COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, October 24, 2019

The Council met at 9:39 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Rollins.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, and Schreyer.

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Clerk. I'd like to now recognize two first-time pages who are with us today; Aimie Langan attends Mennonite Brethren Collegiate Institute in the Elmwood-East Kildonan Ward and Caleb Shelvey attends Springs Christian Academy in St. Boniface Ward. Welcome and thank you for your service to Council. We'll now move into morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker and good morning to my council colleagues. And I want to welcome all those that joined us here in-person in the gallery and those that might be watching via the Livestream. I do have some brief opening remarks today. Firstly, echoing the comments of appreciation from Councillor Rollins a few moments ago in the opening prayer, I want to extend my appreciation to all members of council for their efforts over the course of the last week or two with respect to the response to the Manitoba storm. I know members of council have been very busy answering questions and responding to the needs of constituents in their wards. Of course, I want to thank all of the members of the Winnipeg Public Service in various departments that have been working diligently in response to the storm. I also want to thank of course the Provincial government for their efforts and the efforts of their Crown agencies including of course the outstanding efforts and continuing efforts of Manitoba Hydro as well as all those that have come into our country and our province to provide support. We know that we have hydro workers in from the US and I want to…I also want to just personally thank many of Canada's big city mayors who have reached out to me and I have had dialogue with as had our emergency operations manager with counterparts across Canada. We have Canadians in from places like Calgary, Saskatoon, Regina and Toronto. And I want to thank them….I want to thank them for answering the call, providing assistance to the City of Winnipeg and our residents in our time of need. I've encouraged all of them that they can begin starting to cheer for the Winnipeg Blue Bombers and the Winnipeg Jets while they're here and keep that feeling when they go home, especially to places like Regina and Saskatoon. But I just want to say thank you to everybody for their efforts. I know this storm is unprecedented. The response is going to take a lot of time and a lot of patience for Winnipeggers. And we just want to say thank you to the efforts of members of the public service and all those private sector and public sector crews that are out there doing difficult, often dangerous work in our community to protect life safety and to get Winnipeg moving again in all areas of our city. We do really appreciate the efforts. Madam Speaker, I also want to just highlight...you know, they say timing in politics is everything. I wish that weren't the case in this instance, but a few weeks before the storm I had announced the Million Tree Challenge. We didn't realize when that announcement was made how much we would need the efforts of our community to help with expanding the tree canopy. Roughly 10% of our tree canopy was damaged in the storm. And now more than ever we're going to need everybody's efforts to help us build a stronger and more diverse tree canopy for future generations. I want to thank members of council for their support as well as the public service who are now undertaking some efforts to provide structure to the program. And of course, Tree Canada as well as CN for the first of what I'm hoping are many private-sector donations to the effort. They donated a million dollars right out of the gate to help with that effort through Tree Canada. I know other members of council including Councillor Orlikow, have been supporting the program. And I just want to thank and applaud everybody for their efforts. Madam Speaker, speaking of efforts, Councillor Gillingham and I were busy in New York about a month ago. We travelled to New York for what has become an annual trip of Finance Chairs over the years including of course Councillor Gillingham and I along with members of our public service. We met with S&P Global as well as Moody's to discuss our credit rating as well as our overall financial structures and practices. The meetings were excellent. And I want to thank Councillor Gillingham for his preparation for those meetings as well as our public service who did some really good work in those meetings. I also had the opportunity while I was in New York to meet with our…the Canadian Ambassador to the UN. I had the opportunity to attend the general assembly along with

Canadian delegation, which I appreciate their efforts at the United Nations on behalf of Canada. I also had an opportunity to meet with Consul General Phyllis Yaffe from Winnipeg serving Canada in the role of Consul General in New York. All of those discussions included discussion about how Winnipeg is growing, how we are becoming more diverse, how we are working to better protect and promote human rights here in our community, on the ground where it matters most. And I just want to say thank you for those meetings and thank you for the efforts in their service to our country in New York. In closing, I also want to just mention that I had an opportunity to welcome the Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention. They had their AGM and meetings here at City Hall I believe it was last week. And I want to thank members of the public service as well as members of council who are supporting those efforts. And last but not least, on the political front, I want to congratulate Premier Brian Pallister yesterday for his cabinet shuffle. I want to welcome Minister Rochelle Squires into the new portfolio for her as Minister for Municipal Relations. I know many members of council and I have good, healthy relationships with many members of the provincial legislature including Minister Squires and I'm really looking forward to working with her in this new portfolio. We've already been in touch and there is a lot of work ahead for us all, and I'm looking forward to supporting her in that new role. And lastly of course there was a federal election this week. I want to congratulate all those that had the courage of their convictions to put their name on a ballot across Canada including here in the City of Winnipeg. I want to congratulate all those on behalf of Council and Winnipeggers, all those that were re-elected and all those that are newly elected including Raquel, Leah and of course, Marty. Our council colleague Marty Morantz has served Winnipeggers here in this council chamber before and I want to wish him all the very best in his new role. And I've already asked him if he's helped balance the federal budget. He's my member of parliament now. I live in his constituency. It's a minority parliament. There's no excuses to Councillor Morantz…or sorry, Member of Parliament Morantz. Jokes aside, I want to wish him and the others all the very best for this new role. Their efforts are much appreciated by Winnipeggers across the political spectrum. There's some…it certainly is a bit of a microcosm of Canada in terms of the voting patterns. We have New Democrat, Liberal and Conservatives in Parliament and I want to wish all of them all the very best with their efforts. And we'll be there to hopefully help them all be successful in helping move our country forward and our city forward as well, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Chambers, Deputy Mayor, your morning statement please.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not certain if everyone is aware that it was a year ago on October 24th, 2018, that Winnipeggers went to the polls to cast their votes to elect this city council, the 17th Winnipeg City Council. On the anniversary of that election which saw the most diverse council in our city's history, we are one year into our mandate. Thank you. We are one year into our mandate that assists our city with growing steadily towards a million people population, steadily and sustainably. Today our council will listen to, debate among and decide upon a variety of issues. It is imperative that we work collaboratively and purposely together acting with integrity that each of those votes casted in our favour a year ago brought us here to this chamber. Congratulations to all my council colleagues on our one-year anniversary. One down, three to go.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Chambers. Councillor Gillingham followed by Councillor Santos.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker and good morning. I want to echo the Mayor's comments, specifically congratulating our former councillor colleague, Marty Morantz on his election win. And certainly I look forward to working with Marty as the new Member of Parliament elect to strengthen the community of Charleswood-St. James-Assiniboia-Headingly. And I'm sure my councillor colleague, Councillor Klein as well will look forward to working with him as Marty's territory now covers both of our wards. I want to take the opportunity to thank outgoing Member of Parliament, Dr. Doug Eyolfson for his excellent work. Second of all, I want to just remind this council that at last month's council meeting, we gave a send-off to team Kurz, aka team Canada from the Assiniboine Memorial Curling Club. They were headed to Scotland representing Canada in the Mixed Curling World Championships. Well, I am very proud to say that team Kurz are world champions. They won the world championship, yes, earlier this month. So congratulations to Colin Kurz. Congratulations to Colin Kurz, Meghan Walter, Brendan Bilawka and Sara Oliver on their win. And finally, speaking of curling, congratulations to the Deer Lodge Curling Club on the celebration of their 100th anniversary. Last week I was invited to attend a short, on-ice ceremony to mark this historic event and I certainly wish Deer Lodge Curling Club another 100 years.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Santos and our last speaker will be Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Santos: Thank you Madam Speaker. Good morning everyone. I just want to take this time to quickly acknowledge something very rare to recognize a major milestone in the Point Douglas Ward as well as the entire city as a whole. Earlier this summer, Canada Soccer's Hall of Fame has recognized United Weston Football Club as an organization of distinction. This is a program that recognizes the long-standing traditions of soccer here in Canada. It has been much debated on whether soccer is one of the oldest sports known to mankind, but what we do know is that in 1909 a man known as Hector Tyler who worked with the CP Railways for many years founded one of Winnipeg's very

first football club. With a very long, rich history dating all the way back in the early 1900s, the two neighbourhood soccer teams, United and Weston amalgamated to form United Weston Football Club. I did a little bit of more research with our City Archivists and confirmed that they're in our city directories that places back in the 1920s that Weston United Football Club boundaries were on Notre Dame between Myrtle Street and the CPR tracks. This is an area that is still known today as Weston, a neighbourhood that I'm very proud to represent. A hundred ten years later, United Weston Football Club is now believed to be one of the longest-existing amateur soccer teams in all of Canada. This is something that all of Winnipeg should be very proud of. Next year, it's my understanding that Manitoba Soccer Association will be hosting its annual awards ceremony and honouring Weston United Football's accomplishment. I welcome all of my council colleagues to participate in the dinner when the time comes. Earlier today some of the team officials, the referees and players were here this morning and they are here in the gallery. And we had an opportunity to meet with them with myself and some of my council colleagues. We welcome you to City Hall. And on behalf of myself, my council colleagues and the City of Winnipeg, we give you our utmost respectful congratulations and we wish you all the best and cheers to 100 more years in the sport of soccer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Santos. Finally, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Yesterday marked the 175th anniversary of Louis Riel's birth. And yesterday also marked…and I was proud to represent city council and Mayor Brian Bowman at the launch with…along with President Chartrand and his ministers at the Manitoba Métis Federation and President Chartier with the Royal Canadian Mint, the unveiling of a new coin featuring a portrait of Louis Riel at the Fort Garry Hotel. As we know, Louis Riel is often known as the Father of Manitoba. And I want to recognize this beautiful coin that you too could get for $60 at the Canadian Mint. It's a beautiful commemoration of the Métis leader with a big Métis sash that loops around the front and behind him that is reminiscent of the Métis infinity symbol. And I would like to acknowledge Louis Riel, the Manitoba Métis Federation and thank them very much for the very moving experience and the beautiful work that was unveiled of Mr. David Garneau from Saskatchewan.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Rollins. We have a condolence motion before us moved by Councillor Gillingham, seconded by Councillor Klein. It is for former Councillor Gordon Keatch. Mr. Clerk, would you please read this into the record.

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Gordon Charles Keatch, which occurred on June 25, 2019.

Mr Keatch served two terms as Trustee of the St. James School Division and served as Councillor for the City of St. James from 1966 to 1967.

This Council extends to his family its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Please rise for a moment of silence. Please be seated. Thank you.

MINUTES

Councillor Orlikow moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on September 26, 2019, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into delegations. Yes, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to suspend the rules to add seven more names for the low income bus pass program item that is on the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works for October 1st.

Madam Speaker: Okay, seven additional names all in support of this item, the low income bus pass. And the names are?

Councillor Gilroy: Molly McCracken, Debbie…sorry, I need my glasses. Debbie…do you need the full names, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gilroy: Debbie Stillito, Mark Cohoe, Dana Smith, Paulette Tremblay, Al Wiebe and Oke Ojekudo.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all in favour of hearing these additional delegations? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, we have a notice of Motion No. 2 on our desks, dealing with Québec's Bill 21 that will come up later in the agenda. We have a number of citizens here today in the gallery that would like to speak to this motion. They were not able to formally register to speak as this item is not on the agenda. I believe it's a very important issue for our city and council to support. As such, I would like to request that Council suspend the rules to deal with this motion today and allow these delegations to speak. I would move that the following suspensions take place; suspend the rules to consider Motion No. 2 now rather than later in the agenda as we do have the delegations present. Suspend the rule to deal with Motion 2 today rather than have it referred to the next council meeting. Suspend the rule to hear the following delegations to speak to Motion 2: Simarpreet Singh, Tasneem Vali, Aliyah Harb, Idris Elbaki, Bell Jarnuski, Imree Carr, Kudas Abu-Salela…sorry, Zara Khadim, Mohammad Almaleki, Sozan Palani, Mamneet Sheena Gurm, Jakob Sanderson and Noelle Asagher. And I would also like to suspend the rule to allow council to deal with the matter that would normally be out of order and or outside of council purview as this is addressing legislation from another province because our community feels that it is important for this city council to lead by example in the fight for equality of all of our citizens as we've done in the past. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, just for point of clarification with all due respect to the motion, is Councillor Nason asking that as soon as it hits the floor, if we do debate it today by virtue of a two-thirds vote to spend the rules, we may refer it in the process of deliberation, we may refer it to the next meeting or to an appropriate department. Is he asking that we not do that before it hits the floor?

Madam Speaker: That's your right to do that when the opportunity comes up. Councillor Nason is asking for four suspensions. Was there another question? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, I guess my first…I'm not sure if that's a point of order. I'm not sure if those four suspensions at this point are the right idea. I think the suspension of the rules to hear delegations, that I think is the matter in front of us right now. I think the other matters that Councillor Nason has brought up should be done within the agenda. But…so I'm fine with spending rules to hear the delegations. The other ones I think we should be separating those out having those separate debates at a later time.

Madam Speaker: This is a complicated process so we will restate what's before us here today. I'd like to just put some thoughts on the record about process here. I know this is an important matter, but I'm really not sure what the time sensitivity is on this item and why this simply could not have gone forward to the November meeting of this council as per the process prescribed in our by-law, Councillor Nason. Delegations then that are here today and others in the public would have an opportunity to come speak to the item. In any event, this is before us today and it is within your right to ask for the suspensions of the rules. I would like to ask Council though in the future to work within our procedure by-law. I would certainly appreciate that and I think all members of council would.

Councillor Rollins: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Rollins: Can you clarify…isn't walk-ons and the ability that Councillor Nason is suggesting in the procedural by-law?

Madam Speaker: It is within his right, yes, and I did state that Councillor Rollins, thank you. So we do have delegations today. There are four suspensions of the rules that are being asked for today. So we're going to go through them. Mr. Clerk, please chime in if you feel something is being missed here. So the first one we'll be voting on is Councillor Nason has asked to change the order of proceedings to consider Motion 1 at this point in the agenda rather than after EPC reports as it normally would be. Okay, we will not be debating the item at this time, just to deal with the item at this time. Let's go through all four of them so there's an understanding. Can we do that first?

Councillor Gillingham: We can. I'm just wondering about…I don't understand the order of being willing to hear something today when we haven't voted on whether we're going to hear it or not.

Madam Speaker: We're going to restate that order.

Councillor Gillingham: Okay, thank you.

Madam Speaker: And Mr. Clerk, if you can go through the four items. And I'm going to speak after that.

City Clerk: Councillor Nason has requested a suspension of the rules on Motion No. 2. Motion No. 2 would normally only come up in your agenda during the EPC motions section, so the first appropriate suspension would be, does Council want to even consider Motion 2 right now. So I think a suspension of the rules to vote on and deal with Motion 2 right now versus allowing it to occur during the EPC motions section.

Madam Speaker: We can't go any further with delegations unless we deal with that vote first, okay? And the second vote, Mr. Clerk?

City Clerk: The second vote, once you choose to deal with it now would be to decide whether to suspend the rules to hear it today. Normally, this motion is a notice of motion so it would simply be going to the November Council meeting. So once you've decided to deal with it now, you decide whether you want to deal with it today or have it normally…as normal process, go to the November Council meeting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And the third vote would be to allow the addendum delegations to speak. Okay, and there's another suspension as well. This item is actually out of order. It's not related to city business. And so it is out of order according to the procedure by-law, but it is Council's right to suspend the rules to hear the item. Okay, that will be vote number three. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, appreciate this. This is complicated. Thank you. Is it possible to support hearing the item now, therefore support hearing the delegations to respect the fact that they've come to City Hall today and then vote on whether to hear the matter today or not? Can we...basically what I'm wondering…can you say, support hearing the item now, therefore allowing the delegations to be heard now but then have a vote after that as to whether to actually hear the item today in the EPC general process?

Madam Speaker: No, because if an item is not on the agenda then we don't have delegations speak to the item, Councillor Gillingham. So a lot of thought has gone into this by the Clerk. So I would like to follow the process that's in front of us that they've laid out for us. We've looked at other precedent in the past. So yes, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Just to be clear though on that, that would mean that people that were in delegations for other items that are on the list, this would move the other people in front of them?

Madam Speaker: That's right, the addendum delegations that we're speaking about right now about Bill 21, would come after all those that have been registered including the low-income bus pass, okay, because folks that have been registered will be heard first. So again, the first vote is to change the order of proceedings, I think we've had enough questions now, to change the order of proceedings to consider the motion to at this point in the agenda. And whether you want to hear delegations, we'll talk about that in a few moments. So we'll have a vote on changing the order of proceedings to hear Motion 2 at this point in the agenda instead of after EPC business, okay. Does everyone understand?

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, so right now we're being asked to move an item immediately in the agenda right now?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Mayor Bowman: Can we speak to the matter if we want to move it to another place in the agenda like after EPC, for example?

Madam Speaker: The opportunity to speak to the item will be later, Mr. Mayor. But now it's just we're moving it up in the agenda so we can deal with the addendum delegations.

Mayor Bowman: But if I'd like to speak to that decision, can I speak to it?

Madam Speaker: There's no speaking to suspensions.

Mayor Bowman: So the move to suspend to move it immediately up, we can't debate? You just vote on it?

Madam Speaker: That's right.

Mayor Bowman: Okay, thank you Madam Speaker.

Councillor Orlikow: So point of clarification. I know we're kind of bogging up time and I'm sorry everybody, but I'm trying to get my head around it. So I definitely don't have a problem with the delegations. So my question though is are we going to hear the delegations or are we going to move the agenda item up now, vote on the matter...

Madam Speaker: We have to deal with each item separately, Councillor Orlikow. Good question. Right now we're just moving it up to deal with the item now.

Councillor Orlikow: Before delegations or after delegations? Are we moving the item up before delegations or after delegations?

Madam Speaker: We'll deal with the delegations momentarily. Right now we're just moving the agenda…the item up in the agenda so we can deal with the delegation vote in a moment.

Councillor Orlikow: But it will be…okay, so we're not saying we're going to hold the delegations back and we're going to vote on this matter and then have the delegations speak? Delegations would still go first and then it's just number one on the agenda?

Madam Speaker: That's right and then EPC.

Councillor Orlikow: All right, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Sorry, I still need some clarification on if we were to not vote...if say we voted and we didn't vote to change the order of proceeding, can we still hear it?

Madam Speaker: No, we cannot. We cannot hear delegations. We first need to change the…

Councillor Santos: Not hear delegations, could we still hear the motion and debate the motion?

Madam Speaker: That would come up later during EPC matters.

Councillor Santos: But then can we suspend the rules at that time to hear delegations?

Madam Speaker: No, it's not normally done. Delegations are at the front of the meeting here at Council.

Councillor Santos: At the very front. They're not done during the middle of the meeting?

Madam Speaker: That's right. That's right.

Councillor Santos: Okay, got you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: So again…if the proper processes were followed, there would be a greater voice for delegations to be heard, it would be on an agenda. There would be more representation from delegations and the opportunity for them to see exactly when they would appear on the schedule, is that correct?

Madam Speaker: I did state that as well. Yes, Councillor Chambers. Okay, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'm sorry. Madam Speaker, I really…I do appreciate your comments at the beginning and I just want to make sure what we're voting on. The first vote is whether or not Councillor Nason has moved that we will hear this matter on the agenda immediately. If we were to vote against it, would it be within his rights to then re-introduce another motion asking that it be at the end of EPC so that we could respect the current process in delegations that have...I

mean, for those of us that want to support it and want to support the intent of the motion, but want to also respect others that are here, if we were to vote against it, he could? Okay.

Madam Speaker: This item Mr. Mayor is a notice of motion currently, Motion 2. It's on your desks. It is a notice of motion. So technically what's before us is we would be dealing with this at the November Council meeting where the delegations that are here today could speak and others in the public. Councillor Nason is asking that we change the order of items so we deal with the item now to allow delegations to speak that are here today. Okay, but there's a number of votes that have to take place because we're also suspending the rules to deal with the item today. It's a notice of motion, which means the November Council meeting. So…Mr. Clerk, would you like to clarify anything more so we can move forward one way or another?

City Clerk: Basically, the Procedure By-law lays out the order in which you hear items on the agenda. So normally you would be debating and asking for a suspension of the rules on Motion No. 2 after the EPC reports. Councillor Nason is simply asking that we have that debate on whether to suspend or introduce that item now. And so that's the first suspension of the rules. You're not hearing the item. You're basically just deciding whether you're going to have suspension of the rules to hear the item now versus later so that the addendum delegations can appear. That's all the first suspension of the rules would do.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: So to understand correctly, if we don't do the suspension of the rules right now, all the delegations that are here this morning would have to wait perhaps for another suspension of the rules after the EPC items and all the other delegations to potentially deal with this item at the end of the EPC agenda. It would simply require a separate suspension of the rules so all the people who want to speak to it probably wouldn't be heard for several hours.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Browaty, if we don't suspend the rules right now to deal with the item at this time, then we'll move on to the other delegations that are here and that have registered. And this item will come up under normal business under Executive Policy Committee as a notice of motion.

Councillor Browaty: We could potentially though suspend the rules again at that time for a delegation.

Madam Speaker: At that time, yes. For Council to hear…deal with the item today but not for delegations, I've never seen that quite frankly, where we hear delegations in the middle of our Council proceedings.

Councillor Browaty: Perhaps the Clerk could clarify that we could potentially have delegations after the EPC regular agenda or not. I don't know if it's not…

Madam Speaker: Again, I've never seen it procedurally. Anything is possible with a suspension of the rules.

Councillor Eadie: That was my point of order, Madam Speaker. We are suspending the rules so that rule about when delegations come can also be suspended, right?

Madam Speaker: Yes. Mr. Clerk, anything to add to that?

City Clerk: It's correct that Council can suspend any rule in the Procedure By-law.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Is it possible that the motion to suspend the rules could be amended so that the delegations could be heard in order and therefore the delegation referring to Councillor Nason's motion in question now could be heard after the delegations that are listed in the minutes?

Madam Speaker: He's not asking to debate the motion at this time. We're just asking to…so I'm going to call the question now and there was a call for a recorded vote. So the vote is on changing the orders of…order proceedings so we can consider this motion at this time. And the purpose of this vote is just so we can have the next vote, which is to allow these delegations to speak today. Okay? Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Just to be clear Madam Speaker if I heard you right; the purpose of this vote is to deal with the matter now. The purpose of the subsequent vote, the second vote is not specific to the delegations. It's specific to whether or not to hear the item today. The third vote would be for delegations. Am I correct?

Madam Speaker: Actually, that's correct Councillor Gillingham. The second vote is to deal with this item today opposed to a notice of motion. Because again, we can't have delegations speak if it's a notice of motion, okay? So there was a call for recorded vote and the first vote is suspension of the rules to change the order of proceedings to consider Motion 2 at this point in the agenda rather than after the EPC reports. Okay. All in favour of that suspension? We need two-thirds, 11 votes. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillor Eadie

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

Madam Speaker: That motion carries to change the order of proceedings and now the vote to have this motion…to have this motion not go to the November meeting of Council, but rather to be dealt with today. Okay. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillor Gillingham

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

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

Madam Speaker: So the motion…suspension passes. We will deal with this item today. Now a third vote to allow Council to consider an item that is not related to City business which is normally out of order as per the Procedure By-law. All in favour...yes?

Councillor Nason: It's supposed to be suspend the rules to let the delegations speak on Motion 2?

Madam Speaker: That's going to be after.

Councillor Nason: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: So to allow Council…we're putting this on the record so let's do this properly. So to allow Council to consider an item that is not related to City business. This item should be out of order as per our Procedure By-law. Please rise. They're all recorded. Thank you, Councillor Lukes. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 16, Nays none.

Madam Speaker: The vote is unanimous. And now, the final vote to allow the addendum delegations. How many delegates were there? You had read them out Councillor Nason, to speak today. And there will be five minutes, Mr. Clerk, no questions, correct? No suspending, no extensions of time, five minutes, no questions. All in favour? Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Just a clarification, if we vote for this, these delegations would speak after the other delegations we've already registered and also approved from Councillor Gilroy, right?

Madam Speaker: That is correct, yes. And there's other delegations that have registered as well, Councillor Eadie. Thank you. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Madam Speaker: The addendum delegations, the vote is unanimous. And again, the motion will be considered after the EPC reports during regular business. Our first delegation, I would like to call forward Mr. Carlos Sosa and following that, we'll hear from Mr. Josh Brandon if they can both come down. Mr. Sosa is in support of Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, the report dated October 1st, 2019, regarding Low-Income Transit Pass Program, the Policy and Financial Impact. You have ten minutes, sir. Thank you.

DELEGATIONS

Carlos Sosa: Thank you. Members of City Council, good morning. My name is Carlos Sosa. I am here to speak in support of the report from the Standing Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works from October 1st on the low-income bus pass. The introduction of the low-income bus pass is a welcome move, but there is always room for improvements. As a support worker that supports people with intellectual disabilities that live independently in the community, many of my supported individuals live in poverty. They also utilize transit as a way of facilitating their inclusion into the community. One of my supported individuals reported to me that the biggest reason why he uses the bus is to get a break from his apartment because he has no friends. Many of my supported individuals also rely on employment and income assistance, which is bare bones and they struggle day-to-day just to survive. The current proposed rates will make it very difficult for my clients to afford the bus pass. Fifty bucks for my supported individuals will be extremely difficult for them to save on a monthly basis. The individuals that I work with would benefit from a sliding scale approach that would be based on a single fare that would start at $5 a month. It's also critical that we look at other fare options such as single fares for those who do not necessarily need to use the bus all the time. The proposal on the table also needs to be extended to those who are under the age of 18, especially when we have one of the highest child poverty rates in the country. Ultimately, the goal should be an aim for free public transit within the City of Winnipeg, which would facilitate a more inclusive city. Another thing that is not clear is whether Winnipeg Transit Plus users would even be eligible for the low-income bus pass. So it's absolutely critical that this get cleared up today. I also use this as an opportunity to call on our provincial government to restore the 50/50 funding agreement that was cut a couple years ago. Our provincial government should be playing a major role in funding this critical social programming, which assists in the development in creating a more inclusive city for our marginalized populations. The introduction of the bus pass, the low-income bus pass must not come at the expense of rising bus fares or cutting transit routes. At the same time, Winnipeg Transit Plus must also be protected from cutbacks. The quality of service must be acknowledged and protected. I also use this as an opportunity to call on the City of Winnipeg to adopt a disability policy lens so that when new programs are developed, they are done to consider the impacts of proposed policy moves that will have on people living with disabilities. You have a critical choice to make today and obviously where this is going isn't a good move. I also do understand that it's been fairly difficult dealing with this provincial government, and I completely agree it's been very difficult. So we must consider the impacts that this move will have on marginalized citizens. Again, it's a step in the right direction. We also need to consider that transit…transit…that public transit is a means in which people in all communities utilize it to connect with society and services and also to the broader communities. So I definitely encourage you to support this motion, but also to commit to making the necessary improvements, which will also make this low-income bus pass a lot better for marginalized citizens and for the supported individuals that I work with. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Sosa, we'll just ask you to stand down. We'll take the next delegation and we'll call you back for questions. If Mr. Josh Brandon can now come forward and he is in support of the same item. We'll put five minutes on the clock.

Josh Brandon: Thank you so much. And thank you everyone for taking this important step. I want to particularly thank Cindy Gilroy, not just for her motion to suspend the rules to allow the additional delegates to speak, but also for her role in spearheading this idea of a low-income bus pass as well as the councillors that have worked…many councillors have worked on this over the past couple of years. So really, this is a big first step. Beyond just the members of council here, I know that this is something that in the community people have been working for for many years. The Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, it's something we have been advocating for for several years now that we need to have a low-income bus pass. And that's really rooted in the work we do in the community. The Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, we've been working for a sustainable and equitable city that's caring for all residents of Winnipeg. Transit is an important part of that. So in the work that I do in the community, I've worked with people who have told me about how because of the cost of transit, they haven't been able to make medical appointments. I've talked with employers who have had to let go of workers because their workers aren't able to afford to get to job sites. And I've talked to people who have felt increased social isolation because they can't afford to make those important social connections. Transit is such an important piece in the daily lives of all residents of Winnipeg, but particularly for low-income people. I also want to add that as we move towards a growing city, we've talked about we're growing to a city of 1 million people, and we're faced with a climate emergency, we need to make sure that transit is affordable and accessible for every resident here in Winnipeg. So congratulations for taking this first step towards a low-income bus pass, but we really recognize that we need to do more also. The monthly bus pass, what's being proposed here, $70 a month starting this next spring, moving to $50 or 50% off by 2022, that's still going to be out of reach for a lot of low-income households. We need to look at other models like Calgary that have implemented sliding-scale fares. We also need to consider single-fare options because a lot of people don't have the money at the beginning of the month to buy a whole bus pass. And we need to recognize that youth and children living in poverty, they're living in poor families and they need to be able to access reduced fares as well. Moreover, we cannot use a low-income bus pass as licence for increased fares more generally. I remember that when we first started talking about this low-income bus pass about two years ago, many of us were down here confronting a 25 cent fare increase. If we increase the bus fares every year, that will just erode the value of a low-income bus pass. So we need to make sure that bus fare is affordable for everyone, whether or not you have the low-income bus pass. We also need to recognize that the Province needs to do more. We've been joining our partners at Functional Transit Winnipeg, calling on the Province to reinstate the 50/50 funding agreement. We also know that about $4 million a year, the Province is spending for EIA recipients who are eligible for bus passes through its various programs. And so this low-income bus pass actually could benefit the Province. And so we need to work together to make sure that the Province does their fair share. And we'll be working with you to partner on that. A low-income bus pass will be an important milestone for this city to reaching its goal of making poverty reduction an aspect of every City policy. And that's something that I know is important for a lot of councillors who voted in support of a poverty reduction strategy for Winnipeg. And so I encourage you to continue with that policy direction. Several community members are going to be speaking today, talking about their personal experiences, how low-income transit is important for them. I hope you will listen to their voices and take this important step to introducing the low-income bus pass. Thank you so much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Brandon. This is your opportunity for questions. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'm glad to see Carlos Sosa here and Josh Brandon. Carlos Sosa, neighbour of mine for many years, both of us living within a block or two of the poorest urban area in Canada. And that's where we're from. Carlos mentioned the idea of a sliding scale, and I'm not sure whether Josh Brandon as he deals with these same very issues regarding poverty and this poorest urban area in Canada right here, not far from here. In fact, one could argue City Hall is amongst that poorest urban area in Canada. The issue of a sliding scale, I'm not sure who would wish to speak to this, if they both can, but where does…you know, I'm sure people have questions. Where does this come from? What has been the discussion? And if one would like to make any comments regarding the sliding scale.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Mr. Sosa.

Carlos Sosa: Yeah, I mean I think a sliding-scale approach for the people that I work with would be beneficial because we need to realize that EIA...I mean, people with disabilities who are on EIA receive low benefits. And yeah, a bus pass on EIA is not automatic. In fact, some of my clients don't even qualify for the bus pass for EIA and so therefore, there's a goal for us to make, the City to make the bus pass affordable. And so again, one of my clients would have difficulty saving up the $50 or even the $70. So but that $5, that $5 would make it affordable for him to access the services, to go out and meet his friends. So it's absolutely critical that we value and understand that lived experience. It's so critical.

Josh Brandon: Well, you know, the sliding scale is based on equity. In cities like Calgary, they've introduced a low-income bus pass that varies depending on what your income level is. And for the people with very low incomes, it's as low as $5 a month. The Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives has shown that for some low-income people they're paying as much as 6% of their income for transit. And that's clearly unaffordable for people. Even at a 50% reduction, that would still be 3% of their income. Just imagine if any of you were spending 3% of your income for a bus pass, how unaffordable that might be. And so, we're just asking that we look at that as part of the package of options that you consider today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Speaker. Thank you very much, both of you for your presentations. I wanted to address just one or two things. I looked at this as much as we can and as far as we can right now, but it appears that the Province hasn't really changed their funding. They've changed how they provided to the City. So they provided a one big cheque if you will, and then the City has the ability then to allocate it to the resources that they see necessary. This council gets to vote on that. And I…this truly is an investment in our community. So it would be, you know, I look at it from a different perspective, but as that this is more of helping our neighbours. But listening to you and looking at the u bus pass that we have right now, is that more of an opportunity for people to gain access? That one is more affordable than what I'm hearing the prices are today, would that help more just to use an existing program we already have?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Would one of you like to address that question?

Josh Brandon: Sure. You know, the U-Pass actually goes further than the proposed low-income bus pass. If we were to install a program where the U-Pass kind of model was universally accessible, that would be great. If every citizen as part of their tax bill pays for a bus pass and every resident of Winnipeg would get a bus pass. That would be the model we would be talking about if we were to universalize the U-Pass program. We'd be very much in support of that. We hope that this low-income bus pass might be a first step in that direction of making universal access to transit available.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, we thank you for your presentation today. Next I'd like to call Michel Durand-Wood in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Finance dated October 11th, 2019, regarding the Financial Management Plan. We'll have ten minutes on the clock. And following that, we'll get into our addendum delegations in support of the low-income bus pass. Welcome.

Michel Durand-Wood: Thank you. Good morning, Madam Speaker, Mayor Bowman, esteemed councillors. I am Michel Durand-Wood. I am here to talk to you today about the absolutely riveting topic of financial management plans. I realize that reading through a financial management plan sounds about as fun as crossing Portage and Main on foot, probably not as controversial. But as you certainly know, this is a very key policy document. It's basically what's going to frame all other policy decisions going forward including budgeting. So as a responsible and engaged, and some would say nerdy citizen of Winnipeg, I decided to read through the plan. And then my hydro came back on after the storm, I went online and I watched the YouTube videos of the SPC meeting and the EPC meeting as well. So I was kind of disappointed when I saw the EPC meeting that this went through and was approved with no discussion and not even a single question because surely a document of this magnitude deserved a little bit more than a rubber stamp. Now, I was reassured somewhat in watching the Finance Committee proceedings because I really want to thank and congratulate Councillors Gilroy and Nason on their very relevant questioning and very probing questioning on the plan. But one question in particular, and I believe it was from Councillor Nason, really, really resonated with me. So as you know, the financial management plan sets out eight financial goals, and I'm going to quote directly from the plan here, "Against which current and future financial performance can be measured." Now one figure in the plan says that from 2011 to 2018, our property assessment base grew by 58%. Councillor Nason's question was compared to what. Now that's a really insightful question because as with any financial figure, when it's quoted on its own, it's meaningless. It only has meaning when it's compared to something else. So is 58% good, is it bad? We don't know. We can't know unless we compare it to another figure. Now, Councillor Nason wanted to compare it to our growth in the economy, which is very interesting as well, but from my point of view I think it was more…it's more interesting to compare it to other goals in the plan, specifically number 7, debt, and number 5, infrastructure because if you're going to brag about growth under one goal, surely you'd want to do it under the other goals. Well shocker, those numbers aren't in there. So being the resourceful nerd that I am, I went online again and I was able to find the debt numbers in some buried report on the City website so I can present those to you now, you're welcome. Now while our assessment base grew 58% over the seven years, it turns out our debt grew by about 100% over the same period, it roughly doubled. And it's projected to continue to increase so that over a ten-year period, it will have almost tripled. Now, 58% doesn't sound so great anymore, does it? Pretty sure Councillors Nason and Gilroy might have had some follow-up questions if they had been presented with that information. So what about infrastructure? How much did our infrastructure grow from 2011 to 2018, sorry to let you down, but my research skills aren't that good. I couldn't find that anywhere. So I find that pretty troubling, and the reason for that is that infrastructure from a financial perspective behaves very much like debt. When a city borrows money, it

comes with a future financial liability, an obligation to repay it at a later date. We know when and we know how much. Similarly, when we build a piece of infrastructure, it also comes with a future financial liability of course to maintain it and repair it, but ultimately to replace it when it comes to the end of its useful life and then to do that again when it comes to the end of its useful life again and then again and again forever. From the moment we build something, like say the sexy new Waverley underpass, we already know that one day, we're going to have to replace it. And through the magic of asset management planning, we even know when and we know how much it's going to cost. It's just like debt. Now, if it looks like a debt and it quacks like a debt, maybe we should treat it like a debt. Now we obviously can't take on an infinite amount of debt without compromising our ability to meet our future obligations to pay it. But is it different with infrastructure? Can we just go out there and build an infinite amount of infrastructure and then bask in the warm glow of assessment-based growth? Because that's certainly what the underlying assumption seems to be in the financial management plan. Because here's how it treats debt; it measures both how much our debt costs us as well as the total amount of debt that we can afford to take on. But for infrastructure, it only measures how much it costs us. So what we're saying there is that we're assuming that more infrastructure is always better because it helps grow our assessment base so we don't need to measure it. But we can debunk that with a single example. Would we spend a trillion dollars to build infrastructure if it only grew our assessment base by a single dollar? I would hope not. So if a trillion to one isn't it, then what is the ideal ratio of infrastructure to assessment base? Because remember, new infrastructure should not only create enough new tax value to pay for this new services, but also to replace itself periodically forever. And furthermore, if that ratio exists for new infrastructure, surely it exists for existing infrastructure. Now that sounds like something the MBAs and the CPAs that we have working for us would be able to hammer out pretty quickly just like the maximum debt ratio that we already have established. But here is the kicker; infrastructure is like debt, but it's a lot worse. When debt comes to the end of its term, we pay it, that's the end of it. But when infrastructure comes to the end of its life, we pay to replace it and then the clock just resets and starts over again. It's like a never-ending zombie debt. And yet, we've never bothered to calculate what is the maximum amount of zombies that we can afford to replace. And it seems like a really massive blind spot in our financial management plan. So here's my question. As with debt, where we've determined a maximum amount we can prudently take on as a proportion of our income, what is the maximum dollar amount of infrastructure we can prudently take on as a proportion of our income given the inevitable obligation to replace all of it periodically forever? In other words, we have a debt ceiling, so how much is our infrastructure ceiling? What I'm asking for here today doesn't cost any money, doesn't require a policy or by-law change, just asking you to ask a question. And I know what you're thinking, why should we listen to some random guy from Elmwood? The truth is I didn't just wake up having had a vision of assessment-based infrastructure ratios etched upon gleaning tablets handed down to me from the cloud by the Mayor. All across North America, there is a movement for strong towns, having cities do the math, all the math on their financial decisions. Cities like Minneapolis, Edmonton, Victoria, even North Battlefield, Saskatchewan are starting to ask themselves these kinds of questions and the answers are leading them to very different policy choices than we're making. We've had a financial management plan in place since 1995 and this is going to be the third time we have renewed it. But despite that, our financial position is continued to worsen. We never have enough money, our debt is increasing and budgets keep calling for more and more hard choices. Clearly there is something we're missing. And discovering what that is can start with a single question. What is the maximum dollar amount of infrastructure our assessment base can reasonably be expected to pay to replace? We have nothing to lose in asking and everything to gain. So let's just ask. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We have questions. Please refrain from applause during the debates and delegation. We have questions. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes Madam Speaker, through you I really appreciate the presentation that this delegation has brought to us. I'm kind of a geek too. I kind of read through the financial management plan. And it does set forth really what we're going to end up with in our budgets in our multi-year budgeting now, Madam Speaker. And I've looked at our assessment rolls every time the re-assessment happens. So Madam Speaker, in terms of growth, if you look at the assessment, the number of assessed units have gone up quite substantially in certain years like 2014, 2015, 2013, not so much today, Madam Speaker. The growth if you look at it and I will get to my question shortly, much of the growth from 2011 to 2018 or whatever it was, is as a result of reassessment of existing property. Now, that is a type of growth in itself in terms of measuring people's increasing wealth, not increasing money flow, but increasing wealth on paper. And then you have a number of units. So my question really is getting at...I did listen, Mr. Snyder sent some links and I listened to this stuff, but…so my question is really, when it comes to growth and it talked about better growth happens in poorer neighbourhoods and I'm wondering as you are very immersed in this strong, whatever they call it, maybe you could explain to me how that growth that happens in poorer neighbourhoods, not in suburbian growth of lots of things, could you explain that to us a little bit?

Michel Durand-Wood: Okay. So I think what you're saying is that or what you're asking is, is to compare growth in inner-city neighbourhoods versus growth in suburban neighbourhoods and the return on investment in each of those. So if I understand correctly, the...I guess we can sort of lay it out this way, how easy is it to get a $100,000 property in Point Douglas to become $105,000 property? We can make some very small-scale investments. Some of those investments

might even cost nothing to the City. One of the examples I always use is in my neighbourhood there is a bus stop on Stadacona that is essentially a Winnipeg Transit sign beside a dumpster. Now how do you make that bus stop 5% better? Move the dumpster. It costs nothing. And so I guess, you know, what we're talking about here is, if we have very little money to invest, should we be investing in our poorer neighbourhoods or in our richer neighbourhoods? It's a lot easier to make…get a 5% return in Point Douglas or in Elmwood or in the North End because getting a $100.000 house to a $105,000 value is a lot easier than going to, no offense to Waverley West, but going to Waverley West and getting a 5% return there which is to increase a $500,000 house to a $525,000 house. How do you increase by $25,000 with very little investment? It's a lot harder to boost your growth that way. Is that what the question was?

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you Mr. Durand. Second question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I have a follow-up question and I confirmed that that's what I read in one of the articles Mr. Snyder sent. Madam Speaker, my follow-up question is merely if you're increasing the growth in poor neighbourhoods and you buy your property based on your income, what effect is that having on neighbourhoods that Councillor Schreyer, for example, talked about the poorest neighbourhoods. And my ward represents a lot of very poor neighbourhoods as well. What effect when you create that kind of growth, not new growth, but growth in wealth, what effect is that having on the people?

Michel Durand-Wood: Well, the ideal is that you're hoping that that growth in wealth is actually going to the people of that neighbourhood which need it the most. And the fact that you're aiming to do it incrementally, 2, 3, 4, 5% at a time will help to reduce displacement on those that might not be participating in that growth and wealth versus a fire hose of investment where you throw in hundreds of millions of dollars to upgrade everything all at once, you end up gentrifying and pushing out the very people that you're trying to help. Now again, this is really next-level stuff. Today I'm just here to have you ask that first question. And then once we know the answer to that, then we can start debating what appropriate policy is to...once we know where our starting point is. But yeah, very good question and I have a lot of opinions on that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further Councillor Eadie? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Our non-very, non-random Michel Durand-Wood, another one of my neighbours also lives 2.5 blocks from what is within...in terms of a population of 100,000, the poorest urban area in Canada. I've had to make a decision in the last term. I'm the only member of this council today that last term had to make a tough decision and voted against the bus corridor in south Winnipeg, which in upon its completion would speed up travel from downtown to the U of M by only five minutes and only during rush hour. And I had to vote against it because I felt it was the right thing in terms of doing the right thing for our resources and in terms of our infrastructure. Michel Durand-Wood has taken a different tact. It is complimentary to it. It is not contradictory to as we have discussed before, the concerns over increasing our debt for infrastructure. I have made my points on this racking…banging my head against the wall in terms of why we're doing this, why we think any infrastructure or any construction development is good. But I've been dealing with the rate of inflation regarding infrastructure because it is…Madam Speaker, construction inflation. When you build it and when you maintain it. I would ask Michel Durand-Wood if in the discussions he's had besides the one we've had on this and besides the research we do independently, the issue of why infrastructure inflation...if he's noticed that infrastructure inflation is separate, it's different, it's in its own dimension in terms of inflation over the years. Has Michel Durand-Wood noticed that infrastructure cost in terms of what it costs a household has changed dramatically compared to other rates of inflation that we have to deal with as government?

Michel Durand-Wood: Okay. So that's not something that I've measured personally. If you say it has, then I believe you. As…you know, basic economics will tell us is that demand drives price. And so if we as a city are demanding a lot of infrastructure be constructed and we are building too much, that will drive the price up more than if we were building less. So we are a little bit of a victim of our own process. Now, I agree on the bus rapid transit corridor. I think that's a lot of infrastructure money for not a lot of results. I mean, we could…there's a lot of stuff we could do with transit to make it significantly better for a lot less money. An example is what they did to 14th street in New York where essentially they just reserve two lanes for buses that used to be mixed traffic. We could do that on Portage with some paint and some pylons and say, this curb lane belongs to buses only. It would increase transit's effectiveness multiple-fold for, again, the cost of paint and some pylons. We already own the pylons. So it would be really nothing. So again, it's this sort of choice between big infrastructure spending and small, cautious investments. It's really hard to know which we should do unless we know what is the maximum amount of infrastructure that we can afford. We have 35 billion, if we…you know, I have an idea of what our maximum is, but I would like to hear the MBAs and the CPAs in the room tell us what they think that number is. Because it makes a difference, if they say…come back and say, well our maximum is $40 billion, then I'm like, okay, so we've got breathing room. But if they come back and say it's $32, oh, okay, then we have to be really careful. If they come back and they say it's 12 to our 35, then we really have some major policy decisions we've got to make and start acting differently so again…

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We do have further questions.

Michel Durand-Wood: Before we go to what should we do, I think we should start with where are we. What is our…what's starting level are we at?

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

Councillor Schreyer: Extension?

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I voted against the bus corridor because I wanted more buses...I wanted more money for our transit system. So in order to afford that in all reality, it had to come from the bus corridors. I couldn't think of a better way to do it. So I voted against the bus corridors so I could vote for a better transit system and that meant more buses. More people employed in the transit industry on a day-to-day basis. We've increased our money…people don't know how much they've been paying for their bus corridors for the next generation and so forth if we continue on this path of bus corridors. But we have less buses, less money, less spaces on our buses. We're reducing our routes. Madam Speaker...I ask Michel Durand-Wood, if he had his preference, would he would do what I did? I had to vote against bus corridors so I could vote for more buses, better routes, more seats on buses for more Winnipeggers.

Michel Durand-Wood: So again, I think we're jumping…putting the cart ahead of the horse here. We're trying to debate specific policy directions that we should be choosing when we don't actually know the base information of where we're starting from. I think it's important to know we can't decide what infrastructure we need or what kind of choices we should be making about anything without knowing where we are. If we didn't know what our debt ceiling was, how would we know whether we can borrow anymore, right? And so, the point I'm trying to make here is we need to ask the question what is our infrastructure ceiling so that we know where we're starting from. Is it an emergency? Do we have breathing room? Is it close? We need to know that. My calculations say what they say. But again, we have some very smart people on staff that can calculate this for us with a remarkable amount of precision and I think we should ask them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, final question.

Councillor Schreyer: Is Michel Durand-Wood willing to work with me to ask these questions? I've been asking them for four and a half years. I will continue to do so.

Michel Durand-Wood: Yes, I would be willing to work with you councillor.

Madam Speaker: That brings our question period to a close. We do have many other delegations here before us, okay if Council can now move on. Okay. Thank you for your time.

Michel Durand-Wood: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We'll now get on to our addendum delegations in support of Item 1 on the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated October 1st, 2019. It's regarding the low-income bus pass. And these individuals are in support. There will be five minutes, no questions, no extensions as we voted on earlier. Molly McCracken, if I could call her forward, followed by Debbie Stillito. Is Molly here? Good morning, welcome.

Molly McCracken: Good morning. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak to you this morning. I'm with the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. We're a non-profit charitable research institute here in Manitoba. We are very pleased and applaud Mayor Bowman, Councillor Gilroy and Council for this motion and we encourage you to approve it today and also for your leadership in working towards social inclusion in our city. We know social inclusion is so important. No one should face discrimination based on religious identity as we will be hearing about later this morning based on income or race, gender, ability, age or any other factors. We know social inclusion is key to the City's Charter Act Mandate to maintain the health, safety and welfare of our inhabitants and as…particularly as we're talking about transportation equity here, it is key to OurWinnipeg sustainable transportation envisions a safe, efficient and equitable transportation system. I am on the Steering Committee of Make Poverty History Manitoba. And we're very pleased that Council is working with the community on a city poverty reduction strategy in response to the thousands of Winnipeggers who stood together for the call for a Winnipeg without poverty. It is within our grasp. And a low-income bus pass is a key game-changing idea. We're so happy to see it being considered here today. And it's so important within an overall comprehensive strategy. And I should note that this is not a new idea. Many in the community have

been wanting a low-income bus pass for many, many years and it's been a central aspect of our alternative municipal budget that our office produces with community members. The increase to the cost of bus by 25 cents in 2018 made transportation too expensive for some of our low-income community members. People have to choose between basic needs and getting where they need to go. We did in 2018 the state of the inner-city report, which is guided by community called Green Light Go. And as we found in that report, today in Winnipeg we know that there is a single mom who has to push her stroller for blocks and blocks to save on the bus fare so she can afford to buy milk. We know that today there is a teenager who is not going to school because their parents can't afford the transportation to get there. And we know there is someone who wants to get into the workforce but can't afford to get to even just a temporary job because they can't afford the bus fare. I know we're all very concerned about the well-being of our city and I grew up here. I look around on the streets. I have never seen this amount of social exclusion in our city. And I know a lot of people are suffering from poverty and low-income options for transit are needed today, right now, to alleviate the suffering in our city. So I am going to make seven recommendations to you to approve upon this motion. We ask that you consider implementing the low-income bus pass faster than the current schedule to 50% in 2020/21, a 50% discount. Currently it's scheduled to be a 30% discount for an adult bus pass. We need a single fare option, 50% off $100 bus pass helps, but is still too high. Many low-income people as our researcher Ellen Smirl found, don't buy a pass, but do single trips as they can afford them. So we encourage single fares at a discounted rate as soon as possible. And there should be an option to provide bus tokens to community-based groups pro bono so they can then give those to low-income people and to people who are experiencing homelessness so they can get around. The best practices we heard earlier is a sliding scale as in Calgary and I'd be happy to share more information that we've learned about the sliding scale program with councillors or the public servants. We know that you will also be considering free transit for children age 11. We also consider that you look to extending this to age 18. We also ask that you look when you're evaluating this to consider also talking to people who aren't using the low-income bus pass as those…as well as those who are because we know that you're going to be talking to…evaluating people who are using, please also talk to people who aren't. I have several other recommendations here, but I'm running out of time. So thank you so much for your time today.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you Ms. McCracken. Thank you very much. I'd like to call up the next speaker, Debbie Stillito. Thank you. You have five minutes.

Debbie Stillito: Mr. Mayor, members of the Council, my name is Debbie Stillito. I am a volunteer advocate for people on employment and income assistance at Low-Income Intermediary Project. I am also on the Steering Committee of Make Poverty History. I'm speaking for single people and people on disabilities. As a disabled person who is not allowed to drive due to medical problems on EIA, I have to rely on bus transportation. I understand that Mayor Bowman is working on a low-income bus pass and I respect the attempts to improve things. Personally, I don't feel it's enough though. The average person on EIA is given two basic amounts; money for rent and money for basic needs. What people fail to realize is that the basic needs means whatever you need that is not your rent. So we have to use the money for bills, food, clothing, medical expenses that are not covered by EIA and other things. I did a study at the University of Winnipeg where we looked at where I spent my money each month for a full year. My study showed that half of my basic income goes to essential bills and clothing and medical expenses so on and so forth which are at the basic amounts. Clothing, I look for sales in second-hand stores, that's all I can get, leaving me with only about $2 a day for food, $60 a month. If I have to pay for a bus pass at $50 a month, that would mean that I would be left with only $10 for food. I would be more…it would be more helpful for me to pay half for a bus ticket than it would to buy the whole monthly bus pass. I know people that have to travel from different areas of the city to get to places where they can eat and get help like an advocate that can help them. I see people in my office every day, saying that they had to walk long distances to get to our office because they have no money to take the bus. We offer a free service that many people who need it can't access because they can't take the bus. A bus pass will still be out of reach for most single people and disabled people. We still have to decide food over transportation. Since we can't afford to take the bus, I, for example, have about a four-block radius from my home that I can shop from. It is typically painful for me to walk that distance, but what choice do I have? I also can't go to free events around the city because I just can't afford to take the bus. Many of us suffer from mental illness and getting out of the house and into the community is helpful. Thankfully, I found a place that is close enough to my…to where I live to be able to walk to every day. I know so many people that are in the same position that I am in. We are often confined in small areas of town to be able to get around. We used to be able to get a mental health bus pass from EIA, but we can't get that anymore because of the cutbacks. Now only people with 12 or more medical appointments per month can get those bus passes. And I have seen doctors actually lie to be able to get those bus passes for people. Also, there needs to be more buses to accommodate the people that will finally be able to take the bus. I use a walker and I have to avoid taking the bus at rush hour because I can't get a seat to sit on. I fell on the bus once because I had to stand with my walker, and I ended up opening up an incision where I had just gotten stitches removed. It still hurts today. Now I make sure that I get a seat on the bus. I have been told by people that take the bus that I am lazy and I shouldn't need a walker. One guy almost punched me because I told him nicely that there was a seat across the aisle from where he had to get up to give me a seat. It was a good thing there were witnesses because the bus driver didn't do anything. We feel that a sliding scale for a bus pass is what is ultimately needed and that all

people in poverty should be able to get a bus pass that is more affordable even at 50% of the cost of a bus pass. The people who need to take the bus the most still can't afford to take it. Okay, I'm almost done.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I'd like to call down Mr. Mark Cohoe now please, thank you. And I'd like to have Dana Smith up next to speak. Thank you.

Mark Cohoe: Thanks so much for allowing me to speak today and for suspending the rules. I'm Mark Cohoe. I'm Executive Director with Bike Winnipeg. So really, our goal through our organization is to make it easier to bike in this city and easier to get around. Certainly, as part of that, we recognize that inequitable as Molly pointed out that part of the sustainable transportation policy document, one of the goals within that is a safe, efficient and equitable transportation system for people, goods and services. So certainly the equitability part of this is something we see as very important. And while people of all income levels are biking, we recognize that for many people, cycling really is their only method of transportation that they have the financial resources available for to move around and to get around. Certainly within that though, as well, even though they might be riding their bikes through summer, they are going to occasionally...a good portion of them are going to be choosing to bus in winter, which obviously puts that affordability issue into question for them. So we really are grateful to see that the City moving forward with the low-income bus pass. It makes a big difference for a lot of people to have that ability. As Debbie had talked about, you know, a choice between food and transportation isn't something that we want to be moving forward and it's certainly not something that goes towards that equitability. But beyond that, as well, for many people on bikes, the distance that they're travelling to their destination might be further. So the bike can be just a first mile, last mile portion of this and a regular bus pass can make a significant difference especially, again, if that affordability is factored in, it means that more people can choose to do that. That extends your bus service substantially and gives them that option to have some longer range in their travels if they are biking. One thing we do think that could really be improved upon though is that single-fare service. Again, for a lot of people, whether it's $70, whether it's $60, whether it's $50, if it's that choice between food and that transportation, the transportation might lose out. So that equitability portion of this is important to certainly...for a lot of people they might be choosing to bike around, to walk because they can't…simply can't afford that $50. So an option that I think is important is to have that single fare option available on the discount rate there as well. Certainly from an administration standpoint, you have the process in the works to do that. So it's not too much more of an administrative cost to include the single fares. It's all going on the Peggo card anyway. But what that means though as well is certainly those single fare trips, many people can take the bike, you know, where they are on their local trips for most of their trips, but when they need to go on a slightly different trip that might be a longer trip, it might be a situation where weather has made it a lot more difficult to bike or they want to do that or it might be a special occasion or they might be going across a barrier where there's no really safe cycling facility available to them. That single fare option then becomes available. But again, if it's $3 to take that bus, that's going to be a choice that's factoring into people. It's $6 return. So for a lot of people, that's going to be a decision that they're going to have to make that choice that, unfortunately, due to financial reasons, they just don't have that same accessibility, the same mobility options that me or you might have. So I'm hoping you will consider looking at including a single fare option at least in the future, if not on the motion now and look forward to, you know, choose maybe that sliding scale model to make sure that this is an equitable as possible solution that you're putting forward. But again, we do appreciate that this is the motion moving forward. It's certainly…it is important, and we support going with a low-income bus pass. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Cohoe. Thank you very much. Dana Smith. Is Dana Smith there? No Dana Smith, sorry. Paulette Tremblay. Paulette Tremblay? Could you come down? Are you wanting to speak? She's coming, okay. And Mr. Al Wiebe, if he's here, if you can come up for next, please. Thank you. I think that Paulette is coming somewhere. Here is Paulette. Paulette is before Mr. Wiebe. Thank you.

Paulette Tremblay: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Council. My name is Paulette. I'm a certified advocate in the disenfranchised Manitoba for many years. I live below poverty level like many people in Manitoba. During this time I have noticed that many problems have been lowered and be cut. People who live in poverty have an extra time getting...pardon me, getting…sorry, time getting to their next week. Many people have serious medical issues and require transportation to medical appointments. Would it not be possible for the City to provide…the latest assessment from them, for a $10 bus pass from, and this is what I have, from Handi-Transit…$10 bus pass where people can actually get a card like this with their face on it so it can't be transferred to anybody. It would be so simple for this, $10 a year. Everybody…it can't be transferred to anybody else. And I get this…I'm on disability, I can't walk, okay. So I get on the bus for $3.20 for three years, but I have to pay $3.20 in three years. Okay. But $10 a year I think is reasonable for people on low-income, seriously I do. We really need it. And $10 a year for people on low-income is seriously reasonable. We can't afford anything else. We can't. We get $3.20 a day for food, nothing else. We can't even go…we can't go to Safeway or get vegetables. We have to go to Harvest. Harvest doesn't have any food. They don't. We need stuff. You know, women have to go and buy things. It's expensive. It's really expensive. We can't do that for ourselves. Ten dollars a year, I think it's possible. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much, Paulette. Mr. Al Wiebe and then after Mr. Al Wiebe, Oke Ojekudo.

Al Wiebe: Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Councillor Gilroy and the Council as a whole for addressing this issue and having us here today. Most of what I was going to say has been spoken to already so I will just relate some personal experiences on how much a reduced bus pass would be a great benefit to everybody. I have had to turn down jobs in the past because I could not afford the three weeks transportation cost to get to the job and back. If I did that, we wouldn't be eating. That job or those jobs, there's several in the past and they would have greatly improved our life. Couldn't do it. Make a choice, food or transportation to get to a job. So you sit around and wait for the next job opportunity to come about and hopefully it's within walking distance so you don't have to take transit. A lot of folks used to get bus passes on EIA because of restrictive changes made in the past few years, that's not the way it is anymore and many folks don't get bus passes now. They used to get bus passes to go to doctors' appointments. That's not possible now. You actually have to have four doctors' appointments to get that bus pass. People are using their own food budget money to get to personal health appointments and doctors' appointments and vital appointments that they need to go to every day and every week. It's crucial that a reduced bus fare come into place and the individual bus tickets be reduced, not only to 30%, but 50%. My partner is a volunteer. She has volunteered for ten years. She can't work because of mental health issues. She's volunteered for ten years at the same place. Sixteen trips a month. And because we could not afford a bus pass, she would have to dish that out every single time. She went twice a week, she would dish out $6 times two is $12 a week. She gets $100 for or did get $100 for her volunteer rewards program. We end up spending about 90 somewhat dollars some months for just volunteering and that money was supposed to help us with groceries. It went strictly to transit. Thirty percent is a great start. Fifty percent is a better start. Five dollars is the ultimate for people that just can't afford. It's so vital that we don't have to choose between...or people in poverty don't have to choose between food and transit. I'm a primary example of how not being able to meet nutritional needs work. I had a massive heart attack in September of '17. We need to change things. Thirty percent is great, but 50% is better. And please, please, please consider individual bus tickets for the reduction as well because people just can't afford to even spend $50 a month up front for bus tickets. Thank you.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Thank you Mr. Wiebe. We have our last speaker on this item. Okay. Could I have Oke Okejudo up, I know I did that name wrong.

Oke Ojekudo: Good morning, everybody. My name is Oke Ojekudo. I'm a newcomer to Canada. First of all, I want to thank everybody here for the opportunity to speak and to be added to the list of people speaking today. And I want to thank all of our councillors here for identifying the need for a low-income bus pass which is what I will be talking about right now. I want to voice my support for this step in the right direction towards affordable transportation for everybody. And I must say as a newcomer to Canada, still trying to find my feet and trying to figure out how best to use my skills to help Canada and the city we are living which is Winnipeg of course. Cost of transport is a huge issue for me. For me to take the bus, it involves getting up like…and getting ready 40 minutes earlier than I have to start work to go outside and wait for the bus, which is often late because of traffic and the frequency of buses that don't come. And then I have to…often on the bus, I end up standing almost every day on the bus because there's so many people on the bus. And just to do all of this, it takes 6% of my income. I calculated the math this morning. It takes 6% of my income to actually be able to afford a bus pass for the month. So imagine spending 6% of your income just to wait outside in the cold that I'm still not used to and take the bus to just stand on the bus for the 40 minutes it takes to get to work. And I feel like…and even after all of that, I can lose my bus pass, it can drop and it went missing, there is no…I can't go get a replacement just like that. I have to buy a new bus pass like spend the additional money or figure out how I'm going to continue the rest of my month. These are issues that I think can be addressed if we adopt the universal bus pass model like U of M, the U-Pass at U of M, where everybody pays for everybody to be able to afford to take the bus. With the U Pass system at U of M, it is only reduced to like $5 a person, and that just makes it all the more affordable for students in the U of M to actually take the bus. I think that's a model that would really help people, especially low-income people to be able to afford to take the bus. Now even better than that I think is adopting a sliding scale universal bus pass model. So not just everybody paying but everybody paying an amount that they can afford pretty much. So basically, making sure that's even as everybody is paying, we all know we have different capabilities or different financial standings. So I think when we adopt…when we adopt universal model, a sliding scale universal model is even better than just the everybody pays for everybody to afford to use the bus pass. And I know that that might be a far reach or that's not something we can get to right away. So as we plan or submit arrangements to figure out a way to make that happen for us at some point, I think going with this low-income bus pass, moving to a more aggressive and a faster implementation of the 50% reduction starting next year is something that is possible and it's something I believe we can do if we set our hearts to do. Even if we cannot get to the sliding scale universal model right away, we should at least be able to try for the 50% bus pass reduction to make things, it is a bit more affordable. And lastly before (inaudible) I'm just going to talk about some benefits I think if everybody contributes, maybe thinking, why should everybody have to contribute for a bus pass for everybody, everybody doesn't take the bus. But the truth is that reduced (inaudible) helps everybody and that's something can happen if we adopt this good, affordable bus pass transit model. Also, there is environmental issue. We've been doing global strikes for climate, this is something that will really be helpful to our

environment if we adopt a universal bus pass to reduce the number of cars on the road. And that will also reduce traffic for those that actually have to drive that you still can't take the bus for one reason or the other. So doing this is going to help open the car drivers and the people that live in poverty that would want to take the bus. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. We'll now move on to addendum delegations on Motion 2, Bill 21 as per the earlier suspension of the rules. First up, I'd like to call Simarpreet Singh. And second speaker will be Im-reet Kaur. Welcome.

Simarpreet Singh: Thank you. Good morning. Thank you Madam Speaker, Your Worship Mayor Bowman, and honourable members of the council for giving me the opportunity to speak on the motion put forward by Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes. My name is Simarpreet Singh. I'm here before you as a proud Winnipegger, a proud Canadian and a member of Sikh Heritage Manitoba. I consider myself very lucky to be residing in Winnipeg where I see people from different lots of life from all around the world. Winnipeggers recently took part in celebrating 50th annual Folklorama where they enjoyed the great diversity of the city. Even in this chamber, I'm delighted to see such a diverse group of elected officials. I moved to the City of Winnipeg from a small town called Deloraine to pursue my post-secondary education. Today I'm working towards a doctorate degree in chemistry and hope to pursue a career in academia because of my love of teaching and promoting science. Luckily, I'm able to follow my dream of becoming an educator in Winnipeg, but I can't say the same for my fellow Canadians residing in Québec. Québec's Bill 21 reinforces systemic racism and discrimination in Canada. This bill impacts visible minorities the most, people who wear their articles of faith, such as turbans, hijabs or the kipra as part of their identity cannot become teachers, they cannot serve in public office, they cannot serve the community as police officers. This discriminatory legislation will impact people who possess invaluable knowledge, talent and experience by forcing them to choose between their identity and employment. Recently on (inaudible) a turban-wearing woman, friend and someone who shares a similar passion of teaching was forced to leave her family and friends in Montreal to move to BC so that she could follow her passion and still be true to her identity. I feel their pain and the pain of other Canadians who might be going through something very similar. My personal fear is for this discriminatory legislation to have a snowball effect. Bill 21 sets a terrifying example which will normalize a sense of distrust for people that look different if the bill is not challenged by our leaders or by our institutions. Bill 21 also sets a dangerous precedent to allow provinces to override and undermine protective fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and this bill is clearly an infringement of those fundamental rights. We as Canadians must protect our rights as guaranteed by the Charter. Organizations such as World Safe Organization are fighting this bill in court, but the fight does not stop with these organizations. The fight against Bill 21 needs the support of everyone in this chamber to reflect on how they want to be remembered in history at this time. As Winnipeggers, as Canadians, this motion is an opportunity to firmly take a stand against discrimination and send a strong message that Winnipeg does not support laws that create a space for intolerance. Members of the council, our fellow Canadians are once again feeling marginalized and need to hear from leaders like you that you stand shoulder to shoulder with your fellow citizens against the discriminations sanctioned by Bill 21. I sincerely thank Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes for bringing this motion forward in front of the council to continue to shed light on this issue. And just as the Canadian Charter guarantees freedoms and rights for all Canadians, a law that violates freedoms for some of us should be a concern for all of us. I'll leave you with these words from Prime Minister Diefenbaker, "I'm a Canadian, a free Canadian. Free to speak without fear, free to worship god in my own way, free to stand for what I think right, free to oppose what I believe wrong, free to choose those who shall govern my country. This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold for myself and all of mankind." Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your time. Next is Im-reet Kaur followed by Tasneem Vali. Good morning.

Im-reet Kaur: Good morning. On behalf of the World Sikh Organization of Canada and Sikh Heritage Manitoba, I would first like to begin by acknowledging that we are on Treaty 1 Territory and the homeland of the Métis Nation. Reconciliation is legitimizing and participating in a national movement that encompasses a lot of issues such as environmental rights and honouring the treaties. Sikh Gurus have always instructed us to be sovereign beings and doing so, we cannot underestimate the sovereignty of our Indigenous brothers and sisters. I thank the Council for giving me this opportunity to talk about the adverse effects of Bill 21 that is already being felt by Quebecers. And it is sort of an alarm bell for a lot of us who have faced some sort of discrimination based on the way we look or our religious...the religion that we follow. Unfortunately, the stories of discrimination are far too common for those who look like us because racialized groups sort of grow up knowing that at some point this will happen to them in their life. And Canadians residing in Québec who want to serve their communities along with practising their religion are now being forced to choose between their faith and employment. That means that public servants such as police officers, elected officials, teachers, judges, principals among others cannot be people who choose to wear their religious identity as a part of themselves. And that is immoral. Secularism by definition prevents the government to dictate the religious beliefs of people. And Bill 21 breaches that very concept of secularism. Let's refer to Bill 21 as what it is because it is legislated discrimination. It not only prevents Canadians from serving the community but like my colleague said, it sets a very dangerous precedent, the precedent that the provinces can invoke the notwithstanding clause in order to undermine the

rights that are enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that precede that clause. And additionally, it sends a message to minority communities that they do not belong in the social, cultural and political fabric of this country and that is extremely harmful. I want to mention my friend, Im-reet Kaur, she has already been mentioned, but she grew up in Québec, trained to be a teacher in Québec. The same day she graduated, this bill was passed. And that is...I cannot describe that in words. And she had to move to BC in order to find a teaching job. This is not a story that's the story of the past. It is happening right now as we speak. And I also want to mention Hira Tour who is a dear friend of mine who was not allowed to enter the Canadian Legion because of his turban. You might think that that is also a story of a last century, but it is as recent as of two years ago. And these stories are far too common in communities. And when we hear them, we always say, when is this going to stop? I would like to say that WSO has spent a lot of time fighting and challenging discrimination that minorities are repeatedly subjected to in Québec and outside of Québec. And when we first heard of this bill, we thought, how is this still happening now because we've seen our parents and grandparents hearing and experiencing this discrimination, but this generation cannot go back and talk about the same things that our ancestors have fought. I'd like to thank the National Council of Canadian Muslims and Canadian Civil Liberties Association that have filed a legal challenge against the law along with WSO which is the World Sikh Organization of Canada. But this does not stop here. I believe that public servants like yourself and every elected official needs to stand up and say that these kind of discriminatory laws have no place in Canada. And bringing forward this motion also helps this conversation relevant because as Canadians we should never tolerate discrimination. Lastly, I want to thank the two councillors for bringing the motion forward. We are humbled by the support that we've had with them. And thank you for working with the residents of Winnipeg in order to bring this forward. Lastly, I would like to thank CUPE Local 2348 for allowing me to do my civic duty here today. Thank you so much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation. Next is Tasneem Vali followed by Idris Elbaki. Welcome.

Tasneem Vali: Good morning everybody, Mr. Mayor, Madam Speaker, members of the Council and everybody present here. My name is Tasneem Vali, thank you for allowing me to speak in opposition of Bill 21 and in support of the motion requesting the Council to oppose this bill and support in principle the constitutional challenge. We all know that as the speakers have mentioned before, Bill 21 negatively affects individuals who wear religious attire. And it also sets a dangerous precedent of legalized intolerance. I cannot remain complacent when my active devotion is challenged and judged as being oppressive. My hijab is a sign of devotion. It is not merely a symbol. And I should not have to choose between practising my faith and my profession. I should be able to serve my community as an educator, as a police officer, however I choose. I'm proud…I'm a very proud Winnipegger and I'm proud to say that we do have a Hijabi RCMP officer in Winnipeg. So Winnipeg is a city that does not allow this. Canada is my home and it should be a place of safety for me. It should not be a place where I am challenged to change myself and stopped from being who I am. In 2019 we should be talking about more important issues. We should be talking about how Canada has received a B grade for education on the world forum. We should be worried about how our future is progressing with education, with our children, with research, not with what I wear on my head. My form of expression and my belief does not force anybody to worship the way I worship. Just because I'm in a position of authority as a teacher or as a police officer or as a judge does not mean I will impose my beliefs on others. And we should be clear with that. It, in fact, shows that I am disciplined, I manage my time well, I respect others and I value their opinions because I choose to accept them as they are as they should choose to accept me as I am. In conclusion, my faith is an integral part of my identity, and it is a human right to be able to practice that peacefully. I am apprehensive that in 2019 Canada is legislating my personal choices. I fear for Margaret Atwood's prediction to come true in her book. She won the Booker Prize. And I fear that in 2019, if this is what we're debating, that might be what we're headed to. I fear for my children. I have two teenage daughters. They wear a hijab. And I hope they are not fighting the same battles that I am fighting. So in conclusion, I would like to thank City Council, Councillor Lukes and Nason for this motion because it has reassured me that I belong in Canada and that Winnipeg is my home and it is a safe place for me. Thank you so much for letting me speak today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Idris Elbaki followed by Qudus Abusaleh. Thank you, welcome.

Idris Elbaki: Good morning everybody, thank you. I have to say that your discussion about suspending the rules was quite fascinating, but really, thank you for allowing us the chance to address you this morning.

Madam Speaker: It was for us as well.

Idris Elbaki: It's important. I understand process is very important. I would like to start by quoting Martin Luther King who said, "In the end, we will not remember the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends." And I consider all of you to be friends of myself and of my community and of Winnipeg of course. I want to speak as a father of two girls, two teenage girls, 15 and 12, who both wear the hijab. And when we had our first daughter, we took a trip to Montreal when she was 4 and she was fascinated by the French language. And so she made a decision then that she will go to French immersion. And that has defined our family's choice in education is French immersion all the way for all four of our children. And so I was always hoping that you know, with French, she might be able to you know at some point, as

sad as that may be for me as a father, she'll pick up and go and work wherever she would like, have a career, have a family, but it seems that that may not be the case. And I would hate to tell her that there's a part of Canada that may not just be suitable for her, given her choices in life, in faith, in career and so on. I would like to tell them both that this country is all yours and you belong to all of it. If maybe Québec is going through a hard time now, at least your city is a place where you will always belong and always find support. You know, why should the municipal government of Winnipeg be talking about a bill that has been passed in Québec by the provincial government? And I very much appreciate your work on broken trees and pipes and snowplowing and waste collection and so on. I mean, I live here. I pay taxes and I appreciate that, but I think it's also important that we understand that we live in interesting times and that the tone that we set and the words that we say make a difference in people's lives. And that if we say the right thing, that could just enable someone to thrive and to succeed, and if we say the opposite that could force them into becoming marginalized and not feel that they belong in this city or in this country. Bill 21 is about faith, about people's expression of their religious beliefs. Faith is not a threat to secularism in Canada. In fact, in this example, we have an example of extreme secularism threatening people's ability to practice and express their religion and that's just something that violates their fundamental human rights and the fundamentals of the Canadian Charter of Rights. Finally, again, I want to go back to the fact that we live in interesting times. There is a lot of fear. There are white folks who are afraid of immigrants and people of colour. There are minorities who are afraid of this growing sense of alt-right or white supremacy and so on. And so I hope that you will make a statement today that we will not be defined by fear. We will not be defined by fear. In fact, we will be defined by friendship, by being allies and neighbours of each other. And we'll make a statement that when one of us thrives, we all thrive. And it is possible in Winnipeg, in Manitoba and in Canada just to enjoy the variety and the diversity of our religions, our cultures, our languages, our ways of thinking, ways of life, that is enriching to all of us and doesn't…you know, no single culture is a threat or poses a risk to any other culture. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our next speaker is Qudus Abusaleh followed by Zara Khadim. Welcome.

Qudus Abusaleh: Thank you. As-salāmu ʿalaykum everyone, may peace be upon you all. I would like to acknowledge that we are on Treaty 1 Territory the original lands of the Cree, Oji-Cree, Anishinaabe, Métis and Dené people. Thank you Madam Speaker, thank you Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes. Now, Bill 21 bans the appearance and the display of religious symbols and dress like the hijab, turban, kippahs among others. And proponents in Québec have called this a commendable display and protection of secular values. But I want to be very clear, secular values do not translate into the enforced absence of religious symbols and dress. By definition, secularism and a secular state is not anti-religious, but it's simply neutral regarding religious dress and symbols. Since 2004, the interpretation of the courts for religious freedoms has been 1) to protect the rights to declare religious beliefs, 2) to protect the right to manifest these religious beliefs and 3) to protect the right not to be compelled by the state to engage in religious activity and the right to be protected, not to be compelled by the state to de-engage from religious activities as long as the practice upholds the human rights code. To legislate against religious dress and symbols is to turn a democratic, neutral, secular state into a tyrannical cult of secularism. I strongly urge city councillors when this motion is brought forward to a vote to continue and to...I strongly urge city councillors when this motion is brought forward to a vote to stand up for the values we pride ourselves in Winnipeg. Winnipeg will…is the home and will continue to be the proud home of people from all faiths. I strongly urge city councillors when this motion is brought forward to a vote to protect and uphold fundamental and constitutional human rights. At the Canadian Federation of Students where I'm an executive, we have a national campaign that takes a strong stance against faith-based discrimination. Post-secondary institutions are hubs of academic and social discourse, intellectual ideas and ultimately career opportunities. Bill 21 creates barriers for people who want to pursue a career in public service. And our multi-culture society calls for a public service that represents the population not merely by policy, but by lived experience and by shared faith and common culture. While we may be unable to change what is happening in Québec, I strongly urge city councillors to take this opportunity to set a strong precedent that Winnipeg and people living in Winnipeg of all faiths will never have to fear facing such obstacles. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you sir for your presentation. Next is Zara Khadim, followed by Mohammad Almaleki. Good morning.

Zara Khadim: Good morning, my name is Zara Khadim. Thanks for giving me the opportunity to speak about this important issue today. I'll keep this pretty short because my colleagues already mentioned a lot of the points that I wanted to talk about. But I guess I'll start off by talking a little bit about myself. I started wearing the hijab or the head scarf at the age of 12. And I just remember my parents sitting me down and they're just like, you know, this is an important decision, we think you're a little too young and there's a lot of responsibility that comes with it. But at the end of the day it was my choice and my parents respected that right. Fast-forward ten years, I have no regrets or anything. Today I am a Canadian Muslim woman that visibly wears a religious symbol on my head every day. I'm also a second-year law student at the University of Manitoba. And I remember when I first read that the bill passed in Québec and I just thought…I mean in a couple of years, I'm going to be a practicing lawyer, hopefully, but it's scary to think that I won't...if I decide one day that I just want to pack up and move to Québec and practice there, I won't have that option. And my

classmates that are equal citizens as I am will and...that's scary to think. The hijab is a part of my identity. I don't think I'll ever be able to live without it. It's as if somebody was asking me to amputate my right arm and try to live with that. It's pretty difficult to think of that. I think it's really funny that lawmakers in Québec, like predominantly male lawmakers, believe that the bill is protecting me from oppression but it's funny that I'll stand here today and honestly tell everyone in this room that I'm not being oppressed. This is my choice. And like, a perfect example of this is my two older sisters chose not to wear and I'm the youngest of the family and I wear it. So it really…like, this is a choice that nobody influenced. I also think that…I mean, we're finally moving forward and Canadian lawmakers are starting to accept that women are able to do whatever they want with their body and the nation has no place in the bedroom. But we're taking a few steps back now and deciding that we're going to dictate what women wear and not just women, people of all different religions can wear and can't wear. And I think that's all. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Mohammad Almaleki followed by Sozan Palani.

Mohammad Almaleki: Thank you Madam Speaker and councillors for being here. I have to admit, I am a little sad that I have to be here, although many of you are my friends and I love being here and learning about the process that goes on here. The fact that I have to be here to speak about a bill that to be honest, as a Canadian, this conversation should never have had to move forward. This is not something we should be debating right now. We should be hearing EPC right now. But none the less, Canada's a country in which we have not always been on the right side of history. When we have been at our most divided and standing at the crossroads of history and having to decide between what's right and what's wrong, we have not always made the right decision. We committed some of the worst atrocities towards Indigenous people of this land. We…during World War II, we turned away a ship full of Jews from Europe who were here looking for refuge and instead they found a Canadian policy of none is too many. We imprisoned Japanese Canadians whose only crime seemed to be they looked different than us. We systematically discriminated and persecuted members of the LGBT community simply because they wanted to choose who to love. In each instance Canadian lawmakers decades later stood up in parliament and had to make a tearful apology for past wrongs and had to admit that they were on the wrong side of history and apologize for destroying countless lives and causing irreparable damage to so many communities. And here we are again, at another crossroads in 2019 where we find ourselves once again more divided than ever and having to fight for the soul but also the moral compass of our country. This time, I pray that we make the right choice. I pray no Canadian lawmaker has to stand decades later from now and say we made a mistake. I pray we make the right decision and restore the moral compass of our country. But beyond all, I pray that years later…sorry Zara, years later from now I don't have to look at my future daughter in the eyes and tell her that although she chooses to wear the hijab and that she's a Canadian that wearing the hijab might make her less Canadian. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Sozan Palani. Welcome.

Sozan Palani: Thank you. Okay, first and foremost, I want to say good morning to everyone here today and thank you to all the speakers for addressing such an important cause. My name is Sozan Palani. I am a second-year nursing student at the University of Manitoba. Along with my student title, I am also of Kurdish decent. I am a daughter of two Kurdish immigrants, a sibling to four brothers and one sister and a best friend to three lovely young hijabis who unfortunately could not be here today, one of them is actually in her practicum right now for her teaching degree, and so I would like to speak on her behalf as well. Above all these titles, I am a Muslim Canadian. Just like me, I'm sure many of you have numerous concepts that form your identity. Also, for many of us, our religious beliefs, practices and expression is a dominating aspect in our self-identity, for me it is. As a consequence, a bill like Bill 21 is terrifying and devastating to many of us whose self-concept is so deeply intertwined within our religious identity. To strip us of our right to express our identity and go as far as to barricade us from taking on career opportunities because of our religious expression is not only discrimination in its full definition, but simply put, it's un-Canadian. We have come so far as a nation by working and building towards an absolutely diverse, free and accepting country. Thus, implementing Bill 21 is not only an attack on our religious minority groups, but an attack on our Canadian values. This issue is one for the nation and one for our province. And I know I speak for all diligent and morally conscious Canadians when I say it needs to be appealed. The support of our government representatives is crucial in this matter. And I thank you guys for bringing this up today. So I ask and hope you make the right decision. Speak up and stop the bill. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mamneet Sheena Gurm, if you could please come forward. Followed by Jakob Sanderson and we'll hear the last delegation, Noelle Asagher. And then we will break for recess for lunch. Welcome.

Mamneet Sheena Gurm: Thank you, good morning. My name is Sheena Gurm and I am a volunteer with Sikh Heritage Manitoba. I would like to begin by saying thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak and express my views at today's city council meeting regarding Bill 21. I would like to tell you that evidence thus far strongly points towards the fact that women will be and are disproportionately impacted by Bill 21, especially Muslim and Sikh women. Evidence

thus far also strongly suggests that the bill disproportionately impacts professions that are dominated by women, notably teachers in public schools. Being an aspiring teacher myself, it is heart-wrenching to witness that other aspiring teachers are being forced to withdraw their job applications. Others have been forced to move out of Québec, and yet other women must deal with racist remarks at their workplaces and in their larger communities all due to Bill 21. These are the individuals who are the most integrated into our society. These are the people like me and like you who have studied here who want to give back to the societies and communities that have given them so much. Bill 21, in my opinion, robs these individuals of the right to give back as citizens, taking away their purpose in life essentially. Clearly, rather than promoting religious neutrality of the state in order to provide better public service as claimed, the bill targets and prevents select active citizens from providing effective public service in their communities. I ask where is the evidence that banning religious symbols at work will improve our work environments, foster better learning in schools and make society safer and more unified. Where is the evidence that wearing religious symbols at schools influences children negatively? Where is the evidence proving that when public servants such as teachers wear religious symbols at work it is proselytizing? There is, however, plethora of evidence arguing the exact opposite. There is evidence proving that when such secular laws are passed, they instill and normalize fear, hate, discrimination and xenophobia, all of which ultimately disintegrates social cohesion. There is data showing that practicing freedom of religion and beliefs has a range of benefits and that includes better socio-economic outcomes of countries, enhanced social and human capital as well as lower engagement of individuals in risky behaviours. And these are just to name a few. And these, in my opinion, are the key for a safer, healthier, sustainable and more unified societies. So religious and cultural diversity is our strength as Canadians and as a nation, it's not a weakness. It is time to stand up against and denounce Bill 21 that not only undermines our fundamental human rights and citizenship, but also threatens the essence of our diversity, our strength and our unity. It is time to start supporting and implementing evidence-based laws and policies and denouncing those that are baseless and lack supporting evidence such as Bill 21. Winnipeg is the city where we have the Canadian Museum of Human Rights, making our city actually one of the strongest proponents of fundamental human rights and freedoms. So I feel that it's our duty and it's the duty of our councillors to stand up against the infringement of these rights, which is the case with Bill 21. So with that, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Councillor Lukes and Councillor Nason for bringing this motion forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Jakob Sanderson.

Jakob Sanderson: Thank you and hello to the members of Council. I'm here as the President of the University of Manitoba Student's Union to speak in favour of our city taking a courageous stand against Québec's Bill 21. I'm not a religious person, nor a visible minority and I don't offer the lived experience of so many incredible presenters to this council today, but as a person in a position of representing 24,000-plus students, many of whom do have that lived experience, I felt it was incumbent upon myself to offer my voice today and I want to specifically thank Qudus who spoke earlier today for asking me to be here and giving me this opportunity. In my position as UMSU President, I have had the incredibly unique privilege of having the opportunity to work with numerous student and community groups on campus from a wide array of cultural and religious backgrounds. And as members of city council, I have often attended many of their events alongside you. I hope you have noted as I have the extent to which these student and community leaders enrich our institutions and our city by allowing us to learn from them, connect with them, and embrace a society that takes pride in its diversity. I have had the privilege of attending our campus mosque during prayer on several occasions both on sombre occasions and during times of celebration. And the manner in which I have been embraced and welcomed and literally made room for because it's much too small for our incredible Muslim population on campus on each occasion has been truly inspiring. Now, imagine the message that we send when we strip away any opportunity at expressing the religious freedoms of these students and community members, teachers, leaders and caregivers. We send the message that pride should not be taken in our diversity, that it is not welcome and that we want to take the symbols, these expressions and these ways of life, and the expressions of love and compassion and drive them underground. This goes against what Canada professes that it stands for and it goes against what the original peoples of Turtle Island have always stood for. The flag hanging above the head of Councillor Chambers there states that our motto in Winnipeg is one with the strength of many. We must allow that same mantra to define how we use our voice across this country. While procedurally we may not be in order taking our council's time and voice to concern ourselves with an issue in Québec, I would urge us all to see that it is in fact within the order of our mandate. Winnipeg is the home of the Canadian Museum of Human Rights, the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation and is inhabiting Treaty 1 Land. We must continue Winnipeg's legacy at this time. We are a city and a country that is stronger as one through the strength of many. I ask that we show our brothers and sisters in Québec the same compassion, the same love and solidarity that has always been shown to us by members of these targeted communities each day in Winnipeg. And I ask that we say to the rest of this country and the rest of the people across this nation that Winnipeg will stand up for religious freedom, diversity and expression even when it is difficult. Thank you so much to Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes for this motion and thank you for allowing us the time to speak today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you very much. And I'd like to make sure Mr. Clerk the record reflects that Jakob Sanderson was here on behalf of the University of Manitoba Students Union. And our final speaker today is Noelle Asaghe on behalf of the University of Winnipeg Students Association. Welcome.

Noelle Asagher: Thank you Madam Speaker. My name is Noelle and I am the Vice President of Student Affairs with the University of Winnipeg Students Association. I'm also a Muslim woman living on Treaty 1 Territory. Bill 21, formally passed in Québec is a direct hit on Muslim communities and contributes to the growing Islamophobia that Muslims, and especially Muslim women experience on a daily basis. There is no room in a city that prides itself on inclusivity for a bill that would inherently take away my right to see my people in positions of power. Growing up in a small French town, I was the only Muslim woman I knew. It was until university when I finally saw people from my community represented in different spheres of life like academia, health care and sociopolitical circles. After completing my degree at the University of Winnipeg, I realized I have learned a lot from my professors, but I've learned even more from the Muslim women around me at the university and in other public buildings. Denying that experience to others with a piece of legislation similar to that of Bill 21 would be to deny young women like me from learning from people who look like them. An important thing to remember is that when we discuss Islamophobia, when we discuss anti-Semitism or the visible discrimination that Bill 21 presents, we must acknowledge that our post-secondary institutions are not immune to acts of hate. Where we find solidarity though, are in these spaces and to deny that access to those who wear hijabs or turbans or kippahs would be to actively discriminate against marginalized communities from coming together, learning and rising together. To not take a stance on this topic is to remain complacent and to side with the oppressor instead of the oppressed. We are asking that the City make it clear that they stand with marginalized students and members of our communities, not only for us…not only with us, but beside us. As a non-hijabi Muslim woman, I do not experience the same day-to-day barriers that my sisters experience, but this does not mean that I should wait until it…it happens to me until…sorry, but this does not mean that I should wait until it happens to me to take a stance. As a student leader I must actively take steps to protect those around me. I encourage you to do the same. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Noelle. Council will momentarily recess and reconvene at 1:30. And I say 1:30, Councillor Lukes? There is no food service on campus. I think 1:30 is more appropriate for today unless there's a motion. There is no food service on campus and people need to go out and there's others they want to speak to I'm sure before they leave the building. Now just for process, Mr. Clerk, there's many people in the gallery, if you could indicate when we will be debating Bill 21.

City Clerk: Thank you Madam Speaker. There's three reports of EPC; seven items in the first report, one in each of the second two reports and following that will be EPC motions section where Bill 21 will be debated.

Madam Speaker: So it could be possibly around 2:30, 3:00. It's difficult to pin-point the exact time. And Councillor Lukes. Councillor Nason can make people aware in the gallery and give them some more details. Thank you. We will now adjourn and reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
October 24, 2019, at 1:40 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our council meeting for October 24th, 2019. We'll start with the Executive Policy Committee, the report dated October 8th, 2019, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 8, 2019

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good afternoon, everyone. I'll begin by introducing the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1 through 7. This is the report of October 8th, 2019.

Madam Speaker: Item 4 is pulled. Okay, I'll call the question on Item 1 through 3, 5 through 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 4 – Contribution in Lieu of Land Dedication Reserve – Wilkes South

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor. No? We will get into the speaking order. Councillor Klein, you stood this item down.

Councillor Klein: It's an opportunity to stand and share my appreciation that the group agreed to allow for this change within the ward land dedication system. So I wanted to just simply stand and say thank you to the Mayor and others.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Any further speakers on this item? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. The Executive Policy, report of October 15th, 2019, Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 15, 2019**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I move…I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item 1.

Item No. 1 Application to the Province of Manitoba for Disaster Financial Assistance

Madam Speaker: And we do have an amending motion to go with this one, amending Motion No. 4. Okay, Mr. Mayor to introduce the item and then we'll move on to Councillor Gillingham to introduce the amending motion.

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait till after the amendment is introduced and have more to say at the conclusion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Gillingham,
Seconded by His Worship Mayor Bowman,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has experienced an unprecedented weather event with strong winds and heavy snowfall that continues to require prompt action to prevent or limit harm or damage to the safety of residents, and to prevent further damage to property;

AND WHEREAS as a result of the unprecedented weather event on October 13, 2019 the Mayor declared a state of local emergency for the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS crews continue to clear and remove downed trees and fallen branches city-wide, aided by contractors and crews from other Canadian municipalities, including the Cities of Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary, and Toronto;

AND WHEREAS additional actions taken by the City to date in support of the cleanup and recovery effort include a waiver of commercial tipping fees at the Brady Road Landfill, extending hours at the 4R depots and temporarily closing certain City parks to ensure public safety;

AND WHEREAS it is anticipated that the clean-up effort will take a number of weeks or more;

AND WHEREAS the clean-up effort is required to protect the City's urban forest from and limit the spread of Dutch elm disease and the emerald ash borer beetle,

AND WHERAS the clean-up effort is also required to facilitate required snow removal and snow storage efforts this coming winter;

AND WHEREAS on October 15, 2019 the Executive Policy Committee recommended to Council that the City of Winnipeg apply to the Province of Manitoba for Disaster Financial Assistance to offset City costs related to the storm event;

AND WHEREAS notwithstanding the powers currently available to a municipality under the Emergency Measures Act, in the interest of greater openness and transparency it is appropriate for Council to approve certain measures for the Public Service to undertake in order to recover from this unprecedented weather event.

AND WHEREAS the Public Service has for several months been engaged in the development of an Emergency Management By-law which would clarify and confirm the powers of the Public Service to respond quickly and appropriately to emergencies such as this unprecedented weather event, which By-law will be brought to Council for consideration in the coming months but which is not yet in place;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 1of the Report of Executive Policy Committee dated October 15, 2019 be amended by adding the following new recommendations:

"2. That City Council support the Winnipeg Public Service in its efforts to respond to the damage related to this unprecedented weather event, by delegating the authority to the Chief Administrative Officer (notwithstanding any monetary limits set forth in any policy or administrative standard to the contrary, including the Materials Management Policy) to direct and authorize the Public Service to take all appropriate measures to recover, with respect to the cleaning up of public spaces to ensure public safety and public access, including the following:

A. Approving secondment of other municipalities' employees under the Materials Management Policy.

B. Waiving City fees to assist residents and businesses in cleaning up private property and in other recovery measures.

C. Over-expending budgeted amounts as necessary for clean-up efforts on public spaces and to seek retroactive approval from Council for any over-expenditure.

3. That actions taken to date by the Chief Administrative Officer and members of the Winnipeg Public Service to respond to and recover from this unprecedented weather event be endorsed and ratified.

4. That the Chief Administrative Officer report back to Council, through the Standing Policy Committee on Finance by January 2020 on the operational and financial impacts, including a detailed accounting of all expenses related to cleanup and recovery, to the City of Winnipeg from this extreme weather event, including any request to continue the measures contained in the above-noted resolutions."

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. Yes, the amendment is before us. It just provides more detail around really giving the public service the authority to respond to the storm and the storm cleanup and the cost related to storm cleanup and the need for resources around the storm cleanup. I won't read it all. The motion...the amending motion has been distributed. Just simply to say that I will point out Item No. 4…this amending motion really kind of grants the CAO the delegated authority to gain and get access to the resources and spend the money needed to assist with the massive cleanup that our staff and others are undertaking right now. Item No. 4 does call for the...a report to Council through the Standing Policy Committee on Finance by January 2020 on the operational financial impacts including a detailed accounting of all expenses related to cleanup and recovery to the City of Winnipeg from this extreme weather event including any requests to continue the measures contained in the above-noted resolutions. Therefore, if there was a need or a request from the CAO to continue with the expenditure to cleanup, that would have to come forward in January. What this is about is trying to make sure that our administration has at their disposal the resources needed and that they're nimble enough to respond to what we're facing right now. And so I'll leave it at that, that that's the amending motion.

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

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, I'm just wondering because of the change to the motion and some clarity questions that I'm struggling with. I would ask a question…I would like to ask a question of the Acting CAO on it because this is a time-sensitive issue. And I'm wondering if he could be called forward before Council now to provide some clarification for me on this matter prior to voting.

Madam Speaker: So you're seeking clarification, not seeking new information?

Councillor Klein: Clarification.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Ruta, if you could please come forward. There's a microphone here. And if you can ask the question through the Chair, please.

Mike Ruta: Of course.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair and through you, I thank you to Mr. Ruta and all the staff for their efforts lately, they are greatly appreciated and you can certainly see work is happening. When this motion first came forward, the first one I understood and the changes are...this is where I need the clarification because…

Madam Speaker: We'll stop the clock.

Councillor Klein: I want to know if there is any significant delays to the other municipalities upon arrival to them working? Do we have some contractual issues and that's what this change is for? And was it our fault or was it something that came up out of the blue?

Mike Ruta: Yes Councillor, it's my understanding that we...with the exception of one municipality we've been able to enter into contracts with the other municipality or at least draft contracts. One municipality had a little bit of an issue with respect to liability. And so we're just waiting to have this reviewed…this motion reviewed by Council today and we'll be able to proceed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Ruta.

Councillor Klein: I have a (inaudible), I'll do it later though.

Madam Speaker: That answers your question. Councillor Nason, this is not question period for the CAO.

Councillor Nason: I understand, but it actually is directed towards the CAO. I'm just curious. You have the ability to access up to $50 million. I'm just wondering…is it your expectation that this will exceed $50 million?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, I don't think we're getting into questions like that if you seek clarification on something before us. We're going to move on into the debate now.

Councillor Nason: Madam Chair, we're being asked to vote on a motion to extend further powers to the CAO. You know, he has access to $50 million. I'm just trying to clarify if this will be over and above his existing powers.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Ruta.

Mike Ruta: Councillor, I'm not sure what the extent of the total cost of the incident will amount to at this point. We do have some initial costs to date, but there's a number of things that are outstanding, and specifically with respect to the tree canopy and additional work that has to be done during the course of the year. So I can't comment on the total amount of the incidents. We're certainly hoping for DFA coverage at some point and that's something that will help the City immensely in terms of the cost.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Ruta. We'll turn the clock off. Councillor Klein had a question for the CAO. He was not speaking to the item. Who would like to speak next? Councillor Klein, did you want to continue with your speaking opportunity? Okay, well you were…you had the floor so go ahead and then we'll hear from Councillor Eadie. Thank you Mr. Ruta.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair. I certainly do appreciate how difficult and how expensive it is to address all of that happened in this once-in-a-lifetime storm. And I appreciate the efforts that have gone on to date. And I believe that turning to our partner, the provincial government for assistance in these times is appropriate. But I'm wondering because it doesn't give us that information, have we applied to the federal government who has awarded disaster relief of this type in the past to other jurisdictions across Canada and to other countries throughout the world. We have not heard if there is a plan to send that request. If the Province controls the federal disaster assistance money, will that be included in said letter to the…or negotiations to the Province? There was some questions about why we didn't call back, understandably some laid off summer Forestry and Park staff that, you know, that are available. Many of them are students and wouldn't be available. Why not all Winnipeg companies were contacted in an effort to work as one? We were informed, fair enough, that I think four or five or six maybe local companies were hired, but some of us aren't privy to all that information. The new motion certainly does address keeping track of costs. But I'm wondering, what costs? Is that covering legal claims, is that covering any insurance claims, is that covering damage to City property? Is that covering overtime that may have occurred? All of that is very unclear at this particular point in time. And I think it's fair and transparent to, you know, inform all members of Council as much as we can and to provide that information asking us to vote in favour of something. I'm frankly shocked that we haven't been able to keep track of costs as of today. We

haven't sat down to forecast expenses ourselves. I'm sure we probably have, but I don't know that for certain. Had we been working for…we've been working for over a week surely, we could estimate the costs going forward based on actuals to date. However, we also do appreciate the other communities that have stepped up, as the Mayor has certainly acknowledged them on social media and rightfully so. But we also should know and taxpayers should know that there is a cost to that. And I think that that's what this motion is about today. We are paying for their services as we should. I've also heard that there are, you know, opportunities to, you know, maybe look for other means of help. So my uncertainty on the reasons why and the change in the motion are still sitting with me. So I'd like to hear what other people have to say in the spirit of a debate so that I'm more informed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Klein. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to speak in support of the main report as well as the amendment. And I appreciate the amendment, Madam Speaker, outlining in more detail what we're dealing with in terms of financial though, it's not definite, but who knows what the real cost will be to finally clean it up, Madam Speaker. What I do know, Madam Speaker, is I think it is appropriate to move this along as expediently as possible because I know, Madam Speaker, that the population of Winnipeg wants it cleaned up and actually, they don't understand why it hasn't been cleaned up as fast as it is. And it's very difficult. There's no doubt about that, Madam Speaker, and there will be a lot of costs that you might not be able to say is emergency, but nevertheless will need to be cleaned up, needs to be dealt with. And I won't…I'm not…I wouldn't necessarily call it a once-in-a-lifetime. We don't know what the future holds, but this is our first experience with this kind of storm, Madam Speaker, that carried enough weight in the very wet snow and leaves that had not fallen yet to the ground, Madam Speaker, and held all that. If you think about it, like I had a…in my own yard I had a tree just fall over from the weight, just couldn't handle it, fell out at the root. So the damage to our forests, the canopy and so on, both private and public is very difficult, Madam Speaker. And there is a need to clean up our parks and our...I trust in our emergency measures team to appropriately deal with things in priority order in order to get there. And…but I don't want to get too far into it other than to say I'm glad to hear that we had some non-Forestry workers, but Parks and Open Spaces people who clean up…clean up things. They don't necessarily take care of a tree that's been damaged or anything, but they definitely clean up whatever hits the ground and they deal with that kind of stuff. And I'm glad to hear that we called back the staff that were able to work who weren't going to school. And we do a number, Madam Speaker, of workers and I know several people who have worked most of their lives and still work in Parks and Open Spaces, but work most of their life in these positions and do get laid off, Madam Speaker. And we needed them. There was a call to duty and I'm glad they're back and they're helping us out. So I have no problem with giving the ability to our CAO whether interim or not. I definitely know that our senior administration is charged to make sure that we also watch out and be careful for the financial stability and finances of the City of Winnipeg. Whether you agree with some of their ideas or not, Madam Speaker, they do realize that they have to be prudent in moving forward. And I know they'll measure whatever they can when they can. And so I support the amending motion and the main motion. Let's get on with it, get it to the Province and probably it's the Province who can go to the City because Winnipeg is part of the Province of Manitoba. And the Province of Manitoba will be more than likely asking for disaster assistance from the federal government. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Councillor Gillingham, to close on the amending motion.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. Just in my close, maybe I'll reiterate for the sake of my councillor colleague who did ask specifically at what cost will be captured and communicated. I do point my colleagues back to, again, Item No. 4 in this resolution that says "all expenses". So all expenses related to the cleanup and recovery are to be provided through a detailed accounting in the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close on the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I made comments earlier today of appreciation for all those that are helping with respect to the cleanup of what can only be described as an unprecedented weather event. And so I'll reiterate our appreciation for all of their efforts including those that have come in from out of province. I appreciate Councillor Gillingham's amendment which I've seconded, asking for additional openness, transparency and accountability by Council in due course as some of the numbers do come in. And the original motion though let's keep it in mind is to ask the provincial government who is the level of government we apply to for funding when and if it's available through disaster financial assistance from both provincial and federal governments. I did speak with the premier earlier this week. We had a very productive discussion. He certainly appreciates the work that members of public service are doing. And as I communicated, appreciation for Manitoba Hydro and the public service at the province of Manitoba for their efforts. Of course there are significant costs and we're going to keep working collaboratively with our provincial government partners to try to get disaster financial assistance from provincial and/or federal sources as may be made available. But we do want to make sure we are very clear with our public service right now that our

citizens do expect them to be working expeditiously during a local state of emergency to protect life safety and to remove debris that is in public lands. And we want to make sure that they have the full resources and backing of this council to do their important work in a timely manner. And this amendment certainly clarifies that, along with making the request through the provincial government for disaster financial assistance. I also want to once again extend my appreciation for those that have come into Winnipeg from other countries, in the case the US and of course from other cities. In particular, I want to thank Mayor John Tory and the crews from Toronto that arrived less than two days...yesterday was the first workday here. My understanding is they began work yesterday and subject to the approval here and the clarity that's required with Council can provide more services to us, you know, following this direction. I also want to thank Mayor Michael Fougere and the City of Regina as well as Mayor Charlie Clark and the citizens and crews that have come in from Saskatoon as well as Mayor Naheed Nenshi for his support and those of his citizens and the crews that are being provided from the City of Calgary. I also just remind all of us and our citizens that it is going to take some time to clear the debris. And under the leadership and the Emergency Operations Centre by our EOC Manager, Jay Shaw, and the outstanding service of our public service, we're going to continue to do the work that our citizens expect of us. And I also want to just close in once again underscoring the appreciation that we have for the work of the public service. You know, often our role is to scrutinize and provide the accountability for tax dollars here at City Hall. This is a time where we really need to be very clear and unwavering in our support and our appreciation for difficult work that's occurring in our community in response to this storm. All corners of our city were affected, and members of our public service have been working very hard. And for that, on behalf of this council and the citizens that we all have the privilege of serving, I just want to say thank you for their efforts.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that I'll call the question on amending Motion No. 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now the vote on the main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Moving forward, Mr. Mayor, on the next report of EPC dated October 17, 2019.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED OCTOBER 17, 2019

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item 1. I would like to speak to this. Would this be the appropriate time?

Madam Speaker: And the item has been pulled as well. And we just have one item so yes, Mr. Mayor, you have the floor to introduce Item 1.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I want to thank...this matter relates to the negotiated agreement between ATU and the City of Winnipeg. This was a very long and difficult negotiation that occurred. I want to thank the negotiators on both sides of the table for being able to reach an agreed upon collective agreement and in particular, of course, our negotiators on behalf of the City of Winnipeg as well as the negotiating team at ATU. Obviously we were very pleased that we have negotiated agreement before Council. I appreciate the fact that the Amalgamated Transit Union membership has approved this as well. And you know, the value and the support that we provide to our transit operations and our transit operators is something that shouldn't be undervalued. We greatly appreciate the work that they do each and every day to move well over 150, 160,000 transit rides per day. It is…it's incredibly important to keep our city moving. I know we'll be voting momentarily on a historic vote really for a first-ever low-income bus pass. But of course we want to see the buses moving throughout this year and in the coming years. This is a 48-month term, that's four years and something that I think will serve our citizens and provide the stability to members of the Amalgamated Transit Union as well as to riders to have that certainty going forward. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Speaker and to Mr. Mayor's point through you. Yes, I did. I made a social media post that said it was a two-year deal and it was a four-year deal. I…obviously, I've made a mistake there and actually went right on social media afterwards and apologized for that, and noted that it was a four-year deal. But I will say this, it's disappointing to experience how little involved some elected officials are at City Hall. Understanding, through a great deal of experience with CBAs, I really need to know and would like to know…and I'll note also because it probably will come up in a response that I would have asked these questions had we been involved in a meeting, but not all councillors were offered that meeting. I would like to know and I'm sure residents need to know the financial impact of the increased shift premiums, the new training options, the salary adjustments and especially because of the desire to introduce a four-year budget or forecast because we really can't put in four-year budgets. It's not permitted under the act. I'm also a little troubled by the fact that reading the agreement we learned of an addition that I don't remember being

discussed or brought to our attention to provide the service...requiring the service to the best efforts of the transit to offer French in one specific ward, St. Boniface. Will this affect scheduling or costs or are we offering a premium for drivers who speak French? Why is it just one ward specified in the CBA? Why, given the fact that we celebrate we're on Treaty 1 Land, not offering Cree or other First Nations languages or Tagalog or Punjabi. It's troubling to have that come upon you by a report that's given to you a few days…or four days beforehand. But however, I will say that I appreciate and thank the members of the ATU. They were stressed during this whole period. We have heard growing frustrations and I appreciated the opportunity to sit down with several members and hear of those frustrations and to learn from them. But I have to end by saying, if this is collaboration we should be sitting down and be made aware of everything as it goes forward, especially when it comes to how we're going to budget for that.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I rise to speak to the agreement. I of course am going to support ratify...I am voting to ratify the agreement that the two negotiating teams finally came together on, Madam Speaker. It's really the experience of this particular negotiation which was difficult. And Madam Speaker, it seems to me it was very difficult because I think either side wasn't understanding each other about what they were talking about. And when things started going out into the public and what I would call negotiating in the public and stating things that aren't…were not necessarily of the main concern, Madam Speaker, to one side or the other side for that matter because there probably was some misunderstanding as well from the labour side as well. What I do know, Madam Speaker, is that the drivers and the mechanics and the people who take care of our transit system, not only are they providing a service that is essential to many Winnipeggers and I mean essential. The people have no choice. That was very clear that...and actually, we heard a little bit of that about the low-income pass. People talk about their dependency on that transit system. And for it to stop when you have no alternatives is not a good thing. So really, negotiations, the type I prefer...and I've been involved actually directly at the negotiation tables with the Seven Oaks School Division, being the chair of negotiations with the education assistants because that happened to be the portfolio I got, but we also had a team of councillors who sat with our expert negotiators across the table from both the labourers and their representatives in negotiations. I see no conflict in that kind of thing. You might say that, oh, the governance part is getting into minutia and detail of managing the system. However, if we had certain individuals who were at the table…around the Council and I know we all understand the needs and concerns that people have in their various wards and through the city. It's not just a ward-centred thing. The transit system is for the whole system and it has to acknowledge that there are various groups of people that we need to take care of. And within this agreement I note that they talk about improving scheduling, which has a great effect on many people including the drivers and the ability of those routes to accommodate the needs of the users, the drivers, the workers. And so I think this is a good agreement. I know that it was only ratified by 51% of ATU 1505's membership. But again, because of what the dealings that went on out in the public discourse, there was a lack...a destruction of any trust that may have existed, Madam Speaker, any trust. And in order to negotiate a good agreement that's in the interests of all parties, especially in the end, the users...because remember, interest-based bargaining, looking at it from that perspective, is to be able to consider all the dynamics of everybody involved in the system. And so I hope that through this four-year agreement that we're about to ratify, I think we have the people to ratify it, that a trust can be built with our workers. And for that matter, with the users of our transit system because they don't trust…that's what I heard when I'm riding the buses every day, whether waiting at a bus stop or on a bus. And I understand that...I think we have an appropriate chair who now rides the bus quite a bit. And I think that's very good because now the chairperson has a very good understanding about that system. Because you do need to use it day-to-day to really understand from a governance perspective the decisions you're making on a governance basis. And so…and if you don't have that day-to-day experience, then it is important to listen carefully, listen, listen to the people who know. That is important. So we can point out the failures, but I'm going to end my speech with a successful agreement. And I believe that all sides are sincere and wanting to provide the best system that is good for everybody involved. And hopefully at the end of this four-year term of this agreement there will be that trust between all parties. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close on the item. Okay I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So as a result of our earlier vote to suspend the rules, next we will deal with Motion 2 which is in paper copy on your desk. It's the notice of motion which was brought forward by Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes to oppose Québec's Bill 21. We will be dealing with the item today. Councillor Nason to introduce Motion 2.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS in 2019 the Province of Québec enacted Bill 21 (An Act Respecting the Laicity of the State) which prohibits public servants from wearing religious symbols including turbans, hijabs, kippahs, the cross and many others;

AND WHEREAS religious wear in certain traditions is considered an important act of devotion and is not a mere symbol of religious identity;

AND WHEREAS the wearing of religiously-mandated signs or clothing as/or religious symbols is a fundamental right in the exercise of "freedom of thought, conscience and religion," as written in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and does not in any way diminish the ability of public servants to fulfill their duties;

AND WHEREAS restricting the ability of citizens from wearing religious symbols affects all components of society: first nations, settlers and immigrants;

AND WHEREAS Freedom of religion in Canada is protected by the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Human Rights Act;

AND WHEREAS The City of Winnipeg stands firmly to support religious freedom as this is aligned with the Canadian Charter of Human Rights;

AND WHEREAS a secular and religiously neutral state is achieved by treating all citizens fairly through unbiased governance structures that do not favor one religion over another;

AND WHEREAS forcing citizens to abandon certain cultural and religious practices will create an environment that fosters intolerance and inequity;

AND WHEREAS Bill 21 is a divisive law that perpetuates exclusion, discrimination, and class division by increasing systematic barriers to employment for religious groups;

AND WHEREAS The National Council of Canadian Muslims (NCCM), the Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA), the World Sikh Organization (WSO) and others have initiated a constitutional challenge against Bill 21;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg City Council is a signatory of The Declaration to join the Canadian Coalition of Municipalities against Racism and Discrimination (2006);

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg is a multicultural, socially diverse, and inclusive city that is home to many different faiths, religions, genders, languages, and cultures;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg takes its role as a human rights city and the home of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights seriously;

AND WHEREAS Government has an important role in protecting our shared values of tolerance and diversity;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Winnipeg City Council oppose Québec's Bill 21, and support in principle, the constitutional challenge to Bill 21, and continue to support building a welcoming city where everyone has access to opportunity and prosperity.

Councillor Nason: It feels like forever since we started this dialogue this morning. I do want to open, Madam Speaker, by thanking my council colleagues for voting to suspend the rules whether they really wanted to or not and afford those many voices that were heard this morning to let our communities know that we're speaking up against this legislation being put forward in Québec. You know, understanding Québec within their Bill 21, you know, Québec is a distinct society, but sometimes their values don't align with the rest of us in Canada. With having just exited the most fracturing and divisive federal campaign where identity politics were front and centre, and one where no leader really rallied to denounce the approach being undertaken in Québec's Bill 21, I know in Manitoba we are a diverse community and an inclusive community, one where the Charter of Rights and Freedoms are enforced and upheld. We also just had the

Supreme Court of Canada hold session here for the very first time outside of Ottawa. You know, perhaps they can come back and hold that charter challenge here, you know, in a future consideration. After all, Winnipeg is home to the Canadian Museum of Human Rights. So when Mr. Simarpreet Singh who is a practising Sikh contacted my office as a Transcona resident, I knew that this was important to him and my local community and so many others within our city that this motion had to be spoken out against. I also want to thank Councillor Lukes who herself has many members in her community that are of different faiths and ethnic upbringing. In supporting this motion and securing some very specific language in the motion to address their concerns. For seconding of this motion is an important one for our communities. I know our premier has invited people in the labour movement within Québec that may be affected by this to consider moving to Manitoba. It would be my hope that approval of this motion in Winnipeg, after all, Manitoba's largest metropolitan centre will encourage our province to also allay the fears within our community and put forward a similar approach. Thank you Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to thank all of council for allowing us to hear this important motion today and for suspending the rules, all the rules and allowing this to come forward. I want to note for the record that Val Ginewiski was here today to speak to the motion but she could not stay. She did leave her notes with me and I will send them all to you. For whatever reason we can't submit them to be on the record, but I just really want it noted that she came to speak to this. I can't thank all the speakers enough for coming forward to speak to this motion. I worked with Councillor Nason to craft this motion. I worked with members of the community. It really states everything that I would like to say. Our city, our province and our country is enriched by the multicultural tapestry that is Canada. As a city, I believe we need to stand up and send a message not only to minority communities, but to the entire country that Winnipeg is a city that stands firmly to support religious freedom as aligned with the Canadian Charter of Human Rights. I hope that when Québec's secularism law is challenged in Québec's Superior Court, that Winnipeg's City Council position will be noted and it will contribute positively to the decision-making process. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: I want to thank through the Chair, through you, Councillor Sharma, Speaker Sharma, I want to thank Councillors Nason, Councillors Lukes and all the delegates today for bringing this urgent matter forward so that the Council was not, to quote Idris, to quote others, Council was not a silent friend. I do believe there are times when municipalism movements matter and that this should be a place...Council should be a place that hears the priorities of our citizens in urgent matters like this motion. So through you I would like to thank Councillor Nason and Lukes. Bill 21 is a racist act. Québec Premier, François Legault and his CAQ party have forwarded and passed racist and discriminatory legislation in Bill 21. Bill 21 made Mayor Plante of Montreal plead to the premier ministre of Québec to not invoke the notwithstanding clause to allow governments to temporarily override certain portions of the Constitution Chart of Rights and Freedoms. She also responded with a declaration…unprecedented declaration, a rare moment of unity between the city, its administration and its opposition parties to reaffirm the cities as if this should be stated in Canada in any city…big city in Canada, large or small, unwavering support for its employees. We heard today in the delegations people talk about their ambitions to become an educator. As a former chair of the largest and oldest school division in Manitoba, that was very touching for me as a former school trustee who felt really protective over educators…all of our educators. Cities can provide support when province and federal politicians may fail. We can pick that up and that's why mayor after mayor and city councillor after city councillor believes in big cities. And so I'm proud to stand in support of this motion. I'm proud to stand in support…always of our communities, some of whom spoke so passionately here and always of faith expression; the act of wearing turbans, hijabs or kippah. The act of Bill 21 against faith expression, the prejudice that people fear might be a policy trend, it's important as a city councillor for Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry and the Chair of Protection to stand in support of this motion today. And once again, for the third time, I'd like to thank my council colleagues.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Through you Madam Speaker, I'd also like to thank Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes for this motion. I think this is an excellent motion. I am very, very supportive of it. I was a little bit nervous of not letting it go through the process because I do believe that there would be even more speakers and I think that we would have more of an opportunity to carry on this conversation because I think a lot of this needs to be heard and I think that this could have been also heard at EPC and then on to Council next week and maybe even have members from…more members from Winnipeg join in, which I think would have been a positive. But I do know that the intent here is something that I really do support. And I really do want to thank the councillors. I think this is something that we should be standing up for. This is something that we should say as a community that we don't support. And I want to thank all the speakers that came here today. I think that this is an issue that has brought many people here today to talk about something that's

important that has impacted them and sometimes that takes courage to talk about if you haven't normally been in a public setting speaking about this. And I really do appreciated hearing from those people here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gilroy. Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. I'm in support of this motion which opposes the proposal in Québec. One…and we have to heed everyone's remarks on this, remarks of all Canadians including what we've heard this morning and including all our remarks. I would like to say a few things that are not inconsistent with my support of this motion. First of all, let's not pretend that everybody understands what we're doing here at Winnipeg City Hall. Is every municipality doing this? I don't think so, but so why are we doing this? Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, that some people might question whether we're questioning the rights of the courts to deal with this in terms of interpreting the Charter of Rights and Freedoms or whether it be that we would prefer what we had before 1982, before we repatriated the Canadian Constitution, before we brought in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in which the courts would make said decisions such as this. Before that time, Madam Speaker, these decisions were made by parliaments, by legislators. And we have what was called supremacy of parliament over these issues. So I don't think…we're not questioning that, I believe it's not the intent of this motion. I am not saying we should go back to supremacy of parliament on these issues, but you can't blame people for wondering why we're doing this at a city council chamber. Also I'd like to make the point that we should be sensitive to why this is happening in Québec and why this pattern has been happening in Québec over decades and generations. And Madam Speaker, we should appreciate…I was considering making…offering an amendment to this motion, recognizing that Québec in a very distinctive way has been oppressed by religion or religious oppression over generations and also by a cultural minority over generations, which is how Québec has dealt with that in recent generations in a way that is different from the rest of Canada because it was oppressed by religion in a way that's unique to them, a religion to which I'm born and raised, the catholic church, I'll just say it because they did. And also by an English minority that oppressed them socially and economically for generations. Let's think back to the 1960s. What happened in Québec and how is that part of the pattern of today. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, until the 1960s Québec had the highest birth rate in Canada. In less than a decade, they had the lowest birthrate in Canada. This era is called La Révolution tranquille, the quiet revolution. Very, very real, it's a very real social revolution in Québec. Sort of maybe… one could argue, the biggest one we've had in Canada, the most successful one we've had in Canada. We call it the quiet revolution. It was done democratically. It was done using elections, legislature, parliament, politics, democracy. You may recall the progressive liberal governments starting with Jean Lesage in Québec where they started to use government as the tool to represent people beyond the church and beyond the English Anglo-economic forces that dominated business through laws in Québec to the extent that, as an example Madam Speaker, I'm not making this up. It's all there. It was traditional that the professions for the Québecois would be doctors and lawyers. It wouldn't be the captains of industry. It wouldn't be business. There was a certain barring in a sense of those French Canadians, those Québecois, if you will, from attaining those opportunities. So in the '60s it started changing, reacting to oppression…by religious oppression and oppression by a cultural minority. So we really should be sensitive to that. It's the truth. And despite the progressive liberal governments of Québec, the pattern of reaction continued and they elected the Parti Québecois in 1976 to continue that pattern. And to this day, we realize that the axis of political involvement and coalescing in Québec is around different issues. It's about sovereignty and Québec nationalism and its place in the federation. We saw that in just this week in Québec. But let's be sensitive in terms of why it happened. Okay, don't be sensitive about it. Just acknowledge it. Why did this happen? It is because of oppression to the people of Québec and how the majority think as they perceive themselves. Within a shared experience of the…some people today, certainly their parents, their grandparents and their ancestors for generation. And as we say in Québec, je me souviens, there is sort of debate over what that means, but it is a reaction. But I would say, and one of the reasons I'm supporting this motion is because for so many people it's sincerely out of fear. It's our job as Canadians and our job as people that support this motion to guarantee, do what we can to evolve that trust why Québec has despite two referenda decided to stay within this federation. And so we are part of this struggle. It's easy to say...and I'm not saying it's wrong. I support this that Bill 21 in Québec is wrong. But we should be sensitive as to how it happened and how we can continue moving forward in terms of addressing those issues, that for some people, some Québecois in all sincerity support it by virtue of fear of religious oppression or imposition or imposing religion and also because of the very real history of oppression by a cultural minority in Québec. And that pattern leads us to today. The challenge continues to, Madam Speaker, to show how we are a progressive and tolerant society and a country. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, you have the floor.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you Madam Speaker. I am in support of the motion, Madam Speaker. I am somewhat concerned, but really, what effect can we have other than to speak out and whether or not the people of Québec will be listening or not to what any of us on Council here have to say. We'll send a letter. But Madam Speaker, you know, I hesitate to meddle in something that is now being dealt with by the court system which we set up, this country was set up and whether or not Québec decided to...they had a dissenting opinion in terms of the Charter and living with their patriation of our constitution and so on and so forth. Madam Speaker, nevertheless, there is a system set up today to

deal with things I think most appropriately. There will be people who I believe understand pastoral prudence have the experience to evaluate things from a human rights perspective. The reason we have human rights in Canada and our Charter and the reason that Canada is strong...racism does exist...all kinds of discrimination still exists, Madam Speaker. I'm a member of an equality-seeking group as well. I'm a totally blind…I'm a person who's totally blind. And we have had to fight for our rights against the majority. Because really, Canada is set up to help us deal…at sometimes, our majority-thinking people who think in majority together, set…in Québec's case they say 70% of the citizens in Québec are good with Bill 21. That doesn't mean they're right, but I am not the one that should ultimately decide that they're wrong, even though they think in a majority a certain way. Yes, they've had to live with the past, Madam Speaker. And in this country, the Indigenous people have had to live with what was done to them in the past by religion, by colonization and domination, the tromping of the rights of Indigenous people. That happens in this country. And I'm proud to say that Winnipeg is the human rights city, that it acknowledges all of these rights. Our Mayor Bowman has made Winnipeg. The Human Rights Museum has made Winnipeg the human rights city. So I guess it is appropriate that we discuss this at our council floor. But again, I have to trust in a court system that recognizes that fears that things of the past may arise again that may affect the distinct society that does exist in Québec. It's more than just this thing about religion. It's language rights and everything that Québec is all about. They also have a different legal system based on their heritage from where they come from. That's good. I don't understand those laws there in any matter, Madam Speaker, but what I do know is that we need people who can make the appropriate judgments, help people deal with their fears. I wear pink today not because...it's just kind of coincidental, but you know, you could say the churches dominated, pushed, bullied people of Québec a certain direction for many decades until the '60s when the revolution came out. But we must always be cognizant that we are a different society today. This is a society that has said we want reconciliation with Indigenous people. We want Québec to be part of our country. I don't see them as, you know, not part of Canada. They think differently there. However, in context to human rights values in this country, they themselves should know best that when you have a majority of people in power or people who are there can affect your lives in the wrong way, that is not good. I have no problem. Like, I don't get the problem. If I'm going to wear a hijab and you can't see my face, I can't see any of you anyway. I don't get it. You can trust...I trust you. I trust you Madam Speaker. I don't need to…just because somebody wears a hijab doesn't influence my thinking, but you know, it shouldn't effect anybody who can sees thinking. You know, there is some difficulty though. You know, we have women's rights, religious rights. There is a rights thing, and we trust in our court system, which is really what I'm saying today is. I trust in that court system, just like the leader of the NDP trusts that if he goes out there wearing what he wears, he has Canadian values. He's not Québecois, but he's Canadian. He has our values. He has our respect. He would never push his religion on the people of Québec just because he wears what he wears. People need to try to heal. And I think part of the problem in Québec is it's taking them a long time to heal from how they were treated as this country formulated and came together. So let's trust the judgment of the people that were appointed to make sure that the majority does not tromp over the minority. And let's trust that whatever they have to say on the issue brings the Québec people towards...

Madam Speaker: All in favour of the extension? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Eadie: Towards the healing that they need to be able to not be so sensitive to people's religious whatever you want…imagery, whatever you want to call it, freedom. That's right. But no one single religion should dictate what I should do with my rights. If I was a woman, I have the right to choose. No religion should be able to decide that. But that's not what we're talking about here. It's all about imagery. It's not necessarily about freedom. Yeah, you are free to wear, but should any one religion become the dominant religion of a country and start making decisions for other people when it comes to their human rights acknowledged internationally through the United Nations. Remember, human rights are there and nobody's religious rights can trump my disability rights, my right to be able to participate. I don't see how religious imagery is preventing somebody from participating in a government service program like for the people of la rec. The people who are blind who are French in Québec. Those religious symbolisms will have no effect, no effect on the services that they receive from the government of Québec. I leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you Councillor Eadie. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Canada is a geographically massive country with a relatively small population spread out across…largely spread out across the Canada-US border. The United States is a behemoth. Military, financial, cultural, it very much affects everything in our daily lives. Going back to my school days, the one thing that really differentiated Canada versus the United States was how we treated newcomers. The United States was all supposed to be a cultural melting pot. Everybody came in together. They left what they brought in at the door, and they became an American. Canada by comparison was a mosaic. What you bring in is still retained. Yes, you are a Canadian, but you can be a Ukrainian Canadian, you can be a German Canadian, you can be a Sikh newcomer, you can be a Manitoban, you can be a Québecer, you can even be a Roughrider fan, but I would recommend against it. The difference is...Mosaic Field hey. Again, the difference is we support, we embrace and we recognize each other's differences and we enshrine that that is something you are allowed to do. We encourage it. Bill 21 is the opposite of that. We are saying that you cannot display on your sleeve your religious personal views and beliefs. It's unconstitutional. I

find it completely unacceptable that all political parties in this last federal election, national political parties, in my mind underplayed this issue and they would not stand up for what is Canada. All political parties. It was a disappointment. So again, I think Canadians…again, this is not really within the purview of Winnipeg City Council. I think this is in the purview of being Canadian. Canadians from coast to coast should join…from coast to coast to coast and say this is un-Canadian and we stand with all Canadians, regardless of what they look like, who they pray to and what their beliefs are. Thank you very much.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you to Councillor Lukes and Councillor Nason for bringing this motion forward. I think it's a great example of why debates are helpful inside the chamber and to listen to people. I certainly appreciate all the speakers we had today. I appreciate more that every one of them said they were a Winnipegger, they're a Canadian. This is…and this is the message we need, one people. This is what this is about is being truly one...like, one people, Canadians first. I think that that's exactly what we heard today. I guess I would have…somewhat along the lines of Councillor Schreyer, would have liked to see, let's go a little bit further. Put a little more to this letter and we will send a letter to Québec, that's great if we decide on that today. But why not send a letter to our Prime Minister asking him to, you know, take action against this inequality, take action against this bill. And why not draft a by-law at some time here in City Council to ensure that that never happens in the City of Winnipeg. So again, I salute both Councillor Nason and Lukes for this motion and I certainly will support it.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I hadn't planned to speak to this but went for a run over the noon hour and thought of a couple of things that I think are worth saying. Firstly, I'd like to thank Councillor Nason and Councillor Lukes for not following the procedure of getting a report and actually getting this on the table and in front of us for debate. I, by contrast, did follow the correct or prescribed route and got a report about a certain human rights issue or what (inaudible) is a human rights issue and I will be supporting this by the way. Get that out of the way. A certain human rights issue and that was the service of Handi-Transit throughout the city, Handi-Transit now being owned by other names, but I'll…for the sake of this debate simply refer to it as Handi-Transit. That to me was a human rights issue. We got a report instead, a report that indicated that this was the standard procedure throughout Canada. It gave a cost of 6 to $800,000 for extending the service throughout the geography of Winnipeg. Five years later looking at the numbers, I realized something was wrong. The staff admitted…in fact, they have made quite a serious mistake over costing it by somewhere around…depending on how you look at it, a third to 50%. I looked at the Ombudsman's report that recently came out. This was one of the many issues that was dealt with. So the Ombudsman's view is, as part of our previously referenced review of other Canadian para-transit systems, we found that of the 12 services, we considered nine provided a wider service corridor than Winnipeg. Eight para-transit systems pride its service based on city-limits with no relation to the fixed truth system bus stops. The Americans with Disabilities Act requires services to provide it within a three-quarter mile corridor fixture. It's two and a half times what Winnipeg Transit does. Given the continued expansion of Winnipeg suburbs and the need for para-transit service, we find that the current transit service corridor 500 metres to be unfairly restricted and the report recommended the scrapping of that standard. So I'm pleased to hear a lot of very eloquent statements today about the importance of human rights and with this element, which does carry with it a price tag, I would hope that in that same spirit we look to expand the service, we look to scrap the 500 metre rule. Yes, there will be a price tag, but I guess it might be time for us to put our money where our mouths are and take some action on what to me has always been a troubling human rights issue. I want to thank Councillor Nason. Perhaps he and I can combine on something on this one too as he has been quite a champion on this issue as well. Two other matters in brief. Something troubled me this morning. I'm pretty sure the speaker didn't mean it in a negative way, but there were comments about two things that are factually correct. The Canadian government in the 1930s did turn away a ship of would-be Jewish immigrants; whole literature about that, the 'None Is Too Many' book. The Canadian government did imprison Japanese Canadians without due cause and did…subsequently to Brian Mulroney, issue an apology. But that is part of a story. The other part of the story that didn't get mentioned and which bothers me and I want to mention this because it's some of my family members and some people who grew up on the street I live on. People volunteered in that generation to fight fascism. They weren't drafted necessarily, they didn't have to go. But a number of Canadians did go. They went to other continents to fight an ideology that was profoundly racist, was murderous. So I think it is half a story to talk about some of those things we heard this morning. And the other half, I owe it to my uncles and some other people who went off and gave their lives in pursuit of democracy, in pursuit of fighting their fascist ideology to say, you know, we're here today and we enjoy a lot of freedoms because a lot of people in that generation stood up to some pretty…some regimes that didn't have any respect for human rights. So I think it's important that we note that. We all do it, we all talk about it on November 11th, but I think we should maybe remember that as well as we go forward. And it's been said that…to utilize something Councillor Browaty said, it's been said by the American communitarian thinker Amitai Etzioni, well, you can talk about a mosaic, but even a mosaic needs glue and a frame and that might be worth remembering as we talk about our culture. Certain things do frame us. Certain things do

unite us. And I think some of that is that while the Americans didn't get into the war while many countries didn't…many countries stayed on the sidelines, Canadians voted and Canadians went as of September 1939. Didn't invade Canada, they invaded Poland, and yet Canadians of that generation stood up and went to battle to protect some of the human rights we continue to enjoy today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise today in support of this motion. And I want to thank Councillor Lukes and Councillor Nason on the courage of their convictions as the Mayor's often referred to in bringing this forward. It really shows a lot of class on your part and that you have been thinking about this on behalf of your constituents. Again I support this motion going forward, but the only reservation I have is based on what I've learned this morning in our time here in our council chambers is that there is a process that we could adhere to that would give a greater voice potentially to people coming and speaking in delegation to support this very important motion that you've put forward. You know, I've had the opportunity to travel around the world in my previous role with the provincial nominee program. One of the things that's really remarked on our province, our city is the fact that people choose to come here on the basis of those values that we hold dear. The fact that we can be who we are and live a life of freedom, live a life of not being persecuted based on what we believe. And so having a place like Winnipeg, like Manitoba, and indeed Canada to the extent is reasons why Canada is a top settlement destination among immigrants. I note that in the last election, the People's Party of Canada who ran on a platform of lowering immigration levels and fighting against political correctness had no elected officials in the last election. And I believe that's a value that Canadians held out in terms of not voting to support that party and their ideals on lowering immigration levels and fighting against political correctness. Because I think we all need stability in our daily lives and understanding that we are different, but those differences, once we understand them, are things that bind us together as Canadians. So I will support this motion, but urge that we consider processes that provide a greater voice to issues such as this. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. I too want to thank the members of the delegations that appeared before us this morning and all members of Council today for their comments. You know, Canada is quite a remarkable country. I…you know, have always appreciated opportunities to travel to the province of Québec as I have elsewhere in our country and do believe notwithstanding, obviously, there are differences in systems of law and other areas with the province of Québec. The values of democracy and inclusion are ones that I believe unite us all as Canadians. This bill and law now in Québec obviously doesn't reflect that and for that reason, I will be supporting this motion today. I think it's important, however, that while we condemn Bill 21, we also redouble our efforts to ensure that we are building a city here in the City of Winnipeg that provides an inclusive home for all of our residents. And for that I'm grateful of the work already underway by this council for the Human Rights Committee of Council and other reconciliation efforts and other steps that we have and we're going to continue to take right here in our community that is in fact within our area of jurisdiction. I certainly echo the comments that have been made by many about following proper processes. I very much hope this is a unique instance in which we are suspending the rules. I think this was a record today for suspensions. I don't think that's occurred certainly during my time before. And for reasons that have been articulated by my colleagues, part of the reason which we like to have things go through respective committees and of course typically have administrative reports where we feel it's appropriate is so that we provide everybody with ample notification to come and speak in delegation at numerous steps along the way. That being said, today we are being asked to vote on this. I and others have suspended the rules and I will wholeheartedly be supporting this. I think it's important that we don't...one of the things I've regretted certainly in recent days is some of the discussion with respect to Québec or Alberta in particular or the prairies. I think it's important to keep in mind we're all Canadian. This bill and this law in Québec doesn't obviously reflect the values that I believe all Canadians including those in cities in Québec hold dear and echo the comments that have been made today by the Mayor of Montreal who is part of our Big City Mayor's Caucus and I want to support her in her efforts. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let me be clear, I'll be supporting this motion. I did vote against hearing it today. For some of the reasons that my colleagues have mentioned, I believe there's a process in place that can be followed. The matter that we're discussing today is a matter that certainly is important, but it does fall outside the purview of this council. And though it's important, its timing that we deal with it today I believe is not critical. It could have gone through the process of being referral through Executive Policy Committee back to Council where in fact, it would have had two more opportunities to be heard and discussed. And I get a little concerned as well also that when we have delegations or folks that come or I don't know if they were invited or whatever they came to be to attend the meetings…members of the public that attend the meetings with either the hope or the thought that perhaps they can speak to an item that's not even on our agenda. I get a little concerned about that. But here we are and nonetheless, as

I indicated, I will be supporting this motion. And I too on a personal level as a Canadian oppose the Bill 21 and the principles of Bill 21. In my view, it's impossible or should be impossible to separate one's personal faith from their daily life. So to ask someone to leave their faith at home or in a house of worship and not carry, you know, your body, soul and spirit and mind. And so to not…to be told you can't carry that into the public domain is something I think that it's certainly not a community that I want to live in. As I said, I think it's impossible to separate one's faith from one's daily life. One's faith drives one's values, drives one's decision-making. And so I think that those are important things. And I think that…I appreciate the comments of my colleagues thus far and certainly support what has been said around this chamber. Councillor Mayes referenced, you know, the Second World War and today reminded me of the famous quote from Martin Niemöller, the Germany pastor in the Second World War who opposed his own government. And I got thinking about that quote again. And I wonder if in this context if we just traded kind of some of the words and kind of amend it a bit if it would fit in our country today. "First they restricted a police officer wearing a turban. I did not speak out because I do not wear a turban. Then they restricted a teacher wearing a hijab and I did not speak out because I don't wear a hijab. Then they restricted the administrator wearing a kippah and I did not speak out because I don't wear a kippah. Then they came to restrict me and there was no one left to speak for me." This matters. It matters to Canada and I think it should and I appreciate that it does matter to my council colleagues. And so certainly I'm glad to support the motions before us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Nason, your opportunity to close on Motion 2.

Councillor Nason: I want to thank my council colleagues for their comments today. I did hear three times that EPC should have been the governing power over hearing this for the first time before coming to Council. I'm a bit challenged by that, but I do appreciate the fact that we suspended the rules not once, not twice, not three times, but four times so that community members that we as councillors have reached out to, so that they could come and speak to this important matter to them in the community. I think we were well represented by many of the voices that came here today. Could there have been others? Yes. But there's opportunities for them to speak after we have brought this forward and voted on it. It sounds like we're going to be supportive of this matter. It is a great opportunity for us to show leadership, to show togetherness, show unity as a council. We've had consensus here. That is what council is about is about building consensus, right? We've got 16 votes. Hopefully 16 of us will vote in unanimous of this. We shall see. But again, I'd like to close with my hope that you support this motion and send a strong message that we are a welcoming and inclusive city to call home. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Lukes, you're calling for a recorded vote. I'll call the question on Motion 2, our opposition to the province of Québec's enacted Bill 21. Those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The motion is unanimously passed. Thank you. Now moving on to Motion 3. This is a notice of motion moved by Councillor Klein and seconded by Councillor Nason regarding vacancy of the mayor position. This is notice of motion. It will be on next month's Council agenda. Okay, thank you. Following that, Motion 5, this is a motion from Councillor Klein and seconded by councillor...Mr. Clerk, do you have the seconder? Councillor Nason. And this is also a notice of motion regarding the organizational by-law. It will be on our November Council meeting. Thank you. Drawing your attention to Motion 6 now, this is moved by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It's an automatic referral to EPC. It is regarding tax credit programs. We'll now move into by-laws, Mr. Clerk, correct? There's no by-laws though…no by-laws, that's correct. We'll now have question period for the Mayor. Thirty minutes on the clock, please. Any questions for Mayor Bowman? Councillor Klein.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Charter Act (the Charter) specifies that where the Mayor is absent or unavailable for any reason, the Deputy Mayor or in the absence of the Deputy Mayor, the Acting Deputy Mayor performs the duties and functions, and may exercise the powers, of the Mayor;

AND WHEREAS in accordance with the Charter, if the office of the Mayor becomes vacant in the last 12 months of the Mayor's term of office, no election shall be held to fill the vacancy for the balance of the term, making the Deputy or Acting Deputy Mayor, the de facto unelected Mayor of the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS while acting as the unelected Mayor, the Deputy or Acting Deputy Mayor would substantially increase their profile, giving them an unfair advantage should they chose to run for the office of Mayor in the subsequent election;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the City of Winnipeg request the Province of Manitoba to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter Act to disqualify the Deputy Mayor or Acting Deputy from being a candidate for the office of Mayor in any election where they have been previously acting as unelected Mayor, due to that office being vacated.

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

WHEREAS section 62(1) of the City of Winnipeg Charter states that the Executive Policy Committee of Council must formulate and present recommendations to Council regarding budgets;

AND WHEREAS under the City Organization By-law No. 7100/97, the Executive Policy Committee has jurisdiction to formulate and present recommendations to Council on Capital and Operating budgets;

AND WHEREAS there is currently no provision in the City of Winnipeg Charter, or the City Organization By-law No. 7100/97, to allow all Councillors to participate equally in the formulation of the Capital and Operating budget recommendation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. *The Province of Manitoba be requested to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to ensure all Councillors are allowed to participate in the formulation of the budget recommendation.*

2. *The City Organization By-law No. 7100/97 be amended to allow all Councillors to participate equally in the formulation of the Capital and Operating budget recommendations.*

3. *Presentations from departments on their respective budgets be made to all members of Council during the Budget Review process.*

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,
WHEREAS the City Of Winnipeg Charter states as follows:

> *"GRANT, LOAN, TAX REBATE AND TAX CREDIT PROGRAMS*
>
> *General authority*
>
> *219(1) Council may pass by-laws establishing programs of grants, loans, tax rebates and tax credits"*

AND WHEREAS people's ability to purchase a home is based on the person's or family's income;

AND WHEREAS the demand for lower cost homes has driven the market values of these homes up much faster than expensive homes across the city since the early 2000's;

AND WHEREAS the reassessment process has caused the owners of these lower valued homes to pay higher property tax increases than the owners of the more expensive homes and far beyond the city's budget increases;

AND WHEREAS it is time to assist these lower valued home owners just as small businesses were assisted with the offsetting business tax credit in the mid 2000's;

AND WHEREAS the 2019 tax assessment roll reports that there are 192,428 residential "1" properties of which 67,204 are valued under $250,000 in Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that during the new four year budgeting process the city establish a $100.00 property tax credit for owner homes valued under $250,000 in a by-law for 2020, another reassessment year.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, I have a question to the Mayor, and in fairness, I have spoken to the Integrity Commissioner about this question. I spoke to her on September 23rd about concerns of the impact of how we as Councillors perform our duty. I have asked the administration for full clarity as well and have asked the Mayor on August 28th and a date after that in early September to hold a special meeting regarding the contempt of court case. I'm wondering if the Mayor will hold that because I read through the court documents that the City will be in court in front of Justice Grammond tomorrow and reading through the documents, understanding that it could be appealed, right now taxpayers face a penalty of at least $2 million or approximately $2 million plus. This is concerning. It's concerning because we don't know. We're kept in the dark about this one. It's concerning that we're told to ask for clarification, ask for meetings and nothing seems to…

Madam Speaker: Your question, Councillor.

Councillor Klein: Yes, my question is can we have this meeting and can the Mayor commit to more open discussions when the City is sued?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to my council colleague, my understanding is that one of the committees certainly in my absence has received a briefing and there has been dialogue from the public service to all members of Council and I would continue to support that.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Then a second question will be if the Mayor is aware that the City was served with another lawsuit a couple of days ago regarding 514 Wellington.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: No. I believe there was a question raised in my scrum at the lunch hour on this matter, and given that the matter is before the courts, I wasn't willing to provide comment, nor have I looked into or received information on that particular matter and so I'll be doing so in the coming days.

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

Councillor Nason: No offence to CBC Radio One, but listening to CJOB yesterday morning, in the morning show, the Mayor had made mention with regards to political leanings of members of Council and left some questions in my mind pertaining to two members of the Council didn't know which way they leaned but it seemed to be some comedy in relation to that. I'm wondering if the Mayor could let us know what two members he may have been referring to in that commentary.

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

Mayor Bowman: I don't recall referencing two members of Council in my CBC interview, Madam Speaker. I am often asked about how we are able to balance budgets here at City Hall when there are many members of Council that are members of political parties. I believe the Councillor who asked this has been a member of the both provincial and federal Conservative Parties. I'm not sure if he still is, but I know other members of Council have indicated that they're members of the NDP. I presume there may be Liberals on Council. There may be many like myself who are not a member of any political party, and so one of the things I have communicated and continue to communicate is how grateful I am that we are able to collaborate on matters as we have just done with respect to Bill 21, in a way that transcends what would be in other legislative bodies more divisive discussions and debates based on party lines. And the fact that we are able to balance budgets and receive the support and input of members, certainly of NDP and Conservatives, is something I'm very proud of. I would love to see balanced budgets at the Provincial Legislature supported by both the NDP and the Progressive Conservatives. I'd love to see balanced budgets in our Federal Parliament supported across the board. I would just generally like to see balanced budgets on the floor of the Legislature and Parliament and so I'm presuming that the question related to an answer along those lines Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Any questions for the Mayor? Let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. It's the report dated October 2nd, 2019. We do have some items being pulled; Item 1, Item 3 and 7, and 6. Any others? I'll call the question on Item 2, 4, 5, and 8. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 1.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED OCTOBER 2, 2019

Item 1 – Winnipeg Police Board – 2018 Annual Report

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to introduce this item.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I'll just introduce it by acknowledging the work of the Winnipeg Police Board, work that largely took place before I was elected to council. With thanks to the board members including my council colleagues that sat on the board at the time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Rollins. Councillor Klein, your opportunity to speak to the item.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair. Also, through you, thank you councillor…to the councillor for her kind words about the members of the board. I want to also acknowledge the good work of the staff at the Winnipeg Police Board. They have managed to work together and reduce our costs on a regular basis, at the same time as increasing the number of public hearings and discussions and forums, not only through the board, but in attendance with ongoing regular police forums that are held throughout our city. So it was a very productive year, in fact, given that we were able to reduce expenses substantially and improve our effectiveness and reach within the community. So I wanted to pass on my special gratitude to the two members that operate the Winnipeg Police Board. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Seeing none, Councillor Rollins, do you wish to close?

Councillor Rollins: Yes, thank you. There was representation at the Standing Policy Committee of Protection, Community Services and Parks with respect to questions on police and Police Board work and in particular a focus on budgets. And I hope to see more people talk about protection at large in the city, but want to acknowledge the good work of the Winnipeg Police Board and service with respect to this annual report. So thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 3, Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 – Winnipeg Police Service – 2018 Statement of Revenues and Expenses

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins to introduce this item.

Councillor Rollins: Again, this is the report of the statement of revenues and expenses and includes the independent auditor's report for the year ending on December 31st, 2018. Just a month in office and the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks was happy to move this along to Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This was stood down by Councillor Klein or Gillingham, the next speaker. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Number 3, the Winnipeg Police Service.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much. Again, it will acknowledge the difficult times that the service is in right now and the challenges that they have to address our public safety worries and find better, more efficient ways of keeping the community safe. I did want to note that there was some conversation, some in the media, some during a different standing policy committee of the police…of the police and the money that is associated to traffic control and cameras. And I think it's a good example of how this, you know, impacts the City Police Service. And I think it's something that we should acknowledge that if we're going to set budgets for traffic fines or violations, that we should, you know, be thoughtful of the fact people might actually start driving slower and it could impact service because it is a budget item.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Klein. Any further speakers? Councillor Rollins, do you wish to close or I can call the question? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 6, Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 – Facility Naming – Ab MacDonald Memorial Arena

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins to introduce the item.

Councillor Rollins: Sure. Thank you. I would like to acknowledge all this delegates that came including members of Ab McDonald's family that came to the Standing Policy on Protection, Community Services, and Parks. It was a really excellent reminder of all the service and all the things that Ab McDonald did for the City of Winnipeg, not only for the NHL, but in terms of his volunteerism with our community services. It was a real honour to get to meet them. And I will let my council colleague talk further on the plans.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. Simply put, I think what I would like to do, just to set the background, is just to read into the record the whereas' because it really explains the rationale behind the naming…the renaming of the St. James Civic Centre Arena to the Ab McDonald Memorial Arena. "Whereas Ab McDonald was a resident of St. James from 1967 until his passing in September 2018. Whereas Ab McDonald was a well-known and respected Winnipegger who made very important contributions to St. James and to the greater Winnipeg community as a volunteer, fund-raiser, advocate, and influential ambassador to the city. Whereas Ab McDonald achieved great success as a professional hockey player winning four Stanley Cups over 17 professional season and was the first captain of the Winnipeg Jets World Hockey Association Team from 1972 to 1974. And whereas Ab McDonald had an enduring reputation as a respected, humble gentleman who was committed to his family, his team and his hometown. And whereas Council's received several letters in support from community members to name the arena within the St. James Civic Centre in recognition of Ab McDonald's successes and contribution. Therefore, the arena…be it resolved, the arena within the St. James Civic Centre be named the Ab McDonald Memorial Arena. And the rest of the resolutions are there. I certainly want to thank Mr. Don Kuryk and members of the McDonald family for their efforts in bringing forward this initiative. And I think it is very fitting should this pass Council today, I will be talking to Mr. Kuryk and the McDonald family about the, you know, timing of a little ceremony to rename the arena in the Civic Centre. So I encourage all my colleagues to support this report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins, I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Item 7, Mr. Clerk.

Item 7 – Request for First Charge against the 2020 Capital Budget and Consolidation of the St. James Civic Centre – Facility Renewal and Expansion Project

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to introduce the item.

Councillor Rollins: Sure. So essentially, what we need to do today is call on to that first call for that many for the St. James Civic Centre facility renewal and expansion project. It is going to require Council as we do so often to authorize the budget. So we'll go ahead and do that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think this was one of the items that we've put forward to the government for special funding to consider taking care of. My question is why are we spending this money now given that we have heard several times that our next few budgets, next several years, we'll be forced to make some difficult decisions within the city. And I'm wondering why we wouldn't take this opportunity to pause for just a brief period of time and consider the realities of our finances. As we heard from a speaker earlier this morning, there are other options and other creative opportunities that exist across this country. We could look at the public-private partnership concept that is being used in other jurisdictions. They are utilized to bring…to allow for more locations for city programs to be facilitated. And it takes away the risk and the debt from the City of Winnipeg and taxpayers. I'm concerned that we're moving ahead with the expenses and we haven't got the approval for the federal funding and we're just kind of acting a little too quickly here and would ask for a pause.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm rising today to support this motion. I believe I was the one that moved it along from Protection, Community Services and Parks. Madam Speaker, I think it's essential that we move ahead with this report. It's in regards to a facility that the risk is actually waiting too long before we proceed to deal with it and that this has been indicated in the capital program for quite some time, I think even longer than...I was going to say from Councillor Fielding. And I supported it because there was a program to fix a number of facilities. There is also, Madam Speaker, as you know, a library program that we need to move ahead. And that was a report and we look forward to doing it. And so in order for our application to be successful through the Province to the Feds, we do have…it's still the same government, it's a minority one, but it's still the same government. They're still running those programs. And so we need this to move along because time's a waiting and it needs to be taken care of appropriately. I wouldn't want to wait around for facilities in our community committee area, Madam Speaker. So I think it's important that we move along. This is a recommendation that comes from our administration so that they can deal with this capital project in a timely fashion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Eadie. Any other speakers? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I'm rising to support this also. This project has been a long time in the works. There's had to be very creative approaches to financing it. There's been discoveries that weren't anticipated at all. It's an older facility. We know that in the next 20 years the demographics are dramatically changing where people 70 plus and over will be the majority in the city. I'm rising in support of this because the time is right and we need to move this project along.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker. Yes, I'm rising to support this report as well. A couple concerns I would have with delaying it. It would drive…could well drive up the prices if we delay it. I would not want to put at risk either the commitment from the provincial government that has made the commitment last year. They publicly announced their commitment to $3.9 million towards this project. What this report recommends before us that we're voting on today is to authorize a first call, but then also to consolidate municipal accommodations budgets as well to…really to accomplish much of the work that's needed within the facility. And by investing in the facility now, the St. James Civic Centre, we can extend the life of that vital community asset, that vital community centre, where so many seniors from all through western Winnipeg and families from all through western Winnipeg are there for figure skating or hockey or some other ice sports or they're there to use the pool or the weight room or media rooms as well. So I do believe the time for moving on this project and this report is now and making this investment now. And as both my previous councillor colleagues, Councillor Eadie and Councillor Lukes have stated this project has been on the books I think since…I'm pretty sure since the budget books in 2013. So I'll be supporting this report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Councillor Rollins, do you wish to close?

Councillor Rollins: Yes. Councillor Klein is asking through the Chair a fair question with respect to the debt room and the occupation of the debt room that we have a sensitive question related to budget and multi-year budget process. And I want to acknowledge that and be happy to reflect on the previous meetings where we voted on the capital projects and...but as other folks have said, this project is long time in the works. It's an older facility. We are working on the building envelope and there is some funding from the provincial government. It's also an older facility that is host to really exceptional hockey tournaments, to which many folks around the table who happen to be hockey moms and dads, and that's bingo for those of you that are counting how many times I say "hockey mom" have enjoyed. So in full support of this motion and happy to move it today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, with that I'll call the question on Item 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Bowman: Yes, okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, where are we here? We'll now move on to by-laws under this committee. Councillor Rollins.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Rollins: I move By-law No. 82/2019 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 82/2019.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I move that By-law No. 82/2019 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 82/2019.

Councillor Rollins: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 82/2019 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed and I move a recorded vote.

Councillor Orlikow: For a by-law?

Councillor Rollins: Can I?

Madam Speaker: On the by-law?

Councillor Rollins: Yes I can.

Madam Speaker: We can, yes. Okay, so call for a recorded vote on the third reading of By-law No. 82/2019. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Brian Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Carried, thank you. We'll now have question period for the Chair, for Councillor Rollins. Councillor Chambers.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. The question I have for…sorry, Madam Speaker. The question I have for the Chair…it is noted that just ahead of the holiday season, thefts tend to spike according to many loss prevention experts. In this past week alone, there have been some brazen daytime thefts in Manitoba liquor stores throughout the city. At lunch today, I was discussing with my council colleagues on such events that took place in my ward. Councillor Browaty was able to share one experience that happened in his ward as well. Manitoba Liquor and Lotteries has their policies regarding staff intervention during the act of instances of theft, but the general public is outraged by the lack of action and consequences and is engaging in their own interventions at their own risk. What is your Standing Policy Committee doing to engage other levels of government to address these issues and restore public confidence in the safety of the shopping experience?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you Madam Chair, and it seems that the Standing Policy on Protection, which you know, I've always said that that's a capital "P" on protection, is becoming the place to go to talk about protective issues on the city. Interesting though, it was commented on by a criminologist who visited the Standing Policy Committee to substantially address community policing concerns at the Standing Policy Committee. Interesting that the secretary then of the Police Board noted that that conversation hasn't been had at the Police Board, and I can't comment on that, that not being a board that I am a member of, but I can say that I do expect through budget that those concerns with respect to divesting to community services as well as the concerns specific and more generally related to the safety in Winnipeg will come forward through the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. One of the things that had come forward was a concern from Osborne Village when they noted there was a police officer at the MLCC across the street and community members wanted to know why there was additional police protection there and not at the Subway across the street, for instance, that had had multiple thefts as well. And so fair question by Councillor Chambers with respect to protection of the city with respect to shopping experience. So part of the discussion has been with BIZ groups. Part of the discussion has been very much with BIZ groups as well as businesses to figure out where people can discuss these issues, and the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks is always open. I am also, as other councillors can, participating in David Asper's process with the Province to talk about what other kind of structures and how the policy framework on policing is underdeveloped in Manitoba, and I encourage my council colleagues to participate in that process. It is coming up next month and I'm happy to off-line with the member of the Police Board on that process. That other councillors and citizens can participate in, and I think it's really important as we know Winnipeggers want to see more boots on the ground, and we saw last year that there was a very big difference between the structural relationship we have with police through the Standing Policy Committee on Protection looking at as we do their annual reports and their budgets, but not having a strong voice on operations as many of us would like. And that we do have to work with the Provincial Government to clarify, to express the needs of Winnipeggers whether they're shopping or not.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Rollins. Any further questions? Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you. For clarity, as the current Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board, the program that David Asper is speaking to Councillors about in the Manitoba Police Commission is about downtown safety. It's not about the Police Act. It is specifically downtown safety. There has been a company hired by the Province…

Madam Speaker: Your question Councillor Klein, please.

Councillor Klein: I know that the Mayor would like a question, but for clarity, you can't…

Madam Speaker: Someone else as well. Sorry.

Councillor Klein: …you can't condemn the Police Board or make comments that just aren't true and whether or not it's been discussed at a Police Board meeting, not all of those meetings are public. My question is this. Listening to how we're requiring the Province…we're looking at different ways…we're requiring the Province, and I heard Councillor Chambers' interview with the media about the potential of having to possibly charge if they don't do something.

Madam Speaker: The question, please.

Councillor Klein: Is that in the plans?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Sorry, I believe Councillor Klein was cut off Madam Chair, and I understood his question…I didn't understand his question.

Madam Speaker: Could you restate the question please, Councillor Klein?

Councillor Klein: Sure, happy to. Are we, given the information we've heard, planning to charge the Province or the liquor stores if they don't put in appropriate security measures?

Councillor Rollins: So this question isn't in the purview of the City. The Manitoba Liquor Commission as though, does have paid private supports and has an arrangement through the Winnipeg Police Service to provide off-duty police, and they pay for it as a contract basis. The Chief Smyth, when I asked him the question told me of that arrangement, but you know substantially, I think Councillor Klein's asking a question of clarification from an interview I didn't hear of Councillor Chambers.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, and through you Chair, thank you for that. Police do often have services where the MLC does pay for officers…

Madam Speaker: The question please.

Councillor Klein: …like the case she noted earlier. My question is this. Now that we've heard from the CAO, does the Chair of that Committee know how long crews from out of town have been waiting and it's a two-part question, and are we responsible for those costs during the time that they had to wait?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, I think you should clarify that question. Restate it please.

Councillor Klein: Okay, number one…how long have the crews had to wait given some issues contractual?

Madam Speaker: What crews? Yeah, if you could re-state.

Councillor Klein: Sorry, the Forestry crews from outside of town.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: So with gratitude to the crews that have come to us from all over, my understanding is they have not been waiting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Klein: Third question.

Madam Speaker: Final question?

Councillor Klein: We've heard from the CAO that there were some crews that had to wait for a bit or one. Are we responsible for those costs of waiting time? Does the Chair know that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I'm...again, we're really grateful to those cities that have been providing us auxiliary crews. Folks have commented that they've seen them working in the city. Substantially though, I do think this is a question for administration, and perhaps I heard something that Councillor Klein did not and I will refer to administration, but to my knowledge as Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, they haven't been waiting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. On to Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I'll be asking this question in French, as Riel residents do have a right to service in French in the City of Winnipeg, and we do live in a bilingual country so with those comments I will ask my question.

Translation of French Spoken:
So thanks Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question to Councillor Rollins, in the 2019 budget there was no new fees or property taxes. This weekend, there were parents and grandparents who wrote to their ward councillor why there was a fee of $7 to help with lessons for their children, a new fee that was never discussed with their councillor.

Councillor Rollins:

Translation of French Spoken:
For this question.

Councillor Rollins: Through the Chair.

Translation of French Spoken:
No new fees.

Councillor Rollins: There is no fee for watching a child take swim lessons. There is no new practice. At Bonivital Pool, I did become aware of a situation where parents, grandparents were being charged a $7 viewing fee. I understand that that has been corrected and that took place over the weekend. Council will recall that this council, through budget and through a separate motion in budget, ensured that Winnipeggers would not be charged any new fees, so it came as a surprise as the emails came in this weekend to see new fees and, in particular, a viewing fee. I understand Community Services are assessing how many people were mistakenly charged.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, second question.

Councillor Allard:

Translation of French Spoken:

Thank you Madam Chair. A question…I'm searching for the word in French, I would like to ask a second question; what measures or how can a parent or someone in charge could search how to be reimbursed. What would be the next step for someone seeking a refund?

Councillor Rollins: You can call 311. The parents can call 311. The grandparents can call 311 and/or attend at the Bonivital Pool for a refund, credit or free admission pass. This is you know what I'm being told by Community Services in writing. And so parents can be reimbursed that admission price.

Madam Speaker: Are there further questions? Councillor Eadie, you're on the list. You're next.

Councillor Eadie: No, it's okay.

Madam Speaker: Any other questions for our chair? Seeing none. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Just a quick one on this unprecedented issue of our 30,000 tree canopy being affected by the storm. Just wondering, we've got a multi-year delay in maintenance pertaining to trimming of trees. You know, probably some of those branches are no longer there that have been problematic. But I'm wondering if the Chair, through you, if the Chair, can articulate if the residents have to do anything to ensure that they're placed in queue to get trees that they had previously brought forward as being a challenge addressed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Well, thank you for the question. We're all getting those questions and really important that, you know, as winds come up and the weather changes, trees that were a 311 call sometimes can be a 911 call, and we saw some dramatic footage of that in North Kildonan I believe just a few days ago. So I think that the question is, you know, how are things being triaged and looked after and the answer is through 311, sometimes you have to update again, whether you're emailing 311 or you're calling 911 because the situation with your tree has changed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move forward, the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. The report dated October 1st, 2019. Councillor Allard.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED OCTOBER 1, 2019**

Councillor Allard: I would like to move the Consent Agenda.

Madam Speaker: All in favour?

Councillor Browaty: One to be pulled.

Madam Speaker: You want to pull 1. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Low Income Transit Pass Program – Policy and Financial Impact

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard to introduce the item.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. I just want to say, I appreciate that this program is very well intended and I'd like to thank the members of the public that were here this morning that spoke in support of this program. I do recognize that the cost of transit, whether it be a monthly pass or even single fare is a hardship…a financial hardship for some individuals. Ultimately, we need to appreciate that municipal funding from the Province which to a basket model and I think it was 2015 or 2016, and frozen at that level. Sure it gave us more flexibility, but it ended the open-ended 50/50 model that some could argue is unsustainable in the current era of financial austerity. I mean, Transit already receives significant mill rate support. Again, in residents that I speak to, the number one issue I hear is...and again, this is the year of transit, is to improve service and ridership. We hear lots about pass ups, buses that go past bus stops because they're full as well as on-time performance. I know that the next phase of the master plan, and I'm looking forward to the exercise, is re-looking at how routes are currently out there. But again, I think we've really stretched the rubber band really far. I mean, if you look at the metrics for a public transit system in a highly unionized environment, we have a fairly high-performing transit system as it is today. It's…I don't think there's that much we can do with the current system to meet users expectations, but I do think it's a good exercise to re-evaluate our route numbers and such. Again, I think transit master transit plan is going to have financial impacts. It's…I don't think when we see the final version that we come to, it's going to be a financial ask back to council to implement what's being proposed. The recommendations we have received up to this point from the administration have acknowledged that the administration of the program is going to be fairly costly. And there aren't very good means to necessarily prevent fraudulent use and reselling potentially of these new passes. So again, I think we're almost opening the idea of downloading costs to the City of Winnipeg. I believe most social programs like this for high-needs individuals and low-income folks is the responsibility of the Province of Manitoba. So based on that, again, a well-intended program if we were flush for cash, it would be definitely something beneficial to do. I just don't think at this point this is the best use of scarce city taxpayer dollars and I'll be voting in opposition to this thing. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm supporting this version of a low-income pass, Madam Speaker. I mentioned this, though, to other people, Madam Speaker. One should consider that, you know, provincially poverty is a lot more related to their mandate, Madam Speaker. However, Madam Speaker, if we look at our transit system in terms of user fees, user paying, you know, one could argue well, the seniors' discount, well that's a provincial responsibility too. Various aspects there, education, university students, on and on I could go, Madam Speaker. I think what we're losing here, though, is...so there's all kinds of revenue that comes in and we have different rates of revenue from different users. And I think that's problematic because ultimately, yeah, there's a senior's discount, but you know, if I'm senior and I got a really good pension and I'm just using the bus, I can afford to pay, you know, the regular rate. I don't get that, Madam Speaker. You know, I have a pretty good salary, Madam Speaker. I could pay full fare or buy a monthly pass…regular monthly pass, whatever. But there are people with disabilities who live in poverty. There are seniors who live in poverty, they have no choice, there's no car choice or any choice. They have no choice. There's people who work for not much more than minimum wage. They have a hard time paying the fees to ride the buses. We as a city have a responsibility to make sure that we have a transit system that is efficient and effective for...and I say "effective" too. I'm not talking about that fake efficiency where you're reducing service. I'm talking about real efficiency in delivering a

service. And that's hopefully what the master…the new plan is going to bring forward is more efficient bus routes, those kinds of things. We'll see what happens, I don't know. But effective is very important. But you know, I think we missed the point. And you know, we heard about how certain councillors have worked on this for a while. Since I got elected, I was working along with the students who were trying to get low…get their passes. I tried to say to them, you know, I really think we should be just going for one low-income pass that works for university students who aren't making a lot of money, right, one low pass that would work for seniors who can't afford to pay regular fare, one low-cost fare, one customer that needs...one type of customer who needs to have a lower fee on their bus pass. It would be much simpler to administrate and maintain. I don't know why we're not going there. But this is what I've been trying to promote behind the scenes, some people don't agree with me. I'm just trying to suggest a better way to do things. Now, this is the only thing we have. And we did hear from people who live on low-income, work with people on low-income. And what we're hearing is even getting to half the price, there's a lot of people who can't afford to pay for that. Now hopefully the Province will pay for it through income…employment income assistance. I just want to conclude about this 50/50. So all the revenues Transit brings in, we use that and apply it against all of our costs, and whatever is left over 50% Province, 50% property tax supported. That's what that plan is. Yeah, there is, you know, they're supporting right now the Province, maybe about 50%. I don't know. We're having a huge amount of costs with Transit Plus aggravation service. But the...we went out and gouged the users and we charged them too much money and we had all this extra money. So you can't really compare what's happened because the Province got out of their 50/50 share of the net expenditures, net expenditures, after all the revenues that come in. And the Province needs to go back to that kind of an agreement. Their basket thing is...I'll try it again. I'll just say it doesn't work. Yeah, it helps them hold down costs, but really, it's allowing them to push us into reducing service. Right? That's what they did. I heard they reduced all the red tape, Madam Speaker. Well you know what they dumped probably 3,000 regulations onto the City with the Vehicles for Hire Act. Likw what they're doing is they're dumping everything. That's what this provincial government is doing. And you know, I'm sorry to be a little that way. Yeah, I'm a New Democrat, but you know what, if the NDP did that, I would be feeling the same way. I would speak up. I don't hold no party lines. Alls I'm telling you is what doesn't work for this City of Winnipeg is the approach that the Province is using and especially for transit. Transit is an essential thing for people to live. Transit is essential for economic growth, which the Premier says he's going to take care of. So let's pay attention to that. People need to be transported. Not everybody is going to make $25, $30 an hour. People are out there making $13, $14, $15 an hour and they need transportation they can afford. And the only way we can provide that affordable transit, Madam Speaker, is to have a decent provincial partner like other provinces do. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker. You know, watching the recent federal election and some of the negativity during that campaign, I think it's understandable. A lot of Canadians might ask why the heck would I get involved in politics. Well, today is the day in which I think all members of Council have the opportunity to do something very progressive and positive for people that need assistance in our community, that's going to make a real, tangible difference in their day-to-day lives. I woke up this morning. I was very excited to come to Council. I'm still excited to be here today notwithstanding the length of our discussions today because we get to vote on something that I know has been supported at committee by Councillor Allard, Santos and Councillor Sharma. Councillor Browaty has been consistent in his opposition and I respect obviously disagree with that, but respect his right to express his views on this. And I know it was unanimously approved by Executive Policy Committee. We hear from some that, of course, they would like Council to go faster and deeper in the discount. I hear those concerns. I appreciate those that came in delegation today to express their concerns and desires for additional assistance. I think under the circumstances this is a reasonable and a responsible path forward over multiple years so that we can better assess the performance of the low-income bus pass and make sure we're making capital and other decisions with data being collected in a phased-in approach. The experience from other cities, and let's keep in mind, we're not the first city to do this. In fact, there are many other cities that have low-income bus passes and in my discussions in reaching out to other big city mayors, they've told me that it has been a positive experience that the costs need to be obviously monitored and managed along the way. And I think this provides us with a responsible path forward to phase it in. But let's keep in mind, this has been talked about for many, many years. Councillor Gerbasi spoke about it in a very passionate way for many years. Other members of council have. Councillor Gilroy championed it as well. And I want to commend the leadership of Councillor Matt Allard. His stewardship in the capacity as chair of the committee on a number of large files, like many of our chairs who have been doing very difficult work which I know we all appreciate really does make a difference to be able to move something of this size and importance through the committee process. Certainly, I will be supporting it. I would urge all members of Council to support it. And I hope in discussions that we may all have with the riders of transit, especially those that will benefit from the low-income bus pass, we thank them for supporting Transit. We just approved the new collective agreement for ATU. And these two measures today are pieces of a larger puzzle that we're going to continue to work on as a council to make sure we're modernizing transit, to move it from being your grandma and grandpa's transit system to one that's positioned for us and for our kids. And there is a lot of work that has to happen by this council and by the public service as well as our Transit Department over the coming years, and this is a very positive step in the right direction. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Next is Councillor Rollins followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Rollins: I want to stand in support of the low-income bus pass, Madam Speaker. And I want to do so to acknowledge the work over a number of years and thank you through you to Mr. Mayor for mentioning my predecessor, Councillor Jenny Gerbasi, and former Deputy Mayor who long since advocated with her sister in struggle, Councillor Gilroy on the low-income bus pass. I want to acknowledge the reports of Winnipeg without Poverty, Make Poverty History Manitoba. And I really appreciated the advocates including Functional Transit Winnipeg, Social Planning Council, EIA advocates. And in particular, them continuing to occupy this space that we need to reach further into our poverty reduction strategy, our barrier-free transit and mode shift. I want to thank Molly McCracken for her comments on transportation equity and thank her for her comments and work on what she characterized is the key game changing idea. We must continue to work on social and economic exclusion in this city. And I want to thank one of the kings of mode shift himself who came here in delegation, Mark Cohoe in his fabulous Bike Winnipeg sweater…branded sweater. I noticed that. The Social Planning Council comments is going to be a question that I ask Councillor Allard, but I stand in support of the low-income bus pass including I want to acknowledge the work of ATU and who is pushing us in particular on barrier-free transit and very good bus forward mode shift day-to-day at Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Rollins. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, through you Madam Chair, I rise in support of the motion that's in front of us here today, no surprise. I'm very, very proud of the work that this council has done to put this motion forward and our mayor for really championing this because I think that we did need a champion and he did a lot of the leg work and we had lots of conversations about it. I know he talked with many mayors about this issue so we can learn a little bit about from other cities on low-income programs in their cities. I wanted to talk about some of the comments that we heard today because I think this is just a start, you know. And I know that there's many of us that would like to see many different programs and those are things that we can definitely talk about as we move forward, but this is going to be a huge start. And in three years, you know, it's going to be $50 for somebody with low income. Fifty dollars means a lot. Now I know that there is more work that maybe we can be doing and those are things that I think we should continue to look at as we move forward. And I know that some people talked about moving faster on that. And you know what, I think that we got to be mindful that we did lose that 50/50 funding. We don't know the impacts of what the uptake is going to be. So we want to make sure that we have a good, frequent service and we want to make sure that we have affordable services. So I'm really excited to see the progress that we're making. Is there more to do? Absolutely. Should we be continuing to look at those different programs that might be supportive of a low-income bus pass and might look at other jurisdictions to see what they're doing? Absolutely. But I think that right now moving forward with this progressive policy will help many, many families in not only my community, but throughout Winnipeg. So I rise in support of this. And I just want to thank all members of council and those that were here prior to me that have been fighting for this. Because I think this is kind of something in history and I'm very proud to be part of it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I rise today. I'm challenged about this policy that's before us today. I am in agreement of supporting those who are disadvantaged. I've been champion along with Councillor Mayes, Councillor Chambers with regards to this challenging 500 metre rule, where we're disadvantaging those with disabilities. However, I feel financially we're not looking at this in the right way. We've got a new provincial government. We've got a renewed federal government that's, you know, looking like they're going to have to actually work with other people. We've got extra gas tax money that came this year. There is one taxpayer that's bearing the brunt of supporting these programs. And I think we owe it to that taxpayer that we work together, that we make sure that we're not consistently creeping out of our lanes with regards to policy. You know, Councillor Eadie mentioned about one pass for all, students and those of low income. I purposely…or purposely…I fully agree with that. However, we need to look and make sure that we're the most appropriate level of government to deliver that policy. You know, we do not deliver social services to Manitobans. That is a provincial responsibility through the EIA program. To me, this should be something that we go back to a renewed provincial government, to a renewed federal government, have those discussions before we go head long into something that in four years' time will cost the taxpayers of Winnipeg over $3 million notionally. These are estimates. But I think that we can work in a collaborative fashion, hopefully, on funding that's frozen at 2016 levels if I understand correctly on the basket funding that we have for getting Handi-Transit that as I understand is under $400,000 to eliminate that 500 metre rule which the Ombudsman said is discriminatory. We need to do better by the citizens. We need to work wholly and completely with the other levels of government. I just don't think we're ready for this approach at this time. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's great that we're doing this. I think it's important we're not the only municipality to have done this, of course. So we have to ask the question, why are we doing this now? Why didn't we do this 30 years ago? Why wasn't it like this when I was a kid or when I was taking the bus to university, which I did again two weeks ago from Kildonan Place to the U of M and back. Having said that Madam Speaker, we have to ask some questions. Is the rate of inflation you know for...based on the wages of Transit workers, has it gone up so markedly above the consumer price index? Has the wages of Transit workers gone up markedly above the average wage of Winnipeggers? Has the wages of Transit workers gone up markedly above our tax increases? Madam Speaker, no, it hasn't. So why are we doing this now? Why is it important? Why didn't we do this 30 years ago? What's the difference? This is how we have to judge economics. We're going to four-year plans because when it comes to budgeting, it's about long-term patterns. Often enough and it is the case like this here, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, we've seen the rise of poverty and the decrease of the middle class slowly but surely since 1980. So you could say, well, what relevance does that have? Well, because the pattern continues, Madam Speaker. So we have to ask the questions why. What's the difference? Why do we have more poor people now than we did a generation or two ago? Why is the middle class shrinking over the past generation or two? And why is it that therefore, because we have more poor people than we have relative to our economy I would say since the 1960s that we need to bring up some adjustment just for the perpetuation of that which is the basis of working-class people to get around. I mean, the minimum, and that is some form of affordable public transit, Madam Speaker. And relative to working-class people and people that have made their presentation this morning, those with disabilities, those with physical challenges, those with mental and emotional challenges, those that because of that struggle financially now more than ever, as explained, Madam Speaker, struggle now more than ever at least in terms of how they explained it in terms of what the EIA used to fund in terms of bus passes and what they no longer do. The decreasing of services for those with these challenges, the diminishing budgets on the federal, provincial and therefore municipal level for these people that rely on the public transit system more than anybody else. And Madam Speaker, what we're doing today is an indication of a much larger problem. So this is an expression of a much larger problem. The poor are getting poorer. More people are poor. The middle class is shrinking. Is our economy shrinking? No. We often hear great statistics about how well the Canadian economy is doing, how well the Manitoba economy is doing, how great the Winnipeg economy is doing and it's true. Especially Manitoba, we're doing all right. We have been for over the last decade. Things change, you know, over the past year or so, but these things happen and you have to look at them in a greater context besides one year or two. These things aren't the great economic indicators of our society, how well an economy's doing over, you know, a year or two. A decade or two, yeah, that really tells you something. That tells you where we're going. So bear that in mind. Madam Speaker, our economy…we talk about how well our economy is doing. We have a provincial, conservative government saying how well our economy's doing. A federal, liberal government saying how well our economy's doing. So Madam Speaker, why is this an expression of greater poverty, more poor people, shrinking middle class? Well Madam Speaker, let's bear in mind, when we talk about economic growth in this country and when we talk about wealth creation in this country, bear in mind, Madam Speaker, what are the statistics. And I don't want to exaggerate, there's no point. But 80% of the economic wealth creation or economic growth goes to what? Less than 5% of the population. So let's bear that in mind, Madam Speaker, when we talk about these economic statistics. If all these economic statistics were so great, we wouldn't need to do this. Bear that in mind. I'm not blaming any individual, but this is what I'm saying today is good. I support it. Bear in mind why we have to do this and its indication of where we're going as a society. And if we're willing to deal with this, let's have the greater discussion in terms of why. And everything we do, we have to act on those questions, Madam Speaker, and those, you know, realistic answers. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Next is Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair. Again, I do stand to support the motion. How could you not? Especially given the history of how some things can get used against you. But I hope that…I hope that we listen to the individuals who spoke today; the taxpayers who came down here and shared their stories and shared their concerns. This is one step forward. This isn't…I'm hoping that we heard them and we will listen to their ideas and that we will, you know, consider their approach options because this is a matter of choice. And as we say, we have tough decisions to make in a budget. I believe they have tougher decisions to make. As we did with the U-Pass for our post-secondary facilities, they have the same challenges as some of our other residents. So I do hope we take this further that we open up a discussion and not wait out the time. But I do support the fact that we are at least making a small step forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Seeing no further speakers, back to you Councillor Allard to close.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you. Thanks to all my colleagues for what I think are generally supportive comments. I think my comments to the public, media and as well as the standing policy committee is, you know, we do need to walk before we run. This is a historic moment. If we do endorse this policy today, I want to recognize Mayor Bowman, Cindy Gilroy in particular for moving this forward. I know that you were talking about in your last campaign and we're here today and hopefully about to endorse this policy. Yes, there I think is...we heard valuable feedback today in terms of,

you know, how the policy might be tweaked over time. I welcome those conversations going forward. I do support…I do hope that everyone can support this motion here today. I mean, maybe a point of clarification on the basket funding and the 50/50 funding agreement. So in 2016, yes, the City of Winnipeg grant was frozen. We did have a 50/50 funding agreement which means that every year that goes by there is a new hole in transit funding that wasn't there before. So it's pretty clear if you were to look at what the reality would be today if we had a 50/50 funding agreement that we would have more money for transit. It's pretty hard to argue otherwise and I heard some comments, maybe not recognizing that financial reality earlier, so I wanted to share. And the way that I see things, I mean, every year is a cut that we don't have the 50/50 funding. Anyhow, I digress a little bit. I think it's maybe…well, it is on topic because we're talking about low-income bus pass provision and there will be a cost, but there also may be…there may be new subscribers to transit that we're not getting right now because perhaps there's going to be a new market for those who currently can't afford the passes today. But on full implementation of the program, may be able to afford in the future. So I think this is a step in the right direction and yes, these are tough fiscal times, but I think this is a tremendous policy and I hope that every one of you will support it today and we have that opportunity. So with that, I know we're getting late in the day, I'm going to sit down. I think everyone has made very good points and I hope we can all support this motion here today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Allard. There has been a few calls for a recorded vote. We shall have that. All in favor of the low-income bus pass, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillor Browaty

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you Mr. Clerk. The low income transit pass program passes. We are now onto question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Councillor Rollins followed by Councillor Eadie.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Rollins: My first question through the Chair is are you as excited as I am that that just passed practically unanimously with notes. But my second question is based on the research in the 2018 State of the Inner City Report: Green Light Go Improving Transportation Equity in Winnipeg. There was about eight recommendations that Ms McCracken presented in her delegation comments today. Looking at needing a single-fare option, 50 percent off on $100 bus pass, to free transit for children to age 11, to finally the current proposal with respect to a report on…that she referred to, it takes all day to be poor…

Madam Speaker: The question please Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: So my question for the Chair is among those eight, is there any priorities and what could Winnipeggers expect to see in terms of working on next?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. That's an excellent question. I know that there's a number of priorities. There's a number of fare products we might explore. I know some of my colleagues campaigned on free transit. Some of us like myself campaigned on free transit for kids under 12. There's all sorts of fare options, changes to service that we might look at. We do have a Transit Master Plan that's coming up. That's going to offer some recommendations, and you know, we heard earlier comments about the 500 meter rule. We have a report that says how we would implement that, so these are all questions that we're going to have to consider as a council. Perhaps we may want to see what the Transit Master Plan has in terms of recommendations. We don't necessarily have to wait for that. Any of my council colleagues who want to see a particular policy implemented, by all means move a motion, ask for a report. I know it was a challenge to

just get a report on how much it would cost for free transit for kids. We had that discussion at committee. It was a tight vote, got passionate, but ultimately, my colleagues supported my request to get the costing on that, so to my colleagues who have ideas on how to move transit forward, how to encourage mode shift in Winnipeg, we do have a goal to have mode shift of 50 percent by 2030. There's a lot of work to do to get to that point. There's also a lot of competing priorities, so to my colleagues who have ideas, please move a motion, convince myself and my colleagues to get a report and then get in the budget and vote for the budget. We all have that capacity as city councillors. That's certainly the style that I've had ever since I was elected, so if you want something in the budget, please put your money where your mouth is, move the motions, get the reports and vote for the budget. That's why we were elected. So with that, thank you for the question, Councillor Rollins.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question, Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Klein.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, anyway…never mind. I am not answering nor replying to questions. Okay, this is a "did you know" Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, just in our recent discussion and debate about who might be responsible for social service, employment and income assistance, Madam Speaker, but I'm wondering if the Chairperson knows that the City of Winnipeg actually pays the Province of Manitoba to deliver some, I think it's nursing services as well as income assistance services? Did you know that Chairperson?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: I did not know that. Thank you to my colleague for asking me that question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. On to Councillor Klein, followed by Councillor Nason.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair, and through you, I have a question for the Chair of that Committee as it relates to a motion that he is bringing forward, which I appreciate. Back several weeks ago, early October, I sent a request through him, well to him and members of the transit and some of our public service, looking for reports specifically answering, asking for the number of complaints, the type of complaints specifically companies associated with those complaints and so on and I see that now we have to put it through as a motion to be addressed. I guess my question is how have we gone on for all of these years without measuring this. I mean, you can't manage something if you don't measure it. So I'm a little shocked to learn, and I would like to know if his motion coming forward is just a perk that we haven't been measuring complaints. We have no reports to share.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Klein. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you for the question. I was…well thank you Councillor Klein through you Madam Speaker. I am going to read the motion that I plan on moving at the next IRPW meeting. I believe it may be already included in the agenda. And so I'll read it out just so everybody has it for their information so…

"WHEREAS Transit Plus provides transportation for approximately 7,500 clients who are unable to use the fixed-route transit system;

AND WHEREAS Transit Plus was the subject of a January 2019 report by the Manitoba Ombudsman, which included 19 recommendations for Winnipeg Transit Plus service improvements;

AND WHEREAS the Ombudsman's recommendations are in various stages of implementation;

AND WHEREAS the Ombudsman's report identified customer service and the complaint process as areas requiring improvement;

AND WHEREAS a number of Councillors have been fielding inquiries from Winnipeg Transit Plus clients regarding the complaint process and operations of Transit Plus;

AND WHEREAS Councillors have requested a significant amount of statistical data from the Public Service that will necessarily take time to compile, and having this information in the form of a report to the Standing Committee will make this information publicly accessible;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back within 60 days on the following:

1. Beginning in 2016, and each year thereafter:

A. The number of complaints made to Winnipeg Transit Plus, organized by complaint type.
B. The number of fines imposed on each Winnipeg Transit Plus contractor.
C. The number of instances in which a reservation was made, and Winnipeg Transit Plus contractor did not attend for service.
D. The number of requests for service that Winnipeg Transit Plus contractors were unable to accommodate. "

So I hope that answers the question. I am happy to hear any follow up questions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Klein, second question.

Councillor Klein: Yes, thank you, second question, and I do acknowledge and I tried to at the start that I have read that motion and I see the details of that. I also acknowledge that I did receive an e-mail back on October 11th, saying that it would be…

Madam Speaker: Okay your question?

Councillor Klein: …a couple days for the report. My question still stands from the original one…does this mean an operation, the City, has not been tracking complaints and why and the details of those complaints or issues? Have we not been tracking?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you Madam Speaker. I believe the answer to that question is in the motion, and I'll just lift the "whereas" language:

"AND WHEREAS Councillors have requested a significant amount of statistical data from the Public Service that will necessarily take time to compile, and having this information in the form of a report to the Standing Committee will make this information publicly accessible;"

To me that tells me that yes, this information is being tracked and it will take time to compile and to present to the public and council in due course, and that's why I am moving this motion and I hope to have consent from my colleagues to ask for the information at Standing Committee and for all of us to have access to that information once it's been compiled.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you. Through you Madam Chair, I appreciate that answer from Councillor Allard. So my final question would be if we have been tracking it and it's going to take time to compile it, have we not been using that tracking data, and will he commit to ensuring that the department starts to utilize this tracking to improve customer service and get those details to all councillors as well?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker, I certainly can commit to doing what can best serve the public in terms of this new information that I hope my colleagues will support at committee to ask for that report. I personally think we should do everything we can to provide the best possible service out of the limited tax dollars that we have to provide those services with, so certainly I think any one of us would want to make sure that we're doing that the very best of our abilities to deliver those services.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Nason followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Nason: On the, now one year that I've been here, well, one year since I've been elected, I've been told many times to ask for a report, make a motion at community committee to go up to the standing committee to then come to wherever and come back. What I've now learned is that we continue to kick the can down the road. You ask for something back in 60 days, it comes back well, one of the reports I've asked for is now going to be well over a year before it comes back. Trying to find out for the residents of Transcona with regards to truck routes. You know, people are consistently having kids put at risk because we have a truck route that was arbitrarily moved from one road to another road, from a four-lane road to a two-lane road. I'm trying to make sure that our citizens are safe but yet we continue to have the public service come back and say, we don't have enough staff and we have too many reports coming…being requested of us. So my question to the Chair is what is an expected level of time to get a report back. When you ask for it in 60 days, is two years soon or what?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Councillor…Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Nason, if the councillor is aware of a report that is outstanding, I would be happy to follow up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Schreyer…or second question Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: I appreciate the response from the Chair. With regards to Transit Plus and the 500-meter rule, can he articulate when we should expect that limitation that's, you know, being described as discriminatory, will be removed?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you for the question. I understand from deliberations at our Public Works Committee that there will be a report forthcoming on the status of the Ombudsman recommendations, many which are at different stages of implementation. This is one of many issues that was highlighted in the report and expecting a report soon from our public service in terms of how to address that.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you Councillor Allard. Final question.

Councillor Nason: Just if, through you, if the Chair can confirm, if as through his budget planning will the 500-metre rule be removed?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. As…Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Nason, as the Councillor is aware, we've just launched dates for the budget process. I believe this budget process will be the most transparent budget process that I've ever seen since my election. The Councillor is welcome to come to committee, make presentations, make motions, make delegations and make suggestions in terms of how we might accomplish those goals, and I welcome that dialogue coming forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, you now have the floor.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. About nine minutes ago, just before Councillor Eadie asked his question, the last thing that Councillor Allard said is vote for the budget. I am not sure if he can offer context in terms what he meant by that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker, this…I feel like this might be Council 101, so as councillors we are elected to represent the people. This is representative democracy. What did I mean by "move a motion and vote for the budget"? Well, we're going to have a proposed budget at some point. We…it's incumbent on us to either support or not support the budget. The budget, I mean despite being a tough budget will likely contain many good things. It may contain some more challenging things, so my challenge to my colleagues, in particular those who tend to not vote for the budget, is tell us what you need to see. What are your priorities as the representative for your wards, for your communities? What do we need to do to get that to that budget to a point where you are willing to support it, and I think we're going to have that opportunity in the process that has been outlined by the Mayor and EPC, and I hope to have a real collaboration on this budget process going forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. I'm not sure if I understand that. I appreciate the 101 explanation in terms of we bring forth a budget, we vote for or against the budget as what Councillor Allard said. I do accept and I appreciate what he's saying that councillors should be involved to the extent that they ought to and they wish to given the process by which we may be involved to offer our suggestions. That I all understand. I'm guessing, and I don't want to guess, so I'm asking for his clarification. He's pre-supposing that by virtue of the process that we should vote for the budget…we know now that we should vote for the budget?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes our question period under this committee. Shall we move on? Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We have a report, Councillor Gillingham, the report dated October 11th, 2019.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
DATED OCTOBER 11, 2019

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Item 1.

Councillor Eadie: I'd like to stand it down.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Financial Management Plan

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham, your opportunity to introduce the item.

Councillor Gillingham: I will wait to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you Madam Speaker. We had an interesting delegation that came to speak and while I agree with a lot of what he had to say, there are things I necessarily don't disagree. But he makes a good point. And actually, there's…I think we all received an e-mail from one Mr. Snyder who asked, why are we moving this so fast? This financial plan we are talking about this is going to do us for the next 10 years. That is what it says. Given…you know, that is the impression you are given in the policy. So there's the actual policy document and then there's this whole document that gives us examples of what's happened since the last plan from 2011 to 2018. Oddly enough, I think I voted against that financial plan too, but only for one reason, it was a little bit different in style, Madam Speaker. But Madam Speaker, I can't in 10 minutes plus extension begin to go into what is in this report. What is very clear about this report is it does set the parameters for our next four years in the budgeting process because that policy will be trotted out every time. There might be somewhat of a disagreement with the direction we are going in certain areas, Madam Speaker. I will just speak quickly to the…so there's eight overall goals and then there's targets and so on and so forth. You know, I love that one...what is it? Adjusted for inflation...taxation, financing based on inflation, holding inflation and adjusted to growth. Madam Speaker, there is a statement in there. And so the delegate that came to speak, he was talking about growth. But you are talking about…there's two kinds of growth and that actually is covered in here, two sort of kind of growths. But one is called economic growth which is to say to grow your assessment role, I guess, in commercial, industrial, multi-family would be good, those kind of things. That's kind of what they call economic growth, but well, economic growth is quite different. We don't get to share in the economic growth, Madam Speaker, of the city because we are not given a growth tax. And yeah, 1% PST was cut. That is a growth tax. Sorry, value added tax. It is called the growth tax. As the economy grows and people spend more money, it grows. It would be good to have that, but I digress. Like I don't know even. Again, I am having a hard time getting here. But I want to go to number 8 which is dealing with debt. They are talking in here about liquidity and reserve to handle problems. That's 8…wait, 7? Is 7 there? See I can't…I haven't memorized all 68 pages yet, Madam Speaker. But I just wanted to say on the debt, it talks about and we heard about this in a seminar, we heard about how we pay interest out of operating money. But Madam Speaker, I don't know why we are paying interest out of operating funds when it comes to say a local road and we borrow money. The interest costs should be coming out of that fund. It is a reserve…well, it's not even a reserve…it's a fund to pay for local roads and it builds by about 5 to $6 million every year. So there is cash coming in. And most of what we spend now, it's cash going out. We are not using debt when we reconstruct a back lane or we reconstruct a road,

which will last a couple of generations. It's supposed to last 30 to 50 years, Madam Speaker. Okay, so we should bare a debt there. And if we are making interest payments, it should come out of that fund not out of operating money that pays for, let's say, our Forestry crews who are work…you know, they work. They are not building projects. They are pruning trees and they're doing this and they're doing that, whatever. So that is not in our debt strategy nor is it in the debt by-law, Madam Speaker. And here they are talking about not even modifying it. They are just talking about managing liquidity and our contingency reserve and water and waste contingency reserve which is really called retained earnings. They don't have a reserve, reserve, they have retained earnings to deal with problems. Anyway, I digress. So there's no changes there. I can't actually vote for this financial management plan because I think there's some false statements in here as well. Because there are two kinds of growth that happen; we have new taxable units coming on board, okay? Now, in 2014 as I explained to that guy, there was a big increase in our tax assessment role in regard to that. Lots of it, lots of it. Now it's not so much anymore. What's happening is probably the bigger portion of the growth is actually reassessment. So I go to goal number two, which is, you know, we need to have affordable, equitable property taxation and number one goal, right, talks about quality of life. We've got all these wonderful words; affordability, vitality, on and on. You know, it's in here. Those are called social goods to the city, quality of life. That is why we all get together in big urban settings because supposedly all of us people can share in paying for those quality of life things, but we should be paying for it according to our ability to contribute, but we all should be able to share equally. And equally is related to substantively. The lawyers in the room I think understand the difference between substantive equality and equal. Anyway, so we were talking about human rights today. So Madam Speaker, there is a whole bunch of concerns I have in here. But as people know, I introduced a…I introduced a motion today that is going to go to EPC. I will bring some numbers this time that back up what I am trying to say for Councillor Allard's edification, budget 101. I am concerned about the whole city. I am not concerned just about my ward. That's budget 101. You vote for a budget what effect is it having on various groups of people throughout Winnipeg? That's what we were told by the guy from Osgood Hall, the expert in municipal governance. We are to listen to our words and worry about them, right? What I find…

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

Councillor Eadie: What I find with this, and I'm going to be voting against it, I recommend that you all vote against it so it goes back so more work can be done on it on a more respectful basis. Because there is some senses in here that are…they are not accurate, Madam Speaker. They are not accurate. They don't make sense, actually. I think I know a little bit about finance, a little bit. I campaigned on fair City financing. And that's across the board. All of the financing on the revenue side, how we do that, what is fair. We need to evaluate it. We need to work with it. And it needs to meet the needs of all people according to their ability, their ability to pay. And so, it should be evaluated from that perspective. I am not voting for it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, followed by Councillor Klein.

Councillor Nason: So in reviewing this, and it came to Finance before, but you know, you rush to look at stuff and you look at it again and you see some fresh perspectives. You hear from constituents and residents of the city. You know, Susan Thompson, Glen Murray, Sam Katz, they've all looked at this. Now we are looking under Mayor Bowman. I am challenged from the perspective of the timing. You know, we're hearing we're up against the debt ceiling. We're hearing, you know, we've got this crisis before us that's going to likely exceed the authority of our acting CAO. There is money going out more than we have available to us. And I understand with the plan you can figure things out a little tighter. However, the challenge we have is we've gone ahead and we've increase fees, we've cut services continually since Mayor Bowman became mayor. We have implemented impact fees. You know, I don't know why we didn't look at this before we implemented impact fees. And I'm hoping Councillor Gillingham, as chair will…can address that because, you know, bringing in some very heavy fees that, you know, they talk about it being it's on the developer. Well, no, it is on the people buying the homes. So we need to...people are buying homes, Councillor Allard, right? You know, infill…well…it is a challenge. You know, the cat calls the looks. The representatives that were here prior to a year ago voted brought that in. Those that have departed have moved on to other areas. Some just became a member of parliament that was Chair of Finance. The challenge we have is we have got to make tough choices, and I would like to at least have the perspective to know fully and completely what's around that bend. Now, we can come to the various standing committees and try to get those understandings. I have raised this before. The standing committee…standing policy committee, that you know, presently I am a member of is the only committee that doesn't have anybody come to it. So therefore, you can't bring forward a lot of questions. You can ask them as an attendee, but there is no guarantee that the administration is going to actually be presented to respond to them. So you know, I just…I want to say that, you know, I appreciate this coming forward. Again, you know, we seem to be a little bit down the path with this coming in. Everything seems to be compressed into very restrictive timelines to read it, to be properly informed four days for many of my council colleagues to look it and try to understand. You know, some of the representatives that were here today obviously paid attention to when it was at Finance and asked very articulated questions that I appreciate. My council colleague, Kevin Klein, I think has argued many of these in the past either at committee or on the floor of council or, well,

social media. Though sometimes he does hit the wrong key and get two years versus four years on contracts. But I digress. I do thank you for the time and I know that time is short. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Nason. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Klein: Luckily I don't have to type anything. So thank you, Madam Chair. I am going to stand opposed to this. I have…there is far, far too many questions that linger about why this is being put through, why it didn't start off at community committee and go through the finances, just those questions are there. And I believe that we truly have missed an opportunity with the financial management plan. It appears more of a copy and paste with a couple of adjustments. This is one of the most important documents that an organization has. This is one of those documents that you have to be able to review on a consistent basis so that it matches the challenges of your organization whether it's private or public. This is very important. We have been fed data to Councillor Eadie's point. Well, it's going to happen once. Not on the shirt though. We also have a…we've been presented with a lot of data and it's no slight to the data that's provided but we have no way of confirming where that data came from. We were just asked to accept that. And in the real world you don't. You look to qualify that data. You've got to have quantified data in order to make these decisions. In this…does this ask the questions that we need to be asking on a regular basis? There is so much here with this document that is so important, I struggle to understand why all of a sudden, after years of not doing it we bring it up and now it is important to get it done today. With that, it is shocking that we don't have set times to review this document as a council. It is clear that there is division. I understand that. And I see how. But we have to be financially responsible. We have to do...we are obligated to be financial stewards of taxpayers' money. This…I don't believe this document goes far enough. I don't believe that the information provided in here is quantitative data. I don't believe that we have taken this opportunity to establish the financial changes necessary when we are looking at guidelines and, you know, putting in a policy that is so important. So I will not support this. You know, we have to as a council, again, I know you say no to everything, I'm saying it. I get it. But this is an opportunity to really sit down and go through what this means and how we can make it better. And I would just ask that we…that we would do that.

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

Councillor Mayes: I perhaps wish this document had the weight that some people seem to ascribe to it. I have no memory of it ever being referred to in the past eight years. I raise only one issue though and I'll support it partly because frankly, I don't think it's particularly binding or frankly, I don't think I've ever heard anyone reference the thing in my years here. I stand to be corrected on that. There is, however, a passage on page 2. Having I think lost…I think when I voted against the multi-year budget, I think it was 14-2. Eadie might have been with me. Or it might have been 15-1. But there was a lot of talk about the word 'certainty'. And if you look on page…under number two here, "In addition, the provincial funding model for both capital and operating grants in the city has changed beginning in 2017. The City continues to be challenged by long-term uncertainty and lack of predictability of provincial grants." So I raise that solely to reclaim the bill again as I did when we first came here and talked about multi-year budgeting. We will probably be here in a few years when we are correcting the multi-year budget that we ourselves will adopt in a few months. And we'll be told by, perhaps somebody from Osgood Hall or somebody else unelected who works for the City of Winnipeg, that they're going to have to correct what we put in and that we're going to have to correct out something that some of us have fought for with great energy just as I was told once I had to present a business case to the civil service here. And I said, my business case is my items in the budget as adopted by Council. It's right there in front of you, it's in the capital budget. No, you need to present a business case. So let us remember when we are faced with that perhaps in a year or two or three when we are told that it is time for the corrections and the corrections are due to the uncertainty and perhaps the province doesn't come through as we saw. Even though we're adopting multi-year framework based on certainty we have right in front of us that our second biggest source of revenue is in fact riddled with uncertainty. Unfortunate, but I didn't write it. So I would say, just as a note of caution, somewhere down the line we are going to come to the corrections and when we do, just keep in mind that we will have made certain assumptions based on multi-year framework. We'll have fought for certain things. There will be those who try and get those things out of the budget because they need to correct the mistakes the democratically elected people make. I would just encourage people to remember the compromises that were made. Councillor Allard's right, if you want some things in the budget, sometimes you have to vote for some things you're not wild about in order to get them in. He has stated that rather eloquently. So I raise this simply as a cautionary note for the future. This is the inherent weakness in a multi-year framework. Klein is probably going to say that we don't have the legal authority to formally adopt a four year budget and I think he is right on that. So we'll have to revisit this each year in any sense, but I would just want to note that given that we head into a process that is designed to bring certainty knowing full well that our second biggest source of revenue is inherently uncertain. There will then be subsequent fights each year I would suspect. I look forward to them but I will certainly not feel bound by the advice of anyone unelected from Osgood Hall or the City of Winnipeg staff telling me how to do my job. I am going to do the best job I can as determined by the residents of St. Vital. We've heard today that our job is not to look after our wards or words to that effect. No, our job is actually to look after our wards because we are elected on a ward basis. Certainly we have to look to take care of the city as a whole, that is certainly true, but there is no one on the

civil service side whose job is to particularly look after one ward or another that rests with us. And that, in my view, is part of why we have a budget that we all get a vote on. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Mayes. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: There were two statements that really hit me in this report when I read it. One of them was, "An important component of the success of long-term financial planning is having a clear understanding of the organization's strategic plans and service priorities." So we have talked about strategic planning before. We know that virtually every city in Canada sets up a strategic plan when elected, every council; setting out goals, plans, priorities and service priorities. We've not done that. The City's never done that. We were going to have an exercise to look at setting out service priorities. That fell off the board. We did have $100,000 exercise to look at how we would do a budgeting strategic plan which in conversations with Councillor Gillingham some of that work is being applied to this multi-year budget. I didn't come to the meeting the day it was presented. There was a storm. And quite honestly, I've not had a time to thoroughly review it and I just don't feel comfortable about this in the timeframe that we've had. I'm not a financial analyst by any means. I would have liked to have a more in depth presentation on this to have an opportunity to ask questions and I didn't. I don't feel comfortable voting for this. I would really like to have an overview of it and a better understanding of it, but I didn't make that request, that's my fault. I did not make that request because there's a lot going on. But I don't feel comfortable voting for it for those reasons.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Lukes. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I want to thank the public service for their work and preparation of this material. I also want to thank Finance Committee members for their diligence in bringing this forward including our chair who continues to provide outstanding stewardship in his capacity as Chair of Finance. I heard just a few moments ago from one of my councillor colleagues concern about this being rushed through. I just remind everyone, this did go through the committee process. All members of council, one would hope would read reports before they would come before council with the additional times as initially proposed by Councillor Lukes that we have afforded to the timing of when reports are made public so we have that time to review materials. I also keep in mind, we literally today just waived, suspended numerous times for the benefit of the same member of council so that we could hear the Bill 21. And we did that because of his advocacy and our deference to hear something that was rushed through. Notwithstanding that, this is certainly worthy of support as Councillor Mayes has articulated, and I don't think he literally meant Osgood Hall because he and I both went to U of T Law School. I don't think that was a shot at Osgood Hall Law School. But his point about this matter and its deference and how often we refer to it, my hope and expectation is we can. And I know it does help guide our public service in the preparation of administrative reports that they ultimately then provide to Council for consideration which we may or may not accept their recommendations or not. That is ultimately what council does each and every day. Councillor Klein just referenced the fact that, and I'm paraphrasing that he was surprised that this isn't brought forward or required to come forward for approval on a regular basis. I simply just asked our interim CAO, Mike Ruta, it's done about every five years. So I propose an amendment and this is what you can do on the floor of council that we ask that this matter come back for renewal and approval within the next five years. And if that's something that could be supported as an amendment, that would help address the concern that Councillor Klein has just raised and will allow some certainty for a future council that this matter and this strategy would come back at a regular interval for approval. I will obviously be speaking to this and I would like to introduce that amendment if I can at this time. Pardon me?

Madam Speaker: I was just going to say, is that going to be in writing? Or is someone…we would need it written.

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, that's…you know what…

Madam Speaker: And it's actually time for…

Mayor Bowman: You know what, I won't…you know what I'll do is I will make…through my comments, I will recommend at Finance that's something the Finance Chair and committee can always introduce in their own way at committee if they so choose. In my comments I would just simply say, it is within the purview of committees and ultimately Council for renewal to come back and just from…is very simple, just ask our interim CAO what the regular interval is. He said five years so it wouldn't put undue stress on the public service to simply codify it. But that's something…that would be a separate vote then. I won't introduce it now. It's been a long day for everybody. I'll be supporting it. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Good. Councillor Schreyer, you have not spoken yet.

Councillor Schreyer: No.

Madam Speaker: Go ahead.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, His Worship was willing to do an amendment. However, he'd already spoken. However, it's not too late if an amendment would be brought forward to the Clerks before the end of deliberation. If someone else wanted to sponsor that…bring forward amendment. It isn't too late at this point in terms of a sort of a point of procedure. Look, it's not a surprise that I am at odds in general with sort of the budgetary...with the budgets and the process here at City Hall. Not new. I don't think I grand stand about it. In fact, everyone can vouch for me that I don't. But I like to think I explain myself pretty well. I represent people's concerns pretty well when it comes to the budget. It was a relief today to see Michel Durand-Wood, happens by coincidence to be my neighbor, bring forth an excellent explanation in terms of the detriment that mere infrastructure development can be to sustainability…budgetary sustainability. He looks at it differently than I do. But…and he truly does look at it differently than I do. But there's no…I have no conflict with what he says, Madam Speaker. I would add as I have for the last five years that when you look at the infrastructure debt per person...I want to be clear about this and I will continue to be even clearer on this, that it is a function of construction inflation…the inflation rates regarding infrastructure development and maintenance that are different from regular inflation, different from the consumer price index. And that is part of the unsustainability of what Michel Durand-Wood was talking about this morning. Now, you know, people can talk about partisanship, I can say for a fact that Michel Durand-Wood has never been a member of the New Democratic Party. I don't know who he votes for. I don't really care really to say in this case. He has not been overly supportive of me. He's been certainly respectful. What he says, he says on his own volition. It's got nothing to do with me. He has come to these conclusions and other people have independently of me. I would like to say I've had some influence over the last five years given the consistency of what he says with what I do, but no. But these concerns are very real. He is not the only one. He's…I will say more than the tip of the iceberg today, but it's really important. And as I said this morning, sometimes I just feel that what is more than…it is not a minority. These are, I would say, in essence reflective of majority concerns that we don't address in our budget solutions and in our process. I've got a few minutes here. And do want to mention a few things that I am not just at odds with in terms of the assumptions we make and what we take for facts, what we take for axioms. And one is we say we want to ensure adequate reserves, all right. That doesn't mean in my opinion that we have. It says we want to maintain adequate reserves, but we are not, Madam Speaker. Of course, that's a matter of opinion, but our reserves basically have been dwindling and we've essentially done nothing about. And the fact…as a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, here is the greatest indication of how that's a fact. We've doubled…okay, we've reduced it a little bit, but at one point during the last five years we doubled or increased by 50% the amount of our water and rate…water rates that we pay, everybody pays to put toward general revenue. Madam Speaker, if we have these water rates which is essentially a tax, Winnipeggers have reduced their water consumption. And yet, despite reducing their water consumption, their water rates had to go up. And we have been explained by the department of Water and Waste that in order to sustain revenues because of reduced water consumption, they had to increase the rates just so we would maintain the same revenue. Okay, that we can understand because why would we want to reduce our revenue to Water and Waste? However, Madam Speaker, then we have taken out even more, a higher percentage, what we call the derivative. In this case, the derivative is highly arbitrary. It's just a decision not…derivative usually means a profit, it does in other sectors. In this case we used the term derivative as an arbitrary term that which we want to take out. It is not based on what is extra. Because we are supposed to build a reserves, that's what we are talking about, Madam Speaker, we're talking about the reserves. And Madam Speaker, we are just about to go into what is the largest, most expensive engineering project in the history of Winnipeg. And that is the water purification filtration plant for north Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, and the whole system. So we are to undergo the most expensive engineering project in the history of Winnipeg, but in the years leading up, we are taking the money away that would have gone to the reserves. Where else would it have gone? It's a water rate. And if we're not spending it on water, it would go to the water reserve, but it didn't, it went to general revenue, Madam Speaker. And of course, part and parcel of what I think Michel Durand-Wood was saying this morning, and what I have been saying for five years is because we've got a budgetary…systemic budgetary problem and I'd say primarily as I've been saying for five years, because of our infrastructure. Lack of priorities on what we're creating, thinking that big infrastructure is the mass solution. Going big on something and do we get the payoff, Madam Speaker? Do we get the bang for our buck? Does the amount of investment in certain infrastructure project…do we get that value back? Madam Speaker, bear in mind, these are not forever. We can't pretend we build a bus corridor and it's forever. It is not. It is for a finite period of time within the lifetime essentially of everybody in this room so pretty finite, Madam Speaker. And then…and then what happens? Well Madam Speaker, this is what we have to talk about; budgeting over a decade, two decades, generations, Madam Speaker. So just in terms reserves, I think I gave some sort of answer in terms of how I am just at odds with our perception and how we portray it. Madam Speaker, also, it did say here, if I may quote on terms of the last one, I guess that is it for me, Madam Speaker, lucky you. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Well Madam Speaker, I wish to move this matter…refer this matter back to Finance.

Madam Speaker: Refer the matter back to Finance. I will call the vote on that. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. That was quite loud. Thank you. Good. Onto the…going forward here, there is no motions, there is no by-laws. We will now have any questions for the Chair for Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Okay. Just a couple of quick questions. The first one I don't know if Councillor Gillingham, I think he's aware, but sometime ago I requested a list…full list detailing all times we have hired consultants in the last two years, the costs of those consultants and the purpose of those consultants, and I'm wondering if we could get an update on that report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Through you Madam Speaker I thank the Councillor for his reminder and I will certainly look into that and get that information to him as soon as possible. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein, second question.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, and through you Madam Speaker, I appreciate that. Sometimes it does…things do get lost. I would like to ask through you Madam Chair what our plans are if we have any to mitigate the risk of the several lawsuits that we are facing as a city. I urge everyone in this room to go online tonight to read the court submissions for tomorrow's hearing. It's potentially very expensive, and that's not us paying. It's the taxpayer, so have we mitigated that risk, have we put together a plan, sorry or started discussions about what we do next.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you through you Madam Speaker. Just recently I recall…I don't remember the date, we did consider and approve additional funding for Legal Services Department. I don't remember the date on that, but as far as specifically a risk or a risk list, I'd have to check with administration as far as what has been done to this point so I can certainly check and get back to the Councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Klein: No third question.

Madam Speaker: Third, we're onto the third, yes.

Councillor Klein: I appreciate that response through you Madam Chair from Councillor Gillingham. I do recall that we all voted to add an additional $1 million for legal fees because we were using some outside resources, and I guess my question is more specific to do we have a budget in case we lose? Do we have a budget we're facing for the staff and so on?

Madam Speaker: The question?

Councillor Klein: Where is that accounted for? Where can we see that in the budget line?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you through you Madam Speaker. I'll certainly gather that information and get it to the Councillor.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Going back to my days of education and accounting and putting together balance sheets and discussing the issue of extraordinary, potential extraordinary events and notes and so on, usually, Madam Speaker, would fall on the balance sheet near where it has your contingency reserve balance. And my question, Madam Speaker, is I didn't see...well, I don't know when these lawsuits, potentially the risk, but I didn't see the annual statements. Were the…were some of these extraordinary risks noted in those financial statements?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for his question, and I will certainly gather the information specific to his question and get an answer for the Councillor and get back to him.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie. You're good? Councillor Lukes, we can come back. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much Madam Chair. I want to thank Councillor Gillingham for always taking my calls and discussing strategic planning. We both have come to the agreement that a budget isn't a strategic plan for an organization. I have mentioned this many times that cities all across Canada, virtually all do a strategic plan when council is elected. I am unclear as to why the City of Winnipeg doesn't do one, and I would like Councillor Gillingham if it's possible to explain to us why we don't set out a strategic plan because it helps guide council and it helps, even probably more importantly, guide the public service which has often said to me we need a strategic plan.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think respectfully to my council colleague, we have talked about this before. I don't know that I am the one alone around this chamber to answer that question. That would be a council decision, not necessarily the Chair of Finance's decision. I certainly, you know, would welcome the opportunity in the future to do more strategic planning specific to that. The strategic planning sessions that we adopted in the 2019 budget as one of the recommendations of $100,000 towards the strategic planning sessions if you go back to the recommendation within the budget specific to identifying priorities, strategic priorities within the multi-year budgets, so that was the…I guess the…I'll say the limited scope of what that session was, and that limited scope was articulated in the recommendation of the 2019 budget that was adopted. But as far as the broader, you know, larger global strategic plan, being part of the conversation, but I don't think I am the individual to councillors to answer that question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes, second question.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I guess I probably should've directed that question to the Mayor. I will next time. Having previously been on the Executive Policy Committee, during the budget process, we were provided…I'm directing this to Councillor Gillingham…we were provided risk lists. Departments would bring forward items and have a big spread sheet of risks. Will those lists be available to councillors to review during the budget process?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker through you. In response, as indicated in our meeting that Council had just in advance of the budget recommended targets going out did indicate that if, you know, my view is if councillors want specific information or more information from departments, that can be requested. I know that, you know, we're going to be moving into a process whereby standing committees are utilized, and I want to take the opportunity actually right here on the floor of council and get on record. I want to express appreciation to Councillor Sharma, to you Madam Speaker and to Councillor Eadie who over the last couple of years in my meetings with individual councillors in the role as Finance Chair in preparation for the budget, it was the two Councillors, Sharma and Eadie who suggested maybe there's a way to incorporate the standing committees in the budget process, and so we're trying to do that. In the upcoming standing committee meetings, there'll be three specific public meetings prior to a preliminary budget being tabled. There'll be a budget…there'll be a meeting where departments present their budgets, a meeting where delegations can be heard and then a meeting where those standing committees can make recommendation are to make recommendation to the Executive Policy Committee. Frankly, at any point, it's certainly within the purview of councillors to ask for information from the departments that they would need to make their decisions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: And I just would like to clarify, because Councillor Allard indicated that there was an opportunity…there would be an opportunity to make motions during these budget committee meetings, and I just want to clarify is that…because this is a new process, I understand that, you know, things are being worked through. I've been working with Councillor Gillingham on understanding briefings and the availabilities if you're not on a committee, but I would like to understand or just have clarification, will councillors be able to make motions at the committee meetings, the budget committee meetings?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I…maybe I'll defer to the Clerks for a second to see if there is a…put the Clerks on the spot. Again, Madam Speaker, through you, yes this is a new process. I maybe will ask the Clerks as far as the limits within…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham, you could take it under advisement.

Councillor Gillingham: …or I could take it under advisement.

Madam Speaker: This isn't question period for the Clerks at this time.

Councillor Gillingham: Yeah, maybe I'll do that. Thank you Madam Speaker. I'll take that under advisement. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers at this time? No further questions. Let's move forward. Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED OCTOBER 3, 2019

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We're pulling Item 1, Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Testing of the Chemically Enhanced Primary Treatment Process for Phosphorus Removal

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy to introduce the item.

Councillor Gilroy: I will wait to hear from my councillor colleague.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair. I just wanted to stand and make sure it is clear that, yes, I was a part of the committee when we worked on this change to the motion and talked about why at EPC. But I think it is important that, you know, the facts get on the record so that they…I know that only some are used, but let's get the facts in the record. This is not…this is more about setting a time…setting a deadline so that we know that we are committed to reducing the phosphorus being contributed to Lake Winnipeg at this moment. It doesn't matter what our percentage is compared to others. It doesn't matter about what we have done in the past. We right now are at 3.4 times higher than the national accepted level. So I appreciate that we were able to put in that we are going to test and there is some generic deadlines if you will. I appreciate that. But I also want to make sure that everyone knows because some have said that it is interesting that I don't trust the public service. It is not about that. Let's go back again to financials. It is prudent to always question information that you are given. And I continue to ask other people about this. In fact, a former chemical engineer in the Province of Ontario who was involved in the water and treatment plants along Lake Ontario who obviously, they had a lot of issues and was told that they used the ferric chloride system to treat wastewater very effectively, that it has helped in the issue of pollution going into Lake Ontario. There was lots that he and I went back and forth on, but he also noted that after reading the report, I said…that is available online, that the cost for ferric chloride is probably much less than what we are indicating right now. We have no way of substantiating that, and I understand that. I appreciate that we are putting a date to it. I appreciate what we have done in the past. But this is more about being, you know, good managers and saying, here is the deadline that we want. Here is when we want this process to be finished or started. And possibly there will be times you might have to put a little extension in. But I think what the people are asking for and what taxpayers that have investments along the lake are asking for is that we just simply show a commitment to the timeline of when the work to reduce the phosphorus is going to happen. Not two or three years or not when a certain plant's concluded because there is conflicting statements in our own consultant's report. If you take the time to read through the whole thing, it is very long but there are conflicting statements. It is not about individuals or, you know, agendas or, you know, looking at one group as, you know, being a lobby group or whatever, this is just about doing what is proper and saying okay, let's take the time to establish the deadline so we can follow up with the public service for the milestone and say, okay, it is done. Great. Does it need to be one year testing? Could we as a city not just sit down and look at other opinions, again, not challenging anybody, it is just the prudent thing to do. It is good due diligence considering the impact that we see in Lake Winnipeg today and considering the impact all of the pollution going into Lake Winnipeg could be in 10, 20 years. We could do our little part by simply just

saying to the residents of Winnipeg and our friends along Lake Winnipeg that we hear you and we agree, we need to take action. We need help with funding the new plant. We have asked for that funding. We are doing our part. We have an opportunity to maybe introduce something that could be tested as it goes because in the consultant's report they said there is no challenges with the increased waste, but I have seen and heard a lot of people saying there is. So it's just the confusion around the information. That is what the deadlines are for, is for a commitment from us as managers to go back and know where the milestones are and check on this in a prudent fashion and to take leadership on and accept the responsibility of governing over that particular utility.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Klein. Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Today I rise in support of this motion that allows the City of Winnipeg to demonstrate its commitment to improving and restoring the health of Lake Winnipeg through the reduction of phosphorus loads. Over the many years, we have heard how phosphorus loads have contributed to the decline of the health of our beloved lake. And that at source, the City of Winnipeg must address its phosphorus load and make every effort now and into the future towards significant reduction of phosphorus that contributes to the blue-green algae blooms. I have met with stakeholder groups and have listened intently to residents in my ward and indeed all of Winnipeg that the City must act now, now, now. While this motion provides the opportunity to act as proper stewards by carefully, diligently and proactively seeking interim solutions to reducing the phosphorus load while work is being done to upgrade our sewage treatment plants that address new technologies, the growth of our city and for the long-term sustainability of our environment. I had drafted my own motion to be presented at the Water and Waste Standing Policy Committee but instead worked in collaboration with my council colleagues on this motion because it is not about me. It is about our collective efforts that are necessary to moving forward in the best interest of our city and in this case, our province. The Lake Winnipeg file and resulting phosphorus issue is a very passionate topic for Winnipeggers and Manitobans. So much so that it deserves clarity and understanding in layman's terms so there is no misinformation or double speak. First, water and waste is in the process of issuing the RFP that allows for testing of chemicals to reduce the phosphorus on an interim basis. The City did not reject the proposal of the International Institute for Sustainable Development to consider the use of ferric chloride to reduce the phosphorus levels on interim basis. Water and Waste send a notice of alteration to the Province back in July of 2019 requesting approval to consider this option after a period of appropriate testing. Without proper testing, the unknown could potentially do more harm to the lake by added partially untreated sewage directly into the river and therefore directly into the lake. The North End Waste Pollution Control Center needs extensive upgrades to address aging infrastructure as well as accommodate new technology including the bio-neutral removal, what our environmental license mandates as well as the growth of our city that we are currently experiencing. The South Winnipeg Treatment Plant is currently undergoing upgrades as well and sludge from that facility is currently being transported to the North Winnipeg Treatment Plant for treatment as part of the ongoing process. The third-party consultants provide…report provides a clear path of process that has been presented at committee and now expedited through measures of this motion. I thank the public for being so engaged in this matter and holding their elected officials to task on moving with due diligence and full understanding of what this represents. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Chambers. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. As the dean of this council, I don't think there is a single issue that is more frustrating. And it feels like Groundhog Day in dealing with the notion of dealing with phosphorus at the North End plant. In fact, if you go onto YouTube and type in "Browaty", there is an interview I did with Dan Vadeboncoer. He was a student at Red River College at the time, 10 years ago, where I talked about the phosphorus process. I remember back many years ago, we brought in a legitimate scientist from the University of Alberta who came and said, you know what, we can do this really quickly, we can get 90 odd percent of the way there by using ferric chloride now. That was 10 years ago. We could have been for the last decade dramatically reducing the amount of phosphorus going into Lake Winnipeg. But there were certain individuals at the province of Manitoba that basically said, no, we are going to go down this path. It's a very complicated process. Our North End plant handles 70% of our sewage. The cost of that upgrade is massive, and you can't just shut down your sewage treatment plant while you do the upgrades. You need to be operating a system throughout that entire process. They have broken it down to three…into three steps now. We had a really good council seminar back in February. But if you looked at the Venn diagram, the commissioning of the biological process to deal with phosphorus at the North End plant doesn't come up for about another 12 years still. So from the time we were talking about if, you know, the provincial bureaucrats from the day hadn't been so stubborn, we could have been dramatically dealing with phosphorus for 22 years at a fraction of the cost. But no, we're going to go for the gold ring and deal with the biological process. Not to say the other upgrades and processes needed to be…didn't need to be improved at the North End plant. That was other work and a lot of it does need to be done. But the reality is 22 years. Utterly frustrating, but that's the reality of the complications of having to do the work that was prescribed by the Province to us a decade ago. The speech I gave 10 years ago was almost the identical speech I'm giving right now, you know, why are we doing the biological process when the chemical process would get us there if we're using ferric chloride and here we are today. So again, pure and utter frustration. I do want to

thank my council colleagues. As being the rep for the Red River Basin Commission over the years, I've seen that, you know, we are not the only ones acting, working on improving water quality throughout the basin. Agricultural practices in the Dakotas where you need all sorts of fertilizers and products are used on fields. They are doing all sorts of ways now to take storm runoff so that it doesn't go into the tributaries and then go into lakes. The types of rainwater collection and that recirculation that they use to you know, recollect those valuable nutrients so that they don't go into the lakes and the rivers and eventually to Lake Winnipeg. They're making huge improvements. The former governor now of Minnesota has made massive improvements in their agricultural processes and new, very aggressive targets that they're aggressively going after to improve water quality. I want to thank my colleagues here for the support of the Red River Basin Commissions with IISD and folks on the working of the restoration of the Netley-Libau Marsh. Again, there's other things we can do to dramatically improve the water quality of Lake Winnipeg. Again, no matter where you are on environmental issues, I don't think anyone can dispute the necessity of clean air and clean water. So again, I thank Councillor Klein. If this is the…I'll make one more comment. I mean, when the government changed…when the provincial government changed a couple years ago, one of my first bits of advice to anyone who would listen to Mayor Bowman and such was we are getting a new provincial government here. We are not expecting, you know, Brink's trucks full of money coming from Broadway, but perhaps there is a chance, maybe find some common sense on this issue. But you know, we could go down the path towards the ferric chloride and the phosphorus process. Unfortunately, that has not happened to this point. But I'd like to thank Councillor Klein and folks for this motion. And hopefully, you know, again, we are on this process towards, you know, the next 12 years implementing the biological process, hopefully we can do something in the interim that will help.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Browaty. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you Madam Speaker. Last month I was an original supporter of the original motion. It was questioned here in Council, you know, the…whether concerns were accurate or justified, not exactly sure of the question and answer. Nonetheless, do feel I…it is an opportunity to defend myself or explain myself in terms of why I supported the motion in the first place. It gives you sort of an indication in sort of the life of a city councillor, as a member of the standing committee in question. Happens to be summertime, we're prorogued, but I start getting calls. You know, you guys, meaning me as well as a few other councillors including Councillor Klein could have done a better job on phosphorus. You missed the boat. You could be doing something better right now. And I am not trying to deny I could have been doing a better job. I just said, you know, I…in…for the most part, when it comes to the administrative management, if you will, of the system, I tend to have faith in the system. I do, believe it or not. Despite never having voted in favour of a budget yet, inherently I have faith in the system in general. But that…I can't let myself off the hook, because they've got concerns. People have got concerns. How do I answer them? No problem. You don't have a problem. There's no problem, you're wrong. Your concerns are misguided. You are misinformed. Could I say that? I will say that to people if it is true, if I believe it. How do I say that to…but in this case I couldn't do it. I couldn't say, no, it is okay, things are happening once I sort of took a look. Inherently, yes, the system, the administrative system is going to be dealing with phosphate in a greater capacity, but things happened over the summertime. Council has reacted, the administration reacted on basically a good thing. But politics sort of gets in the way of policy sometimes. And it's questioning whether, you know, at the last meeting, whether it's justified to have concerns as raised by Councillor Klein's motion of which I was an original supporter. So bear in mind, a few things we have to take into account. One, we know that in the last 12 years the major change we have had in terms of phosphate reduction was 12 years ago, 20% reduction. We could have done anything more over the last 12 years. Nothing was really stopping us. The change is, and I understand…Councillor Klein says that's not important, that's fine. I'm just letting you know how people brought their concerns to me and how I couldn't answer them and saying your concerns aren't justified. And one of the, I have to admit, we could have been doing more over the last 12 years. Could have been doing something more over the last term. And I was on the Standing Committee for Water and Waste last year. I admit. I didn't do anything about it last year either. So let's not get…I am not trying to be judgmental here, but when people are trying to tell me you are missing the boat here, how do I answer them? Well, we have a solution here. So a fellow member of the standing committee brings forth a motion. Well, let's face it. Every single one of us knows that's the day of our…that's daily life for us. We have to deal with problems. People come up to us. I am on the standing committee. I am on the hook. I'm…not just as a city councillor, but as a member of that committee. So what am I supposed to do, ignore it? Say it's not a good idea? It had a timeline. That's what I said in the last council meeting. What this does is offer a timeline to give people more greater confidence as they…as they should expect. In fact, it offered a timeline but based upon after testing. So the issue was responsibility of the motion because of testing. So I asked the member of the consulting firm for water and waste was there to deal with this and I asked them point blank, is testing responsible? He said very responsible was his response. It was very responsible to do the testing. Thus, confidence in the motion. It was already in the existing motion. Testing. Well, great. Another reason why in terms prudence and concerns about testing and responsibility towards that, but I'd have confidence in putting…in supporting the motion to give greater timeline. Madam Speaker, also bear in mind, I am not saying anything new. This is not coming from left field. I have always had a concern over using our water rates for general revenue, increasing our dividend and net overall dividend the last five years, increasing it to take more money out of our water and waste rates that we pay…that all Winnipeggers pay to put in general revenue and then increasing

our rates on top of that and that money could have gone to this in the last number of years towards decreasing our phosphates. I am not blaming any member of the city council or any member of the administration any more than I am myself. But that doesn't mean that I was off the hook because, well, you know, that's just the way it goes. Sooner or later we'll deal with the system and the administration's going to do testing. The reality is Madam Speaker, that we could have been doing this earlier. So why should people have the confidence that it is just going to happen? Well we…what we know that we were late on every single timeline given to us, mandated to us by the Province. I am not blaming any individual or the administration responsible for Water and Waste, but when it comes to trying to account to people that are asking me these questions, how can I say there is no problem? Well, there is. So let's just try to fix it or to the extent provide the mechanism by which people can judge and watch what we are doing with something that sort of we have to backtrack on. We are behind. Because we had greater…we had the potential to do this years earlier including the year before when I was on Water and Waste. So can I support this motion and let people know, yeah, your concerns are justified and we are dealing with it? Yes, yes, I can. In fact, during the deliberation we've had at Water and Waste, we hashed it out with my fellow members, Chair Gilroy and Councillor Chambers and conferring with the administration I thought it would be best symbolically to allow Councillor Klein to amend his own motion. For the sake of proof of collaboration of council because it came from a non-EPC member, but it came from a responsible member of the proper standing committee and of course it was brought forth back to standing committee. I didn't ask for that. I didn't vote for it, but not bad. I mean, that is a way to do it. That is part of the procedure so it went that way. I didn't exactly balk at the idea. But there we are back at Water and Waste Committee and we have brought forth a better motion that we can all have greater confidence in, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers at all? I will call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Okay, call for a recorded vote. I did not. I did not call the question. All in favuor, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. The…carried unanimously. We will now move on to question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Okay, seeing none. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. Are there any questions for Councillor Orlikow on this committee? Councillor Klein.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Klein: Councillor Orlikow. So through you Madam Chair, I'd just like to know how Councillor Orlikow is doing?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Very well thank you.

Councillor Klein: Very good to hear. I have no further questions.

(inaudible speaking in the background)

Madam Speaker: Okay. Are there any questions on this committee? There are no reports today. There will be forthcoming. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Chairperson, we had a bit of discussion and within the financial plan which Councillor Orlikow appropriately moved referral back to Finance, but Innovation and Economic Development, Madam Speaker, is the portfolio and within that financial management plan, when it talks about economic growth, but in terms of economic growth it only talks about adding property. I'm wondering, Madam Speaker, if Councillor Orlikow had a perspective on the usage of that kind of language and does he have any concerns about that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Madam Chair, through you to Councillor Eadie, do I have a concern? No. Not particularly, because we really are our major funding source besides…our secondary source is the provincial government…is our assessment value, is the properties. I am a big believer that growth does not pay for growth, but again what we need to be focusing on, the only way we get real revenue is by property tax. So we can talk about economic growth being GDP, we can talk about jobs, and the neat thing about this one, and I've met with EDW a few times on this is that at the end of the day, they all kind of feed into the same thing, but how do you measure what our role is. So our role, really, you know, everybody could have their benchmarks and actually I think the transit, the low income transit pass, is actually a very big economic driver for us. That's what businesses come to Winnipeg for. One of the major things they ask for is tax relief but also transit because they need to get those people to their businesses. So again, but we also know people as we heard today, some people have to lose their jobs, they can't even afford transit. So again, an economic driver…is that an economic development opportunity? I'd say it is. But again, we're all going to have different opinions about what economic development is. We're going to have EDW come to us. They were hoping to come to the next meeting but the calendar didn't work. We have them coming to the following meeting. But again, really we can talk about many things that we want as Winnipeggers, but at the end of the day on economic development, we have to really keep our…where our revenue stream is which is providing jobs and opportunities for people to be able to afford to buy a home, to live in a home and that will increase our assessment base. I can understand your comments before Councillor Eadie, through you Madam Chair, about the reassessment. We are running out of land. That is definitely happening right now. So our value of our land is increasing quite quickly. I understand the pressures that (inaudible), but for us as the City of Winnipeg, and I really look forward to that. And I mean this what I said to Councillor Klein that I really am enjoying this, having these types of debates and discussions about what is economic development for the City of Winnipeg, and that's why EDW is going to come and help us a little bit with that. But at the end of the day, it has to be something that drives revenue to us. We talked about it a little bit today about the idea of what is the city's mandate? This is where…again we all may want to have a black and white answer. This is provincial, this is City. Well, if we don't create new jobs, people aren't going to come to Winnipeg. We can have all the immigration we want, which is great, but if they don't have jobs, they're going to last long. They're going to move to a place where that has jobs. So we need to be able to provide jobs so they actually buy a home which we can therefore tax and therefore get new revenues in. So the idea of using the assessment base in the financial plan to me was actually a simple, simplistic view but it is actually accurate. That is our main driver. But how do we feed that so the assessment base can go up in an equitable way. That is done through working with the Province and working with our partners. I don't think we should be doing all this work because you say economic development really isn't our direct line of business, but again, working with EDW, Bold is another company we are working with, Manitoba Tech is also in there, and there's World Trade Centre, there's a number of groups that we're actually meeting right now and they're going to be coming to the Committee, and I think it's very appropriate that we have Innovation and Economic Development side by side. Innovation drives economic development. That's really important. So how do we get these players? Right now you see, I think, the EDW did a post today about going out on a mission to go find tech workers. Winnipeg is not Toronto in the tech world. Toronto is doing incredibly well, but we are a secondary city on tech. But like other cities are facing, we need people. We need people that have those skills to be able to fill those jobs or those businesses aren't going to come here. And I also want to take this opportunity to talk about something that's pretty exciting. The Mayor may growl at me shortly, but it's how do we work with EDW better? How…when someone comes to the City of Winnipeg, we had Sarah (inaudible) of the PP&D Department who was really helping businesses when EDW said "I have business X coming to the City of Winnipeg". This is what their needs are, this is where they want to kind of go, how do we do that? Well that was Sarah, and then she would have to go to Water and Waste to get their answer, and it was very cumbersome, so my hope is what we're going to be doing is following the innovation plan. We're going to be imbedding innovation officers on each department, probably reassigning some mandates to different individuals, not making new jobs, where that business is going to have a point person that they can contact daily for the basic information, but when things are really kind of more hyperactive, we call it, we take Sarah's job and we make it a corporate job, so that person has the responsibility to do all departments. So again, asking someone from the PP&D to go over to transit to get them to answer to them, it's a little more difficult. So now what we need is a corporate officer, and that's why I love this position because it's corporate. It's not about one business line. It's about all of them, that will then take the lead on that and get all the chiefs that are available together to be able to provide these businesses a quick response time. These businesses that are flying over Winnipeg right now, and Councillor Gillingham, I think our major priority right now (inaudible) is Centreport, but we need serviced industrial lands and we don't have any, and that's our best opportunity myself. I concur with that. But when they come here to Winnipeg, they're not saying, "Hey, you know, let me know in a few weeks". They are bidding right now in Calgary, Toronto, wherever, heaven forbid Regina. But regardless, they're coming to Winnipeg and we have to be able to provide them that answer that they want in about three or four days. And so, we need to streamline our system and EDW is working with us on that as well, like Yes Winnipeg. How do we do that? So that's again, why people ask me and I know Councillor Klein talked a little bit about, about terms of reference. Really what I'm doing right now with the Committee is baking a cake. We're putting…all the pieces are on the table, but we now have to mold this into something that industry

wants and these developers want, and also the innovation community wants. So it's a super exciting time for that, but we are based upon a major revenue source for Winnipeg is to…we have to always go back to the, are people buying….does…are people buying homes here? Is our assessment value going up? So I'm okay with that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: So if I get you right, the Economic Development Corporate Officer is going to be modeled like we have done for the film industry with Kenny Boyce?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: No, it will be a little bit broader than that because Kenny Boyce's is really is limited to films. This could be any industry from Legumes. Could be…we have four or five pillars that we are focusing on which is…that I won't get into today. EDW will get into that for us a little bit more, but when those particular companies come to town or are interested in, we have to be able to capture them within Winnipeg, and as I agreed with EDW, if we can't capture Winnipeg because we just don't have the land or what they want, we need to capture it in Manitoba. So Winnipeg is working for all of Manitoba. First, we're going to try to get them to come here, but some of these industries, for example, the one that is going to Rosser, we just didn't have the land for them, what they wanted. And I'm not sure if having that kind of industry in the middle of the city is the best use of our land either. Regardless, we did not say "you know what. You're not doing Winnipeg. We're not going to help you anymore." No EDW will help them, and if it is in another municipality secondary, we are going to try and support them. We have the Winnipeg Capital Region or the Metro Region working with them on trying to help figure out this model a bit, so yeah, that's about it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, we will move on. Next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Mayes on the report dated September 4th, 2019.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 4, 2019

Councillor Mayes: First we'll do the September 4th one. So I'll move and introduce Items 6 and 7 and move EPC recommendations to be adopted.

Madam Speaker: Okay, those two have been stood down. Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 – Amendment to the Airport Vicinity Protection Area Secondary Plan By-Law No. 6378/94 for Polo Park/Former Stadium Site

Madam Speaker: Okay, this was stood down by Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Mayes, would you like to introduce the item?

Councillor Mayes: No.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I simply stood this down. Initially when this came forward to Executive Policy Committee, I moved a 30-day extension at that time to give the parties involved an opportunity to maybe iron out some of the matters that there wasn't agreement on at that point. After the first…at the conclusion of the first 30-day extension, it seemed that the parties were still far apart. Now, at Executive Policy Committee and it's before us here now, is there was the request…motion…not a motion, there was a motion, I should say, not a request, a motion for another 30-day extension. I am supporting that but I do want to say that beyond that I believe that it is…if nothing changes, I believe it is time that the Council ultimately at the next council meeting give first reading to the by-law understanding that my consultation with the Clerks today, the by-law will be prepared for the next council meeting in time for that. And you know, I'm making no comments what so ever in regards to the merit of the application, but I believe it is time that at our next council meeting that the process be followed and the application kind of proceed along. So I look forward to our next council meeting. I do hope something happens in the next…the time between now and that council meeting, but I just wanted to state that that looking forward to the next council meeting on this as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes? I can ask the question if you are ready. All in favour of Item 6? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 7 – Amendment to the Airport Vicinity Protection Area Secondary Plan By-Law No. 6378/94 Properties Identified Generally along the West Side St. James Street between Portage Avenue and Sargent Avenue

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Much the same again, one should note Councillor Gillingham did actually raise this a couple years ago, not that I remember, but he has pointed out recently that he did raise this item a couple years ago. So I think that is worth noting in an attempt to try and get this thing moving. But here we are now, and I know he is on top of the issue. So a lot of serious issues raised by both sides here, but yeah, there is a long process ahead, I suspect. I thought it was worth flagging that I think 2016 Councillor Gillingham had kind of spotted the oncoming issues and had brought forward a motion on that that anyway, got referred as these things often do. I will wait to hear his comments then.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. Really, no further comments, my comments really related to Item No. 6, would apply to No. 7 as well.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. With that, I will call the question on Item 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Mayes on the next report.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 30, 2019**

Councillor Mayes: This is the report dated September 30th, 2019. I will move adoption of Items 1 through 13 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Items 1 through 13. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we now have a notice of motion. It was brought forward by Councillor Klein and Councillor Lukes at the September council meeting. It's regarding the Historical Resources By-law. On your desks is the amending motion to this, Motion 1, also brought forward by the same councillors, Councillor Klein and Lukes. Councillor Klein, this is your opportunity to introduce the amending Motion 1.

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

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

WHEREAS on at the Council meeting held on September 26, 2019, Council was presented with a Notice of Motion regarding a proposed amendment to the Historical Resources By-law 55/2014:

AND WHEREAS the third "WHEREAS" of said motion stated that:

> *"once a resource is nominated, the owner is prohibited from altering or demolishing their building until the nomination is considered by the Historic Buildings Committee and Council, a process that can take up to 36 months;"*

AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Public Service has advised that although the original version of the Historical Resources By-law did allow for up to 36 months to review and make recommendations concerning a nominated resource, the by-law has been updated to reduce the review period to up to 12 months;

AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Public Service has further advised that once nominated the owner is prohibited from demolishing the building, but alterations are permitted;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the recommendation contained in the Notice of Motion presented at the Council meeting held on September 26, 2019, regarding a proposed amendment to the Historical Resources By-law No. 55/2014, be amended by deleting all of the wording after "RESOLVED" and replace with the following:

> *"that the Historical Resources By-law No. 55/2014 be amended to require a two thirds vote of Council in the affirmative to add any building or structure to the List of Historic Resources, if the owner is opposed to the listing."*

Councillor Klein: Thank you Madam Chair. The amending…

Madam Speaker: Just one moment, the original notice of motion is on the computers if councillors are looking for it, the amending motion and paper copy.

Councillor Klein: Thank you for that clarity. Obviously I will wait to hear from my colleagues, but I do want to point out that the amendment was specific to the fact that the original motion had spoke to a process that could take up to 36 months. The amendment changed because in discussions we learned that the by-law had been since upgraded to reduce the review period to up to 12 months. And I will speak to it after I hear from everybody else.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Any further speakers? Yes.

Councillor Orlikow: P and D? I'm not sure if that's the proper time or not.

Madam Speaker: And we've got the amending motion and main items. Yeah, they would both…so that is an order, Councillor Orlikow to refer the amending Motion 1 and the main motion over to the Property and Development Committee and just majority vote to pass. All in favour? Contrary? Opposed? Yeah, so opposed I heard one, maybe two voices. So the item passes. It is going to the Property and Development Committee.

Councillor Klein: I don't get to speak to the motion that we put in earlier like in September as a notice of motion. Now it comes back to Council and this is another technique to then push it back some more?

Madam Speaker: No, the debate is over, Councillor Klein. The debate is over. Councillor Orlikow moved referral and we voted on it.

Councillor Klein: It's more of a question than a debate. But now after all of the changes…

Madam Speaker: Okay, all right. We are now moving into…there's no motions. We do have by-laws, Councillor Mayes. By-laws under this committee.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – FIRST READING ONLY

Councillor Mayes: A couple of by-laws I think. I'll move that By-law No. 47/2019 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 47/2019

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, onto the next set of by-laws.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes, that first one was a bit different than our normal plan because that goes to…that's a committee referral in essence for public hearing. That said, onto the next. I will move that By-law No. 76/2019 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 76/2019

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll move that By-law No. 76/2019 be read a second time

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 76/2019

Councillor Mayes: I will move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 76/2019 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 under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Councillor Klein.

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

Councillor Klein: Yeah, thank you very much. One question that I have looking over the reports and as I said in that Committee, I've asked several times there. Maybe we need to get it on an official record given how we bring things up in a certain way. I'd like to know if the Chair has the thought about putting forward a discussion or a motion to really clarify why we're paying for a Fairness Commissioner when we often will pass items brought before us that the Fairness Commissioner has indicated issues with. Is it a marketing thing that we're using it for or are we actually using it to base decisions in an open and transparent way?

Madam Speaker: Okay thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: The Fairness Commissioner was approved at some point in the life of the last council. I think if our real estate staff were here, they would make a lengthy argument that they are meeting more and more of the standards in the Fairness Commissioner grid. That said I'll take it under advisement and get a more fulsome answer about the Fairness Commissioner. It is a fair question. Councillor Klein doesn't disagree with this step of marketing, but yeah, we do get a lot of reports that do not hit all the technical standards of the Fairness Commissioner, so perhaps at our next meeting we can have the staff speak a bit to that. I think we have in the past and can again.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. Soon the Public Safety Building will be coming down. We will all probably feel it as it comes down. Through you Madam Chair, I would like to…I think I briefly saw something to the effect that a lot of the materials would be re-purposed, reused, recycled and I am just wondering if the Chair could give us an update on what is going to be happening.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for the question. As I sat there Saturday morning at the Heritage Trust conference; I'd sponsored the keynote with some funding as Chair. Keynote's address came in from Denmark talking about this very issue about reuse of materials in demolitions. Really quite interesting stuff. Various examples of projects he had worked on. It occurred to me that I should ask whoever is responsible for the area about the demolition of the Public Safety

Building. It later occurred to me I am, in fact, would be the person I would be asking that to, so thank you to Councillor Lukes for asking that question. Yeah, it's…I'll do some research, I'll come back. I think that is a good report to make. I know we are not demolishing that building. It's more being dismantled given its enormity and the brutalist concrete nature of the structure. We need to decide whether or not it's an architectural gem or something else. It is a good question in an environmental sense of what are we doing with the materials that we're getting out of that building? It was a thought-provoking conference and I know Councillor Santos I think was there one night. I was there on the Saturday. A number of award-winning folks from the City of Winnipeg, (inaudible), Cindy Tugwell, Number Ten Architecture all getting heritage awards, so worth it to point out that we do care about and support heritage. But that keynote address certainly raised some questions about what is probably our biggest demolition right now, the Public Safety Building. So I'd like to come back and give that a more thorough answer that it deserves.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Okay, any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on to the Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Lukes, think you are prepared to move the report on my behalf dated September 18th, 2019.

REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED SEPTEMBER 18, 2019

Councillor Lukes: Sure, I'd like to move adoption of the Consent Agenda Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Lukes, on the next report dated October 9th, 2019.

REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED OCTOBER 9, 2019

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move adoption of the Consent Agenda Items 1, 2 and 3.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We do have by-laws, Councillor Lukes.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that By-law No. 83/2019 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 83/2019.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to read that By-law No. 83/2019 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 83/2019.

Councillor Lukes: All right, and I would like to move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 83/2019 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. Thank you. Councillor Santos, will you move adjournment? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos and Schreyer.

Council adjourned at 5:52 p.m.