I suspect…and in deference to Councillor Schreyer, I think…I think the idea…I don't want to…anyway, I think we are voting on each clause separately as Councillor Schreyer was certainly supportive of the fair wage paragraph at the committee level. So I don't want to bamboozle somebody into saying, well, you voted against X when really they have been in support of it. So with that I'll close. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Mayes. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary. Carried. We will now have question period for our chair. Any questions for Councillor Mayes?

**Councillor Mayes:** Sorry, I thought we were voting clause by clause. Perhaps I should phrase that more clearly.

**Madam Speaker:** That was announced. Did you make that request?

**Councillor Mayes:** I didn't specifically. I thought I suggested it. I thought Councillor Schreyer would raise that.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, well, I think we have had the vote. Shall we move on? Okay. Next we have question period for the Chair. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Seeing none, we will move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation. Councillor Gilroy on the report dated April 16th, 2018.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION
DATED APRIL 16, 2018**

**Councillor Gilroy:** I'd like to move Item No. 1, High Resolution Cameras.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for our chair for Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION
QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Rather than standing it down to have a discussion, I had a question, Madam Speaker, in regards to the report that just went by and it seems to me, it's sort of working but which I think is good to have the cameras, I totally supported that and I think it's helping to resolve some of the issues, Madam Speaker, in a…well frankly, some…certain neighbourhoods in the City, Madam Speaker. But I can't remember having a major bulk waste dumping happening on private properties, it's not the private property owner who's dumping on them, and I can't remember, my question is, will the City move these cameras to monitor private properties that continually get dumped on?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

**Councillor Gilroy:** You know what, that's a good question, Councillor Eadie. To my knowledge, the Public Service is going to be reporting back in 90 days. I mean the pilot project was a successful project they felt overall and I think they'd like to kind of continue the work that they're doing. But some of that stuff might be coming forward in the, to Parks and Community Services to talk a little bit about how they'd like to see this next phase of this be rolled out. I don't know if that answers your question.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question, Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Just for clarification, Madam Speaker, is the Chairperson saying that in 90 days a report is going to come to PCSP for consideration of further implementation of the cameras?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

**Councillor Gilroy:** That is correct, on how they want to move forward with this.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Okay, seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Orlikow.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED APRIL 9, 2018**

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm pleased to introduce the report and move for adoption of Consent Agenda Items 1 to 16.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Madam Speaker, I'd like to…this is April 9th?

**Madam Speaker:** Yes, that's correct.

**Councillor Schreyer:** I'd like to stand down three.

**Madam Speaker:** I'll call the question on Item 1 and 2, 4 through 16. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

**Item 3 – Openings, Closings and Rededications – Disraeli Bridges Rehabilitation Project – DAOC 2C/2015**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to introduce the item?

**Councillor Orlikow:** I look forward to hearing what my colleague has to say. This is regarding some house cleaning mostly regarding the alignment of the bridge and opening and throughout. So we've gone through all the community committees and every community committee that had part of this so definitely more than happy to hear what he has to say.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Madam Speaker, it's very benevolent. I assure Councillor Orlikow it is merely some housekeeping just in terms of tying up some loose ends literally, some squares and triangles in terms of where the new Disraeli Bridge is placed and thus the properties on different sides and where it's allocated towards private property, public property. This did go through community committee. This side of it, on the north side is in Elmwood, it's right in my ward, right in my neighbourhood and therefore I just wish to give a little bit of history on this and why this is the case. It happens to be, Madam Speaker...and I say this with a little bit of pride for a neighbour of mine, a political colleague of mine, someone whom I've known for over 40 years, Madam Speaker. The reason we have the shape of the Disraeli Bridge, I can't attribute it to one single person but I do know this, Madam Speaker, when it came to the campaign to keep the Disraeli open during construction, we attributed it to primarily one individual, and that is Jim Maloway, the MLA for Elmwood, who was the MLA for Elmwood at that time. And because of what was probably the most successful political petition campaign in Winnipeg that I'm aware of, in my life time, in terms of thousands of people signing the petition to keep the Disraeli open during construction, for many good reasons, Madam Speaker, primarily it had to do with traffic and economics and sort of the economic loss of not keeping the Disraeli open for the two years or so during construction. He managed, Madam Speaker, with that campaign, to put the pressure aloud, Madam Speaker, if you will, the Provincial and City government to reconsider the plan and it happened, Madam Speaker. The plan for the Disraeli was reconsidered, it was reshaped, and thus we end up with the shape we have today, thus these shapes of squares and triangles that we have to clean up today that we will be voting on today, Madam Speaker. So for things to go full circle, I'm not sure if there's a circle involved in this but to bring things home, Madam Speaker, and also, because of the campaign to keep the Disraeli open which was led by Jim Maloway as the local MLA, as well as with the support of many others, we happen to have...which I believe is still to this date, is the longest act of fully developed active transportation bridge in the city. And it happens to be due to the campaign by Jim Maloway to keep the Disraeli open during construction. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I do...I can't let those comments go on the record without giving a little bit of clarification there. While the MLA for the area, Jim Maloway, certainly had a loud campaign running during that time, his campaign was specifically to build a six lane Disraeli structure because he felt that's what was needed. If you look there today, any of the bottlenecks anywhere along Henderson Highway corridor, it has nothing to do with the Disraeli. The four-lane Disraeli that replaced the former four-lane Disraeli works completely fine. There's turning lanes at Hespeler, there are merge lanes that may be issues, but it has nothing to do with the six-lane structure that Mr. Maloway was fighting for. I have to give credit though where credit is due. I thank the former Directors of Public Works, a particular former CAO, Glen Laubenstein of all people, who actually continued designing both a structure that was going to be closed for 18 months versus a structure that would be built parallel to the existing structure and....Laubenstein kept work being done on two scenarios; the initial structure that our city was willing to fund which was an 18 month closure as well as a scenario where we were able to keep the Disraeli structure open, four-lanes, two-lanes in each direction, during all rush hours through the entirety of the project. And I'm going to thank a New Democrat though who is the one who actually made it happen at the end of the day. It was former Premier, Gary Doer. His bags were packed and ready to move to Washington, DC. He had already long announced he wasn't going to be there. He came forward at the 11th hour with the funds to keep the Disraeli open and to build a new structure, to build a wonderful AT amenity that exists there today. While Jim Maloway certainly was part of that vocal opposition along with all residents of northeast Winnipeg, I don't think he was the one who actually got it going. There are a lot of good administrators here in the City, other politicians, not necessarily just Jim Maloway. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Browaty. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Orlikow, do you wish to close? Or I can call the question? All in favour of Item 3? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we'll now move into by-laws. Councillor Orlikow.

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

**Councillor Orlikow:** Sorry, Madam Speaker, I was enthralled by the conversation. Thank you. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 33/2018, 34/2018, 35/2018, 36/2018, 37/2018.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 33/2018, 34/2018, 35/2018, 36/2018 and 37/2018.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Orlikow on the second reading.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to move that the By-laws numbered 33/2018 to 37/2018, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 33/2018 to 37/2018, both inclusive.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Orlikow on the suspension and the third reading.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I move that the rules be suspend and By-laws numbered 33/2018 to 37/2018, both inclusive, be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.
**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will now have question period for our chair. Any questions for Councillor Orlikow? Okay, seeing none, next committee is 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 APRIL 10, 2018**

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure…I'd like to stand down Item No. 2 and move Item No. 1.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, this is the report dated April 10th, 2018. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

**Item 2 – 2018 Operating Grant – Ross House Museum**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Pagtakhan to introduce the item.

**Councillor Pagtakhan:** Yes, thank you very much Madam Speaker. I just really want to put a few remarks on the record regarding the operating funding for the Ross House Museum. What happened a couple of months ago, earlier this year, Madam Speaker, is the Manitoba Historical Society decided to divest itself from operating the Ross House Museum which is part of the Red River Settlement. It was a home that was built by William Ross, a prominent Métis leader back in Winnipeg. So the house is located in Joe Zuken Park in north Point Douglas area within the Mynarski Ward and there is a community effort including talks with the Seven Oaks House Museum, Madam Speaker. The Seven Oaks House Museum is located at 115 Rupertsland. It's got a very capable board of citizens…volunteer citizens, they decided that because this museum is also within the Red River Settlement, built the same time as the Seven Oaks House Museum which was built around 1851 to 1853, Madam Speaker, and it's one of the older surviving residences. They wanted to…they saw the geographical significance as well as the historical significance with these two museums and volunteered to operate the Ross House Museum for this year. So this operating grant was a result of those discussions. They came to community service...they came, sorry, to our committee, Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan, we moved the motion to Protection and then through EPC and now here to Council. Just wanted to congratulate the folks, the board members, at the Seven Oaks House Museum for the work that they've done and to thank the work of those folks at the Historical Society for their previous work in operating the Ross House Museum.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, thank you, Councillor Pagtakhan. Next speaker is Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise, of course, totally in support of this. And Councillor Sharma, I would like to, in speaking to this report I'd like to also thank Councillor Pagtakhan for his diligent work in trying to ensure that Ross House Museum, which is ensconced in the Point Douglas area still today, it is still to Point Douglas, an important asset that is a part of their community. And I would like to reflect also, the thanks to the volunteer board members of the Seven Oaks House Museum, which, of course, is also in my ward, and I really appreciate that they saw fit to take on limited resources in order to actually implement and ensure that Ross House Museum opens this season. It's basically they are looking at...looking after an agreement until December 2018. There's a lot more consideration, Madam Speaker, that needs to be given to how the museum can stay viable and continue on in finances but I think it's so important and I just wanted to actually say that with Councillor Allard often we get into discrepancy about the oldest structure in Winnipeg. It should be clear and St. Boniface does lay claim but what really is there is the Seven Oaks House Museum which was the home of the Inksters, of course, Madam Speaker. That is the oldest residential house and I would point out that although it was moved off its original property, the Ross House Museum is actually the second oldest, Madam Speaker, that was residential. And so there is always history to learn and on behalf of the people...the oldest...I don't know. You have...yeah, yeah. Anyway, I was at the oldest…anyway, sorry. I digress...anyway, Madam Speaker, I just also wanted to, on behalf of the people who live in north Point Douglas, I want to say on their behalf, that thanks to, again, the Seven Oaks House Museum Board and their...brain is not working, their employee who will be taking on additional work in order to ensure that that Ross House Museum is open. And one of the great things about the Ross House Museum and hopefully we can do it this year, of course, Canada Day, July the 1st, they always have the flag raising and a big Canada Day celebration over there. There's also celebrations at Seven Oaks House Museum, but just point that out. So thanks. And I'm glad that something could actually be worked out in what became a disaster situation.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Pagtakhan to close. I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We now have Motion 2 on our desks.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON**
**PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS**
**MOTIONS**

**Motion No. 2**
**Moved by Councillor Eadie,**
**Seconded by Schreyer,**

*WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg is involved in neighbourhood and community safety through Our Winnipeg, Winnipeg Committee for Safety and various one time grants with no consistency for the community groups delivering non-police safety services;*

*AND WHEREAS other areas of the city besides Downtown need city investments in safety such as safety strategies, citizen / ambassador patrols, safe places for youth and initiatives that deal with prevention of crime from the community like the Gang Action Network and North End Hockey Program;*

*AND WHEREAS investments in neighbourhood and community safety reduces the need for WPS resources;*

*AND WHEREAS patrols and other safety initiatives reduce the amount of property crimes and other kinds of criminal activity;*

*AND WHEREAS volunteer based safety patrols are unsustainable in various neighbourhoods throughout the city;*

*AND WHEREAS 24/7 youth drop in centres provide a safe place for the WPS to drop off at risk youth in addition to youth dropping in on their own at an estimated $350,000.00 per year cost;*

*AND WHEREAS communicating with the Winnipeg Police Service, Winnipeg Police board, Community Services, Winnipeg Committee for Safety, business improvement zones, and City Council members' offices who hear from community groups trying to deal with safety issues without stable consistent funding;*

*AND WHEREAS a 0.5 percent property tax increase in 2018 is equivalent to $2.75 million, probably more than is needed for safety initiatives;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to:*

1. *Identify neighbourhoods and business improvement zones which need safety strategies, neighbourhoods and business improvement zones which cannot depend on voluntary citizen patrols, communities needing 24/7 youth drop in centres and organizations that deliver safety/crime prevention services;*

2. *Estimate the costs to provide grants to cover the costs of formulating safety strategies, safety patrols, 24/7 youth drop in centres and various crime prevention initiatives in order to utilize a onetime property tax increase in a dedicated city fund allocated annually for said purposes beginning in 2019's budget;*

3. *Establish a grant application process that would allow a not for profit entity to request funding to create a safety strategy, safety patrol, 24/7 youth drop in centre and various crime prevention services identified in the first be it resolved.*

**Madam Speaker:** It is a motion moved by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Schreyer and it's in regards to neighbourhood safety initiatives. This is an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. We will now have question period for our chair. Any questions for Councillor Pagtakhan? The next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Morantz.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS**
**DATED APRIL 6, 2018**

**Councillor Morantz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to move adoption of Report No. 1.

**Madam Speaker:** That is the report dated April 6th, 2018...pardon me? It's just one item. Councillor Mayes stood it down.

**Councillor Morantz:** I'll wait to hear the comments.

**Madam Speaker:** Yes. Madam Clerk.

**Item 1 – Criteria and Weighting for the Eastern Corridor Study**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Morantz, do you wish to introduce?

**Councillor Morantz:** Sorry, I will wait to hear the comments of my colleagues, thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** The shortest agenda we've ever had from Infrastructure and we still end up with a…still end up with a debate. Very simply put, I want to thank Councillor Morantz for talking to me about this one after EPC because he said your objections weren't really to the methodology or to the weighting so don't vote against it. Say your piece and then if you don't have trouble with the weighting or the methodology, vote for it, very fair request. So my issue here is more with...I think at some point we should have a debate about the priorities of where we're going in terms of different BRT lines. It's difficult because we don't have…we don't have the Province saying a definitive no or a definitive yes or a definitive dollar amount. We've stood here many times and heard well, the Federal Government's interested but they are coming up on three years in power and we don't have a dollar or a particular corridor identified by the Federal Government. You've heard me say before here, Madam Speaker, look, if you look at the Transportation Master Plan that was approved back in 2011, the Main Street corridor is the shortest, the cheapest, has the most transit oriented development potential and has the highest potential ridership. One could debate though that the needs are greater in the eastern corridor. Some would probably make a pretty eloquent argument for that. So my...I just want to flag that, that we have never made a firm commitment to going next, in terms of priority, on the eastern corridor. I don't...I know this study has been going on for years. To suddenly stop it short would possibly not be an effective use of money so I don't take issue with the weighting or the methodology. We had a speaker at the start of the day who had some issues and I think that's healthy and certainly, there were a lot of…a lot of debate when we made that choice about the original corridor that's going down to U of M. So the weighting does matter. But, a lot of different factors are taken into consideration. But again, I want to thank Councillor Morantz for saying, speak to the actual issue here and not something else. So my view is I would hope some time before the end of the life of this council, we do have that opportunity to debate priorities on

BRT, the difficulty here is we do need...we need a funding model that will allow us to go forward and we need some cooperation from our federal or provincial colleagues. So with that, I will support the study as it's presented. Thanks.

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

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know I'm sort of out voted here when it comes to my concerns over BRT in general and its economic feasibility especially when you take into consideration over time, over years, over decades, the notably higher rate of construction inflation compared to standard inflation. The income increases of Winnipeg taxpayers as well as if you can take into consideration, the economic growth rate of our society, at least in terms of how it is dispersed throughout our tax paying economy. And on that basis, I can't say that it's not merely about the criteria of weighting, however, Madam Speaker, I take some solace in the fact that I'm not the only one...I'm not the only elected individual who has lamented over not having taken advantage of the potentiality of using existing rail lines, and I think we're losing vision on this. And I'm not comfortable for when I've seen...in terms of what I have seen so far, Madam Speaker, in terms of the one public consultation or open house that I had a chance to see in my ward, having missed two others because they were…they were arranged while I was on publicly published City business, at least in the case of the last one this winter. Councillor Mayes is the Chair of the standing committee…while we were in standing committee and I had an open house on rapid transit yet again while on City business allowed me at lunch time…allowed a lunch time so I could go at least and visit and talk with some people. Of course, Madam Speaker, I have to admit, there is no other way around this. We have to have our open houses. There's so many people that go there. I have to admit, Madam Speaker, of all the conversations I've had over rapid transit, the open house is merely a fraction of that, Madam Speaker. It's like going to a budget open house. They are important, we have to have them, and I would say for all much us here in this circle that it is merely a fraction of the budget consultations we have. Nonetheless, Madam Speaker, you know, being a witness to other people taking a look at the routes, taking a look at the information, I just...I feel that, again, I'm one of the few, but nonetheless…in this chamber, but I do feel that I can't help it, Madam Speaker, I feel like I represent not just the majority of citizens in my ward that bother to talk about this, but Winnipeggers in general. How this criteria of weighting works out when we're not considering the existent rail lines is my concern, Madam Speaker. And on that basis, I feel obliged to mention that at this point. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm in support of this report. I'm not going to...there is the, you know, the overall which rapid transit corridor is the next one to be built and what benefits they are and the criteria laid out here and they did…our public service did a lot of work, Madam Speaker, in coming together with this, doing the stakeholder conversations, people were talking about what values. And Madam Speaker, we even...you know, if you want to…if you think about it, this is a project that's providing transit. We voted earlier on a winning contract bid for recycle and maintaining a better environment in the city through recycling, Madam Speaker. And you know, I have to say, in going through the criteria for this project and how it's weighted and what they are listing out as criteria, again, I hope that the cost of, you know, determining which route and all that kind of stuff, isn't the paramount thing necessarily. Because sometimes these other criteria that are listed out, Madam Speaker, are more important, whereas in that last contract we looked at the weight was given a high rate...the highest rate given was the cost. So...and I think sometimes that can lead to some bad decisions, Madam Speaker. So in reading through, it looks like there's a need for a delay and it talks about…and I hope that the Chairperson can...I totally missed the discussion that happened at IRPW in regards to this. I'm wondering if you could just explain. I think they are talking about tweaking some criteria measurements related to dollars, I think, money. And when it comes to money, you know, it would be nice, Madam Speaker if the other levels of government were on board so we had some certainty, but there are different criterias. The shortest and cheapest of course was Main Street. But I think it had a higher…a good weight because of the transit oriented development maybe, but technically it is a short line and I'm not necessarily sure...and some decade, I won't be on City Council, I'm sure, when we really go to analyze that one, Madam Speaker. But it could be longer. I think it starts at Burrows, like just thinking where the demand of transit to happens and so on. But anyway, I digress, Madam Speaker. So just…I just wanted to say, if the Chairperson could just sort of describe the reasoning and I believe it was…they were trying to...and then they will have to go back to more stakeholder consultation. But if you could just describe that aspect to it, I'd appreciate it, thanks.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Gerbasi.

**Councillor Gerbasi:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm obviously going to be supporting this report today. I just wanted to make a couple of comments. Wow, it's really hard to build rapid transit in Winnipeg. You know, it's really hard. I have been involved in tasks force going way back for the last 20 years and we've been talking about this corridor probably for 30 or 40 years, long before my time. And it's in our transportation master plan as some of you may know, it was adopted just as much as anything else in there, we tend to think of transit very differently. With roads it's like, well, there's no question, we need them all. When it comes to transit, you know, it's like you just...it's Groundhog Day, you have to start

over at day one again. Every aspect of it, every single report that comes forward on it, we have to question the whole thing. And I mean, I value the questioning and the discussion and all of that, but it's...it can be painful to watch when you do really support rapid transit and believe that every city of our size, the best cities have rapid transit systems and this has just been studied and studied to death, finally we're actually doing the functional study for this route, which goes...connects the first route through downtown, connecting to probably to the Forks, grand central station, connecting three neighbourhoods in the city. Like, it's an essential piece of the framework for our transportation network. Whatever we build, this has got to be built at some point. And then the other point I just wanted to mention was the federal funding saying, you know, there is no funding, there's no…well, we have to have a shovel-ready project. We have to have…be ready to apply for significant funding for major transportation projects like this. There is a process and the Federal Government has announced a very large infrastructure funding program over the next 10 to 11 years, long term, 10 to 11 years, with something like 80 something billion in the 2017 budget alone, a lot of that on green infrastructure. And these are big numbers that are really significant. The programs haven't all been rolled out. It isn't clear yet. There's going to be a lot of work ahead. This is just the functional part of the study but we've got to keep moving forward. I won't be here to stand up every time we get a transit report like I have for probably the last 20 years and harp on this, so it's going to be up to...it's going to be up to all of you and the next council to keep forward on rapid transit. But I just felt like I had to say something because you've got to look at the big picture. You've got to look at the long term and not...and that's not easy to do. But this is a…this is part of building our city and it doesn't always get the importance when we look...we just assume it's not going to build itself. It's going to depend on this council to have a vision and to move forward and this is a study that we're in the middle of. So frankly, I think it's…obviously, we need to keep moving on it and we need to take the next steps and we need to prioritize it. Obviously, that's what I think so. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gerbasi. Any further speakers? Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you. Thank you to everyone for your attention. I do want to make the point I think Councillor Gerbasi has too, but we were talking about criteria for the functional design right now, but since my colleague, Councillor Mayes, did bring up the issue of prioritization, I did want to note that according to our public documents the eastern corridor is the next recommended route in our transportation master plan. I don't know how my learned colleague voted on that master plan. I know that we may not have voted on this plan as a whole as a council but just read the excerpt from the public engagement materials from Transit on this. So why is the eastern corridor the next rapid transit corridor being studied and the answer is, "The Transportation Master Plan makes the recommendation for an eastern rapid transit corridor to be the next phase of rapid transit following stage two of the southeast rapid transit way. The study is the first stage in moving forward towards implementation of the recommendation." So I would urge everyone to vote for this report here before us today. I know it's been well supported. And just to remind everyone, the issue today is establishing criteria on which implementation of the eastern route we should take but if we are going to talk about the broader issue of which is the next recommended leg of rapid transit, it's clear according to our council documents that the Transportation Master Plan recommends the eastern route as being the next document. I mean, we can validate that as a council, but that is currently the policy direction of the City of Winnipeg. That's certainly what I have been communicating to the public and the stakeholders on what the next leg might be. In terms of re-evaluating where the next leg could be, that's certainly a question we should have as a council but currently, my understanding and I would invite anybody, correct me if I'm wrong, but my understanding right now is that our City of Winnipeg policy is to move forward on the eastern leg and if any colleague can correct me if I'm wrong, I would invite them to, but that's certainly what I've been communicating to my residents and members of the public. So with that, thank you for your attention.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Allard. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Morantz to close.

**Councillor Morantz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues for this discussion. It's been I think a good discussion. And I also want to thank the delegate who is still hanging in there, in our gallery, for her insightful comments this morning. This report, just for the edification of the public, it's nothing to do with the priority…choice of terms of priorities of where or when we're going to build another rapid transit route, actually just our public service providing us with information as to how they do their analysis. So the report says that it outlines the proposed criteria in weightings that will be used to evaluate options, multiple criteria are used in a process known as AHP, Analytical Hierarchical Process, has been used in the weighting process. AHP is a well-known decision making tool that has been in use on major projects globally for the past 20 years in various city departments. So I think that's just really what this report is about. I also want to just point out, the report talks about, at the bottom of page six, it says, "That public input is important. The criteria for evaluation were initially shared with the public who were able to provide commentary regarding the choice of criteria. The public responded well to the list of criteria that were developed indicating that they were...that they generally were in agreement with the choice of criteria. Subsequently, public engagement regarding the weightings took place, in 2017, the public were asked to consider the decision making process and to make comments. The input was carefully considered and resulted in some minor changes being made to the criteria weighting." I point weighting…I point this out only to say that this isn't just the public service in a vacuum saying this is how we're going to

weight different criteria for this project. They actually went out and had public consultation. So that's really what this report is about. They're just explaining to us how they weighed criteria when they were doing the study. I was a little unclear about the question that my colleague, Councillor Eadie had. So perhaps he could clarify…clarify that in terms of something about cost. But other than that, those are my comments. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Morantz. With that, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for our chair. Councillor Eadie.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS**
**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Eadie:** Thanks, Madam Speaker. I guess I wasn't very clear, but as I read through the report, Madam Speaker, there was a section in there that talked about changing something related to, I think, it's cost number four? I can't remember what number four. Anyways, as I was reading it, I think there was a discussion that they might have to be going back to some stakeholders if they do change it or don't change it, and I was just trying to understand that, Madam Speaker. If he recalls anything, I can always ask, Mr. Patman after.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Morantz.

**Councillor Morantz:** Through you, I'd like to thank my colleague for his question. If…I think what would suggest in this case, is that I would take it under advisement and ask if Councillor Eadie could maybe send me an email with respect to the question, I can take it up with Mr. Patman and get back to him.

**Councillor Eadie:** Second question.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question, Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, Madam Speaker. I'm wondering, it was not today's business, but it is on IRPW's next agenda, the item about the improvements to AT pedestrian snow clearing and there's a number of maps, Madam Speaker. I'm wondering if somehow the Chairperson could ask, like for me, it's just a map of what they're doing to do now. I haven't the foggiest idea where they're making improvements in my ward, as far as reading the map, Madam Speaker. And I'm wondering if the Chairperson would undertake to charge the administration, when they come to present at IRPW to maybe, well at least help this person who can't see, understand where the improvements are happening and actually where some of their reductions are happening. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Morantz.

**Councillor Morantz:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll thank my colleague for the question. The report is quite complex and I…but I have no doubt that the Public Service will be happy to answer any questions that my colleagues have. The maps were painstakingly put together and I was advised that it was really like putting a puzzle together for the whole city, but the general principle of the report was to re-prioritize mostly P2s and P3s to P1s, to allow for more connectivity across the city. There were no reductions in service, but there were areas where, for example, if you had one street that was, part of it was classified as P1 and part of it was classified as a P2 or P3, and you have a situation where the P1 portion sidewalk would get cleared first and so in order to have more continuity throughout the city, they reclassified streets from P2s and P3s to more P1s, so that when they come and plow the streets, they don't stop at the end of the block that they keep going and making sure that's it's clear. The maps are quite involved and I will be asking the Public Service to make sure that they make themselves available to councillors to answer any questions they might have about what changes may be taking place in their wards and the reasons for those changes. I also understand, by the way, that there was quite a bit of public consultation around the production of that report as well.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Eadie, final question.

**Councillor Eadie:** Final question. Madam Speaker, did the Chairperson know that the overall City finance appendices indicates that there are reductions in some areas and improvements in others, netting out to a higher cost, mind you, but is he aware that there have been some reductions in some areas?

**Councillor Morantz:** I'm not aware that there's any reduction in service related to this report. If, Madam Speaker, if the Councillor has something specific I'd appreciate that seeing that and I can certainly take it up with the Public Service and get any information or explanation that might be required.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions for the Chair? Okay, we'll move on to the final committee for today, the Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Gilroy, will you please move the report of April 4th, 2018 on my behalf?

**REPORT OF THE**
**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL**
**DATED APRIL 4, 2018**

**Councillor Gilroy:** Absolutely. Items 1 through 5.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, six is pulled. There is no six.. It's 1 through 5. I'm still awake. Okay. Number five, we'll do that. Councillor Lukes, No. 1, okay. So we'll call the question on 2, 3 and 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

**Item 1 – Community Committee Composition**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to introduce?

**Councillor Gilroy:** I'll wait to hear from my colleagues. Thank you.
**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** This is more just to inform residents. Because of the change of the community committees, we've asked the public service report back and develop a strategy for the review of the French Language Services because in the Riel Community Committee, there are French constituents who use the official languages services and with the realignment of the boundaries, some will not be in the Riel Community Committee, but still use those services. So it's just to thank the public service for looking into this and they will be bringing a report back.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Browaty. This is one. Okay, Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to close? Or I can call the question? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, Item 5.

**Item 5 – Election Financing Commission**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Gilroy.

**Councillor Gilroy:** I'll wait to hear from my colleagues.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise...now, this particular report, I appreciate the spirit of the need to say, have a commission in regards to what rules might be changed or determined, Madam Speaker. But again, there are only certain finance decisions that we get to make from a City Council level. There is provincial legislation in place for elections. It tells you who can and cannot contribute to a municipal campaign, Madam Speaker. There is a whole host of things in that provincial legislation. In our charter, I don't believe...and there may be, I know in the Charter there is a number of things that, in order for us to do elections and...but in the Charter, the Boundary's Commission, Madam Speaker, it's very clear about the Boundary's Commission. So...and it's defined who is on it and who isn't and so on and so forth, Madam Speaker. So as I read through this motion, I didn't hear it say about like...I don't know that I read anything in their discussion about how, again, like some of the other initiatives that we wanted to do to ensure that future members of Council are ethical and so on and so forth, Madam Speaker, because when we get into these discussions, Madam Speaker, there's some...and into election campaigns, Madam Speaker, there is innuendo about whether or not somebody is a crooked politician or whatever you want to call it. Madam Speaker, the general population does or does not have a perspective on politicians other than probably the majority of people don't trust them, Madam Speaker. But we all know as individuals and members of this council chamber, especially if you've been on here now and knew, you know that some of these perspectives that might get promoted are untrue. And so, when we look at a Finance Commission, and we're talking about making changes, that commission would be making changes to what's at the City level as far as I can tell. I can make recommendations. I think it's important to make recommendations. I know that the City's Clerks when things arise in Clerks having to operate the elections, they are the ones who run the elections…we just…we're about to pass a by-law that institutes an individual to be able to look at the finances of all of us. And Madam Speaker, and when it looks to expenditures there's a lot of rules. Like, you're not allowed to spend over a certain amount in a ward or in a mayoralty campaign, Madam Speaker. And you know, one of the rules that I'm very clear about is if

councillors and mayors don't submit audited statements, they can't run because that's a violation that is thought to be quite severe, Madam Speaker. And so, you know, there is various rules. And you know, in reviewing the last audit, Madam Speaker, you talked about finance and commissions and talking about ward chests. When you look at the audited statements that were submitted by people, you can see that there is anomalies that have to be looked at as well. I don't know how they were dealt with because I don't know exactly what the repercussions are if people, for example, spend more money than they're supposed to as outlined for each ward or as a mayoralty campaign. These things have to be looked at, Madam Speaker. I'm not going to sit in judgment but if we did have a commission, and there would be a cost, I guess. But you know, I personally, Madam Speaker, I rely on the advice we get from our Clerk's Department. They're the ones who run the elections. They are the ones who make sure that it's democratic and so on. So I don't…I don't really understand the need for…there's recommendations. If you want to lobby the Province and change the rules for municipal election financing, they were changed and actually, the rebate came up at one point because when I ran in 1998, Madam Speaker, a person could spend…who the candidate was, could spend as much money as they had on the election. There was no limitations on how much they could contribute, Madam Speaker. So, you know, those were things that were considered at provincial level and then they set different rules. They said that people can't contribute more than 750 or 1500. For mayoralty, that's the max. These are these maximums, Madam Speaker. And then if you looked at the way it was funded in the past, usually, you know, you have all these different conditions that need to be considered. And so while I appreciate that a Finance Commission is there, there is debate about whether a sign has value, Madam Speaker. What is the value of it? You know, Madam Speaker, I used 1998 signs in 2000, they were cardboard ones, Madam Speaker, and they were re-used. And you know Madam Speaker, I used them...alls I had to do was put a clear garbage bag over top of the sign and I used them, Madam Speaker. That's how frugal I am. Cost conscious, because you know what Madam Speaker, the reality is to raise money for an election, Madam Speaker, the reality is, depending on where you live, where you grew up, who you know, who you hang out with, Madam Speaker, that determines how much money you can find to campaign. And so, when we're looking at these things what is the value of a sign, I would tell you that the 1998 Ross Eadie cardboard signs which I cut off the, "For Old Kildonan" and put in "Seven Oaks School Board", you know, took that off, put them on signs, whatever, Madam Speaker, but I would tell you that the value of that sign was not the same value as it was when it was first purchased. So these kind of things, it does require people to look at it, whether or not it has an effect on the democratic process, Madam Speaker and so on. So, at this point I think...I really appreciate the sentiment of it but I think we already have things in place that deal with it. This is under the assumption that somehow, somehow, we as elected people now, are being unfair or even as a non-incumbent running, that somehow, you know, I followed the rules, I followed the rules. And actually, I took a penalty after the '98 because my life was so busy I got my audited statement in late, Madam Speaker, and so I couldn't run for City Council in 2002. What kind of…you know, I'd like to see a review and maybe this…you know, if you are voting to do it, maybe you should add on…I'm not going to vote for it, but what should be added on is, what are the repercussions if somebody over-expends the allowable amount to spend? What happens if a city councillor, an individual ends up having to pay more than $750 to cover off expenses that are not allowed?

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

**Councillor Eadie:** So you know, if we want to talk about how things operate, I invite the public to go and look at so-called ward chests. My ward chest is $1,800. I never raise...I never spend anywhere near the maximum limit, Madam Speaker, because I couldn't raise enough money to pay for it. Ward chest, the only reason I have $1,800 at my disposal, if I run this year, is because there is an expense there that was determined not to be election-related at all, okay, Madam Speaker. So there you have it, Madam Speaker. So there's all these things. So you know, this innuendo…and you get into campaigns. I want people to know that when the rules are there, I for one follow them to a T. And I am not a corrupt person. I try to do what I can and ward chest...like...anyway, whatever. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Gillingham.

**Councillor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be voting for this referral to the 2019 budget process as it's before us. Just to kind of restate though what I said I think moments ago earlier on in the meeting, though I'm voting in support of this, I'm not convinced that what we're really, ultimately needing which is a more, in my view, a more comprehensive review of the elections at the City of Winnipeg with perhaps an update that would review everything including what His Worship brought forward this morning as well. I'm not convinced that our clerks can't accomplish the same thing. So I look forward to the discussion when the time comes and if...you know, for those that are back here during that time, when the 2019 budget review happens, then I look forward to the discussion there. But if I'm privileged to be back here at that time I think what really needs to be looked at is yes, what is before us but also, whether or not our clerks can accomplish very much the same task with very similar results for the sake of democracy and for the sake of you know, improving, constant improvement of the election process here at the City of Winnipeg.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to thank EPC and…for the referral of this matter to the 2019 budget and that's what I will be supporting here today as well. Again, this is all just about fairness and openness and democracy in general, which is of course very, very important. All I'm saying to everyone is in my mind to bring this motion forward, is it's probably a healthy time and a healthy exercise to review the policies and the procedures and the practices that are out there. The advice may be if we go through this process, if we establish some sort of a commission, the advice may come back and say, you know what, you are the model of a perfect system here and don't change anything. That's entirely possible, I'm not discounting that. I mean we have seen certainly editorials recently about saying that, you know, the vote refund process is good for democracy. But let's have that…let's talk to the public. Let's talk to people who aren't sitting around this table, to get their opinions on what the pro...what's best in the process. In terms of how we go about doing it, again, like we…the commission I'm proposing is not something that I expect to cost huge sums of money. As we did the boundary review I mean, there were some hard costs for renting out rooms that were…of course, some staff resources within the City Clerk's Department but again, my understanding from the City Clerk was that the members of the commission didn't actually take the honorariums or the compensation offered to them so that wasn't a cost there. So again, I don't anticipate going down this path would be a large expenditure. I'd also suggest that you know, if we have an open public process and there are things to implement we would need approval from the Provincial Government, I think with, you know, a four-year window of time to do it, if we start early and we do it in 2019, we have the opportunity to work with the Province and perhaps get that into place for a civic election in 2022. Again, whoever happens to be around this table and even on Broadway when those discussions take place. So again, I think with proper time, proper consultation, and I'm not opposed to the idea of looking at other aspects of the municipal structure or the way council works or doesn't work and look for ways of improving. So again, I appreciate your support for this motion.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you Madam Speaker. Thank you to…thank you for my colleagues for having brought forward the issue of election finance. I thought I would make a few comments in French today since I haven't yet taken the opportunity yet and we have that capacity to communicate that way at Council.

***Translation of French Spoken:***

**Councillor Allard:** So, I would like to thank my colleagues for bringing up the issue of reforming the campaign finance process in Winnipeg. I think that there are a lot of things at stake that we can explore. Councillor Janice Lukes talked about the voter turnout at municipal elections being around 50 %, which is way too low. To me, I think about several... Or probably the majority of people... We must come up with ways to increase participation. The other thing I would like to note is the fact that it isn't necessarily as simple as one would think to compare how we conduct elections in Winnipeg with how it is done in other jurisdictions. For instance, I was just in Vancouver for a conference on the subject of cannabis, and I had the chance to meet with a councillor then. She explained to me that, in Vancouver, political parties are allowed to raise money outside of regular elections. In Winnipeg, if someone wishes to run for mayor or councillor, there are very restrictive limitations and laws on candidate eligibility, so I know that people who are running for Council cannot start campaigning before July 1st. It is not possible to ask for financial contributions or to lead an active campaign before this date, which means that, in Winnipeg, the incumbent councillors have a great advantage over the incumbent councillors in other Canadian jurisdictions. So I intend to vote in favour of my colleague's proposition to examine the overall process. I think that there are pros and cons to all systems. I think that low voter turnout in Winnipeg, which is too low, must be addressed. I was genuinely surprised to see how low the turnout was during the last election, because it was an election about change, and it generated a lot of interest from Winnipeggers. Even under such circumstances, the voter turnout was around 50%. I think that we must find ways to encourage people to vote. In other jurisdictions, like the Province of Manitoba, or the Federal Government, for which I ran twice, we had access to several discounts. I was granted a discount for each vote toward the party I represented. There was a discount for that. There was a specific discount for gifts presented to candidates, and a third discount applied to campaign expenses. Voter turnouts during provincial and federal elections are higher, for several reasons. However, I think that, in Winnipeg, we chose to have councillors, and not political parties, govern our city and represent our community. The mayor represents the city as a whole. We made this choice. I think that that is what Winnipeggers want. They have indicated that they are happy to have people representing their community's interest without fear. However, in such a system, parties are less organized, and voter turnouts are lower. So I think we must find solutions to this problem. And finally, it's expensive to become a candidate and lead a viable campaign. We must find ways to finance the system other than publicly. So, how will we do that? Because I think that people don't only want those candidates who collected the most funds to be way ahead in the election campaigns. We want a system that is more fair. Thank you very much to my colleagues and to Mayor Bowman for honouring his promise to consider removing discounts on gifts at the City. Thank you to my colleague Councillor Browaty for proposing that we review the general financing of elections. I think it is a good discussion to have. I am also looking forward to see what is proposed, if this report were to be approved, to solve those complex problems here in Winnipeg. Thank you for your attention.

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

***Translation of French Spoken:***

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am always inspired by Councillor Allard who always encourages me to use the language of Molière. So, I don't have much to say about this, but I would just like to add that the City of Winnipeg exists under the provincial Charter. We can always solve those problems, whether they are real or perceived, and that is our right. Councillor Allard brought up something interesting when he said that each political and municipal entity in Canada, as is the case for the City of Vancouver and its party system. It changes the dynamics and the rules around campaign contributions. So, I am just pointing out that it is different in every municipality. I don't really see what the problem is with our current system here in Winnipeg. I did not question things when I ran for councillor three years ago. But it is our right to do as we please, to have a commission whose role it is to examine under which conditions changes can be made. But at the same time, Madam Speaker, we must always remember that the City exists by virtue of the provincial Charter. It remains the Province's right to also review our electoral funding system. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy, shall I call the question or do you wish to close? All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Oh, excuse me.

**Madam Speaker:** Oh you wish to close, okay. You have the floor. You have the floor. Thank you.

**Councillor Gilroy:** No, but I will not be speaking French. Yeah, I do hope that councillors do support the motion and just so that you have a little bit more of the background from the conversation because we did have a pretty good conversation at the Governance Committee and we learned a lot. The Clerks do provide an overview after each election to find out, you know, are there things that we can be doing to improving our system and absolutely, we do do that. And actually, Council actually, through that process, there are things that we would've wanted to change and we have done that through Council. But it's never been accepted through the Province to deal with some of those charter issues. So in part of our conversations and understanding this a little bit more, we thought a little bit more of a robust action might help us really dive deep into this issue, look at best practices, really understand what other cities are doing. I mean, we're talking about rebates today, right? Before we make big decisions like that, we really wanted to really understand the impact. And if we look at the last elections, I mean, that was only 50 percent of the public that actually voted in the last municipal election. So there are some things that we really could dive into and hopefully, with outside help, maybe even get the interest of the Province on board to help look at some of these charter issues that we're having, to help improve our system and really make a difference. So I do hope that you consider it. I don't know if a lot of you had that information prior, but we did really ask the Clerks a lot of these questions and yes, they do do a really good process at the end of each election, but what we're really hoping to do is, is really look at that Charter and maybe get the Province on board with some of these issues which we haven't been able to deal with in the past. And hopefully, maybe with that independent body and having that outside look, we would be able to get those changes to happen. So through this process, I think it would be open and transparent for the public. I mean, I have really a great respect to the ward boundary review. I think it was a really, really positive process for the citizens of Winnipeg and I can imagine that being the same process here, where people can actually come and talk about these issues in an open and transparent manner. So I hope that maybe that changes some people's minds today because that's what really was the intent of this motion going forward, is that we do start looking at some of the changes we might want to make in the Charter and being able to implement that. So hopefully, you support this today. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll move on to by-laws under Governance. Councillor Gilroy, will you please move that by-law...the first reading please, on my behalf?

**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL**
**CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

**Councillor Gilroy:** By-law No. 44/2018.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 44/2018.

**Councillor Gilroy:** By-law 45/2018.

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

**Clerk:** So suspension of the rules for 45?

**Madam Speaker:** We're not on that one yet.

**Clerk:** It should just be 44.

**Madam Speaker:** Pardon me? Councillor Gilroy, do the second reading.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Sure. Oh, for the second reading. Okay, the second…so, can we do them all-inclusive or just one at a time?

**Madam Speaker:** It's 44/2018, the second reading.

**Councillor Gilroy:** The second, 44/2018.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 44/2018.

**Councillor Gilroy:** I move extension of the rules for By-law No. 44…for the third time, By-law No. 44/2018.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, now we'll have the addendum by-laws under Governance. Councillor Gilroy.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Okay, and can these be moved all together?

**Madam Speaker:** You'll suspend the rules, yeah.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Okay, I move to suspend the rules for By-law No. 45/2018 and By-law No. 46/2018.

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

**Clerk:** By-law No. 45/2018 and By-law No. 46/2018.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Move to expend the rules for the second time for By-law No. 45/2018 and By-law No. 46/2018.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, for second time. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-laws numbered 45/2018 and 46/2018.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Okay, I move to suspend the rules for the third time for By-law No. 45/2018 and By-law No. 46/2018.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gillingham, will you move that we adjourn?

**Councillor Gillingham:** Yes.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk, roll call.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**Council adjourned at 3:05 p.m.**