

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, September 30, 2020

The Council met at 9:41 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 Orlikow.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, you have the floor for your morning announcements.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good morning to everyone here as well as those that are watching these proceedings. I want to welcome everybody back to our first regular council meeting since the end of July. I hope everyone had the opportunity to enjoy some spectacular weather over the summer. Absent the large festivals and gatherings we're so used to here in the City of Winnipeg, it was the kind of summer those in the prairie provinces love, myself included. Prior to the additional restrictions placed on Winnipeg and the capital region, I took the opportunity to explore our beautiful province with my family. It was a great reminder of the immense natural beauty that we're so fortunate to have in this province. Last week, Madam Speaker, I had the pleasure of visiting all of Winnipeg's electoral wards to plant a tree with each of the local councillors. I was joined by our Deputy Mayor, Councillor John Orlikow. It was an absolute whirlwind tour that included 17 stops over nine hours in support of our Million Tree Challenge. And I want to thank each member of council here today for welcoming me to the wards, helping to plant a tree, not just that day, but with other efforts that councillors are leading in their wards and I want to just encourage all of us to continue to do our part to support the Million Tree Challenge. Earlier this week it was International Right to Know Day, Madam Speaker; something I used to work on quite heavily in my privacy law practice and I just want to say, the launch of the electronic voting last week was a significant step forward for transparency and greater accountability here at city hall, Madam Speaker. There were a number of initiatives undertaken over the last year to increase accessible data for residents including rush hour towing data, a new parking ticket online photo evidence viewer, continued digitization of archives data, notification of street cleaning via the City's Know Your Zone app and the open data charter that we'll be seeing today. I was...it's been a quick rise from our 20th place in 2015 to second place last year. I hope to see this get to first place in the open city's data index. At the end of August, Madam Speaker, I was happy to support the City's move to mandate masks in all City-operated facilities and on Winnipeg transit. In that line of thought, I want to touch on the orange level restrictions just brought into effect this week by the Province of Manitoba. Individuals in the Winnipeg metropolitan region must wear a mask in all indoor public places, limit gatherings to a maximum of 10 people indoors and outdoors. I'm happy to see the Province take a leadership role in protecting the health of Winnipeggers and those in the capital region. Now it's time for Winnipeggers to do their part once again and to do that, we can all help flatten the curve. No one likes, at least, I haven't met anybody that likes wearing a mask. I certainly don't, but it's necessary and it's a reasonable measure to help protect each other, so I really hope to see Winnipeggers continue helping support each other as best they can by wearing a mask when in indoor public places. Madam Speaker, I want to close by offering my sincere condolences and our sincere condolences as a council to the family, friends and coworkers of a Winnipeg Transit employee who lost their life recently in a traffic accident. It was very sad news to learn of, I hope the family, friends and coworkers are doing all right as they grieve this heartbreaking loss, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next speaker is Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker, for allowing me to rise today on National Orange Shirt Day in recognition of the Indigenous people who were forced into schools where they were treated physically and spiritually inappropriate. I just wanted to announce that today at St. John's Park, there is now a facility there that the community, that is Indigenous people, people from the church, people from the neighbourhoods, myself, the councillor, the City is involved and we got together and we now have what is called the Kapabamayak Achaak Healing Forest where we've seen 21 trees planted and a garden. You have to take a visit to this particular facility. It's my understanding my colleague from St. James had an opportunity to experience the Healing Forest. What I wanted to say though today and just announce and recognize, I wear

the shirt that we use when they had their naming ceremony and they came up with the name. The Indigenous words, Kapabamayak Achaak actually stands for wandering spirit. And the residential schools, Madam Speaker, injured people's spirits, the human spirit, the Indigenous spirit. It wasn't just physical problems that were caused to the people who were forced into these schools. And the wandering spirit, St. John's Park, it was a very emotional day for me when I found out what they named it, because actually, when I decided to get on with the rest of my life after losing my eyesight, my spirit was down. And being close to the water, the Red River and the land, the place is very important. And today there are a whole host of kids from schools all over the area who will be practising proper COVID-19 practices, but they will be educated on what residential schools meant to the Indigenous people in this province and in this country. They've been here for thousands of years or actually they were here. And so those kids will now have a great chance to have their spirits lifted and to be able to understand and hear from the Indigenous people who talk about moving forward. And I just want to finish by saying, I've done a lot of reading and...well, listening, both to books and to people, and I have to say that once one's spirit is healed and you have found your way, you can move on and heal and hopefully we can all work together once we've had everybody understand what we did wrong and how we can do things right into the future. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, thank you very much. And before I get into remarks about Orange Shirt Day, I just want to deeply thank Councillor Eadie for those moving words. I had a chance to be in St. John's Park last week on behalf of the Mayor with respect to trees and really did feel Councillor Eadie's presence there. Orange Shirt Day is for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people to acknowledge truths...acknowledge truths related to the residential school system, the impact...the impact resulting that persists to this day of individual family and community intergenerational trauma. Respectfully honouring Indigenous children sent to residential schools by coming together in the spirit of reconciliation and hope affirming as it says on the shirts today, "Every Child Matters". Phyllis Webstad is the founder of Orange Shirt Day, the Orange Shirt Day Society, and she says when she sees people wearing an orange shirt or an every child matters pin for and I quote, "As survivors, it's a little bit of justice in our lifetime for what happened to us." It's nice to see councillors today and so many staff across the City of Winnipeg wear these shirts and communicating that message of social justice every day in their work I know, but especially today. The National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation, NCTCR, will be holding an online reconciliation event today called, Every Child Matters; Reconciliation Through Education. It's a time for over half a million school children to sit down and watch with their education leaders the legacy and the deep understanding of so many survivors. It's also an opportunity for every Canadian, thanks to media partners; APTN, CBC, so far, and I encourage everyone to do home-viewing. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins, and our final speaker is Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Madam Speaker, I echo some of the comments that Councillor Rollins and Councillor Eadie have mentioned this morning and I also wanted to put onto the record a recent opinion piece by Anishinaabe writer, Associate Professor of the Department of Native Studies, University of Manitoba, the son of reconciliation, Mr. Niigaan Sinclair. Wednesday, today, is Orange Shirt Day. When Canadian honours survivors and others impacted by the legacies of residential schools. All Canadians are encouraged to wear orange shirts and spend the day reflecting on how residential schools have shaped the life in this country. Orange Shirt Day was supposed to be and likely will become one day, Canada's National Day of Reconciliation and sixth national holiday. But the bill that was supposed to make it so, was prorogued for the last fall's federal election. Federal liberals had it on their to-do list, but COVID-19 has this way of interrupting everything. Nevertheless, this is the seventh incarnation of the event named in honour of residential school survivor, Phyllis Webstad who had her beautiful orange shirt given to her by her grandmother, taken away from her when she attended the St. Joseph Mission Residential School in BC. Webstad was only six years old at the time. And I quote, "When I got to the mission, they stripped me and they took away my clothes including the orange shirt", Webstad explains. "I didn't understand why they wouldn't give it back to me. It was mine. The colour orange has always reminded me of that and how my feelings didn't matter, how no one cared and how I felt like I was worth nothing." Most Orange Shirt Day events this year are online. The largest by far is called, Every Child Matters, and is being staged by the National Centre for Truth and Reconciliation located at the University of Manitoba campus. The 90-minute taped event will be livestreamed today at 11:00 a.m. on the NCTR Facebook page and APTN and available for everyone to watch afterwards. The NCTR announced more than 10,000 viewers are expected. The event which is primarily for teachers and students will feature well known leaders and activists, elders and residential school survivors such as Webstad. A special part of Every Child Matters will be a celebration for survivors honouring the many birthdays they've missed out on at schools. This is not the only Orange Shirt Day event, though, there are marches, education days and forums everywhere. Some workplaces organize hikes, social media posts and political campaigns. There are events in Europe, Japan and the United States. Orange Shirt Day is a global phenomenon. If you cannot participate in any event, I encourage you to take some time to reflect on how residential schools impacted your life. Think about how you would feel if your children were forcibly removed without your consent. Think about how they would feel being in a foreign, unwelcoming and often violent place where starvation and disease was rampant. Half your day was spent performing labour and the other half memorizing a religion

that you knew nothing about. Think about the parents left behind and what communities would look like with no children. Think about how families would function when the children returned home, and if they did at all, and told their moms and dads that they were taught that they were savages. Think about how this all led to cycles of violence, addiction and trauma. Think about how non-Indigenous peoples benefitted incredibly from what the schools did and how overwhelming trauma and lasting shame in Indigenous families justify Canadian stereotypes and beliefs of Indigenous inferiority. Think about how Canadian governments were able to justify the theft of land and instilled policies and practices that led to over-policing, over-incarceration and rampant poverty in Indigenous communities. Think about as a residential school era ended in 1996, there were already tens of thousands of Indigenous children placed into provincial child welfare systems and how there are more Indigenous children forcibly removed into their...from their families today than during the time the schools operated.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Santos, I appreciate your thought...the remarks.

Councillor Santos: Last paragraph.

Madam Speaker: ...but I do need to ask you to wrap up. Thank you.

Councillor Santos: Think about all of this and how putting on an orange shirt unites us all in a commitment to ensure this devastating legacy ends. It's a small gesture, but a big step into a shared future. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Santos. Before we move on to our scheduled business of the day, I would like to note that as a result of realignments of positions, we do not have a Deputy Speaker for this meeting. Our previous Deputy Speaker was recently appointed to the Executive Policy Committee which invalidates him to continue in this role. I do thank Councillor Browaty for his service as Deputy Speaker. The Charter requires that we do have a Deputy Speaker for each meeting of council and as such, I would like to ask that we deal with Motion 1 that is before us. Councillor Browaty, could you please introduce Motion 1?

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to move suspension of the rules to deal with Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

MOTIONS

Motion No. 1

**Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Santos,**

WHEREAS on November 6, 2019 Councillor Browaty was appointed Deputy Speaker at the annual organizational meeting of Council for a one year term expiring in November 2020;

AND WHEREAS on June 12, 2020 Councillor Browaty was appointed to the Executive Policy Committee;

AND WHEREAS section 67(1) of the City of Winnipeg Charter states that the presiding officer and the deputy presiding officer (Speaker and Deputy Speaker) must not be members of the Executive Policy Committee;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Councillor Ross Eadie be appointed as Deputy Speaker for the remainder of the 2019-2020 term.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The motion before you is...after consultation with council colleagues, it is my pleasure to move that Councillor Ross Eadie be appointed as Deputy Speaker for the remainder of the 2019-2020 term.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Motion is carried.

MINUTES

Councillor Nason moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on July 23, 2020 and August 31, 2020, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into delegations. First, we'll hear from Ms. Jackie Connell. Yes?

Councillor Rollins: I move to suspend the rules to add speakers today.

Madam Speaker: Do you have a list, Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: I do and it's been submitted to the Clerks.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Clerk, if you'd like to read out the names. And what topic is it on, Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: School Resource Officers, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: I have four names of additional delegations who wish to speak in opposition to the motion: Cam Scott, Fadi Ennab, Dorota Blumczynska and Daniel Friesen.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. And are there any other? We'll vote on that item...or Councillor Chambers, you also have additional delegations?

Councillor Chambers: Yes, I'd like to move suspension of the rules to allow a speaker to speak in support of the School Resource Officer issue on the agenda today. And that person being Alicja Szarkiewicz.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, we'll vote on Councillor Rollins motion. All in favour? Recorded vote to suspend the rules. Yes, it is five minutes. No questions. Mr. Clerk, can we vote on both requests at the same time?

City Clerk: You can, Madam Speaker, yes.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of suspending the rules to hear additional delegations, please rise.

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, do I put my hand up in the affirmative?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors 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 vote is unanimous. We'll hear from all delegations as requested. Ms. Jackie Connell; she is appearing before Council in support of the motion moved by Councillor Chambers and seconded by Councillor Mayes regarding the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer Program. Ms. Connell is joining us via Zoom, correct, Mr. Clerk? Is she with us now? Yes.

Clerk: Ms. Connell, you may proceed.

Madam Speaker: Welcome, Ms. Connell. Can you hear us?

Clerk: Just need to unmute your microphone, Jackie.

Jackie Connell: I can hear you.

Madam Speaker: Okay thanks. And we'll have ten minutes on the clock.

Jackie Connell: Good morning, everybody. My name is Jackie Connell. I'm currently an assistant superintendent in Frontier School Division. Previously I have worked for Winnipeg School Division as a classroom teacher and more recently a school administrator in the inner-City of Winnipeg at both Children of the Earth High School and R.B. Russell High School. And I thank you for allowing me the time this morning to speak to you all in favour of the School Resource Officer Program. I am not here to discount any of what you read today or any of what you've heard regarding officers in schools, nor am I here to speak on behalf of any of the aforementioned organizations. But based on my experience as an educator, as a school leader, as a woman, as an Indigenous woman, I do know and I can say for certain that the topic of police in schools is complicated. I will begin by stating that I fully and completely acknowledge the systemic racism that exists in policing, but in fact, it also exists in other areas like education and health. It's one of the reasons that I have chosen to do the work that I do, to support the ongoing success, achievement and needed equality for our Indigenous youth and communities, but also to work daily at dismantling the very real racism that lives and breathes in Manitoba. I do believe that in order for meaningful reconciliation, reconciliation that is rooted in truth to take place between the police and Indigenous people, that the School Resource Officer Program needs to continue. And although the officers who work in our schools do attend many positive activities; feasts, events, celebrations, graduation ceremonies with students and community members, it is important to note, in my opinion, that reconciliation doesn't exclusively live in these happy celebratory kinds of activities. Reconciliation lives in hard, very hard and tough and uncomfortable and messy conversations. And if something isn't uncomfortable, it's likely not reconciliation. But I can share with you that I believe reconciliation lives in a place like a school principal's office when an Indigenous mom comes in and reaches out and requests support because her daughter is in a highly abusive relationship. And this mom who is at her wit's end, who has seen and experienced generations of abuse, and whose family has experienced trauma and violence at the hands of police, begins to feel comfortable enough to reach out and to ask our school resource officer for help because she, over the course of many conversations and many daily interactions, begins to feel that maybe, just maybe, police are in fact here to help support and protect people that look like her. As we work together with that officer in the office to have a conversation about her daughter, put supports in place and eventually help her daughter to flee a very violent and harmful relationship; this relationship, the one between her and the officer sitting across from her...sitting beside her becomes a little less strained. And over the course of the last 15 years, I have had the opportunity to work with seven school resource officers. I could give you hundreds of examples of these kinds of scenarios, none of which are easy, none of which were easy. These scenarios have included working together alongside multidisciplinary teams, officers sitting alongside representatives from health, community supports, housing to help make things better for students, families and communities. Officers, in my opinion, have helped and I've seen it with my own eyes; families and students and schools to navigate some very, very difficult situations. And in my experience, some of which I know have saved lives. I can understand and respect why a student or parent of colour would have a visceral reaction to seeing an officer, but I also believe that in order to address this reaction, in order to support the student and have them experience something different when it comes to the police because they are in fact entitled to experience something different when it comes to the police, can and has taken place within the walls of the school. I believe that we can and must continue to work at improving the deeply damaged relationships that exist between the Indigenous communities and police. And I have seen this work happening in schools with the SRO program. When determining the success of any program, I believe strongly in community consultation, feedback and ongoing evaluation. And although the program isn't infallible, it is contributing to the building of positive relationships with the Winnipeg Police and schools. And if it's removed, that possibility gets removed along with it. The possibility of something better. Things need to get better. Indigenous lives depend on it. Thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Connell. It will be Council's opportunity to ask any questions at this time. Are there any questions for our delegation this morning? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation today.

Jackie Connell: Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Next, we do have someone joining us here in person today. It's Mr. Brian O'Leary. He is the Chair of the Metro Superintendents Group. That's who he is representing today. He is also in support of the same item. And we'll have five minutes on the clock. Welcome, Mr. O'Leary.

Brian O'Leary: Welcome and thanks for hearing me today. I was a skeptic about the School Office Resource Program as a superintendent and actually declined a number of invites from the Winnipeg Police Service to join in. And then, in May of 2015, we experienced a significant tragedy at Garden City Collegiate with the loss of two students to suicide. I received a call the morning on my way to the school from Sergeant Jordie McKenzie and I'm going to name a few officers names who have been involved because I think it's easy to paint police officers with a single brush. And the police force is made up with a number of individuals and I sometimes say there is the odd teacher who would be better off selling shoes, there is probably the odd police officer who would be better off doing something else, but we can't let that colour our vision, our perception of police generally. Jordie McKenzie phoned me and said, what can I do to help? And I said,

could you send us Andrea Kane who had been a school liaison officer who had done some work in the school division and just have her work with us. He sent her, she was there ten minutes later and she was a remarkable contribution to a group of counsellors, social workers, psychologists, school administrators, teachers who set about the task of preventing suicide contagion from taking over. It's a phenomenon I did not understand until that time. Following that, Jordie approached me again and said, would you be interested in being part of the School Resource Officer Program? I invited him to a meeting of principals. He came. We had a discussion. His presentation was compelling. I left the meeting an hour after he had. I found him sitting in the commons at Maples Collegiate with a table of kids around him talking. And we sometimes get the perception that the school resource officers are in fact patrolling hallways or standing in entryways. You're more likely to find them in a principal's office, with a parent, a student or in a home around a kitchen table, often helping a student whose made some mistakes, recover from those mistakes and move on without criminal charges and without an association with the criminal justice system. We have a staff in Seven Oaks School Division of 1500. We have three school resource officers who are part of that. They're not taking the place of any other class of employees. We have counsellors, we have psychologists, we have social workers, we have mainly teachers. They are part of an interdisciplinary team working with students. They have outstanding skills, in my experience, at de-escalating situations. Rarely, if ever, resorting to any kind of use of force. They, as I mentioned, are...make a fundamental contribution in terms of diverting kids from the justice system so that kids can learn a lesson without a lifetime consequence. They can do things that are preventative and proactive that general duty officers on a call to 911 or the nonemergency line don't ever get to. One of the most serious issues that schools face today is online threats and online bullying. And we've had incidents where there is an online threat posed towards a school overnight. We've had police working with our school resource officers track down where the threat came from, visit that home, confiscate the computer, do a threat assessment and put us in a position to operate school the next day with a message home that says to parents and kids who are worried, we got this, you're safe. So this is a program that I came to as a skeptic. Since we've joined it, I've actually had conversations with River East and Louis Riel School Divisions and they've come into the program. The program has done nothing but expand and it is a resource decision we weigh every budget time as you weigh resource decisions. And when I ask principals, do we need more of this or more of that, this is not something that any of our principals would ever want to give up. So I've got 15 seconds. I would like to thank you for listening and thank you as a council for supporting this program and I hope today for continuing to support it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. O'Leary. Council does have questions. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you very much for taking the time and for sharing some positive stories with us. It's very important to me. My question is just for clarity fact because I don't know if a lot of people are hearing the clear picture of what school resource officers are and how the agreement comes to be. And we're getting caught up an awful lot with what is happening south of the 49th parallel. The School Resource Officer Program is a program that the schools sign on to be. The police don't come to you and force the schools to be a part of this, correct?

Brian O'Leary: No, it's a partnership agreement. The resources are, the City gives us, and I'm not sure of the precise classification, but a full constable charges us at an entry level. Doesn't charge us for some of the, you know, car supports and that sort of thing. The Province supports and school divisions support so that the cost share is roughly a third, a third, a third. And schools, we would like to say somebody else should pay for it. I'm sure you would like to say somebody else should pay for it and I'm sure the Province would like to say somebody else should pay for it. It's a three-way cost share and it seems to work fairly well that way.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Thank you for that answer. And every level of government wants everybody else to pay for it. The other question I would have is that I see this as an investment, not a cost because, and you alluded to it in what you told us today, that it is helping officers develop relationships and divert our young individuals away from the justice system so that in five or ten years they're not continuously meeting this individual in a very negative way or at their worst time in their life. They're helping them get through and take a different path. Would you say that that's a fair description of what the school resources officers are trying to do on a daily basis?

Brian O'Leary: I would say yes. It's trying to keep small problems small problems rather than big problems. Trying to keep mistakes young people make from being life altering for them.

Councillor Klein: Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, through you to Mr. O'Leary, being a trustee from 2002 to 2006 in the Seven Oaks School Division, we were considering the SRO program as it had begun in Winnipeg

School Division, I believe 2002. And we did take a decision, we were doing things to work with our youth while they got an education and being part of a community. I love the Seven Oaks School Division's motto. But at that time, we decided not. And can you...and you were citing a particular school, I'm curious, though, where we have every...an adult knows every child in the school. There's different programs to try to work with kids to help them fit in, but specifically, what was missing that the SRO did bring to Garden City at that time?

Brian O'Leary: It was really an exceptional police officer who did a wonderful job. Some of her work was with family. Some of it was handling some of the intrusions and attention that it got. Some of it was just helping staff evaluate the seriousness of issues. You know, we lost two kids tragically, but we were worried about a whole lot more. And the work of the crisis team actually extended through that spring right through the summer into the fall until we felt that we were past it. And the officer, Andrea Kane, was a valuable part of that every step of the way.

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

Councillor Eadie: I often hear stories in the Maples and West Kildonan. What was the aspects of Mr. Constable Edward Finney in terms of the policing work that he did in the community and the school? Why did the Seven Oaks School Division name a school after Constable Edward Finney?

Brian O'Leary: He was the constable responsible for school patrols and when the school was being built, there was a survey of students as to what would be an appropriate name. And students actually came forward with the name of Constable Finney and wanted to recognize him for his work over the years in the community on the street with school patrols.

Councillor Eadie: Good police work, right?

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thanks to Mr. O'Leary for your work on this over the years. My first run as School Board Liaison, I remember people were talking about it at Louis Riel and I think River East and the instruction was, just talk to Brian O'Leary. So thank you for your work on this. I guess what should be made clear here is different divisions democratically decide to sign on at different times, such as your own division and then subsequently Louis Riel and others. And as I look at the list, there are two divisions with schools in Winnipeg at least, DSFM and Seine River that have not opted in. But this is not...maybe rephrasing here, this is not the police decide where to go. This is not City Council directs. This is not the Province directs. If school divisions are interested, they have to express their interest and be part of it.

Brian O'Leary: And weigh the resource expenditure against other items in the budget. So it's a very conscious decision by school divisions and a very considered one.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do have a question, I'm not sure who should address the question, whether it should be Jackie Connell or Brian O'Leary. I do appreciate the obvious insights expressed by Jackie Connell. Also the...geeze, the...Brian O'Leary who may very well be the...who obviously is the most experienced...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, Jackie Connell is no longer with us I understand. So if you'd like to direct your question to Mr. O'Leary.

Councillor Schreyer: Fair enough, I certainly will. Brian O'Leary who I've known for 32 and half years. Involved with school and as a citizen involved with politics in our province. And I would like to ask based on his insights on this, for clarity, because we've dealt in council here with the issue of whether when it comes to the greatest society...outside of schools...whether it should be the police dealing with some types of issues that they do deal with or whether it should be social workers. And in this case, I would like to ask Brian O'Leary then if he can offer clarity why is it that we'd be utilizing officers rather than social workers in these cases?

Brian O'Leary: I'll give you two quick examples. I go back to the online issue. The police and very often the school resource officer opens the door to other police resources. Have an ability to track down online issues and do it very quickly that we don't have. Once a student issuing a threat is identified, some of that long-term work with that student could well be done by a social worker or a counselor. But in the moment, the police have a presence that is really important. Another

thing that schools deal with frequently and critically, high schools...is students coming in and selling drugs in the school...or not students, but people from the community. Standard practice is we issue them a no trespass letter, but we have our school resource officer deliver it to their home usually at about 7:00 in the morning. And an officer knocking on your door at 7:00 in the morning has a very different impact than a school counselor calling or a social worker. So you know, they work in...you know, as part of an interdisciplinary team with other personnel in the schools, but they bring resources, skills, experience that social workers don't have. And in fact, I would say, some of the de-escalation skills, some of the ability of working in teams are attributes that should be more present in regular policing, but all these people have those skills and can bring it back to other assignments as they move out of school resource officer assignments.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you for your presentation here today. Thank you for coming down to city hall for this presentation. I note that later on in this...in the month of October, that the Winnipeg Police Board will be meeting with the Winnipeg metro school superintendents where this has been added to the list of agenda items for discussion. My question to you this morning is, whether or not in your experience with the school resource officers, whether there has ever been a situation where the school resource officer has been called upon to deal with more of a behavioral issue where a child may be acting out...

Madam Speaker: Pause for a moment. Councillor Eadie, you move extension? There is Councillor Chambers that would like to speak and Councillor Rollins. Are you moving a...five minute or two minute? Councillor Eadie moves a five-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, and if I could just restate the question; whether in your experience you're aware of any situation where a school resource officer has been called in to deal with a behavioral issue of a child where a child is acting out and there's maybe noncompliant with the wishes or commands of a teacher. Are you aware of any instances where a school resource officer has been called in to deal with that issue or is their role primarily to be build relationships and not be called in to those types of situations?

Brian O'Leary: Primarily to build relationships. There are moments, and it may be a school resource officer or more likely a call to 911, where there is concern that a student is going to do harm to others or to themselves in a fairly extreme sense. Most of what I would say, we would class as school discipline is handled by school personnel.

Councillor Chambers: Okay, and in that situation where that call is placed to 911, it's not the school resource officer that is dealing with that issue inside the school, it's an outside officer that is dealing with that?

Brian O'Leary: For the most part, yes.

Councillor Chambers: And would it be fair to say in terms of Constable Finney, that that is a resource that he provided and would be an early iteration of a school resource officer?

Brian O'Leary: I think we've benefitted from police officers over the years who go above and beyond, who develop relationships. We would hope that that is most or all of them. Just as we would hope that every teacher goes the extra mile.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you very much for your presentation today.

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

Councillor Rollins: Mr. O'Leary, thank you very much for coming today and adding to the complexity that is the decision that school divisions make with respect to, in your case, a \$474 thousand, almost a half a million-dollar budget for school resource officers. Would you want this council to consider that budget line, as other cities do, within community policing and take that burden away from school divisions?

Brian O'Leary: Any time you would be offering to pay for something, but not diminish the service, we would appreciate that. But, you know, in the current budget climate, we're probably staying with the tri-partied arrangement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, we thank you for your presentation today.

Brian O'Leary: Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: So, yes, Madam Speaker; next delegation is Josiah Neufeld who is appearing in opposition to the motion moved by Councillor Chambers and seconded by Councillor Mayes with respect to the Winnipeg Police Service SRO program. Josiah, can you hear us? Josiah, if you'll unmute yourself, you have ten minutes. Good morning Josiah, I think you need to pause your livestream.

Josiah Neufeld: Hi there, can you hear me?

Clerk: Yes, we can hear you. You have ten minutes.

Josiah Neufeld: Great, thank you. Good morning, I'll be brief because I know there are others who want to speak. I'm not representing any particular group here, but I'm speaking as the parent of two children who attend a school in the Winnipeg School Division. And I'm here to ask City Council not to renew the SRO contracts until there has been more independent community-based consultation with those most affected by policing in our communities. As a parent, I feel uncomfortable having a police officer armed with a gun and a taser in school with my children. At home, my children are taught to resolve conflict non-violently and I'm concerned about what it teaches them that there's someone is carrying a gun in their school. I can only imagine how much more uncomfortable it must feel for parents of children who belong to demographics that are more consistently the target of police suspicion and surveillance. Many of these people have spoken up in recent days and I think we need to listen to them. I know a teacher personally who once observed in a Winnipeg school, a school resource officer and an Indigenous student act out a scene as a part of a presentation on school safety in which the police officer threw the student on to the hood of a police officer car and handcuffed him. This drama confirmed for everyone who was watching that day, the narrative that Indigenous youth like this one, were likely to be arrested by the police. And the fact that the student himself was an eager participant in this drama only underscored how deeply he had internalized his role in this narrative. Recently we've heard many stories shared by groups like Police Free Schools and the Police Accountability Coalition from people who do not feel safe with police officers in schools. Stories of people who have been harassed or mistreated or intimidated. I think we need to hear more from these voices in our communities, particularly from the people most directly affected by policing about how this program affects them. Other cities such as Vancouver, Toronto, Hamilton and Edmonton have recently decided to end or suspend their police in schools programs and do further community consultation as a result of concerns like the ones we've heard from these groups here in Winnipeg. And lastly, I would just like to say that we could pay the salaries of many educational assistants, school counsellors, nurses, social workers and others who are trained in nonviolent conflict resolution and restorative justice techniques for the price of a single school resource officer. EAs on average make about \$40,000 a year as I understand, and the SROs, on the other hand, cost school divisions and the Province about \$100,000 per year and I think this money could be better spent. So thank you. That's all I have to say.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Josiah. Next, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker, our next delegation is Anna Weier who is also appearing before council in opposition of the motion moved by Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Mayes with respect to the Winnipeg Police Service SRO Program.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, does Josiah know to stay back for questions? Is he still in the lobby?

Clerk: Josiah is in the waiting room, so we can bring him back for questions.

Madam Speaker: Okay, great. Thank you. Welcome, Anna. We'll have five minutes on the clock for your presentation.

Anna Weier: Thank you. Good morning. As we've already talked about a lot today, it's Orange Shirt Day. It's a day that we remember all the Indigenous children who were separated from their families and forced into residential schools. We honour the survivors and those children who never made it back to their families. Residential schools perpetuated colonization, genocide and racism. For me, as a white settler on Indigenous land, I feel that part of my responsibility on Orange Shirt Day and every day is to think about the fact that every child matters and consider the ways in which we might be continuing to perpetuate white supremacy and the policing of Indigenous lives in our current systems and in this case, in our educational system. I'm concerned that school resource officer programs do just that: continue the legacy of white supremacy and continue to control and police the lives of Indigenous children. We know that black, Indigenous and people of colour lives are overpoliced in Canada. In fact, research shows that Indigenous people are overpoliced by law enforcement and underserved when they're victims of crime. Over the course of 10 days in April this year, Winnipeg police killed three Indigenous people in our community including a school aged girl, Eishia Hudson. I don't know how it is possible in these circumstances for police to provide any sort of a positive presence in schools. They are not trained to fill the roles that they are being asked to fill and if they do so, at a much higher cost than professionals who actually are. In June of this year, Justice for Black Lives Winnipeg gathered 20,000 Winnipeggers at the legislative building in support of black lives and against police violence. Justice for Black Lives Winnipeg also gathered 115,000 signatures for their petition to

Mayor Bowman and the City of Winnipeg. The petition, among other things, asks to cut current ties between the Manitoba education system and police. The petition states that this police presence in schools gives officers the opportunity to harass BIPOC in a place where all children are supposed to feel safe, included and welcome. Children know what is going on here in Canada, in the United States and in Winnipeg. They know that police commit violence against and murder black, Indigenous and people of colour. And they have their own stories and we've seen in part from stories shared online over the past few weeks. No one should have to feel unsafe at school, especially not in the name of the comfort of others. I am also the parent of a child who will go to a Winnipeg School Division school next year. I don't want my daughter going to a school with a police presence. As someone who was raised in a Mennonite family and whose grandparents were conscientious objectors in the war, I do not support state sanctioned violence in our communities and in our schools. I believe that in schools we should be teaching children about community care. I want my daughter to learn that it is not okay for the City to spend money on a police armored vehicle and a police helicopter ever, but especially not when there are people in our community who haven't been provided with adequate housing or food or mental health supports and the list could go on. The lessons that I want my daughter to be taught at school are not lessons that can be taught by police or with a police presence in school. Under these circumstances, the bare minimum that the city council can do is to not renew the SRO contracts before there has been equitable, independent community-based consultation with those most affected by policing in our city with an equity lens. As individuals, making decisions about police in our city, I challenge you to read Robyn Maynard's, 'Policing Black Lives', which talks about the impact of policing and black lives in Canada. I encourage council to do the brave thing in this moment, not just the bare minimum. I encourage them to read or re-read the Justice for Black Lives Winnipeg petition and begin implementing all of their recommendations now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Anna. At this time, are there any questions for our two delegations?

Anna Weier: And black lives.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Seeing none, I thank you both for your presentations today. Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: At this time, we have Joe Masi on behalf of the Winnipeg Taxi...Winnipeg Community Taxi Association who is appearing before council in opposition to Item 3 on the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated September 16th, 2020 regarding Rebate Taxi Per Trip Cost.

Madam Speaker: Good morning, Mr. Masi, welcome.

Joe Masi: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Your Worship Mayor Bowman and members of council. Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you. I am here officially registered speaking against the resolution before you and urging you to support the motion passed by the Public Works and Infrastructure Renewal Committee on September 16th regarding a small credit, modest credit, on dispatch fees to the industry. I want to recognize the committee members of the...and the Vehicle for Hire Office that put that proposal together and in particular, Councillor Sharma, thank you for your efforts in that regard. You may be asking why provide this support to the industry at this time? The taxi industry operated a very essential service during the pandemic. You can imagine it was a very scary time, it was very risky. And they continued to operate in spite of a lot of the calls being down to provide medical appointments for people bringing them there, groceries, shopping and so on. So what this proposal would do would be to recognize them in a way for providing that service during the pandemic. It was a very tough time and I know I want to at this time acknowledge when we put together the safety guidelines for the industry, it was put together with the Mayor's Office, with the Vehicle for Hire Office, and we put together a set of guidelines so that the people of Winnipeg and the taxi drivers themselves could feel safe. So that is the first point I would like to make. Secondly, the taxi industry lost a lot of business in that month of April. I want to stress this proposal is strictly a credit for the month of April. It is not a longer-term approach. They lost business and some of the government programs didn't quite fit in with them. They got some support, the Autopac renewal or the rebates from the Province. So this credit under dispatch fees would assist greatly to their industry. Thirdly, the dispatch fees are paid up front by the industry, so they paid them up front before the pandemic. It's a great deal of money. They pay the fees. And then the pandemic hit, their business dropped. So I think the idea here would be that the dispatch fee would be a break in the month of April for the drop in business to get some of the relief and money back that they paid up front. This is not direct property tax mill rate money. This is money they paid up front for this dispatch service. So it would recognize a one-month on that. Other cities in Canada have developed some supports similar to this and I would stress that this is a...would be a great help to the industry. And I want to also thank the Vehicle for Hire. They did recommend this to the committee at the time when this proposal was put together. This proposal would go to all the vehicle-for-hire people. This is not just a taxi issue. This would be for limos, for ride shares. And I think...believe the total support package would be about \$16,000, which I think is a modest fee of their own money that they put in up front. So in conclusion, members of council, I would ask you to consider this credit on the dispatch fees to the vehicle-for-hire industry. The owners, I mean there is a misconception, these are small business owners. They operate small businesses. They're your neighbours. They're your family. They're your neighbours. They do provide service to our city. And I think this would be a goodwill gesture on behalf of the City to provide this small credit in the month of April. Madam Speaker, Your Worship Mayor Bowman, members of

council, please consider passing this amended resolution from the committee...or the motion from the committee and I really wish you well in your deliberations. On a personal level, I do want to say to you, I know from my previous work, you folks are dedicated. Municipal level politics is tough grinding and I commend you. I respect what you're doing and I wish you much success as you get through this pandemic. I know you have a tough job right now. This is not easy times to be elected officials so. Madam Speaker, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Masi. At this time, we'll take questions. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Good morning, Mr. Masi, thank you for coming to city hall today for your presentation. I just want to ask a couple of questions. You mentioned that taxi drivers are feeling the crunch in the sense of loss of revenue as a result of the tourism industry, people coming in through Winnipeg International Airport. But are they also facing increased costs in terms of maybe providing PPE such as masks or sanitizing their vehicles in between fares? Is that an increased cost that they're incurring as well?

Joe Masi: Yes, that's correct, Councillor Chambers. They have increased...their costs have continue to, you know, the Autopac and all that, but the additional costs and revenues have gone down. But the month of April, I mean, it's no secret. It was particularly tough, but that's when they need it all. And they still are providing those cleaning services. We want to make sure our cabs are safe for people when they go in them. That's why we developed those guidelines. They have taken it on and they have an obligation to provide that service in a safe way. So there is an increased cost, yes.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Joe Masi is registered in opposition to the report, so I would just like some clarification as to why he's registered in opposition, but asking for us to support.

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

Joe Masi: Well, I was advised by the Clerk's Office that I believe the motion here is that the proposal from the committee was received as information and so, therefore, I've been told I must speak against that motion, but asking you to consider the committee recommendation.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer, anything further? Okay, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: What you're saying, and what I heard today was quite good. It was, the taxi industry, the small business owners we'll call it, they've actually paid this money up front and all you're asking is they get their money...some of their money back.

Joe Masi: Correct.

Councillor Orlikow: So this is not like we're waiving fees or waiving taxes or...it's just, they paid this up front and we're rebating back. That's what this...

Joe Masi: It's very similar to the Autopac rebate. It was recognized traffic was down and the Province brought in a rebate. This would recognize dispatch fees were way down back in April, we're going to give back some of your money that you paid up front.

Councillor Orlikow: It's just a unique point. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Anything further? Seeing no questions, we thank you for your presentation today.

Joe Masi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Council.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: Council's next delegation is Tom Pearson. Tom is presenting via telephone in opposition to Item No. 5 of the report of Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated September 16th, 2020 regarding Sunday/Holiday Bicycle Routes, Wolseley and Churchill Drive. Mr. Pearson, can you hear us? If you would proceed, you have ten minutes.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Pearson, can you hear us?

Clerk: Mr. Pearson, if you'd pause your livestream feed.

Tom Pearson: Hello?

Clerk: We can hear you. Please proceed, Mr. Pearson.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Pearson, can you hear us?

Tom Pearson: I can.

Madam Speaker: It's your opportunity to present to council. Welcome, and there will be ten minutes on the clock.

Tom Pearson: Okay, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Go ahead.

Tom Pearson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council for hearing my submittal. I'm appearing to oppose Public Works report Item 5 – Sunday/Holiday Bicycle Routes. Winnipeg City Council closed 10 Winnipeg streets seven days a week throughout this last summer. This was done without study or consultation with affected residents. Some of these streets are collector routes and the closures created unnecessary congestion and risk to pedestrians in adjoining neighbourhoods. Now you're being asked to make those closures permanent and add even more streets to the list, again, without serious study of the impact or meaningful consultation. I practise as a consulting engineer for about ten years before joining the City of Winnipeg for 28 years until retirement. As an engineer, I know that my first duty is the safety of the public. I believe that the manner in which active transportation routes are being implemented has created public safety issues and costs to society because council has not relied upon the advice of their experts and is making ad hoc decisions on active transportation routes. The Winnipeg Free Press editorial September 18th, closing roads to car showed promise, was in my view very balanced and encouraging. It observed that during COVID, closed roads offered an opportunity for folks to get out and enjoy the outdoors and that many availed themselves of this opportunity. It also observed that these closures in some cases shifted traffic on to other streets and that there was an issue with area residents because of this. The editorial suggested that a more permanent strategy was needed and noted that, in fact, the City of Winnipeg has made good progress towards integrating active transportation routes into new projects such as the new transportation corridor. I agree, and it is my view that a planned approach with a clear statement of purpose and clear objectives for establishing routes, which have been derived through a balanced consultation process will succeed to the benefit of all Winnipeggers. Councillors should step back and consider whether the public has been offered a genuine opportunity to voice an opinion on active transportation and more particularly, on the benefits and drawbacks of permanent seven days a week road closures. There are many among us who believe that the current process has the appearance of being rigged, that Matt Allard has gamed us, that the temporary seven day routes were put forward this spring, were quickly extended through the summer with little study and based upon an observation with no valid measurements to substantiate it that they were a popular measure. Over the summer a survey was done by administration to try and determine how road closures should look moving forward. To many, the survey appears to be so biased that it is laughable. There have been letters to the editor about this, not by me, by the way. More recently, the Public Works Committee suspended the rules so that the measure before council today could proceed without any review or meaningful discussion of the motion by the citizens of Winnipeg at committee. I am certain that in some areas of the city, the seven day a week closures have been popular, however, I also know that usage on Churchill Drive, which I walk daily, quickly waned to where on most occasions I'd see perhaps four pedestrians or cyclists on my walk. There is no mystery behind this. There is a linear park that parallels Churchill Drive. Riverview is one of the most pedestrian-cycling friendly communities in the city with an abundance of trails, bicycle routes and traffic calming features. The road closure did not offer superior experience to other alternatives in the community. Ironically, after the closures were lifted, I went for a walk on September 22nd, which was a glorious fall day, and saw more cyclists and pedestrians than all summer. They were all blissfully sharing the road with vehicle traffic with no apparent conflict and no problem with physical distancing. My hunch is that there are similar situations on other active transportation routes. I believe that the statement that the closures are widely popular, highly used, may in some cases be a fiction. Now that the schools are in operation and people are going back to work, recreational use of roadways has declined and with the cooler weather is almost nonexistence, at least in my neighbourhood. Certainly, Councillor Rollins' recent assertion that Churchill Drive...the Churchill closure should be extended, "To ensure that children would be able to safely ride their bikes to school", is misinformed. There are no elementary schools in the Riverview community in any proximity to Churchill Drive. Again, because I've walked the neighbourhood daily since the start of school, I can tell you these students do not use Churchill Drive to get to school. They use the most direct route which is the residential street network. All these streets have sidewalks and common features such as traffic circles are in place. The risks to students going to these schools this year is no different than any other year. If Churchill Drive is once again

closed to cars, residents that use this collector to get to work or access Pembina and Jubilee for other reasons will be diverted to the residential streets and this will place the students attending these schools at a greater risk. Churchill High School does about Churchill Drive and again, students do not use the active transportation route to get to school. They either walk the residential streets, take a school bus or take Winnipeg Transit or drive. The students that take a Transit bus walk down Brandon from south Osborne or down Hay or Morley. The combination of staff and teenage drivers using the school parking at Churchill and Hay with school bus traffic makes it a very busy intersection. Reinstalling the barricade placed across Churchill at Hay for an active transportation closure will keep...create an extremely dangerous situation for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists trying to navigate the intersection. What I've just outlined is illustrative of why the experts should be consulted on active transportation choices instead of making ad hoc decisions. Councillors, I don't want to be rude, but you don't know what you don't know. These road closures are not without costs or impact to the environment. Many of us have spent time in gridlock on south Osborne or Academy Road due to traffic congestion caused by active transportation closures. The resulting loss in time and unnecessary increase to our city's carbon footprint is regrettable. The closures also increase the risk to children in adjoining neighbourhoods when traffic is diverted to residential streets that students use to cycle, walk and play on. How about devoting time to studying solutions that promote sharing the road instead of the exclusionary practise that is now being jammed through council? Some roads can be closed to traffic without negative consequences. Others should not. I'm certain that with a little thought the traffic engineers at Public Works can come up with a workable plan that will safely incorporate more pedestrian and cyclist activities on our city's most scenic routes without closing them to vehicles. Then all Winnipeggers can enjoy them, even those who can't manage a wheelchair or a scooter and are denied a scenic drive, like my late wife who had early onset Alzheimer's disease. A top down...excuse me; a top down scenic summer drive down Churchill or Wellington Crescent was one of the few joys she had left. These road closures would have robbed her of that joy. They robbed others this summer. I recommend that you table this report and direct the administration to develop policies and objectives relating to the selection of active transportation routes for consideration by Council after meaningful consultation with the public, not just special interest groups. Then have the administration recommend routes and propose the duration of closures for Council consideration. You are not, after all, traffic engineers. Leave it to the experts. If you do this, please include a public education component to diffuse what has become a very divisive issue. I have endured abuse from cyclists and motorists alike as a result of this measure. Mr. Mayor, this concludes my presentation and I would be pleased to answer questions if you wish.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Pearson. We'll now take questions. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I just have one quick question. When I could see back in the early '80s, there is a school called Riverview, which is an elementary school that you would get to off of Churchill Drive if that's the direction you lived and you were riding your bike to school. Are you aware that the Riverview School exists in the Riverview community?

Tom Pearson: I'm aware of all the schools in the neighbourhood. I probably spend an hour and a half a day walking. And Riverview, I've seen students get there. They don't use Churchill Drive. They walk down the residential streets.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, Mr. Pearson, thank you for your delegation today.

Tom Pearson: You're welcome.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, are we now moving on to the additional delegations we added?

Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker. At this time, our first delegation to be heard in support of the motion regarding Winnipeg school...Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer Program is Allie Szarkiewicz.

Madam Speaker: Welcome Allie. Are you ready to make your presentation?

Alicja Szarkiewicz: Yes. Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: And there will be five minutes on the clock and there is no opportunities for questions, Council. That's what we voted on earlier. Go ahead, Allie.

Alicja Szarkiewicz: Okay, thank you. Good morning, and thank you for your indulgence. I'm here today speaking as a concerned citizen and a parent and a retired teacher. I've worked with students at the elementary, middle and high school levels for over 30 years. Students from all ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds and as a proud immigrant myself, I can say that I made many amazing connections with students and school communities throughout the years. I'm also a member of the Winnipeg Police Board and the board does not give operational direction to the Winnipeg Police Service. Today I'm not speaking to whether or not the School Resource Officer Program is good or bad or supported by the board.

The board receives reports from the...about the program that are then shared with the public so we all have the same information. I'm speaking about the reason balanced conversations that take into account both diversity of thought and approach. The decision today is a financial administration decision, not within the scope of the board or the service. It is about the renewal of contracts. I recall when the SRO program was first introduced in 2002, it came about in part as a result of a need and demand by parent advisory councils, educators, administrators wanting to be able to work collaboratively with the police service to create and support better community relationships and safety. The role of the school resource officer is to provide support to the school community as a whole, which includes students, educators, school administrators, school staff and parents. Stemming from the practice of community policing, the SRO program is a collaboration between law enforcement officers and a school community in order to create a setting that is safe and secure with a focus on prevention and early intervention activities. The roles and responsibilities of the school resource officer vary from school to school as well as from division to division, but generally include public safety and law-related education, relationship-building and positive role-modelling, community liaison, problem solving and at times law enforcement. Some of the goals of the SRO program include providing students...providing students...support to students by directing them to the resources that can help, including classroom presentations on crime prevention, cyber bullying, gang awareness, illegal drugs and the like, enhancing neighbourhood safety by building partnerships between the police and the community, helping to prevent youth from entering the justice system by de-escalating situations and utilizing restorative justice and diversion practices, and strengthening relationships for relating to students on a personal level. At the core of the SRO program is relationship and trust-building. These goals are achieved by various responsibilities and activities, including regular and informal contact with students promoting a restorative justice practices, follow-up consultations with parents, teachers and school administrators and mostly, participating in extracurricular and community events. A recent survey conducted in the spring of 2020 showed that students with SROs said that they feel safer at schools. That the SRO is a good resource for advice and mediation. That there is less bullying and violence and the perception of the police officer has become much more positive. With today's need for a more diverse representation of culture on the police service, isn't this a way of inspiring our youth to pursue a career in law enforcement? If a school or division does not want to participate in this program, there is no requirement for them to do so. But the fact that the program has grown from two SROs in 2002, to 19 today, as reported by the Chief of Police on September 24th, it shows that there is the need for this program. There are currently requests from six school divisions to continue it. We've heard a lot about both the positive and negative effects of the program over the last few weeks. Today, I'm here to support the renewing of the SRO contracts. I think cancelling them without robust public consultation with the school communities; that includes students, administrators, education...sorry, educators and parent advisory councils would be a mistake. There have been several formal evaluations of the program over the years and it has been shown to be both positive and helpful. That said, the context of those evaluations wasn't to make it better for students that have traumatic experiences with police outside school and particularly for children whose families struggle from economic or social disparity or who come from racialized communities. If the program needs improvement or changes to be better account for all kids lived experiences, as I'm sure it does, let's find out by study and respectful discussion, not knee-jerk...

Madam Speaker: Allie, I'd like to ask you to wrap up your presentation, please. The clock has run out.

Alicja Szarkiewicz: Knee-jerk reactions to meet social media coverage that doesn't reflect what there is to learn about it. Thank you for hearing my views on this today. And I'd like to leave you with one thought to ponder; please ask yourselves, are we reacting to facts or data or are we just reacting? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation today. We'll now move on. Next set of delegations, councillor...Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: Our next delegation to be heard in opposition to the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer Program and the motion related is Cam Scott. Mr. Scott? If you would turn...pause your livestream, turn on your...unmute yourself. Can you hear us?

Cam Scott: I can hear you, can you hear me?

Clerk: We can. You have five minutes. No questions following.

Cam Scott: My name is Cam Scott and I'm here on behalf of Police Free Schools Winnipeg. You've probably heard those words a lot lately and we like to think they speak for themselves. I'm here as someone who doesn't risk professional retaliation for identifying serious concerns in their place of work. I don't have to walk the same hall as an SRO each week, but I'm here to amplify the direct experience of teachers and students. As an ally, I am not the representative face of the people most harmed by policing. Where personal experience is key, I want to make clear that I'm here for a large number of educators whose concerns have been ignored and explained away by superintendents and principals. Faced with the indisputable reality of racial profiling and the unevenness of law enforcement which disproportionately involves black and Indigenous and low-income youth in the criminal justice system, we believe that reducing police presence in communities

while simultaneously funding real social supports to educators and students is a concrete anti-racist measure. The kind of concrete anti-racist measure toward real student health and equity that always seems to elude the professional development language of administrators. Here under principals' noses is an armed – yes, armed and uniformed officer who is not a deterrent to crime. And let's be real here, why are we allowing student behaviour to be reclassified in the most severely punitive terms as crime. They're not a deterrent to crime, however, but to attendants and involvement of marginalized youth. The very people that educators are trying to bring in. When police were removed from schools in Toronto, suspensions fell by 24%. Expulsions fell by more than half. On our website, you can read a story of a principal who called the SRO after a behavioral incident where after the student feared he was being arrested, ran from the school and did not return from a week...for a week. There was a story about a student, non-violent, but agitated who was placed in handcuffs by an impatient police officer to take them out of the school. I'll quote the story, "If their relationship with school wasn't rocky before this incident, it sure was after." This is not the only time police have come into the building and put youth as young as 12 into handcuffs to escort them out. Brian O'Leary said the other week, "On behalf of Seven Oaks School Division, that we don't see kids staying away from school because there might be a police officer in attendance." Of course, he doesn't see people who are pushed out. We emphasize this unseen effect on students with trauma around policing, but whenever we talk about the unseen effects, we may as well talk about the people who are determined not to notice the scale of the problem. This program is intended to build trust between police and students. I don't think that we pause over this phrase long enough. Why is it that trust is lacking? Why do people from racialized communities fear the police? Why don't so many other students, principally white and middle-class students, have the same misgivings from experience? Rather than play these perspectives against each other, which granted, is a very political thing to do, why don't we stop and admit to ourselves that this discrepancy is precisely the problem? If you look at our website, you'll see stories that anybody concerned with equity and education simply cannot ignore. Many people were formerly in favour of SROs has changed their minds and there is honour in that. Police and administrators are eager to renew and expand a program that has been suspended in Toronto, Hamilton, Vancouver and Edmonton because of demonstrably poor outcomes for racialized students. We're asking someone on the council here to demand a report about those cities concluded SRO programs before pushing ahead with this contract. We're asking for responsible government, due process and humility before the scale of systemic racism in our city and we're far from alone. The Police Accountability Coalition called last week for the removal of school resource officers. One of the community's signatories of that document is the North End Community Renewal Corporation of which Jackie Connell is the board Chair. Now, people are calling, including the last speaker for reports. We are sure that if a report is undertaken that is equity-based and community-led and centres the voices of black and Indigenous students, that the result will be the suspension of this program all together. We encourage that report. We're asking council not to vote on this new SRO contract today, which motion has already been delayed from July because it hadn't been adequately debated. We feel it isn't ready today either because it hasn't taken into consideration any voices from overpoliced communities, nor the national movement of progressive divestment from police presence in schools. I'm here for teachers who want real student health and real racial equality. We know that this will take bravery and modesty from schools and from governments. We understand how those levels interact, but today, we're asking you not to rush this contract through. We're asking council to admit that the meaning...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Scott?

Cam Scott: And to take steps to fix that oversight. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Scott. Yes. Thank you for your presentation. We appreciate you taking the time.

Cam Scott: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, our next delegation.

Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker, our next delegation to be heard in opposition to the motion moved by Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Mayes regarding the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer Program is Fadi Ennab. Mr. Ennab, Fadi, if you would turn on your video and your microphone. It's your turn to present.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Ennab, can you hear us?

Clerk: Good morning, Mr. Ennab. If you would unmute yourself. You have five minutes with no questions following. Mr. Ennab, you need to unmute your audio. Mr. Ennab, if you'll unmute your microphone.

Fadi Ennab: Thank you. Can you hear me now? Yeah.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Welcome, Mr. Ennab. Mr. Ennab, we'll have five minutes on the clock for you.

Fadi Ennab: Thanks. Okay.

Clerk: If you would pause your livestream feed, just pause your YouTube...livestream.

Fadi Ennab: Yep. It's paused, yeah.

Clerk: There you go. Please proceed.

Fadi Ennab: I'm against the motion for involving school resource officers in schools. Hi.

Clerk: We can hear you, please proceed.

Fadi Ennab: Okay, thank you. I'm against the motion for involving school resource officers in schools. I'm an anti-racist screener and instructor and part of my academic background involve the critical analysis of the history of police violence in schools...police violence in Canada, I'm sorry. I have also done research on refugee families in Winnipeg School Division. The police as an institution is part of the racist policies and structural violence that creates and maintains inequities in Canada. Police involvement in the city often include excessive use of violence against racialized groups. The police pave the way for the colonization and land theft to undermine Indigenous self-determination by criminalizing and punishing Ingenuity. The National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls recommend that we need to teach, and I'm quoting them now, "History of police and the oppression and genocide of Indigenous people." The inquiry also stated that the police in continuing the legacy of the past enforced present-day discriminatory and oppressive legislation and policies in areas such as child welfare and land and resource disputes. Racialized violence of police is not a historical issue or an American issue. It is ongoing today in the over-policing of racialized spaces in Winnipeg including the North End. Indigenous populations are also overrepresented in the jails. This spring, the Winnipeg Police killed a 16-year old Indigenous girl, Eisha Hudson who was unarmed in a stopped vehicle. Any justification of this action requires racism, that her life is disposable and not valuable. The killings of black, Indigenous and people of colour throughout Canada by the police is a structural violence. It's a structural issue that is beyond the actions of individual officers. As long as we have policing, we will have disproportionate killings and unfair treatment of equity-seeking groups. As a racialized parent of a daughter in a Winnipeg School Division, I am very concerned about any involvement of police in schools. Since this motion impacts students before parents or the city, I will start with sharing my daughter's opinion, who is nine years old. To her, the SRO at her school does not do anything besides say hello to everyone. Her descriptions liken the SRO to a Walmart greeter. As a parent, the involvement of police in schools is concerning and alarming. The school is a space for education, not for disciplining and punishment. Resources of students...responses of students whether they are behavioral, cultural or social do not need a criminal response that put students as suspects who need to be controlled and disciplined. The trend to militarize the school and normalize police presence by including it in learning and play time as part of the informal curriculum has a negative impact on racialized students and families. Researchers in Canada have shown that racialized students are streamlined into lower careers, if not from school to prison pipeline. More likely to be suspended and more likely to drop out. Thus, they need more support and a culture of safety, support and care, not policing. Given the current epidemic and racial crisis that's facing our city, it is important to prioritize funding to support students who are facing structural disadvantages in the community such as Indigenous children or newcomer students with interrupted schooling, experiences or other equity-seeking groups. Funding for SRO can be spent on the school itself; hiring more trained and diverse staff, inter-cultural workers, peer supports, making the curriculum more inclusive in the spirit of the TRC, et cetera. Recently, the Toronto school district have voted against the SRO involvement in schools. Primarily because of experiences of black and other racialized students who felt targeted by the police. Researchers and community activists including Black Lives Matter in Toronto argue that the police practices are anti-black and anti-immigrant. In 2016, also in Toronto, a six-year old girl was arrested by police for having a tantrum in school. Ultimately, I'm against the SRO because of principle, not just due to resource allocation. We are on Treaty One Territory and the involvement of policing in the city has been and continues to be a violent one.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Ennab, the clock has run out. We appreciate your presentation today.

Fadi Ennab: To honour the treaties and the spirit of reconciliation, we should work to de-funding if not abolishing the police as an institution. If the police need better PR, it should start with equity-seeking groups in the community instead of socializing children to accepting their involvement in their lives. I'm outraged that the SROs are...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Ennab.

Fadi Ennab: Their campaign for the Winnipeg School Division...for the Winnipeg Police.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Ennab, we do need to stop there. We do have other delegations to hear from as well.

Fadi Ennab: Thank you. No to the police in schools (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: But I thank you for your time. Mr. Clerk.

Fadi Ennab: Thanks.

Clerk: Yes, Madam Speaker. At this time, we have an additional delegation to speak in opposition to the motion moved by Councillor Chambers and seconded by Councillor Mayes regarding the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer Program. At this time, we have Dorota Blumczynska. Ms. Blumczynska, if you could unmute your microphone, you have five minutes to present with no questions following.

Dorota Blumczynska: Thank you and good morning. My name is Dorota Blumczynska and I'm presenting on behalf of the Police Accountability Coalition. I want to first express gratitude for the opportunity to speak with you about this very important matter. Last week, the Police Accountability Coalition had an opportunity to bring forward the detailed and well researched briefing amongst which was a recommendation to end the SRO program. I understand that this agenda item was brought to you in July and that there simply hasn't been adequate time to undertake a fulsome and rigorous community consultation. At this point in time, our request to you is simply that you delay this decision so that there is adequate time, at least 60 to 90 days, for a meaningful community conversation about this important issue. The reality is that many of our communities, because of COVID, have not had an opportunity to express their concerns, to express their voices and their experiences, to exercise their agency. And so, we are asking you, of the leadership of our city, to allow time and space for everyone to be included in this issue. We know from research across Canada that there are varying and very passionate perspectives and opinions on this program. We know that there is data that both supports continuing the program but also ending these programs. We need to have an independent third-party undertake a rigorous review in Winnipeg taking into consideration the decisions made across Canada together in the context of our local reality. And then, as a community, that report needs to be presented to us with no less than 30 days for the community to look at it and meaningfully respond. The power in this is the discussion. The power in reviewing this is an opportunity for everyone to speak to their desired state of an education system in our community. We all want the best outcomes for our children, but we also know that our children are not equitably coming into the school system. And we also know that the school system, when there is a police officer present, does not afford every child the same sense of safety and freedom to interact and assurance that their interests are at the heart of the administrators who are there to provide them with an education. As a mother of two young daughters who are women of colour, I am personally, deeply concerned about the presence of police officers within our schools. I would like my children to go to school and to be greeted by community workers and public health nurses. I would like intercultural support workers to be there. I would like additional supports for nonviolent crisis intervention. I would like our children to learn about restorative justice and dialogue and other ways of resolving conflict. And I would like our children to understand that their education and their learning exists in a space that is safe for everyone because if it is not safe for every single child in that school, then it shouldn't be there. And so, with the support of nearly 100 community organizations in Winnipeg, we've brought forward a briefing. And one of the recommendations as I stated earlier is to end this program. In the very least today, I am asking you to please delay the decision and give adequate time and engage an impartial third-party to undertake the review so that together we can engage in a dialogue with enough opportunity for every voice to be heard. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Dorota. We appreciate your presentation today. Thank you for making the time. Mr. Clerk, our next delegation.

Clerk: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Our next delegation to be heard in opposition to the motion moved by Councillor Chambers and seconded by Councillor Mayes regarding the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer Program, is Daniel Friesen. Mr. Friesen, if you'll unmute your microphone, you have five minutes, no questions following. Good morning. We can hear you. Please proceed.

Daniel Friesen: Okay, thank you. I'm here today presenting on behalf of Winnipeg Police Cause Harm, a community-centered police abolitionist group organising on Treaty One Territory. We're committed to de-funding the Winnipeg Police Service and reallocating resources to life sustaining services. The administrative report for today's motion states that it's created in consultation with the Legal Services Department and the Winnipeg Police Board. There is no indication if the people most affected by police in schools were consulted, if they feel that SROs are a good use of public funds or if the SROs are a wanted presence in schools. I'm here to implore council not to renew the SRO contracts before there has been an equitable, independent, community-centered consultation with those most affected by policing in our city. Over the last number of weeks, there has been ample public discourse about the role of police in schools. It is clear that this is an issue that many people have not previously considered or felt empowered to speak up about until now. Across Canada, the role of police in schools is being questioned. Vancouver, Toronto, Hamilton and Edmonton, all recently opted to end or suspend their police in schools program as a result of community concerns like the ones we've been hearing in Winnipeg. As you'll remember, the vote on this motion was already delayed as several councillors felt that the report was rushed and there was inadequate time to consider it. I want to thank council for delaying the vote and for allowing additional delegations today. I also want to encourage you to continue to listen by seeking out the full impacts of the SRO program

through an independent review. To not do so is a deliberate exclusion of stakeholders. Council and school administrators' unquestioning acceptance of the SRO program as wholly good, brings into question whose voices council values and is willing to hear specifically when discussing the role of police. Of course, there are people with positive experiences with SROs, but their stories do not negate the lived experiences of primarily racialized, marginalized and low-income students who have had negative experiences. People from different backgrounds experience police very differently and to deny that reality, even passively, devalues their experience. No one should have to feel threatened at school, especially not in the name of comfort for others. When the decision-makers are all unequivocally supportive of the SRO program, it creates a difficult environment for people to come forward with dissent or negative experiences, knowing that they will only be met with dismissal or denial of their experience. An often repeated line is that the school divisions are requesting SROs and council is just fulfilling the request. Again, I would ask you to consider that majority white and economically well-off administrators do not have the same experience with police as students from marginalized communities. Even if SROs are requested by divisions, it is council's responsibility alongside school boards, to ensure that the programs actually have the intended outcomes and are the best options for students. The popularity of SROs among administrators speaks more to how under-resourced other community supports are. One SRO salary could pay for 450 tablets for students who can't afford a device for remote learning, 44 sets of text books so students wouldn't have to share resources, a remote learning teacher to instruct immunocompromised students or an outdoor education coordinator to facilitate learning in outdoor environments as per provincial pandemic recommendations. Though it is not council's job to determine how school divisions spend their money, it is important that council, both as leaders of and on behalf of their communities, consider a program's full ramifications. The goal of the SRO program is stated as, "To strengthen relationships between communities and police." Yet I've never heard it questioned by council why these relationships are in need of strengthening in the first place. Negative attitudes towards the police come from the negative impacts of policing on communities. We know that racialized people are disproportionately targeted and criminalized by police and society at large. It is naïve to assume that this would not also be the case in schools. To quote Councillor Nason, "Police are taking on more in the community than they need to." Why then are we expecting them to be educators, guidance counsellors, and internet safety instructors; roles they're not trained to fulfill and do so at a much higher cost than professionals who are actually trained to do them. It is clear that council has not taken time to consider the full implications of the SRO program and I'm urging you to conduct a review in consultation with community through an equity lens in contrast with similar programs across Canada that have also been recently reviewed or suspended. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Friesen. We appreciate your presentation today. Mr. Clerk, our next delegation.

Clerk: This concludes the delegations, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Great, thank you. We'll now move on to reports of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21st, 2020. Noting we do have an amending Motion No. 2 on Item 5 – The Joint Venture. Mr. Mayor.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 21, 2020**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I want to just begin by thanking all of the delegates for coming in and adding their voice today to the matters in which they were speaking. I'll introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 22. I would like to pull, Madam Speaker, matter 3, matter 14, and matter 17, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gillingham, 18? Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Sixteen.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Twenty one, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I saw some hands up over here, maybe the items have been pulled? Okay, okay. Councillor Nason, 5 has been pulled, yes. Okay, with that, I'll call the question on Item 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 through 10...pardon me, that would be longer, 11 through 13, 15, 19, 20 and 22. Correct, Mr. Clerk? All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Mayor. Mr. Clerk, Item 3.

Item 3 – Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, we heard from many delegates on the importance of our reconciliation efforts and I want to thank them for adding their voice here today. We have been...our community has been on a journey of reconciliation for many, many years. And I want to thank my council colleagues, this council and previous council for their leadership in supporting the work of our Indigenous Advisory Circle. Also, of course, our ongoing efforts with our Indigenous Relations Division. I believe today is Cindy Blackstock's birthday if my online viewing was accurate. Cindy is someone who has been extremely instrumental in helping guide the work of the Indigenous Accord and the inclusion of school children at the Millennium Library for a visioning exercise. It resulted in the Indigenous Accord. Quite often we hear from community leaders that they want to support the work of reconciliation, but they don't know where to begin. The answer to that from our perspective is...the start can be simply joining as a partner to Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord. The Indigenous Accord is a non-descriptive pledge that organizations and individuals make to do their part in a manner that they feel is appropriate for themselves and for their organizations to implement the calls to action in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. I also want to thank my council colleague, Councillor Sherri Rollins and others for supporting the inclusion of considerations for Indigenous Accord partners to consider the calls to justice in the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls Report. And I want to thank all of those organizations that have signed on as accord partners recently. We know that there are roughly 200 organizations or nearly 200 organizations, that have signed on. And they're doing really good work in the community. I want to thank them. Especially during this year when efforts are so stretched. Resources are so stretched as we deal with COVID-19 in our community. There is a lot of good work happening in the community. It doesn't always have to involve government. It doesn't always have to involve municipal government or tax dollars. This is about creating that ripple effect in the community to spur positive change. And I want to thank this council. Every single member of this council has been supportive of that work. They're demonstrating leadership and I want to thank them. I want to thank the Public Service and all of those organizations involved. And I would ask all those that have not joined the Indigenous Accord as partners in the community, what are you waiting for? Join today. Sign up and join us on this journey of reconciliation. And that includes not-for-profit, for-profit organizations, other levels of government and the media. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any other speakers on this item? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll try and be blunt given the long agenda here today. I don't always agree with the Mayor. I don't agree with the statements he's made that it was all a mess here when he took over. I do, however, have to say, the Mayor deserves a lot of credit for bringing this in. This was something that came in under his first term and has been continued. I do think it has helped in a number of ways and some of that is just changing the lens a bit. A term I usually hate, but it has helped us, I think with that the mattress recycling program that we found a way to do that because we knew as an Indigenous employer and we wanted to work with them. So I think maybe it hasn't changed the world. Maybe we need more people to join in, but it's something. It's a good faith effort. I think the Mayor does deserve some credit for that. And I just...I wanted to say that. I didn't say it at EPC and I wanted to note it today because it is something that came in. We didn't have it prior to 2014. So we now have this accord. More people join each year. I think something is happening. I feel it's changed my view as a, perhaps, beyond middle-aged white male to look at some of the projects in my ward and say, well no, I might have said no to that five years ago, I'm going to say yes to that this time. So thanks to the Mayor on this. I think it's been...I think it's been a success. It's a long journey ahead, but it's a starting point at least.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. If it takes an Indigenous Accord for us to look at...in the current day in terms of a lens by which we look differently in terms of employment opportunities and industry for Indigenous people, if that's what it takes, it's a good thing and that's why I've been supporting these things. Bear in mind, Madam Speaker, we are here to support each other. We're here to challenge each other, Madam Speaker. And it wouldn't be really sincere of me sort of to go along with the same business, something new. Maybe it is for us in the current era for the city. But as a white male, I would like to say that has been heartening to see over decades the progress being made on these things. We're doing this now, we're saying through the lens of the Indigenous Accord here in the City of Winnipeg in the 2010s, the 2020s, it's all very good, Madam Speaker. But I have a sense of history and a sense of progress and to judge ourselves right now...we can say we're a more progressive society right now, but 50 years ago we were already doing this in various capacities through the Province of Manitoba, through the Provincial Government. Don't forget that. If we forget our history, we forget where we're going. I'm not going to say...I just can't say that we're in a progressive...an especially progressive era right now when it comes to issues of Indigenous industry and these types of considerations. We're continuing on it. We're part of the process of progress. And I can't say it any better than that. If there are any concerns about what I'm saying, as if I'm trying to diminish what we're doing, please let me know. My concern is that we stand by our laurels or we just say we're doing good things, we're being progressive and leave it at that. The challenge continues, Madam Speaker.

We're continuing with that. And on that basis, that's why I support the Indigenous Accord and the lens by which we give greater consideration here at this time through the City of Winnipeg for those things that our obligation has been, you know, for generations to come, independent of this Indigenous Accord, and for generations previously that got us to this point. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? I'll call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 5.

Item 5 – Joint Venture

Madam Speaker: This has amending Motion No. 2 to go with it which is moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Klein. Mr. Mayor to introduce and we'll follow with the mover of the Motion 2.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to start by thanking our Finance Chair. Councillor Gillingham has been a very responsible and collaborative steward of that portfolio. And I note that the motion before us refers this matter to the 2021 budget review process so that it can be considered in the context of our balanced budget legislation and through the context of the updates to the four-year or multi-year balanced budget. I see the amending motion would make that decision today. I won't be supporting the amendment, but I'll be supporting that it be considered as part of the budget review process and would invite all members of council to support the original motion. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Klein...or Councillor Nason, pardon me, to introduce the amending Motion 2.

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

THAT Recommendation 1 of Item No 5 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21, 2020 be deleted and replaced with the following:

1. *That \$975,000 of the proceeds from the Edgecorp – City of Winnipeg Joint Venture and the Transcona West Ward Joint Venture be allocated to fund the following projects in the Transcona Ward:*
 - A. *\$275,000 to renew the gravel running track on city property adjacent to Bernie Wolfe School.*
 - B. *\$200,000 towards renewal of Kildonan Meadows Park South including accessibility features*
 - C. *\$100,000 towards renewal of Kern Park including accessibility features*
 - D. *\$100,000 towards renewal of Paulicelli Park including accessibility features*
 - E. *\$100,000 towards renewal of Cedar Ranch Park including accessibility features*
 - F. *\$100,000 towards renewal of Victor Valde Park including accessibility features*
 - G. *\$100,000 towards renewal of Lagimodiere Park including accessibility features*

Councillor Nason: Thank you. I want to thank the Mayor for his comments about referring to the budget. We've got other items that will be before us a little bit later, that are in-year changes; the legal fees. We've got almost \$3 million of legal fees that are in-year changes that are going to be discussed later today. I hope that he, too, moves those to the Budget Committee for further review. You know, this joint venture was one that has seen three times the actual realization of funds. It was expected to be about 6 million for just one of these joint ventures. It's turned out to be 21 million. So a significant windfall that wasn't budgeted for. Again, if growth is to be paying for growth, it should also pay for renewal. I'm simply looking to renew parks that are in our area. There is a track...last month we...or last council meeting we approved a crack...a track in Old Kildonan. I'm simply looking to renew a track. I'm looking to renew several playgrounds with accessibility features. Transcona is a very old community. There is several new areas. We need to renew. I'm simply looking for ways to do that within the funds that have been realized unexpectedly from the ward to be returned for renewal in the ward. Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to start off by saying that I'm jealous that there is no joint ventures in the Mynarski Ward. But I've discussed this with...the amending motion. I've discussed it with the mover and I've thought it through, Madam Speaker. And, Madam Speaker, I'm aware of motions that I've made and I think we've made motions where we've sold off property at a profit, and but we made sure that some of the money, for example, went into establishing a local improvement for sidewalks or for...I was looking at trying to sell a piece of property with the net proceeds going into Land Dedication Reserve so we could upgrade some parks. Those kind of items are kind of what we deal with in...at least in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan area that I'm aware of. And as I think this through and this particular joint venture has been quite successful. And maybe some day Mynarski and Point Douglas will realize some kind of a brown fill joint venture deal to make money related around the CPR rail yards moving one day. I don't know, Madam Speaker. But it seems to me that what's being proposed here...and it's very detailed. I don't think any of us can say that those projects are unworthy or shouldn't be done. Any of them. I think they're very important. It's not taking away the money. I don't know what specifically was identified as revenue for 2021 in this joint venture that has exceeded...and what the projections were for the budget, but I have to say that I'm going to support the amendment today that is being proposed by the councillor. And...because really, that awful four-year budget reduced parks...our park enhancement and rehab fund...got reduced. Things like Community Incentive Grant programs, which don't really pertain to parks, however, you know, there has been continual reductions in the ability for councillors to find money to make sure that the people in their wards are getting the kind of service that they expect and facilities that they can use. Again, I'm kind of jealous that this is here, but I have to say...I have to say that...actually, I would like to see it shared a little more, councillor...Speaker Sharma. We were able to share a Land Dedication Reserve as Old Kildonan expands and we share that amongst the whole city, but as well, amongst our three wards. But I digress. So I'll be supporting this amendment. If the amendment doesn't pass, then I won't be supporting the report at all. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you for the opportunity to speak, Madam Speaker. Unfortunately, I'm just seeing this right now, this morning, because I know there is a formula and that's why I was asking the questions and hopefully the mover can answer some of them at the end. Councillor Eadie brings up a very good point. The formula is based upon the fact that certain wards that have the opportunity to have these joint ventures, they don't get to hoard all the money themselves. It has to go into different pockets including City pockets, which are LOR; Land Operating Reserve, what we use to purchase lands and there are other formulas in there. I would have followed up with the department if I had more time to ask those kind of questions about, is adding another \$975,000 to all worthy projects. I think and councillor here could come up with a list of a million dollars worth of very worthy projects. That's not complicated at all. That's not my issue. Again, I'm not sure about...still have a little problem about the City putting in the running track, but again, I think we've crossed that circle, made that pass already that we're more than happy to invest money to school division properties and we do it all the time with play structures. So that is kind of okay. So again, I won't get into the details of it. My problem, though, really is if this money is allocated to the Transcona Ward exclusively, does that come off the LOR or where does that money come from? I don't know. I've asked the administration right now to give me a readback on that. However, he is...the councillor from Transcona is absolutely correct. This project is going along very well. You know, I used to make comments about who wants to live in Transcona? Lots of people want to live in Transcona. That's definitely being seen by the development that's happened out there. It's quite amazing. The idea of reinvestment; we have Councillor Allard's motion and I think it was Councillor Mayes in a moment of collaboration, talking about reinvesting for infill as well. How do we get some money back and some back to those neighbourhoods that are developing and encourage them to continue to develop and give them a little love back with some money back to their own local wards. It's not that much similar...dissimilar to that. So I'm not raising any huge red flags on this, I'm just not sure where that...if that's the allocation that's part of the agreement. If it's available, if it's already been allocated to other sources? Is it part of our budget? I know the LOR has been used to help balance some of our budget off. What kind of impact this has down the line. So those are some of my concerns that I don't have here because this is just an amending motion that went to it. But maybe Councillor Nason would be able to clarify for me.

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

Councillor Mayes: Virtually everything everyone has said has been factually correct, it's just in how you look at it. I actually think Nason is correct...Councillor Nason is correct on this. The larger issue here being there has been a joint venture...two joint ventures in his ward that have poured money into the Land Operating Reserve. This is not the Land Dedication where your community committee gets 80% and each of the others gets 5% as a way of dividing up. This is a different thing. This is money from a joint venture going to the Land Operating Reserve. Councillor...the motion is factually correct. The River Park South joint venture poured about \$18 million into the City's coffers. And variously working with Councillor Swandel, Councillor Lukes and Councillor Chambers from the adjacent ward to mine, with some of that money was retained for the benefit of south St. Vital. Proud of it. Money came out of the development there and I think that was appropriate just as I think Councillor Nason is right in looking for some of this. That said, it also, as Councillor Gillingham would probably say, should go through the budget process. And that's...so I don't support the amendment with some

reluctance, but I will support and go to bat for this in the budget process, partly because there is a running track. And interestingly, Councillor Orlikow is not quite right, that's actually one of the few tracks that's on City property, though it's adjacent to Bernie Wolfe School. Councillor Nason is right, that is on City property. So quite right, I think, to look to upgrade that pretty decrepit running track. And my thanks to Councillor Nason for being interested in that project. So everyone is right to some extent. There is a precedence; Councillor Nason spotted this right away when went to the joint venture meeting, when I was still Chair of Planning. He knew that some of the money from the one in River Park South had been kept for the benefit of River Park South. I think, perhaps, even some of the money from that went to the tennis court announcement that Councillor Chambers and I did yesterday in Dakota which is a little above River Park South, but a lot of the students come from the River Park South. So I think it's a fair. I think it's a fair request from Councillor Nason. That said, I think it will need to be weighed up in the budget process. So Councillor Orlikow and others, and Councillor Eadie, everyone has I think been factually right to an extent. There are land dedication monies to pay in and then get doled out to different wards. This is different, though, this is joint venture. Well, how have we handled this in other parts of the city? Nason is right. In St. Vital some of the benefit was kept for St. Vital. I think that's fair. Lord knows and Councillor Lukes and I have said this many times, we've certainly heard many speakers claim that it's all just a drain, the suburbs are just soaking money out of the other parts of the city. Well, well, factually, this is two different joint ventures from the suburbs, both of which have benefitted the Land Operating Reserve by tens of millions of dollars. I know some people, MaryAnn Mihychuk, certainly went to the Dakota Collegiate and then represented the north and I'm sure understood that the suburbs including the south have poured money into the Land Operating Reserve and it's been distributed throughout the city. So I think it's a fair request from Councillor Nason. Reluctantly, I can't support the amendment, but I do think this is something we should give serious consideration to. Frankly, it would be hypocritical of me to say otherwise having had the benefit of some of the money from the River Park South joint venture in some very important moments to help the Dakota Community Centre and to help the Dakota Collegiate. So, my thanks to Councillor Nason for bringing this forward, but I can't support the amendment, but certainly feel we should give this serious consideration in the budget process.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I agreed to second this motion not just because it's Councillor Nason, but in looking at the motion, it reminded me over the last two years of being in office of what I'm witnessing. And we're going to be taking some money from LDR for trees because that's a project that some are very...it is very near and dear to their heart, and everyone is going to support that because everyone is talking about that right now. And the other thing that really has been bothering me is that we came together as one city. All these cities merged and we became Winnipeg. One great city. But unfortunately, we don't act as one great council. We just don't. We can say it all we want. We can keep pretending that we do. But we don't. We're not involved as councillors in how money is spent in the budget. We're asked, but there was a budget meeting yesterday or the day before; we weren't involved in it. Not all of us. And we know that. Not trying to bring that up again, but that's a fact. So we're not one great council. We're not one great city, are we? This is a motion that is taking money that was developed and earned in a ward...in a ward that the residents of that ward elected a representative to work on their behalf, the same as the people in St. James did, the same as the people in every ward in this city did. And each and every one of you, I believe, should have a say of what happens in your ward equally. Not just at the end when we get here. Because we know when we get here, it's all predetermined. So I see this as an opportunity for this councillor who represents the great people of Transcona to take the money that was earned in the ward and spend it on viable projects. Why...why is it the decision of EPC for everything? Why is it the Budget Working Group now that has to decide upon this? Where in the budget line...because I looked through it for a week, trying to see, here's this joint venture and this is where all that money is going. We don't have that kind of detail. We pretend like we do, but we don't. We should, but we don't. We should be able to look at this as a joint venture, agree to this as one great council because I'm sure each and every one of you, if you had a joint venture, as Councillor Eadie spoke to, we could be benefitting our own wards. Councillor Lukes fighting for a...you know, a fire station, for a community centre. What else? I mean, she'll probably be fighting for a train station, a bus station, an airport. Who knows, right? But that's her ward and that's what she's fighting for. I'm asking you to take a look at it from the outside. We don't have a say of what goes on in the budget really. We don't have the opportunity to sit equally at the table. This is fair and reasonable. And why can't we be one great council? And one great city? This makes sense. It's simple.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. For the record, everybody around Council has a say on the budget. Every year, Council votes on the budget. It'll be no different this year. Every councillor, if they're in attendance, one way or another will get a say in voting on the budget. In addition to that, and I'll speak to this matter here, I have already set up meetings with...or at least extended invitations to every councillor to meet with them regarding the 2021 budget. I look forward to all councillors' input on the budget. Related to this matter before us, while I certainly can appreciate Councillor Nason's desire and some of the projects he's identified here...I appreciate his desire to invest joint venture funds...reinvest them in his community. That's laudable, and I do appreciate that. I won't be supporting his amending motion. I will be supporting the original motion to take this matter up as part of the 2021 budget deliberations. I think it's important also

though to point out that we're in a crisis, a pandemic and as part of that pandemic...we're addressing the pandemic, we've developed a crisis cash flow management plan that we have been following and sticking to the plan. In that plan, as part of the tier one set of levers, there is the transfer of unallocated equity from the Land Operating Reserve of \$8 million. So we have used the Land Operating Reserve balance to assist the City with navigating through and making it through the financial crunch that we are facing because of COVID-19. And we're not out of the woods yet. And so, it would be the most prudent decision to bring this matter that the Councillor Nason is looking at, to the budget review process where we can take a look and see if there are any funds currently available, unallocated within the Land Operating Reserve or if the entirety of those funds right now is using...is being utilized by the City of Winnipeg to assist us in managing through these unprecedented financial times that we're facing. And so I will not be supporting the amending motion. I will be supporting the original motion to discuss this as part of the 2021 budget update. And again, I look forward to the participation of all councillors in various ways in the 2021 budget as we do every year. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So it looks like here the motion without the amendment, we're taking away from a joint venture in a way that we haven't before. And of course, the money is always shared to some degree or some equation with the rest of the city. It was my understanding that the joint venture was consistent with the joint ventures we've had in the past. However, Councillor Gillingham has explained that due to economic budgetary pressures, we have to re-evaluate how we use the joint venture funds. It's been a privilege for me to sit as a member of another Transcona joint venture and to get some insights into this. I do have to state, it's really important if we're going to understand the budget process, what has been going on here for years and to give context to what I've been saying since elected, you know, almost six years ago, is that we have a budgetary process that was unsustainable. And if you look at the process, the progress...progress in the sense of year by year, I wouldn't call it progressive, Madam Speaker, but if you look at what has been happening for years, even before Mayor Bowman and I were elected six years ago, but including the last six years, there is a pattern of increasing taxes, increasing fees, increasing fines. Whatever we do to increase the revenue from the City, including...including raising the rates for water...our water rates. Increasing the dividend from that and using it for general revenue to an extent that is unprecedented. But everything I'm talking about, Madam Speaker, is pre-COVID. So what is going on, Madam Speaker, was already going to happen, maybe to a greater extent now because of COVID, but it was already happening. Mark my words. Show me how I'm wrong. I've been talking about this every single year for six years. It happened before we were elected for most of us...before most of us were elected. In fact, it was happening before any of us here were elected. It's not just about us. I'm just saying, we haven't been really dealing with the problem. So to some we can say that COVID enhances the dilemma, no doubt about it, Madam Speaker, but before COVID we already had a systemic problem with increasing our taxes, our rates, our fees, our fines, our fees and reducing our services. So we're talking about wanting to deal with this in a budgetary...bring it up as part of the budgetary process, as part of the conversation process in terms of where this money should go. Well, I can see...it's not...I'm not surprised this is where Council is going. This is where we've been going for years. I've been saying this for six years. So this is another manifestation. But if you look at the graphs and charts in terms of increasing our revenues, decreasing services, COVID is merely a single factor, because it was already happening. Let's not forget that. Because if we think it's just COVID, we're not really dealing with how we got here. So Madam Speaker, we're talking about a crisis. And at what point do we call it a crisis? Madam Speaker, I've been talking about it for years how we have certain inflation rates...it's not just me, but I'm the only one, actually, who has put out a report on...a preliminary report, a simple report, Madam Speaker, on the issue of construction inflation, how it's been the largest rate of inflation and including the largest factor on the pressures to increase our budgetary revenue from the people of Winnipeg, from the taxpayers of Winnipeg. And yet, getting less out of it. And if we're going to have a budgetary review on allocation of this joint venture revenue, if it's going to be meaningful, Madam Speaker, we have to take a look at what has been the primary...the pressures on our budget. We've talked about the firefighters. We've talked about our police service budget. We've spent a lot of money negotiating with police services and talking about that economic pressure, but it's not the largest one, Madam Speaker. It's not. It's construction inflation. It's been happening for years, it's been happening for decades. It's been happening for the last six years. We haven't done anything about it. We haven't discussed it. In fact, I asked Council to put in an amendment a couple...a few years ago to a motion to allow for the City of Winnipeg to do a report on construction inflation. The amendment didn't pass Council, Madam Speaker. So we're choosing not to have that knowledge of the greatest increase on budgetary pressures of the City of Winnipeg for the last half dozen years and more. We've decided against it, Madam Speaker. So I've said before in this council, Madam Speaker, that what worries me is that we're willing to play politics to try and get a bigger piece of the pie for our individual wards is my fear. But from what is a dwindling pie, all pre-COVID, Madam Speaker, and that's what I see here. We're doing this again. Now, it's not wrong for us to bring this up as part of the budgetary consultation and conversation, but Madam Speaker when we're talking about this...what I'm saying is this is an expression of something that was inevitable because it's been going on for years. We're...we...there is a smaller pie for all the services that we need to sustain. Just to sustain them. Not to increase them, just to sustain them and we're not. Thus, Madam Speaker, just as we're...now we have the Million Tree Challenge. It's a good thing, but the Million Tree Challenge is because we can only...the City only has the budget right now we've decided, because it's a difficult decision. We all have to make the difficult decisions here, Madam Speaker, on the budget. The City of Winnipeg only replants 1 for every 2 trees that they

have to cut down. And that's a significant budgetary problem for the City of Winnipeg, but that's where we're at. Thus, we're trying to deal more directly with the community in using other avenues to try and deal with this environmental challenge of maintaining our tree canopy for the city. So it's not a wrong thing. It's just an expression of a problematic...a systemic problem with the budget and here's another one. I'm going to support the amendment in this case...and even if the amendment doesn't pass, I'm still going to support the motion, because we have to have the conversation. But my fear is we're not going to deal with the budget consultation properly, but let's try at least given what I've been saying for the last few years including right now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Seeing the hour, we're now going to recess and reconvene at 1:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
September 30, 2020, at 1:42 p.m.**

Clerk: Councillor Allard, can you hear me? You can turn on your video and mic, we're going to be starting momentarily. Councillor Allard, are you there?

Councillor Allard: Yeah, I'm here. I'm just playing with my cat whose...gets to sit here.

Clerk: Welcome.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of September 30th, 2020. We are on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21st, 2020. It's Item 1...pardon me, Item 5, Joint Venture. Councillor Lukes, you are our next speaker.

Councillor Lukes: Ah, yes. All right. Just give me a moment please. Correct, all right. This is in regards to Councillor Nason's motion. So to speak to Councillor Nason's motion regarding the Joint Venture. Regrettably, the 20-year old governance model we work under does not allow equal representation during the budget process. Claims can be made, but the fact of the matter is, many, many private briefings with staff are not allowed for some members of Council, but they are allowed for others who sit on the Executive Policy Committee. I know because I sat on the Mayor's Executive Policy Committee for two years. The level of information I received during the budget process was far more extensive than what I receive now in helping me make well-informed decisions. But even...almost more importantly than the information or equally as important as the information, I had the ability to influence the decisions being made during the draft budget process. And I had the ability to challenge decisions before they went into the draft print version of the budget. Now, because I'm not a member of the Budget Working Group or a member of the Executive Policy Committee, I do not have that same level of influence on the budget process or ability to challenge decisions. I do appreciate Councillor Gillingham's effort to reach out and I always take him up on his efforts to reach out during the budget process to bring forward my concerns for the constituents of the Waverley West Ward. In 2015, 600,000 of proceeds from the City-Quilico-River Park South Joint Venture was allocated to the Dakota Collegiate Alumni Field Project. This motion of Councillor Mayes and mine was sent to the budget process, but at that point in time, Madam Speaker, both Mayes and I sat on EPC and were involved in the budget process and the entire 600,000 was approved. I'll leave it up to your imagination on the conversations that occurred. So without a doubt, Councillor Mayes and I had influence and we had discussions as EPC members in the budget process on whether the 600,000 or not was included. So, you know, this is a...this is an interesting realm that we're in that we have to vote on this today. I'm going to listen to see what other people have to say. I completely understand where Councillor Nason is coming from. I do also understand that we're in a pandemic and I do understand...I see transit buses going by empty continually on the southwest rapid transit corridor. And we are in more dire financial straits than we normally would be during a budget process. So I'm going to listen to what other people say and then decide how I will vote on this, but you know, without a doubt, we do not have that same amount of influence and ability to discuss funding during the budget process.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Nason, do you wish to close?

Councillor Nason: I do, Madam Chair. You know, Councillor Lukes just alluded to empty buses driving by. We know that the budget, unfortunately, did result in Transit cuts in Transcona. So hopefully those will be addressed as part of this update. You know, the multi-year budget and that process isn't as open, transparent, engaging as we'd like. You know, the group that's assigned to that do have an undertaking. They spend a lot of time in a room, hopefully with pencils and erasers because we know, we know for a fact that there's math errors in this multi-year budget. That when it came out

after all that time spent, there were issues with the math on the U-Pass program. Millions of dollars that were badly calculated. You know, we also had legal decisions that were accounted for within that multi-year budget for the police pension. That has to be accounted for. Now we have COVID and we have \$8 million that have been taken from the Land Operating Reserve. We have prep money that has been cut and has been flipped to debt. So, you know, I'm asking for around 5% of what has come in since 2005 as part of a very profitable program, a very profitable partnership. Now, you know, if the Chair of the Budget Working Group and Chair of Finance is promising that we're going to see that very clearly articulated in the budget, great. I'll accept...I'll accept him at his word on that. This was on the EPC agenda. I appeared at EPC. Not one question was asked of me. I approached the Chair of Finance to talk to him to see what his thoughts are with regards to this because I was warned that it would likely get referred to the Budget Working Group. I wanted to have dialogue. I received silence. So as we try to work collaboratively or at least present that we work collaboratively, we need to actually put that to work. I'm trying. I get frustrated. My voice gets raised at time, but I'm trying here. I'm presenting a fair and reasonable approach to a million dollars out of \$21 million. How can we stand against Transcona to realize some of the proceeds of a very growing community that needs this infrastructure for our residents? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, thanks Madam Speaker. Just heard the comment, "Standing against Transcona". I'm very proud to support record road renewal, for example, much of which is happening in Transcona. Local councillor opposed that vote, voted against it. I'm grateful for the leadership of our Finance Chair. The majority of members of Council who have supported Transcona with record investments, sizeable investments in infrastructure and I'm going to continue to champion that in every corner of the city. The motion that is before us does refer to the budget process so it can be reviewed by the Budget Working Group. The Charter, obviously, sets out the responsibilities for the budget to be tabled by Executive Policy Committee. And then, it's debated and scrutinized by Council as a whole. The one thing I will say is I appreciated the work and the leadership of our former council colleague, Councillor Marty Morantz. I thought he took some really positive steps forward to draft up budgets that were more inclusive of all members of Council. Councillor Gillingham has really taken it to another level. His collaborative approach is the reason why after two years of seeing him operate not on Executive Policy Committee, I thought a change would be required because we wanted a more collaborative approach and he's been providing that. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Motion 2.

Councillor Eadie: Recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Call for a recorded vote. All in favour of Councillor Nason's amending Motion No. 2.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Lukes, Nason, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillor Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, and Councillor Santos

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 2 is defeated. And now onto the main item, Item 2, the Joint Venture. Item 5, pardon me. All in favour? Contrary? Okay, it's carried. Mr. Clerk. You'll have to say you'd like to be recorded in opposition, Councillor Klein, and that was Councillor Eadie as well. Thank you. That's if they wish to be recorded in opposition. Okay, I didn't hear that. Mr. Clerk.

Item 14 – 24/7 Safe Space Grant Program

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Thanks, Madam Speaker. Very proud to support this today. I want to thank the efforts of many of my council colleagues, especially all those that voted for the budget which included a million dollars to support new 24/7 safe spaces. And I want to commend the leadership Councillor Rollins as well as Councillor Santos, who I know really championed this. Councillor Gilroy has been a champion from day one for not only these organizations that will be receiving

funding provided the support is there, but also for her leadership in terms of the UN Safe Cities Initiative. Winnipeg's been a leader in how we design and build a city through the lens of protecting women in our community in particular. There's more work to do, of course, but this is monies that were identified or at least the initiative for 24/7 safe space was identified in the Illicit Drug Strategy as something that we could provide leadership for. The Illicit Drug Strategy, of course, is something that we lead on. We invited the Province and the Federal Government to be participants and to work collaboratively with us. As far as we know, it's the only such initiative in the country and one that, quite frankly, I'd like to see more of where we can work with other levels of government on something that is, strictly speaking, not in our area of jurisdiction, but we still have a role to play. The monies that are identified here will provide 100 and...well, \$150,000 each year for four years to Ka Ni Kanichihk, an organization...used to serve on the board of directors and have a great appreciation for the work of their staff and their volunteers. Spence Neighbourhood Association is to receive \$100,000 each year for four years for the West End 24/7...24-hour safe space. Let's keep in mind, of course, one of the benefits of the four-year balanced budget is organizations, in this case, can receive stable funding for a four-year period. So they can spend less time writing reports and applying for funds, and more time providing the services that we all know we need more of in our community. And so, appreciate the support to date from Council for this. The leadership of many councillors to get us to today's vote. And looking forward to making a decision today and flowing these dollars as soon as possible, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this report allocating money for 24/7s to the facilities that are listed, Madam Speaker. And I just thought I'd rise and, you know, the budget thing is really interesting, Madam Speaker, in that one may vote against or vote for a budget, but still support efforts that happen as a result of monies being set aside, Madam Speaker. But I would also note though that this effort, which is very much needed, it is needed in other places. And I actually campaigned saying we needed to do more than that for helping these places who work with people; keep them out of harms way, provide various programming, 24/7 assistance, Madam Speaker. But, you know, COVID's here now, but I must say, when I was pushing this forward, in times of...you know, the city, the economy, people are doing really well, Madam Speaker. And yet, we still had austerity, we wouldn't move forward to help organizations provide the services that they do to keep our population in Winnipeg safe, whether you're a visitor or anything like that. But mostly related to prevention and those kind of things. So while I really appreciate this report and the work that the Budget Working Group along with some leadership; the Mayor and I can't remember which councillors, but I think the Mayor mentioned them. And I think that's great. But...and...but I think we should do more. Yeah, we have the COVID thing and there's a financial problem, but you know, we can do better for Winnipeggers. There are costs associated to the bad things that are happening out there aside from COVID. As a matter of fact, COVID is highlighted the real epidemic that we have in this city and almost, like, almost all the major cities in Canada, if not all of them, are having similar issues. And I think it's time the vision, the focus changes, Madam Speaker. But this report is great and these organizations, I know they provide what is needed on the street and I thank them, actually...thank goodness we're giving the money, but they're the ones who are going to be actually directly helping the people, so I'd like to just thank them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you Madam Speaker. I rise today in support of this report recognizing that there are individuals that, you know, have some fears about staying at places like the Main Streets...Main Street Project or the Siloam Mission, but need temporary shelter to bring them in either from the cold or to stabilize. So having the opportunity to be provided not only with temporary shelter, but for some counselling, some advice, some guidance, creating of the safe space will provide some assistance to those that are most vulnerable in our communities in the downtown context. And I'm hoping that, you know, other levels of government and other partners will see the City's leadership in this and come onboard to providing additional resources that will help in the downtown area for those suffering with mental health, with addictions, those that are trying to stay safe from other elements that are out there and provide, you know, an opportunity for them to get back on the right track. So again, I will be supporting this report. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Rollins followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to stand and recognize the allies of the IWG Working Group who have long before the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls argued for a low-barrier safe space to protect women and gender diverse peoples in Winnipeg and elsewhere. The safe space grant for We 24/7 and Ka Ni Kanichihk over four years is the type of transformative change you can do when you do a four-year budget. While we are still perfecting as a council and a Budgetary Working Group, the multi-year budget, the work of initiating and putting on its feet these safe spaces, these 24/7 spaces is critical. And we know that because the Kikininaw Ōma Strategy to support unsheltered Winnipeggers has helped to inform a new City of Winnipeg report on the current state of residents living in encampments. And as Mayor states, the 24/7 safe space was a theme in the Illicit Drug Strategy. But in turning

to the current state of residents living in encampments, it was one of the top priorities and gaps identified in that report that is still before Council as it was laid over...laid over last Protection and Community Services and Parks meeting to allow time for those community-based organizations who do such hard work in the community to protect women and gender diverse peoples and work in the 24/7 safe spaces in Winnipeg to come lend their voice, work with those unsheltered Winnipeggers to come lend their voice to Council. So I wanted to mark this moment in recognition of all the allies who've pushed this government as well as that of other governments as my colleague, Madam Speaker, Councillor Chambers points out and recognize those whom are owed the success including...including this council.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm happy to support this motion going forward. And I do want to thank all the partner agencies that have worked collaboratively on helping to make this funding a reality. And I also want to...I want to kind of highlight something that the Mayor at one time, when we were having major issues within my own ward, helped supply out of his own...out of his own money...out of his own grant to help support a 24-hour safe space, but it was one-time money. So I'm very happy that now we have ongoing funding to help women have a safe space to go. I just want to highlight some of the great work that the 24-hour safe space that Spence does. It allows youth an opportunity because they cannot go into our shelter system, because they're under 18, a safe place to go. A lot of them are couch surfing, they need to make sure that they have a safe place to go if the place that they are staying at isn't a safe spot. So I think that that's really key in those...in those centres. They can get the services and supports that they need from professionals that understand where they're coming from and can get them the helps and support they need. And I also want to really highlight some of the work Ka Ni Kanichihk does. With the UN Safe Cities, they've been a huge partner. And they started a heart medicine lodge which is a program that works with victims of violence and sexual violence. And it was so well received, but they have lineups for people to get into the program. So that's the need that we're seeing within the community. And I really want to highlight the work that these groups are doing because they are the ones that know where the supports should go, who are needing the supports, and so I'm happy that the City of Winnipeg can partner with them to make sure that they have those supports. I just want to thank this council for making this a reality. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this motion for funding for safe spaces with Ka Ni Kanichihk as well as Spence Neighbourhood Association. I think it's...looking at this as something to learn from to hopefully expand if need be. And I want to offer a financial perspective on this; we're talking about \$100,000 each year and \$150,000 each year for four years. It's not a lot of money for this type of...for what we're trying to accomplish here. Now, some people might not appreciate what can be done for \$100,000 a year or \$150,000 a year. For those individuals in those areas, it can mean their lives. And I want to offer you a comparative financial perspective. Bear in mind, in about an hour or so, within this afternoon, this council meeting, we're going to be discussing adding millions of dollars to the Legal Department. Also, bear in mind, that one thing we're not dealing with because we're talking about...when we talk about \$100,000 a year, \$150,000 a year, we don't even know how to equate that into our construction contracts because we haven't bothered to try. When the construction contracts have been doubling every single decade, way beyond the rate of regular inflation, we don't even know as a council. We don't discuss it. We don't have it on paper. We have no reports. We don't even know how to deal with \$100,000 a year extra. That's peanuts compared to what we've been adding every single year to construction contracts and this year to legal fees and to get the itemization on construction contracts, that's what I'd love to see. In this case, in terms of these important services for Ka Ni Kanichihk as well as Spence Neighbourhood, \$150,000 a year, \$100,000; very easy to understand. There it is plain. That's what we're talking about, Madam Speaker. It's not a lot of money, but there's real value for it and we can see it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? Okay, I'll call the question on Item 14. All in favour?

Mayor Bowman: Recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Okay, call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors 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: Item 14 passed unanimously. Mr. Clerk, Item 16.

Item 16 – Open Data Program

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

Mayor Bowman: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be supporting the Open Data Program. As members of Council will know, this provides our approval for adoption of the International Open Data Charter. It also continues to expand the Open Data Program by releasing additional departmental data outlined in the International Open Data Charter while respecting privacy and security concerns, Madam Speaker and that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to provide an annual report to Council detailing the progress of the City's Open Data Program and to advise of the progress in each succeeding year. I want to just thank the Public Service. Our Public Service has been...has really taken the City of Winnipeg's openness and transparency to levels we haven't seen before. It's why in the Open Cities Index we've moved from twentieth to second in the country in really just a handful of years from 2015 until last year. And there's more work to do. We continue to lead when it comes to open data, open government, and it is something that's being recognized increasingly nationally and internationally. And so, I want to thank my council colleagues for their ongoing leadership and support for our Open Data Program. I want to thank Councillor...Councillor Browaty for his leadership and his portfolio with Innovation and Economic Development and support for this, and ask for Council's support. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I will also be very brief here, but I just wanted to say that it's very exciting that the City of Winnipeg with the support of this motion here today will be signing on to the Open Data Charter. Winnipeg has done a lot of really wonderful things with various data sets that are out there and then the public or private people can take that information and do more wonderful things with it. Whether it's, you know, creating Transit apps, a whole myriad of information; assessment maps, assessment data. There is tons and tons of data that's available out there that the public can go out there and harness and can do all sorts of wonderful things with. The City hosts a hack-a-thon every year where various people within the bureaucracy go out and figure out new ways of providing better data to the public through the City itself. But again, the public has access to this information as well, it doesn't have to be internal. So the principle is wonderful. The implementation and opportunities are immense. So it's my pleasure to support this today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I vote in favour of the Open Data Charter and it's the International Open Data Charter, so part and parcel of something larger than ourselves, Madam Speaker. However, this shouldn't hold us back. His Worship has said we're leading in this country in terms of openness and transparency and I support this. Again, it's our job not just to support these things, but to challenge each other. I've said in this chamber before, Madam Speaker, that Winnipeggers don't know where the pothole budget goes. So we don't know where the allocations are in this city. We don't know by ward, by neighbourhood where we spend the pothole budget. And the pothole budget, we're talking about tens of millions a year. So I would like to see this as part of this. I assume that adopting the Charter doesn't hold us back by progressing further and allowing Winnipeggers to know how we spend the pothole budget because we don't know how we spend our pothole budget. So I vote in this in positivity, Madam Speaker, but at the same time, I'm here to challenge Council. I'm here to challenge city hall that in order to sort of be consistent with what, I believe, Winnipeggers hope this is that it would include something like...would include specifically our pothole budget. It seems simple to me, Madam Speaker. But also, another thing, what I'd like to see in terms of openness and transparency and in terms of the Open Data Charter, digging a little deeper so that Winnipeggers and all of us and every member of this council because we don't. We don't understand what specifically our...the primary budgetary pressures that are hindering us, that are pressuring us to raise taxes, fees, rates, fines, yet reducing services in many sectors of our city. Madam Speaker, you know what we could do for us to have a greater discussion on the budget in the spirit of open data is for us to include the indices of inflation that affect us the most. Madam Speaker, how would that be a contradiction to the spirit of an Open Data Charter? I look forward to that day, Madam Speaker. We talk about this being part of the progression, that we're going to progress on this every year. I hope that's true, Madam Speaker, and that's why I'm voting for it. And I just explained where specifically we should be progressing for the benefit of understanding where our money goes. Where does our pothole budget go? And what specifically are the factors of inflation on the greatest pressures on our budget, those being construction contracts. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on this item? Mr. Mayor, back to you.

Mayor Bowman: I'll...the pothole budget is in the operating budget. All members of Council have been provided with access to the general ledger. I'm sure if Councillor Schreyer needs assistance with that, our Finance Chair can provide

some assistance as can our Public Service. Not with standing that, the potholes are, you know...the potholes...we're trying to reduce the number of potholes with record road investments as well which I know Winnipeggers are increasingly recognizing and appreciating. That being said, this is a vote on open data and hopefully we can support this, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll call the question on Item 16. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 17.

Item 17 – Transfer Federal Funding Allocation under the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program from the Transit Stream to the Green Stream to fund NEWPCC Projects

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce Item 17.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today to support this administrative report. You know, reflecting on this vote today, I mean, giving some thought on just my own experience on Lake Winnipeg. My mom's family is from Victoria Beach. Family members, commercial fisherman, I spent a lot of time as a youngster pulling up nets on Lake Winnipeg and just remember how healthy the lake used to be. It has not been going in the right direction for many, many years. And if you speak with elders, if you speak with those that make their living on the lake now, they've seen a deterioration of the health of Lake Winnipeg. And so, I'm thinking about...I'm thinking about that today. And you know, for many decades there has been discussion, debate and delay on moving forward with upgrades to sewage treatment plants, the North End Sewage Treatment Plant in particular. And this...the previous council made the decision to split the project into three: phase one, phase two and phase three and decided to lead on it and we have been leading. This council has continued to support those upgrades. And I'm...much of my time, when I'm not interacting with members of Council, I'm interacting with members of other levels of government to try to secure funds and to bring them in to assist our efforts. The ISIP request that was identified about a year ago identified our number one project as the upgrades to the North End Sewage Treatment Plant. Phase Workway is underway. There was more work to do even after today's hopeful support for this vote, but let's recognize that we're making significant progress. I'm grateful for the dialogue I've had with Minister Rochelle Squires and the support of our Provincial Government partners to provide increased funding to support the North End Sewage Treatment Plant and our leadership on this file. I'm grateful for the dialogue that I've had with the Prime Minister on this. Recently Minister Catherine McKenna and Minister Dan Vandal, no stranger to members of this chamber, all of whom recognized the priority of this council, the leadership of this council, to support the upgrades to the North End Sewage Treatment Plant. This vote today would allow us to agree to a request that's been made by the Provincial Government to ask for the transfer of \$321.24 million of federal funding under the ISIP transit...public transit infrastructure stream to the green infrastructure stream to fund the Federal Government's funding portion for the upgrades. Obviously, I am supporting them. The administrative report does make the approval subject to the Province committing the total proposed provincial funding portion of \$267.68 million to support the upgrades and that the Province commit to no further reductions to Winnipeg's allocation of the remaining public transit infrastructure stream federal allocation of \$203.61 million and committing to provide the provincial funding portion to match the reduced federal allocation per cost sharing terms of the Manitoba-Canada ISIP bi-lateral agreement. I will continue to be a champion to protect those remaining funds to help support the public transportation plan that will be released next year. We're going to need the support of other levels of government to implement it. And what this administrative report does today is it tries to protect those funds as well as allow for the transfer of the \$321 million, Madam Speaker, to support the upgrades to the North End Sewage Treatment Plant. With this approval there's still more work for us to do, but let's also recognize that while 5% of the nutrient loading in Lake Winnipeg is as a result of the City of Winnipeg, there's still 95% nutrient loading from other sources, Madam Speaker. I've offered my support directly to the Prime Minister and the Premier to support in any efforts to better coordinate and motivate other municipalities and other levels of government to continue to do more to address the 95% and I'll continue to do so going forward, Madam Speaker. But hopeful that we'll be able to approve this today and be able to bring in \$321 million of federal funding to support the number one infrastructure priority of this council and the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this report as well. I just want to draw Council's attention to a statement in the administrative report that I noted at the Executive Policy Committee meeting as well. Certainly, we are required to do the upgrades at the North End Sewage Treatment Plant, the provincial legislation says it's so. So we have no...first of all, we have no choice but to do it for that reason. Second of all, surely for the health of Lake Winnipeg and the City of Winnipeg doing our part to reduce phosphorus loading and nutrient loading to the lake. For that reason, we have to do it. But there's a third reason, and it's articulated here in the report. And I want to draw it to our attention because it's not the last we're going to hear about it. In fact, we'll hear a lot more about it...this in the coming months. And that's related to capacity. In the executive summary in the third paragraph, the last sentence says, "Development in the city and the metro region is hindered by limited biosolids capacity. The biosolids facility cannot

proceed until funding is approved." And we talk about the fact that our city continues to grow even though COVID may slow the rate of growth somewhat for a time. Our population is growing, the demand on industry is growing. We also received a report not that long ago that outlined the fact that our employment lands are facing pressure. There's going to be a shortage of service to employment lands...industrial lands, in the coming years unless Council does something to enable more growth of employment lands. I've talked about the need, you know, for opening up CentrePort south, the Airport Area West Lands as prime and important industrial lands for the future growth...employment growth for the city. You know, we can talk about this in due course, but certainly, in my view, you're not going to have a lot of residential growth unless those people purchasing houses have jobs, good paying jobs, that they can earn an income from to purchase a house. So the need for the city to continue to look at opening up employment lands is certainly something that is pressing, but there's pressure on the city, and the pressure's related to capacity in the North End Sewage Treatment Plant. And so, this move, this transfer...approving this transfer of federal funding allocation is important because it will assist the City in securing the funding that is necessary to do the upgrades of phases one and two of the North End Sewage Treatment Plant to secure the funding that will hopefully, sooner rather than later, be approved. That will inevitably unlock and relieve the pressure that we have related to capacity of the North End Plant. In the coming weeks, we should have a report that comes to Council related to a Class 3 estimate on the Airport Area West Lands. All of Council today at 12:25 this afternoon received an e-mail from Morgan Vespa related to the recent stakeholder engagement summary on that. I raise that...that area of that project...just one of other...of many projects that Council has to consider...will have to consider in the coming years, but they are all related to the fact that we do have pressures on our biosolids capacity that must be addressed. This allocation would assist in...this transfer of funds would assist in getting the right amount of funding behind the project from the Federal and Provincial Government to allow us to do that work. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Councillor Nason followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Nason: I always enjoy discussion about regional planning, the capitol region. You know, this is the north and north Winnipeg sewage plant. We had an opportunity that we could have re-envisioned our city as we grow to a million, but instead, we're limiting ourselves to renovating what will be a hundred-year-old plant by the time it's upgraded. We're spending over a billion dollars to retrofit a hundred-year-old plant. Now, will it meet the needs? Yes. Will it address the challenges at Lake Winnipeg? Perhaps. There was ideas of finding a way faster. It seems that those meetings with the Province got set aside due to COVID, but dealing with the biosolids is a challenge. It's a challenge that can't wait 10 years, but that's the direction that we're going. We're reallocating money that could have re-envisioned transit, but yet, we're going to look for other sources down the road. When we're advocating for funds for the sewage plant it should be direct of the sewage plant. Now, we're borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, you know, this billion-dollar upgrade. So, of a 20 plus billion-dollar problem. We just discussed an item that was referred to the Budget Working Group that was for about the same percentage. I was asking for 5%, but it's a 95% revenue issue. Same situation here. How are we going to address the overall problem when we don't seem to be working on the comprehensive plan? We're, you know, piecemealing this project, trying to cobble the money together, we need a complete plan for this. We need to know how it's funded. We're working the ends against the middle. The Feds has given us this, the Province has given us this, we're going to allocate it towards that. We need to find a complete plan to address this. I hope there's better plans than this in the future.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to...I'm supporting this report, Madam Speaker. I think I'll start off with mentioning that the speeches I've been hearing so far have referred to that we're talking all of north Winnipeg and capital region north of north Winnipeg and a little bit west probably, Madam Speaker. I don't think it's a big thing in our license to change the name of it to just North Winnipeg Sewage Plant. That would make me feel more comfortable because, you know, we're spending a billion...one point something billion dollars, it sounds like we're spending it on the North End, we're not. It's for all of Winnipeg and it's going to be for the northern parts of the capital region. And I just thought I'd pick up, just really quickly, on one item and that is, we do have that contract with West St. Paul to provide the sewage things. And the thing about the capacity is right, we have to build something that's going to last way into the future and that's why it's going to cost \$1.8 billion or estimated 1.8. I'm sure they're way overestimating, Madam Speaker, because nobody wants to know what it would be like if it went over \$1.8 billion in budget. That wouldn't be a very good thing. But Madam Speaker, I was questioned, actually, by people in West St. Paul just now starting to pay to have their sewer service installed in a part of West St. Paul. And the first question I had was, like, well, you're renovating it, do you even have the capacity to add what's in West St. Paul right now? I couldn't answer the question completely, but I think it does. I just...like, this is a way larger plan. The license says we couldn't use the cheaper process which our dean of Council has pointed out to us that there's much cheaper methods, but the licensing states that it has to end up being a certain way. And so, therefore, we're building it a certain way that will last, hopefully, another 100 years and protect our lakes and the rivers of the pollutants that come from there. So I just wanted to mention that. This is the deal we get if we want the money to move ahead with this project, which is priority. I totally agree, this was a big issue when I was running in 2018. People were really angry, they kept saying we're not doing nothing and then they're getting angry when we add money to the cost of their water sewage bills. But that aside, it is a very expensive project but it needs to be done right

and so I know that there's a lot of good work happening from when I was on Water and Waste, Madam Speaker. So anyway, I don't understand why we're even discussing. This is pretty well straightforward. It's the deal we get. That's how we get the Fed money faster so that we can move ahead faster so that we can try to make everybody happy and we can expand our economy and provide more homes for the people of Winnipeg and employment. So thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to rise in support of this report. Recently, over the past couple of years, I feel like have become an interceptor expert on what's going on underneath the ground and to raise a broader awareness on the significance of insuring the treatment plant is expanded and progresses. Like Councillor Gillingham notes, the Airport Area West lands are being looked at to become serviced and the costs related to that. In the southwest quadrant of Winnipeg, the entire...all the waste is transferred to the South Treatment Centre Plant which is treated, but then a portion still requires further treatment at the North Treatment Plant. In the upcoming forecasted budgets there's an \$88 million interceptor that is being projected. If we don't proceed to forward on the expansion of the treatment plant, basically growth will come to a standstill sooner...much sooner than later. And, you know, while it pains me to shift from transit to treatment plant, I think we all have to realize there's only so much money to go around and we have to prioritize. And I think this prioritization of funding towards the treatment plant will allow additional revenues to come about from growth and expansion of our city in residential and industrial and the like. So for those reasons, I will be supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, yes. You'll be next. Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll try and be brief. I'll be supporting the report. The importance of biosolids and the sewage treatment plant, I do think actually we made pretty good progress on this under the current mayor as opposed to where we were during my first term here. So I think that's a very positive development. It's a huge project, but biosolids is also a huge project. That's not even getting to the third phase which will also be hundreds of millions of dollars. And I also should, as I have in the past, give some credit where it's due I think to Minister Squires who has been pretty persistent in saying, we've got to do this, something's going to happen on my watch. It's obviously been something she wants to have as a legacy is some progress on the North End plant. So I think that's incumbent on us to know that, that for the Province this has also been...well, for Minister Squires at least. I can't speak to the rest of the Provincial Government, but this has been a priority. No more heel dragging, I think was her expression when I first met her after the election and here we are. We're making some progress. So hopefully we can complete the funding puzzle with the Federal Government and the Province and get this moving once and for all. And I think it will be a pretty big legacy project for all of us as well, but my thanks to the Mayor for...on this one, we I think have made some real progress in the past six years.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Five and a half years ago we had a brand new council. I was a brand new city councillor. There was resistance here for upgrade to the sewage treatment plant because it was going to be really expensive. And that's why there was, in fact, a resistance to that. We are looking at other options besides this one. We had an NDP Provincial Government at the time, that it was looking like that was the mandate coming from the Province that we would have to do the water sewage treatment plant...redo it. But we were resisting because there was a lot of onus on the City and we already had budgetary problems. However, we are putting hundreds of millions of dollars into...this is what it started off with sort of an important dynamic here at city council to a bus corridor. What's referred to here as part of the Public Transit Infrastructure because we were going to build these south east...complete the south east bus corridor. So I had to make a big decision and I decided I couldn't vote for the bus corridor because we couldn't afford it and it actually had conflict in terms of certain aspects of green or environmental perspective on sustainability. Ad has been presented here by green thinking delegation in terms of putting in a larger and larger burden on the shoulders of our progeny because of excessive infrastructure burden...as a tax burden on every person, on every child, yet unborn in terms of having to pay for that extra infrastructure. But at the same time, Madam Speaker, we were taking our water rates...increasing our water rates then increasing the dividend, increasing the money we took from our water rates, not a tax, but we paid for our water, our water rate, then took it, put it into general revenue...general tax revenue to pay for stuff. And then the fungibility of these budgeting I would say that because of this amazing thing of enhancing, doubling this, which we had already started the term before we were elected, doubling from...well, increasing from 8% to 13, now we're at 12...12% of the rates we pay for our water going towards general revenue. And I would say because the biggest burden now was going to have to pay for this gargantuan multi-hundred-million-dollar bus corridor that I couldn't judge...I couldn't justify being great for sustainability. And I felt there was a better, a more reasonable way...until we take account of our construction contracts and its inflation rate, until we do that...and we've refused...(inaudible) refusal, we voted against doing that in last council, last term. That I couldn't justify the expenditure for bus corridors. I'm pleased to see...it's not a simple decision. Like, it's not a great thing. It's unfortunate. I'm pleased to see now we're willing to take the money out of the public transit

infrastructure, what I already talked about doing five and a half years ago, as the only member of Council that voted against that budget. The only current member of Council. Because of what we're saying today, five and a half years later. Because now we're asking to take that money from the Federal Government that would be put towards public transit infrastructure presumably with more grandiose visions of bus corridors, to put back into our sewage treatment plant because we depleted the reservoirs from water and waste reservoir. We increased our rates we...that everybody in the city had to pay, including the poorest neighbourhoods of the city. Increased the rates, took the money away from water rates, didn't put them to the reservoir fund for future development of our water and waste infrastructure and we put it elsewhere. Now we're asking to put it back. Well, Madam Speaker, five and a half years later, I hope people can kind of see how I...well, I'm kind of relieved. It's not a great story just because I feel sort of vindicated. I'm glad now a council shares my concerns as I expressed them five...five and a half years...five...five and a half years ago, because I did specifically state the unfortunate over-cost of our public transit infrastructure contracts. And the fact that we were taking the money away from water and waste...taking it away from the reservoir for the one day when we did have to create, when we did have to rebuild our sewage treatment plant and putting it back. Requesting it from the Federal Government that we put the money elsewhere. The money they gave us for transit. It's both in the name of something green, environmentally progressive. That kind of thing. So I just made a decision a different way in terms of fiscal accountability, fiscal responsibility. And we are now reversing our decision at city council in favour of what I was talking about and what I got a lot of flack for five and five and a half years ago. So it is true that the City, when it comes to the effects of sewage and the river, Winnipeg is only 5% of that. And His Worship had mentioned that, and that's true. But we are better because of our (inaudible) as a city, we can be more efficient in dealing with our 5%. Also, as Councillor Lukes pointed out, it is good for industry because now we have the infrastructure to deal with that industry more effectively by dealing with our water sewage treatment plant. I've always advocated...I've never been against bus corridors, Madam Speaker. It's about how we do it efficiently. And there's no perfection about it because we put a billion dollars into a bus corridor and yeah, you can get something amazing out of it. Is it worth the money? So I've always been in favour of something more practical. I'm pleased to see, today, that Council's talking about more reasonable planning to our bus corridors. I look forward to that discussion in the months to come. And I'm pleased to see...bear in mind, when maybe we were waiting a different perspective and a potential change of government when we went a few years ago from NDP government to a PC Provincial Government, there was no change in the mandate or the direction from the Province to the City on terms of our obligation to our water...to our sewage treatment plant. So it was just something that both governments agreed with. So now we have to deal. I'm pleased to see that we've sort of changed our perspective, it's really important. That doesn't mean we can't have bus corridors, it means we do them more cheaply and more in line with maybe existing infrastructure. Madam Speaker, I will leave it at that for now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers on Item 17? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? Okay, there's a call for a recorded vote, Item 17. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors 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. Item 17 passes unanimously. Mr. Clerk, Item 18.

Item 18 – Over-Expenditure Authorization for Legal Services Department 2020 Operating Budget and Approval of Single Source Negotiation and Award of Contract – Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters Fraud Matter

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and appreciate the support from all of Council on the last matter. With respect to this, it's unfortunate that Council is having to pursue civil action to try to hold those that we feel have perpetrated fraud against taxpayers accountable. As those following these proceedings will know, the RCMP conducted an extensive investigation that did not result in charges being laid. The Council has had requested...all but one member of Council voted for a call to the Province to have a public inquiry. Unfortunately, the Province declined to call a public inquiry and, of course, that would have been, I'm sure, the preference of most members of Council because a public inquiry would allow for a full public view of matters pertaining to, really, one of the worst scandals in recent memory in the City of Winnipeg. And so, had the Province elected to defer to the request of Council for a public inquiry, I think that would have been in the best interests of Winnipeggers and Winnipeg taxpayers because, you know, often the saying is that natural sunlight is the best disinfectant. You know, you can shine a light in and I have no doubt that had a public inquiry were to

have been called that we would likely learn about additional steps we can take to further protect taxpayers in addition to all of the measures that this and previous council has taken with respect to openness and transparency and accountability. That being said, upon receiving the advice that there was a case to be made to pursue civil action that was initiated to secure the documentation that was collected as part of the RCMP investigation. It's unfortunate that it's required to go to court to secure those documents so that they can be reviewed. I don't believe that's always the case in other jurisdictions, certainly in other countries where a level of government would have to go to that length. But we're following the judicial process. We were recently successful in court to get access to those documents. They, as you can see in the administrative report, there are millions of documents to review. And so, before proceeding to the next stage as part of this due diligence phase, reviewing the documents to be able to determine next steps is something that is going to require an investment on our part. There are timelines associated with that and so decisions need to be made by Council at this stage in a timely way. Of course...I appreciate, of course, with all of the other financial constraints the desire would be not to spend any money, but I ask members of Council...ask the public, what is the cost of not pursuing and defending taxpayers when we feel fraud has occurred? Not only do I want to hold those that the City feels have perpetrated fraud, I want to get those dollars back for taxpayers. I also want to send a message to all those that would otherwise think about...about engaging in fraud at taxpayers' expense. I want them to know that we're going to defend taxpayers' interest. We're going to do everything we can to do our due diligence, to do what Winnipeggers and taxpayers expect of us because of the dollars involved. And so, it's an investment. I think we owe it to taxpayers to review the documents and have officials do so in a timely way, Madam Speaker. And so, I'll be supporting this administrative report and recommendation. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise...with your permission, I'd like to call our CAO forward. Recommendation No. 2 relates to a single-source negotiation award of contract be approved with Deloitte LLP related to forensic accounting services and I would like if possible our CAO, Mr. Ruta to clarify that recommendation, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you're seeking clarity on this item and you have a specific question for Mr. Ruta?

Councillor Gillingham: Yes. Yes, so thank you, through you, Madam Speaker. Just asking our CAO if he can clarify the reason behind a recommendation of sole-source contract in excess of a million dollars, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mike Ruta: Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor and councillors, thank you. And to Councillor Gillingham's question, just turning back the clock a little bit, we engaged Mark Finlayson. In other words, Council engaged Mark Finlayson to conduct the court findings or the court case towards this particular situation. At the same time, they engaged a forensic accountant. And the forensic accountant was able to assist in bringing to the other documentation that we found to move forward with our submission to the Court of Queens Bench on January 6th, 2020. As time and time elapsed, on August 7th, 2020, the judge came out and said, basically, we agree with the City and all documents that related to the RCMP should be released. On August 20th, 2020, because of the volume of information that would have to be analyzed to be able to go to court to go to the examination of discovery, the...Mark Finlayson recommended that we get an organization that could handle the volume of transactions that needed to be analyzed. The individual that Mark Finlayson originally engaged didn't have the capacity to do that, however, a very established person then was able to recommend firms in the city that were able to proceed with that. So on August 20th, 2020, based on recommendations by Mark Finlayson and also from the forensic accountant engaged by Mark Finlayson, we interviewed, as a public service, two firms. Both firms, highly qualified. All able to analyze forensic information. Very difficult task. You have to have advanced computer information assistance to be able to do that. And just looking at the volume of information at that time, on August 20th, it became evident that there was a cost associated of some substance. So that original quote was based on the analysis of information from City systems and there's approximately a million transactions as a result. So on August 20th as well, at that point we didn't realize that...or didn't see at that point that when the next evaluation of the transactions would be done by the court because after the court's analysis or determination on August 7th, there was an appeal. And that appeal was documented in our report. And the appeal was heard on September 11th, 2020. And again, the judge came out in favour of the City and basically said, there's all those documents with respect to the RCMP documents had to be released. The number of documents in the RCMP analysis is well over ten million transactions and quite substantial, we're requiring, again, advance systems to be able to review that. So basically, on August 20th, I should mention that the cost of that analysis with the City transactions is about \$500,000 which is laid out in our report. September 11th, once we found out that the RCMP documents were going to be released to the City, we had to go back to the organization which turned out to be Deloitte that we selected. And they quoted an additional amount of \$550,000 to review all the transactions through the RCMP. The equivalent quote from the other firm that we were looking at was very much aligned. In other words, the costs weren't significantly different. So we felt that at that point there was, you know, significant information to allow us to proceed with Deloitte. At the same time, I have to reaffirm that, really, these were...this is information passed along to us by a forensic accountant who knows

people in the industry. Mark Finlayson who has dealt with people in the industry with respect to any litigation that he's been doing. And their confidence level in the two that were selected for review was very high. The other...some of the determinations was the size of the assignment, the tight timeframe because at the beginning of January, we would have had to move forward with the examination of discovery. And to get there, you'd have to have all that analytical work done. And that's going to take easily a couple of months if not three months of work to do to get to that point. The question about whether an RFP could have been done, it really boiled down to the time limitations. The difficulty to the design...the specifications on which to bid, uncertainties with respect to what will be required for litigation including what types of material will be in the RCMP documents. So you have to...we need somebody who's got that advanced knowledge and ability and proven ability to move forward. So on that basis, we're bringing forward Deloitte as the single-source award. And that's kind of the history of how it developed over the last little while.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Ruta. Anything further? Councillor Klein. Okay, with that, let's proceed with the debate. Thank you very much. Councillor Gillingham, do you wish to speak at this time?

Councillor Gillingham: I think that's fine. I'll be supporting this report.

Madam Speaker: Okay, that's your speaking time. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, so I think three of us have had the privilege to live through the whole thing on Council. Actually, only one lived through the originating start at the old Canada Post building. But I just...it's a lot of money. Forensic audit, forensic analysis is very expensive. I just...we're spending the money now. We're talking about, we have no money for nothing. Yeah, I think there's a good chance that we can win in court. What that will be. And I know first we have to analyze the documents to get there, which this is a lot of money. And then, if we're unable to proceed, to take them to court because we're assured that we stand a chance of winning back a substantial amount of money that went over budget, actually, just to be clear; went over budget and the City had to find money to cover the huge budget increase on the headquarters and we got an inferior product. You know, when it was starting to go sideways, Madam Speaker, before the 2014 election, you know, I was told, okay, so standard contract for project sees that a project steering committee can see the records. It's a standard practice of the contractor, those kinds of things because we've heard all across the country how double billing and cost overruns end up in corrupt pockets...dollars, we've heard of that in Quebec and other places, Madam Speaker. And so, there's that, but when this thing was starting to go sideways, there was a motion moved in this chamber for us to utilize our Charter rights to have our Auditor, who is separate from the day-to-day business unless called upon to do investigations. Now, our City Auditor was involved at the time. I called on him, I...you know, I don't know what the reason was. EPC decided to vote down asking the Auditor to invoke the subpoenaing rights, which means you don't get the records on the convenience of the general contractor, you get the records on subpoena and you send people down and you take them exactly how the RCMP got the records in the first place. Now, I don't know if it was because people thought that it was too much money when they were sitting on EPC, but my motion was shut down because City Legal said, oh no, Auditor can't do that. No, it could. It's in our Charter. It's still the same clause. It's been used already once to do an interview. But you know what, it does give the subpoenaing powers, the power. And if our Auditor doesn't have the ability to do it, can invoke somebody else with expertise to move forward on it. So here we are today and we're asking for a huge increase to cover off costs when it probably would have been cheaper back when it was more relevant. Not waiting for the RCMP to do their investigation. We could have got it done. We asked the Province to do an inquiry, okay. They're the ones who brought in the RCMP. All right, but is that the way we are ditching it? So, you know, ask yourselves. I don't know what the advice of the CFO at the time was, would be too much money for the Auditor to go ahead and move ahead and then have a good look at their books. Maybe there was some double billing papers that disappeared in the meantime, I don't know. Who knows? I don't know what happened. We could have found out when it was going sideways, but we didn't, Madam Speaker. So I just want to point out that, you know, this is a legacy that's left. We have this council who's trying to deal with this and now we're voting on this money. But you know, I have to say, we should have acted the right way in the first place. We should have proceeded in a more prudent, quick manner. And this is going to be going on forever now. We might have been already in court trying to get some of our money back, but no. Now we're moving ahead, inflation is here. These firms, they don't get cheaper. They get more expensive as time goes on. We all know that. So I'll just leave it at that. I really...I'm left no choice to vote for this when, you know what, there are so many, many, many issues, projects, delays, decaying infrastructure and so on that could use this money, Madam Speaker. Really. Only one sample is in Transcona. We already heard what it's going to cost to fix...get those parks and rec stuff up-to-speed. So anyway, I'm left with having to vote for this because, really, I want some accountability and hopefully we have some success. Really, we won't know unless we spend this money because we do need this forensic look at things and it's a lot of records. Anyway, thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I spoke about this at EPC and I'll say now what I said then, I don't think there's anybody in Winnipeg that's not opposed to ensuring someone or some company or organization that's

defrauded taxpayers should be held accountable. They should be. We all want that. The question now is, at what cost and to who? We were all involved in the conversations. We heard the Mayor talk about we want to keep those...we want to hold those people accountable. Who are those people? We often hear it talked about, the former administration, former administration, former administration, that's one person that's named on these lawsuits. But it's one person, a former CAO, that's named. And then there's John Does and Jane Does and corporation A, B, C, D, E, F; so who are those people? We know that the lawyers that we've spoken to have said, this case couldn't be done on contingency, because it's too risky. You know, at best, it's a 50/50 chance of winning. The RCMP didn't find changes and you will hear from legal experts that civil is very different than criminal. Agreed. The lawyers also said, collecting money...if you do win is a bigger risk. Another reason why a law firm wouldn't do it on contingency. These are the questions I want us to ask ourselves as we vote. If a legal firm, experts in the field say, look even if you do win, I don't think you're going to collect the money. So, we're not going to partner with you on this one, you can just pay us millions of dollars. Is that the right decision? We've spent about a million dollars already and the City did win legal fees back of around \$8,500. That's not a million dollars back. Councillor Gillingham stood earlier and said we are in a crisis. Right? Financially, we have a crisis among us. We're in a pandemic. Every dollar counts. We have to be frugal in our budgeting. We have to take funds from where we can get them to make sure we get through the next four years. And for those of you who would like to look at the documents that have been provided by the CFO, just in debentures, from 2014 till the end of this four-year plan, just debentures, our debt almost doubles. Since 2014. Go ahead and call the CFO. We've had the discussion. We have the numbers. So, it almost doubles. And it really kicks in in the last few years here. That's why we love the four-year budget. So, do we want to be adding more to this? Listen, this isn't about egos and it's not about being right and wrong. Somebody did us wrong. The RCMP are not going to charge them. Is it worth the money to take the risk? Law firms are saying they won't, but they'll charge us. They're happy to. Of course they will. And why wouldn't they say, oh, we think you can win, we'll take it on, there's no way we're going to do it in partnership. What does that tell us? And I know the Mayor will have a great closing statement. They're lawyer, he's taught that. And I get that. But the facts are the facts. No law firm will do that on contingency. Too risky. So, you want to risk millions of taxpayers' dollars but you haven't done an internal forensic audit. We're ready to say, we think one person and a bunch of companies that we couldn't identify have defrauded the City. But the people who wrote those cheques, who passed those invoices through the system are here. I've never seen us have a discussion or a Council seminar with them. I've never seen, as Councillor Eadie spoke to, all the invoices. I haven't seen an audit through our invoices that say did we pay the same invoice more than once. It happens in big and small organizations. Mistakes happen. We're human. This is a bigger mistake, I agree. But have we done that work internally and are you willing to put all that money; you're going to throw all that money at a law firm who says, it's too risky for us to do it on contingency, but we're happy to cash your cheque and give it a shot. We know they said...again, I'll clarify, when you win, the chances of getting the money back, they're not that great. Pretty risky. We can't do it on contingency for that. Have we done an internal investigation? Maybe I missed it. Have any of you sat in on a meeting where an internal investigation was laid out for you? And do you feel this is one guy? And is it worth the money you're going to invest, because an internal audit and the rest of this case we know is going to be a lot more money than \$2.2 million. And if you look at what's happening from 2014 to the end of this four-year budget, I know everyone thinks debt is great in government, but almost double? I'm just asking you to consider the risk and is it worth it today. Can you look a resident in the eye and say, you know what, it's worth the gamble to make sure we get this person or persons, they might not pay, but we'll be right.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close?

Mayor Bowman: Yes, and I appreciate the support from my council colleague that my close will be solid. It...I can't guarantee that. I'm going to do my very best to serve in a role that I've been elected to serve and that's to defend the interests of Winnipeggers and Winnipeg taxpayers. And I'll remind all members of Council, we're all elected to that in the manner that we feel is appropriate. Councillor Klein, in his comments, talks about, as he says, "those people". There's more than two dozen named parties in this legal action. It's more than just one person. It is a number of named individuals and corporations and numbered companies. It is all mapped out for the public to see in the statements...in the statement of claim. I will say, there's...we have had certainly at least one Council briefing where all members of Council have had the opportunity to raise questions and have had the ability to raise questions to our Public Service in the interim. And I would continue to encourage my council colleagues to raise any questions that they might have. There have been...there has been an audit conducted of police headquarters, one that I'm grateful we've been implementing the recommendations of that audit. I can understand if someone thinks, well, you know what, let's just move on. Let's just move on. It costs a lot of money. It's not worth it to defend taxpayers' interests. It's not worth it to try to recoup tens of millions of dollars that we believe were fraudulently obtained from taxpayers. It could be okay for some to say, you know what, time to move on. We don't need to send that message to others that would try to obtain monies from taxpayers fraudulently, that we're going to do our best to defend their interests. And that's what this is really about. It's whose interests are we actually protecting? I came here to protect taxpayers' interests because I was sickened by what I saw in the previous administration during this police headquarters scandal. And it is our responsibility to do everything we can, notwithstanding...notwithstanding who our friends might be. Notwithstanding whether or not we want to get to the bottom of it. I do want to get to the bottom of it. I want to make sure we've done everything we can. Now, once we review the documents, we'll make a determination whether or not we should proceed based on a review of that by experts in the field. And I would like to have the benefit of

that review now that we've been successful at court. I appreciate that no everyone may feel that way, some may feel it will cost money to take this next step. It will. It is a lot of money. I regret that we're in this position that the police headquarters scandal occurred. I regret that public inquiry wasn't called. But this council voted for that public inquiry. This Council has continued to try to do what we can to get to the bottom of it and to try to hold those named parties in the statement of claim accountable that we feel took money that they were not entitled to. So I would urge members of Council to support this. Let's do our due diligence. Let's demonstrate that we're looking out for taxpayers' interests because that's who we were elected to protect, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 18. And there's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein and Nason

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 2.

Madam Speaker: Item 18 passes. Mr. Clerk, Item 21.

Item 21 – Investigation into Osborne Village Business Improvement Zone

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues, Councillor Rollins in particular.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins, I believe you stood this down.

Councillor Rollins: I did, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much. I just wanted to consider some of the investigation conclusions that include...included that...well first, let me premise this by saying that I believe the Osborne Village BIZ is...in their actions since I've joined them, really trying to work to be BIZ that is a value to all businesses in Osborne Village. And their summer students this year has really gone over the top to really underline some of the plantings and the community safety that they face. But when I joined the BIZ, I want to echo some of the things that I saw with respect to the investigation conclusions here, in particular, that there was a lack of oversight and consequently, a lack of proper authorization and supporting documents on financial transaction that in December 31st, 2018 that the zone had not submitted audited financial statements to the City as required by the by-law for the proceeding four-years which included 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017. They put some accountability measures in place as outlined in the recommendations and I'm grateful too that where there was once not great understanding of the accountability within the City of Winnipeg because after all, BIZ's raise a levy on businesses that we now have someone responsible within the City of Winnipeg, a manager within PP&D. So, I wanted to stand and recognize some of the Business Improvement Zones' measures that they have put in and really acknowledge that they do provide value to members and recognize that much of the work has been done by the businesses that make up the board to come out and through some difficult years in terms of financial accountability that is recognized within this investigation. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Gillingham followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be brief. I will be certainly supporting this report. I just want to point out though that our City Auditor releases kind of a plan of proposed projects each year. He does that in consultation with councillors looking for suggestions related to, perhaps, areas that could use an audit or be looked at. And I do point out that this year, in 2020, we are also expecting from the Auditor a Business Improvement Zone audit. That's an assurance audit and the report from the Auditor, the plan says they are to examine mechanisms in place against best practices to provide Council assurance that BIZ associations are fulfilling their legislative roles in providing value to members. I raise that because, obviously, perhaps the natural question when we see this Osborne Village BIZ report before us is, well, what about the other BIZ's as well? And so, just bringing to our attention the fact that in due course here

sometime, maybe late this year, early next year we should get a report from our Auditor which will include an analysis that has been done of all BIZs as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. That's why I decided to rise on this matter of the Osborne Village BIZ. This report...actually, and it is being voted on to accept it as information. Can't remember, there are some other Auditor's reports that just...are reports that don't get voted on. But, Madam Speaker, I rise...not all of us Council members sit on Business Improvement Zone boards, but the circumstances that have occurred around Osborne Village BIZ has caused, actually, some turmoil within the other 15 BIZs in that there are a number of concerns that are raised. Of course, the BIZ boards are volunteer, however, they are the governance and they're supposed to make sure that they're accountable. The Business Improvement's Procedures By-law establishes an ability and each BIZ has its own separate by-law that establishes their ability to provide their methodology of taxation. Actually, it's by-laws that allow the Improvement Zones to charge a levy to each of the BIZ members that are within it so that they have enough money to take care of the streets which the business environment in these zones. And over the years, frankly, Madam Speaker, since I've been elected there's been constant reductions to street beautification, for example. Although, we have won a couple of efforts at the North End BIZ. It used to be the Mosaic BIZ, but you know, ultimately, cuts to the graffiti program, cuts to this have resulted on dumping what were City services onto Business Improvement Zones having to get it done. Now, every...I was looking at this and on the Selkirk Avenue BIZ and the North End BIZ...Selkirk Avenue BIZ I know intimately because I have been the president...chairperson of that BIZ since 2010 because all the other BIZ board members told me I wasn't as busy as they are as small business entrepreneurs. So, well...I said, well, we're having problems on Selkirk we've got to...Selkirk Avenue, we've got to deal with them, we've got to try to improve things and I do my best effort. But ultimately, you know, when you hire somebody you have to have a contract. A lot of that wasn't done. That takes a lot of work, you've got to put that work together and do that. So, you know, there was a lot of inappropriate accounting practices happening at that BIZ. I don't think...you know, there is no such thing as perfection in accounting. There's always something you're going to find that was probably not handled appropriately or done appropriately, but most of the time it's immaterial when it comes to audits. When you're auditing immateriality is important, but you do have to have paper back-up, really, Madam Speaker. So, it's unfortunate that this happened to the Osborne Village BIZ. They're going to have to be, going forward, way more accountable, like Council is supposed to be, Madam Speaker. But, you know, I was kind of shocked that, you know, frankly, other BIZ's in other parts of the city are blaming the councillor for not paying attention and doing their job as the appointee on the board. And there is a governance review happening on both sides from the City in regards to Business Improvement Zones, but...and I'm going to be making some suggestions because, you know, the expectations of small business and the businesses involved as members and the board members on these Improvement Zones, they have high expectations of us and two is enough for me, thank you. More than that could be a thing. But Madam Speaker, I just...I had to rise and just speak to this because there is a position that works with the Business Improvement Zones and you know what, I didn't vote for that budget. Like, you know, why you're making the Business Improvement Zones, you people who voted for that budget, that somehow the Business Improvement Zones, with their levy...their levy have to pay now for a City employee who should be overseeing...overseeing and helping the BIZs do what...we started the Business Improvement Zones, we established the ability to...these entities so that they could better the business community, the environment in which we go shopping, in which we go to the restaurants, the places we go. We try to keep an improvement, because you know why it got started up? Because I'll tell you why, because the City started slowly not investing proper amount of money in these Business Zones. That's really why they got started. They had a purpose, they wanted to make it look better, do better; that's what they did, Madam Speaker. That's why the Business Improvement Zones exist. And the City agreed with them. And, you know, like, now you're telling them to pay for the person who is supposed to help them make sure they follow the procedure by-laws because we have a lot of small Business Improvement Zones. And again, we're talking about on Selkirk Avenue...we're talking about small business owners. They...like, they're the ones who are there for...they're working 16 hours, 18 hours a day. They take a little time out...the board, some of them can afford to have...well, I think they all now have administrators or coordinators who are paid employees...are paid contractors the ability, but you know, in the past, a lot of these small businesses, these volunteers are having to do all the work. So, like, anyway, I just wanted to stand up and say, you know, again, it's really too bad that proper accounting practices weren't followed here. I don't think I read in it...in there anywhere other than the finances were not managed appropriately. No where in here did I see that somebody was actually stealing money or anything like that, I think. And it's my understanding, Madam Speaker, probably the whole process of submitting audits and stuff, who knows, maybe they did submit one or two of their audits because we, the City, are not governing and we're not administering this service that we provide to the business community appropriately. And thank goodness the Auditor is doing this governance review, frankly. Anyway, I think I spoke enough to it. The recommendation is accepted as information. It is information, and...but I just believe...I had to stand up and speak on behalf of Business Improvement Zones. Like, I feel really compelled to do that. And I'll leave it at that for now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on the matter? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? Okay, I'll call the question on Item 21. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, next item, we have a motion from councillor...Councillor

Chambers and seconded by Councillor Mayes regarding the School Resource Officer Program. This motion was laid over by Council at the July 23rd meeting. Along with that motion, there was also an amending motion from Councillors Eadie...Councillors Rollins and Eadie. That motion was also laid over to this meeting. Both motions and an attachment were published as part of your online agenda. We'll now hear Councillor Chambers on the original motion, followed by Councillor Rollins on her amending motion. Following that, we'll have any debate. We'll be open to all members to speak. Councillor Chambers.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
 MOTIONS**

**Moved by Councillor Chambers,
 Seconded by Councillor Mayes,**

WHEREAS the Winnipeg Police Service School Resource Officer (SRO) agreement renewals will occur concurrently, establishing deployment of SROs in all school divisions effective September 1, 2020 to June 30, 2023;

AND WHEREAS SROs provide a visible law enforcement presence in and around their schools;

AND WHEREAS SROs focus their efforts on crime prevention, education and maintaining the peace in schools and the program continues to have positive effects in schools and their connected communities;

AND WHEREAS the attached report from the Winnipeg Police Service dated July 15, 2020, further details the SRO program and the requested agreements.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the City enter into, execute and deliver a School Resource Officer Program Agreement with each of the following school divisions and such other agreements as determined necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to implement the intent of the foregoing (the "Ancillary Agreements"):*
 - a) *Louis Riel School Division;*
 - b) *Pembina Trails School Division;*
 - c) *River East Transcona School Division;*
 - d) *St. James-Assiniboia School Division;*
 - e) *Seven Oaks School Division; and*
 - f) *Winnipeg School Division*
2. *That the criteria set forth in paragraphs 2.A. and 2.C. of the School Resource Officer Protocol be waived for the purposes of the Agreements outlined in Recommendation 1 only, in accordance with this report and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.*
3. *That authority be delegated to the Chief of the Winnipeg Police Service to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the School Resource Officer Program Agreements and the Ancillary Agreements, in accordance with this report and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor / Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.*
4. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise today to speak to the motion that's presented from our...that was held over from our July 23rd session. The motion is respecting the School Resource Officers contract that is up for renewal and extension of that contract which allows the provision of School Resource Officers for an additional nine schools. We've heard today from a variety of different community interest groups with respect to the School Resource Officer Program. It's important to note that going forward, the Winnipeg Police Board has a meeting set with the Winnipeg metropolitan...Winnipeg metro school superintendents to discuss the program of the School Resource Officers in addition to other concerns that are raised by the school divisions. I spoke this morning with Ted Fransen who is the superintendent of the Pembina Trails School Division. Ted had indicated to me that he had polled 34 of the schools in his school division and he asked me to specifically relay this information. He spoke specifically to the 34 schools in his division who were

overwhelmingly in support of the School Resource Officer Program and that they are committed to working with us and with the Winnipeg Police Service to improve this program where there are concerns or issues of the community. This is a partnership agreement which I've spoken with Chief Smyth about and it directs...if we don't approve this motion today, he will have no choice but to direct all of his officers to cease their operations of the SRO program because it is a fund...there is funding attached to this motion which allows this program to continue and to expand in the sense of how it was presented with the additional schools and school divisions that are coming online with it. Given the SRO program involves numerous rights and obligations among the parties including the funding arrangement, the Public Service has indicated that Council approval is required as opposed to delegating it to the Chief to sign this contract. So, it is important for us to move forward with this today. So with that, I will hear from my other council colleagues on the concerns that they've raised or they may have with respect to this motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Rollins to introduce your amending motion and to speak to the item.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Just as a reminder, with respect to the item, we're contemplating...we're contemplating a few things today; the main motion, of course, is that the City enter into and execute and deliver a School Resource Officer Program agreement. That the criteria set forth in paragraphs 2A and 2C of the School Resource Officer Protocol be waived for the purposes...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow?

Councillor Orlikow: Sorry to interrupt, I didn't...I hope that you get your minutes back. I just haven't seen the amending motion. I believe she's talking about it, but I didn't know what it is.

Madam Speaker: It's published electronically, I believe. Mr. Clerk, is it in fact there?

City Clerk: Correct, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: It is there.

City Clerk: On July 23rd, there was a motion that came forward as well as an amending motion. Both the original motion and the amending motion along with the attachment report were laid over to this meeting.

Madam Speaker: But they're published under Executive Policy Committee motions.

City Clerk: They're all published under EPC.

Madam Speaker: They are in fact published. Councillor Rollins, please continue. Councillor Rollins.

**Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie**

BE IT RESOLVED that the motion regarding Winnipeg Police Services School Resource Officer Programs be amended by deleting "2.A." in Clause 2.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, thank you. I'm just making sure, Madam Speaker, that through you to the Chair, my colleague is good. So, as I was saying that the criteria set forth in paragraphs 2A and 2C of the School Resource Officer Protocol be waived for the purposes of agreements. So, let's layer into that the City enter into and execute, deliver a School Resource Officer agreement and then that we waive criteria. And just as a reminder, that criteria is 2A; any proposal for renewal or expansion must be tripartite agreement, tripartite in nature. And shall contain a minimum of three-year funding commitment by the appropriate school division and the Province of Manitoba. And...so today, I'm reflecting on that, Madam Speaker. And I want to echo some of the words that our Police Board Chair and my colleague, Councillor Chambers said in his support for the School Resource Officer Program. It's quite personal, Madam Speaker. My fellow dance mom, Nelba Marquez-Greene, lost her daughter Ana Grace on December 14th, 2012 in a school shooting in the United States of America right before her family celebrated Christmas. Councillor Orlikow's sister, Madam Speaker, took one of the last pictures of this child and it was School Resource Officers, Madam Speaker, who've seen too much violence that impacted children, young teens, that spoke most eloquently to this reality in schools when I became a school trustee just two years later in 2014. As a newly elected school trustee, I managed my first year in office with a devastating stabbing at Kelvin High School. It resulted in staff literally holding a child together in his last seconds on earth. And I worked with police very closely to ensure that the division was doing all we could to consider the lessons learned from both the shootings in the United States that were happening at that time and the stabbing at Kelvin High School. And more, Madam

Speaker, during my time in office; suicides, child sex tapes, sex trafficking, protection programs that the School Resource Officers including StreetReach took care of. And so as a result, Madam Speaker, I know and respect many Winnipeg police officers that I got to know at that time including Chief Danny Smyth and Art Stannard. Fierce advocates for School Resource Officers. I know this work and the stories, the helpers like Jordy, Bonnie Emerson, so many are admirable officers in the Winnipeg Police Service. As former Chair of the school board, I now have six years in public office on police and school resource office matters. And it's a matter of public record that I passed budgets with School Resource Officer budgets in mind. And it's a matter of public record that I protected that half a million dollar in School Resource Officers inside the Winnipeg School Division budget each and every year I was trustee, as Chair of Finance, Vice Chair, and then Chair. And I want to be clear about that. However, I also want to be clear that I've heard the stories, Madam Speaker, of inappropriate School Resource Officer behaviour in schools. Inappropriate, bad arrests. Harm to students in school communities and in particular, stories about difficult relationships with black and Indigenous students, misidentification and more. But here is why I'm in support of amending this motion is that further...is that we've been asked to explicitly work with community-based organizations. The way racism works is that you don't open the door to the possibility of it, you don't hear it. And as leaders, we need to create that space, the time for more dialogue including protecting student voices. And with respect to that impenetrable door, you look more further to our difficult history in the Winnipeg Police Service. Forget about the United States, don't go south of the border, really turn to the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, the shooting of JJ Harper and recommendations of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry work still left to do, as I've said before in this chamber, echoing chiefs in Manitoba, we are a city where the police department concluded no wrongdoing on the actionable...actions of Constable Robert Cross. We are a city who have had several chiefs, just months ago, ask for an Indigenous oversight body. So, does Council believe that urban Indigenous people are disproportionately harassed and profiled by police and the justice system? Does Council believe that black, brown and people of colour are disproportionately harassed and profiled by police and the justice system? We were reminded not to ignore this by then investigator of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, Murray Sinclair. He has led several investigations including that of Thunder Bay and influenced reconciliation in Canada, there is no doubt, but his work is applicable today in this moment, in this vote. It sure is. He says, police...he asks us to please consider. Healing, distrust between the Indigenous community and police is our work, our work as councillors. We still have a standing policy committee to consider and advise to Council regarding police matters. We have an Executive Policy Committee that the standing policy committee reports to as well as this council that can handle matters. We need to consider Murray Sinclair's work and what he has coined as, "The healing work", and I quote, "As constituting an emergency". And we have some really important facts before us. There are the facts presented in countless e-mails and the 20,000 people, Black Lives Matters. Prior to Black Lives Matters, we know from former and current members of the Police Board including; Leslie Spillet, Shauna Fontaine, Damon Johnson, who is signatory, to the Police Accountability Coalition that the board has gone backwards and not forward in terms of structures to hear and understand Indigenous voices of the community, saying nothing of black, brown voices in the community, some of which we heard from today. The black brown community has described previous work, at best, really not finished or picked up again in a real way and at worst, as photo-ops. And we have not, unfortunately, had the full diversity of voices represented here in our chamber today. Speakers in our first come, first serve environment were presented with reality of some of the barriers two for and two against today and some, unfortunately, never came back in the off-chance that the two-third vote would happen today. Arguably, we've heard from a significant population of community-based organizations, representatives, rock star people with orders of Manitoba whose education experiences are impacted with colonization, who's concerned that student voices are not being brought into the debate, and that the full and complete histories of communities unknown within school systems or in systems in general are impacted by police adversely. Diverse parent voices need to be heard as well. Over 60 people have e-mailed or called my office alone, how many, Madam Speaker, has e-mailed councillors? That's how I'm going to open.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Next is Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today to speak on a very sensitive topic for me and I'll try my best to be...to remain calm and respectful. The matter before us, if the City should enter into another three-year agreement between Winnipeg Police and school board is something where, if you asked me last year, I would have fully supported. In 2018, the Mayor appointed me as Council Liaison for the Manitoba School Board. I actually met with the board members and we discussed the SROs and how successful this program was and how much more was needed. I'll admit, last year, I actually advocated to get the nineteenth SRO. I attended many inner-city school Christmas lunches in 2019 where I celebrated with the students and my SRO. At that time, I even discussed with my SRO how we needed much more of them, how we needed them to be a part of our community, so that our students can look up to them as heroes and as idols and have a police officer that the students could confide in if something were to go wrong at home or if that kid was being bullied by another student. It gives the school and the students a sense of belonging and a sense of protection. I remember when I was growing up, I wanted to be a police officer. Law and Order was one of my favourite TV shows back in the '90s. I've met many police officers who've been very supportive and even helped one of my friends deal with physical abuse in her relationship. So, my dealings with the police officers when I was a teenager have been very positive. But we all know with this job as a City councillor, our personal opinions, our personal beliefs, our values in lived life experience can change in the blink of an eye. We all know that working on this job meeting with community leaders we are always

learning from them and we must listen to our constituents and literally walk in their shoes. We should be listening to them and we should be listening to our elders, our seniors and forefathers because they have the experience. They are our knowledge keepers. When George Floyd was murdered by a police officer and the Black Lives Matter movement happened, together with the calls to defund police, I watched as the United States of America unfolded and burn. I watched our very own city start to unfold and burn. I even attended the Black Lives Matter rally at the legislative ground and listened to their stories. I told myself that very day that I would do everything in my power to ensure that all blacks, Indigenous and persons of colour would be heard at this table and try my best to think about when...to think about them when I read and review City policies. So, when there was an opportunity to effectively make change, I was accosted by the media and the Winnipeg Police. My family was accosted by the media and the Winnipeg Police. We all know there was an anonymous police source that leaked confidential information to the media about an ongoing investigation against my family. Confidential information about an elected official. An elected official that not only represents close to 60,000 Winnipeggers, but an elected official that represents every single coloured woman and person in this city because all of us have had to deal with this in some form, in some way, in some shape at some point in our lives. And I want to make it clear that what the police service did to me were not deeply hurtful or piercing to me because I have had friends who have had run-ins with the law, because I have lived most of my adult life in an over-policed community in the North End. And a police investigation is not new. I've encountered situations where my friends were arrested by the police and were confronted by police for just sitting in their car. This is not new, and that is the problem. This issue is not about one incident. It is a culture. It is a culture of lack of impunity, of acceptance of over-policing of blacks, Indigenous and persons of colour communities. An entire structure of power that supports that. Improper policing is not new and what we are seeing are incidences like these happening in a pattern. This is a pattern of an attitude towards BIPOC and systemic racism towards others. At last week's Police Board meeting, the Chief of Police simply didn't agree with the community's views and that is where I can't let this go. I could not allow my family. I could not allow my kids that I go home to everyday. I could not allow victims of police violence or worse to see that. To see that justification, to accept it and accept silence which is a form of acceptance. I cannot allow that to stand and that is why I rise to point out this SROs in the schools. The fact that the Winnipeg Police can work with a sense of impunity, my respect for the police has been eroded. When you have a police service that can accost BIPOC with no accountability, my respect for the police has been eroded. When you have a Chief of the Police writing opinions to the Winnipeg Free Press to accost Winnipeggers with no accountability, my respect for the police has been eroded. In this very report today, there's a section that simply states, "The SRO Program is implemented with the following objectives: strengthen relationships between the police and community including the youth." At this time, with my lived-life experience with the Winnipeg Police, I am having a hard time believing the police in signing off on an agreement which allows them to continue to be in my schools. This statement is no longer relevant and it needs a change and a review must happen. I implore the Chief of Police and the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board to do more due diligence and research on the SRO Program. Madam Chair, I'm going to probably ask for an extension of two more minutes. I implore the Chief of Police and the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board to re-evaluate the SRO Program. I implore the new Council Liaison of School Boards to ask the board members to update the June, 2014 evaluation of the SRO Program of the Winnipeg School Division. We heard from some of the SROs and Deputy Chief of Police just recently that they are willing to work with the community groups on whether the program is necessary or how to improve this program.

Madam Speaker: Moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since the 2014 evaluation of the SRO Program, in six years, a lot has happened. In the last six months, a lot has happened and changed. I really do believe there is an opportunity for the Chief of Police and the Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board to really listen to the community. They have already heard some of them at the Winnipeg Police Board just last week and today. The community spoke out about their lived-life experiences and the community wants to suspend the program until there is genuinely a community led equity-based review. And I completely agree with that. I'm deeply concerned that when we have headed down a path where we look at any kind of teenage acting out is worth being criminalized. It ends up looking as if our only response is more cops. More cops on the street, more cops at the airport, more cops in the schools, more private cops at malls and libraries. I think it's a case of, if we think everything is a nail, then we only reach for a hammer. But what the Black Lives Matter movement has shown us is that everything isn't a nail and a hammer can't be our only tool. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move referral to Parks, Protection and Community Services.

Madam Speaker: Well, there was no instructions. This is a time-sensitive matter. Mr. Clerk, I'd like you to weigh in on this because it was already laid over. It's a time-sensitive matter.

City Clerk: The motion is in order, Madam Speaker. The standing policy committee does not have any jurisdiction on this matter, that's it. But Council is supreme and can refer it to the standing policy committee if it so requires...so chooses. However, the motion would have to come back here at some point.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Gilroy moves extension...moves referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. That is in order. We'll vote on the motion now. All in favour? Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Gilroy, Rollins and Santos

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 3, Nays 13.

Madam Speaker: The referral is lost, we'll continue with our debate. Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to speak to the item?

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, so it's unfortunate that the motion just...it died. But I will speak to the motion that's in front of us. My guess, now I have to make a decision on whether to move this forward or not. And this is what I'm seeing; I'm seeing a shift and change. When I was on the school board, there was a time when we were very nervous about what was going on in schools and the school shootings happening in the States and some places in Canada and so the School Resource Officers brought parents and staff lots of comfort. And that was a changing movement that happened, but now we're seeing a new changing movement. And I think that it is upon us now to act on that changing movement like we did when racism hit our streets and newspaper articles talking about how we were the most racist city. We looked at that internally and we recognized it as, yes, there is racism. And we did things to decolonize ourselves and we're still working on that. We did the Winnipeg Indigenous Accord. We did a Human Rights Committee. We're looking at poverty reduction. We're looking at end homelessness strategies and now I think this is a time that we need to look at what other strategies we need to deal with to deal with the overwhelming scope of what we're seeing now nationally and internationally in terms of public policing. And I think that what's happening, and I just want to refer to the many police officers that work...I think they're getting the brunt of it. We have many men and women that are doing their very, very best to help protect us and they're feeling the brunt of this. And I think what they're looking for is action from their leaders to look at, how do we move forward? And to move forward we need to have greater dialogue with our community and make sure that we're policing in the right way. Now, maybe our School Resource Officers...I don't know if I agreed with all that I heard, but maybe our police School Resource Office shift and change. Maybe it isn't what it was when I was on the school board many years ago, right? Maybe we come up with a new plan. In order for us to deal with the animosity that we're having between, I think, people and our Winnipeg Police Services, we have to act as a council. We have to say, there needs to be dialogue. Now, I don't...I think these are complex issues, they're not easy, and they're going to have...they're going to need complex solutions, but it's going to need us to say that we're going to need the time to have those conversations and allow them to take place because until then, I don't think we're...I think we're doing a disservice to our police force because we have many, many men and women that go to work everyday and they're working hard for us. And I don't want...I want to acknowledge that because I think that they're on the other side of that, right? But we can't deny that there's racism and discrimination within our systems. We're one of those systems, right? And we are putting stuff into place to try to deal with our systems. There is something going on, a movement that's saying, Winnipeg, look within your police service. Let's see what we can do. That's not our men and women of our police services, that's us as leaders. And because of the structure of the police service and we don't have that connection, these are the only mechanisms we have to have control over what's going on in our police service. So, I think that if...I wished we could have referred this so we could allow this dialogue to continue and we could have had a space...a safe space to have greater dialogue before we made a decision because maybe we could have changed what the SRO system looks like so we can appease some of the concerns that we're hearing from the public, but that's not what's in front of us now. We have to make a decision. So, in lieu of that, I'm not going to support the recommendation, in lieu of that. And maybe it will come back and maybe we will be able to have this continuing dialogue, but I think it's really, really important that we as leaders take a moment to say, something else is going on here. We need to take a breather and we need to react and listen. And I think that that's key. We're hearing that nationally. We're hearing that internationally. And we have a weird relationship with our Police Board and our police, they're the operations and we're not. But this was our only opportunity to have that conversation take place. So, I hope that we can maybe continue the SRO discussion. I think there's very many positive things about it. Like I said, I supported it as a school trustee, but if this is my only opportunity to say, hey, we need a break and have a really...a rebut...like, this

is the first time I remember as Council that we're having this kind of conversation, right? So, this is my only opportunity. So, that's where I'm standing and I will not be supporting this today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There's a lot of history on this file and if you go back through the different debates we've had over the years as I've been trying to do, it's interesting to see that the evolution of this program. A couple of things though, I think, stand out; A) I want to salute Councillor Chambers. This could not have been easy to push forward given some of what's going on in the community. So, I thought that took considerable courage from Councillor Chambers. This program has evolved for almost two decades. So, there will be people who, like me, didn't see this when they were growing up and I remember learning about this when I became a trustee in Brandon and my kids weren't quite into the school system yet. And it seemed kind of odd to me. Well, wasn't there when I was a kid, so why do we have this now? And I talked to the police, I talked to the people who ran the school division and it was seen as widely popular and useful. Then, I came back to Winnipeg. I got elected to City Council and we've debated this many times over the years. It's important to see the program has continued to grow. If you look back at the history, it's five divisions, then it's six divisions, then it's seven divisions. Former Councillor Havixbeck always championed this. There's a number of notes from 2014 when we've debated it when she actually said, it shouldn't be 11, it should be 15. Ironically, we've got more than that now. So, I know this was certainly something that we have debated in the past and ironically, I think, some of that debate was people who wanted a broader program. But really, what are we debating here? Are we debating George Floyd? Are we debating the Winnipeg Police Service as it operates now? I don't think we are. Certainly, those are very important, relevant factors. And I know Councillor Chambers is very determined as Chair of the Police Board to bring change and to bring progress. And I think this particular program could use some evolution. Obviously, this is the first time that I can remember as a councillor where people have come forward to say, don't renew. But who isn't here saying, don't renew? Why isn't...why aren't there these officers in the Seine River School Division which has...it's an odd division, but it has a few schools within the City of Winnipeg and a bunch that are out. But Seine River's not on this list. DSFM, the Division Scolaire Franco-Manitobaine isn't on this list, why? Because those trustees; commissaires in the French case, chose not to request this, and that's fine. Certainly, when I was School Board Liaison the first time, I talked to Louis Riel School Division. Brian O'Leary who you heard earlier today, talked to them as well about expanding the program. And the democratically elected trustees have chosen to do that. They've made these requests and we've followed suit and enacted them. We don't force it on Seine River. We don't force it on DSFM. Prior to 2015, we didn't force it on Louis Riel, but over time, people, elected as trustees, have made that call to request the program. I certainly do remember talking to Councillor Rollins about this when she got in my face a few times when I was the School Board Liaison and she was a trustee. And she was passionate about the way this was funded and trying to set that right. But the trustees did not want this disbanded, they mostly wanted it expanded. And so, I think you have to pause and think, okay, who did we hear from today? Superintendents. We heard from...we've heard...there's been every opportunity of school trustees didn't want this to vote in the last two months to say, we don't want this anymore. We don't have that in front of us. Chambers talked to Ted Fransen today, he didn't say disband it. We talked...we were six feet away from Christian Michalik of the LRSD and Louise Johnson who is the Chair of the Board of Trustees yesterday for half an hour on this tennis court. Neither of them said, hey, you've got this vote, what we want you to do is get our division out. So, they've had an opportunity if they chose to and the divisions resoundingly continue to want this program. So, I will support not referring it, not deferring it. We have had a two month deferral already. I would like to continue to support this program. I suspect this will look different if it's back in three years, if any of us are back in three years, we will probably be looking at something different. Quite possibly, the school board boundaries may have changed by then. We can't know that for sure either. But I do think it's important to take a look at this program and say, we aren't debating defunding the police today. We aren't debating whether the Province is putting enough money into school divisions. We've got a pretty simple, straight forward vote in front of us. Do we continue a program that a number of divisions have supported and, in fact, bought into in the last couple of years? People like Councillor Chambers have spoken well of it. The current Chair of the Winnipeg School Division have spoken well of it. There is support in the community to continue this program. And there's clearly some opposition, and that is, I think, a new thing and we should make note of that and think about that and try to evolve the program and I'm happy to see Councillor Chambers thinking about that and talking about that. And Councillor Santos has made a request that I can try and follow-up on to take a look at what the evaluation done in 2014 was. But frankly, we've got a lot more divisions on board now, we'd have to broaden out any review. It couldn't just be Winnipeg School Division. It would have to include virtually every other division that operates within the City of Winnipeg. They've all bought in except for Seine River which has maybe three schools, Councillor Lukes, down at the south end of St. Norbert Ward and Division Scolaire Franco-Manitobaine which does have a number of schools. So, I think this is a moment where we can approve this program. We've heard some opposition. We need to talk to the Police Board about how to evolve the program, but really, what we heard from the police and what we heard from the school divisions was not some attempt to increase police power or police presence. This is a program that's had results, some good results over the years, and we've heard about that from people like Brian O'Leary who spoke here today. So, I appreciate the concerns of some of my colleagues. There are, I think, five of us who used to be trustees around this table now and from three different school boards. We didn't hear from the democratically elected trustees. They didn't come forward and say, we want out, and they certainly said a few years

ago, in some cases, we want in, and O'Leary talked about that. The Winnipeg School Division has been in probably for close to 20 years. I would encourage us to support the program. It's got a long history. It's also worth noting that, I guess there are two ways of looking at this; in 2017, Josh Watt, Executive Director of the Manitoba School Boards Association said, this is the best our relationship has ever been with the Winnipeg Police Service. And I've said that publicly many times quoting that. Councillor Santos has said, well, yeah, but the world's shifting and that's also a fair comment. But I think to suddenly say no, we must reject this program with its track record of success, and I'm sure there have been some incidents over the years that people wouldn't view it success, but by and large, the people running the schools tell us we want it, we want to expand it. So let's approve this today, I would say, and move forward. It's been an honour actually being the School Board Liaison, having been an ex school board trustee and plan to continue in that role. And this will be something we can talk about, but I do think for today, we have to remember that the trustees who were elected to make decisions regarding schools have I think given us a message, which is they want to see this continue. So, I'm going to support the motion. And again, I want to commend Councillor Chambers for bringing this forward. And we will, I guess, vote on this today, and then see its future...if it's continued, what its future brings.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I want to acknowledge and say that I respect the comments made by my colleagues; Councillor Rollins, Councillor Santos, Councillor Gilroy and others on this matter of the SROs. But I want to take us down a different path if I can because we're talking about a specific motion today, and quite frankly, I feel that we're being somewhat hypocritical here. In fact, the hypocrisy is somewhat astounding in the sense that we're calling out, you know, the police budgets, we're talking about, you know, not being involved or how they're too expensive, and they're not doing this right and they're not doing that right. Yet, we have, I don't know how many, we called in to be outside because we thought there was going to be a protest. How much does that cost taxpayers? And were they able to respond to calls of taxpayers? At the same time, we're debating this, we're debating the SROs, I bring up...we bring up photo radar, and we all step back. That's the responsibility of police. That's their jurisdiction, that's not us. That's operational. That's them; that's their job. It's almost as if we're picking and choosing. I move a motion to bring body cams forward that I believe would be beneficial to both residents and officers, but that's operational. That's operational. I want to quote the Manitoba Police Services Act so we all under the law. Section 28(4) of the Manitoba Police Services Act said, "The Police Board must not give orders or directions on specific operational decisions, individual operations or day-to-day operations of the police service." So, if the Chief would be required to redispach officers, is that not operational? And if we're saying we need to change the program, we need to alter the program, we need to have deeper conversations about the program, is that us or is that operation or do we need to speak to the Manitoba Police Services Act? We need to be looking at that and changing that. That's what changes policing. That's what changes policing in Canada. We enter into an agreement when you have police with Federal Government to either have the RCMP, have your own police services and you have to follow what the Provinces outlines for you. You have to follow that. We can't pick and choose on these items because it's what is out there today. I understand what people are saying, but have we forgotten the point, and Councillor Mayes tried to make it. This is two parties that have made an agreement. The schools have signed on for this. Our job is not to dictate operational...or operations of the police service. We're not allowed. It's in the law. Yet we're having the debate, and we're having a discussion when both parties have already agreed to it. Both parties are saying, we want this to continue. And I hear what residents are saying, and I hear the concerns. There's parent advisory groups. There's school board trustees. Where are they? We heard the superintendents come forward. We heard what Councillor Chambers said about the school board superintendent he spoke to. I'm not discounting any one of the comments made, but there's a process. So, let's not be political about this. Let's say, here's the process. We are here today voting on whether or not this contract should go forward. Not on the program, because that's not our job. We're not allowed, according to the law. 28(4) clearly states it's not our job. If I bring up photo radar, I guarantee you every one of us are going to go, that's not our area. That's on the police. That's operational; we can't get involved. Or if I bring up body cams. We need to sit down with the Province, then, and have a bigger discussion about the Police Services Act, and start...but we need to start being open communicators with residents and not just jumping on whatever political thing...and I'm not saying anybody is, but I understand there's tensions are high, and I understand that there's problems. But my goodness, in our own building because there was going to be a protest? I think that the RSO Program is between the police and the school boards. The school boards could call them up tomorrow and say, we don't want to at our schools, and they'd be done. I ask the question, are you forced to be in the program? No, you chose to be in the program. So, are we now saying that we are going to make that decision for them? We don't want the Province making decisions for us. That's all I'm saying, and I understand 100% what everybody's saying. I'm just asking you to look at the facts today, be reasonable what we're voting on, and what we're allowed to vote on. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to rise today in support of the motion and the report regarding School Resource Officers, SROs. As the report indicates, this is about relationship building. It's to let kids and police interact in a positive way, having those positive interactions before things escalate and get out of hand. On the other

side, I mean, police officers through the SRO Program will rotate in and out, and it also allows our police officers to meet and deal with the diversity of the people...of the students that are in all our schools. I really appreciated superintendent Brian O'Leary's presentation this morning. I mean, the fact that he was a skeptic of the program and he has come around to it says, I think, quite a bit. You know, he pointed out that the SROs are not glorified security guards in the school, they are interacting with students, with their families before things escalate out of control. Things like restorative justice is part of it too before, you know, people get involved more seriously in the justice system. They help things...one of the comments from one of the people that completed the survey at River East-Transcona School Division, the other school division in my ward, was that it helped deal with problems...bullying. If you're being bullied in school, you're not learning. You're preoccupied with the bullying. If an SRO can help that and helps a student learn, to me, that makes infinite sense and it's an important resource to have in the schools. It also teaches, I believe that's important, and we're not talking about here, is respect for police, for law and order and for following rules. Kids need to understand today that there are consequences for their actions. If they're not getting that at home, perhaps this is a way that they can get that in school. Earlier this year, I attended the Black Lives Matter rally at the legislature. I mean, I felt the anger, the animosity towards police. It was very raw. That relationship needs to change. We need to have more police interactions with the public that are positive. I mean, especially young people, before things go sideways, we need to have those positive interactions. So, there's a lot of work to do. I think the SRO Program does exactly that, so I'm very much in favour of the motion here today and thank Councillor Chambers for moving that forward.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I'll attempt not to be too emotional. I wanted to thank Councillors Chambers and Mayes for bringing this forward, and I...you know, it is interesting that we would have a debate, and we can hear from people, Madam Speaker. I want to make a couple of points first. The Winnipeg Police Board has a bias free policy that was set while I was on there, and the people who were on that...on that board at that time represented the population of the city to best extent it can with the number of members it has. And we all agree, there's no doubt that there is systemic and, for some officers, there's direct racism. There is systemic problems. I don't wear this orange shirt lightly at all. I grew up on those streets, and if you want to talk...talk about interactions with cops, my friends and I and people who were enemies as well out on the street, I have to tell you, the encounters with the cops were not nice, not good. And in some circumstances, it was just picking on us, those cops. But I have to tell you something: in certain circumstances, there was an interaction with the police that was well deserved, well deserved and that's, you know, the way it is. And there was some community police officers that worked certain areas. I believe there was a Constable Donovan...Officer Donovan, who did community policing and, you know, he stepped into the odd school. This was way before SROs, going, you know, talking to...talking to teachers, the administration of schools. And on that point...actually, I just want to step back to the Police Board one sec. I would be totally insulted that somehow, they are charged with governance. There's real problems with it, as Councillor Klein has mentioned. If you really want to change it...it does need to change. And I believe in civilian governance. And I was offended for that board when I hear that somehow the standing committee is going to do a better job at governing than they do. That's why it's not really part of the Protection, Community Services and Parks. Our job is to start handling the prevention more appropriately. Let's start dealing with those issues that I heard my colleagues talk about. That's what we should be dealing with, and we don't seem to be. We're voting for budgets where we cut grants to organizations that are helping kids of all races, all colours. It doesn't matter. The issue is for a lot of people, there's poverty, and some families living in poverty, I have to tell you, there's problems. But I will also point out that I have many Indigenous friends whose families are doing quite well. You can't lump everybody into the same circumstances. So, I'm hearing from the community. I'm hearing people talk about defund the police, and I'm hearing other so-called experts talking about various things. Just because you grew up in the North End doesn't mean you were ever involved in any problems or anything like that. So that's something to point out. But there are families that struggle, and as families struggle, so do the kids. The kids who do the best in school that I found...and I spent four years as a trustee, but I spent full-time...I was in those schools, watching programs, and Mr. O'Leary was the superintendent of Seven Oaks when we decided we weren't going to go with SROs because we were skeptical. We decided that it was better that all the adults who are in the schools need to know the kids. And if they need...so, to the point where the kids respect the adults that are there, and if they need advice or help, we could give it to them. But as Mr. O'Leary has expressed, it doesn't totally work great, and that SROs are a good part of the team. Now, if the way they deliver the SRO Program needs to be changed, it is not City Councillors who make those decisions. It's the school division through trustee and policy change, whatever that is, because they're the ones who are signing the contract to have them in the schools. We do not govern the schools. We do not. Remember that. We are only debating this because it goes to EPC because we're talking about contracts. The Winnipeg Police Board doesn't actually hire the...in other provinces, the police actually work for their police commission in some circumstances, they're employees. All the contracts and everything go through the police board. In our circumstances, any contractual agreements or anything like that is an administrative requirement under our process. And if you read the provincial legislation as Councillor Klein has and points out...and they're looking at changing it, so if you've got problems with the way it operates, and I do, you've got to make recommendations. This is not the time to do it. So if there needs to be change in how that program is delivered in the schools...and yes, they're out in the communities, they're not just in the schools. They're in the communities. It is like community policing. I heard people calling for community policing like Constable

Finney used to kind of do. Like, his whole thing was patrol, but what he did, he actually helped the kids. You know, if he'd seen circumstances where there were problems between students and stuff outside of the school, he was helping them out. That's a good police officer, and there's lots of them. You know, this...this whole...all of a sudden, there's an SRO contract, we've got to defund the police...you know, I agree with the police not delivering certain services out there, but until the Province ponies up the money to deal with those situations appropriately so that the police don't have to come in 24/7, then you know what? They're there. They're sworn to protect us, however that can be done. And yes, there needs to be improvement in the policing. I think that some of this...if there's evidence or issues cited through the schools, it needs to be evaluated against bias-free policing policy, and if there's been a mistake made, it needs to be reported, and it needs to be corrected. I did hear accusations of Chief Smyth about the whole issue of what they called carding, but you know, what's been happening a lot with the police officers lately is I noticed they've been doing like, pull-overs. They're just pulling people over all over the place. It doesn't matter what colour you are. I've got a white friend, that just...you know, he shouldn't have been drinking and driving. I told him, take a taxi. Well, the police are out there watching. That's the way it goes. Now, there might be the odd officer who is a direct racist. I don't know. That's up to professional standards and other mechanisms that are in place to determine that. If I could have two more minutes, I'll complete.

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

Councillor Eadie: So, just to conclude, I don't want to go into a whole bunch of stories, but I can tell you, that many of the struggles about people being biased against each other, a lot of that happens between students. I was ostracized from school, and so were my Indigenous friends that I wear...I don't wear this lightly, at all, because I seen it happening. Systemic discrimination happening to kids in school by other kids, too. And one would hope that the adult leaders would help steer people away from that, Madam Speaker. I am voting for this. I'll support the motion that I had seconded, but I wholeheartedly support...this is a contract we're negotiating...thing that we're voting on, which is an EPC matter in its way, and that's why it was at EPC appropriately. And you know what? I'm just going to conclude with something else. You know, I had a police officer call the media and tell them I got thrown in the drunk tank. I was treated atrociously, but I want you to know that there is a reason that we have police services out there, and there's a reason that there's SROs out there. A personal experience like that, you can't use that to make judgment on this report or any other report. It was offensive, and I agree with that, but you cannot, because some officer felt high and mighty and rats you out or whatever you want to call it, that's one thing. That's a bad officer, and if that officer ever tries to pull it, they should be let go because that's not the professional way to do it. They're not allowed to do that. I never committed a crime, but you know what? I was tortured in the media, and I don't blame the media. The media was called, supposedly councillors are supposed to be better than other people. We're just human beings, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Next, we'll hear from Mayor Bowman followed by Councillor Gillingham.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I want to thank all those citizens who came in delegation this morning. This is a...any time issues of policing arise, especially in the context that we're all operating in this year and in previous years, you know, there's going to be different views, and this is a space, and this is a city where those views can and should be expressed. I think it's...so I first want to just acknowledge that as well as the different views around the council chamber on not only this report, but just on the Winnipeg Police Service. I think it's important to clarify and remind us all of what we are voting on today and what we're not voting on. In the broader picture, I appreciate the service and support of our Chief and the members of the Winnipeg Police Service. They do difficult and dangerous work each and every day and throughout the night. I want to thank...there are three...there are a number of members of Council who have served as Chair of the Police Board around this council chamber, and I want to thank them all for their efforts. And our current Chair is...has provided written correspondence to the Provincial Government on behalf of the Police Board with recommendations for improvements going forward. There's an effort to, as there always should be, to increase the appropriate accountability and oversight of members of the Winnipeg Police Service, really, members of the Public Service, and that needs to continue, especially on our journey of reconciliation. I know, of course, our chief was one of the first to sign the Indigenous Accord. I know he has remained open to being accountable and accessible to members of Council and the media on pretty difficult issues these days, and I have always appreciated that in our chief. Now, what we're voting on today is, as has been pointed out by my Council colleagues, is a legal agreement that needs to be approved or voted on at least by City Council. What we are not being asked to do is to dive into the operations of the Winnipeg Police Service or really into the operations and the direction that's being provided by respective school divisions. I note that this program has been in place for many years. That it has been initiated, administered and is now once again being requested by the school divisions. I will point out for members of the public that are watching, that school trustees are democratically elected to make decisions, and we often have discussions and debate on the floor of this council about respecting the jurisdictions of other levels of government. And so, for those members of the public that came here today and those that may not have the opportunity or the ability to speak in delegation today, I would encourage them to keep the discussion and the dialogue going on matters pertaining to policing as well as SROs with respective school divisions, school trustees, the Winnipeg Police Service, and the Police Board as well as members of Council. We should remain open to that, and we should do so as we're seeing here today in a respectful and safe environment where those views

can be expressed. In 2017; July 19th, 2017, this council was asked to vote on essentially the same administrative report that we're voting on here today as well as the two...the two waivers, 2A and 2C, that we're being asked to vote on today. I will be supporting the main administrative support as I supported it in 2017. I will respectfully not be supporting the amendment, and I'll speak to reasons why. Firstly, the...the two waivers; 2A and 2C speak to...2A, at least, speaks to funding from other levels of government. I'd be concerned that if we don't waive, that we would be aggravating the implementation of the SROs as contemplating in the main administrative report because it speaks to the funding in a restrictive way to provincial funding. So as someone who wants to approve it, I'm not going to support that. 2C is even more important. It's a waiver of a previous requirement for Council to direct, what I would say, are operations of where members of the police service are...are dispatched, and where they...where they are operating. Clearly, clearly operational, and so for those two reasons, I will be supporting the administrative report. I, again, just emphasize the fact, this is not an initiative of this city council, this is an initiative of school trustees and school divisions. Again, program that's requested by, administered, and operated by school divisions in concert, of course, with the Winnipeg Police Service with funding from other levels of government. And so, there are much broader discussions and debates on policing. We should continue to have them as a council. They should continue to be raised, of course, at the Police Board under the new Chair's providing a much...is certainly providing strong leadership in that capacity. I just want to thank all members of Council for expressing their views on this. I'm hopeful that we can vote on this today. I appreciated the fact that Council, including myself, voted to delay today's vote in July. It was walked on, and I certainly, speaking for myself, felt there needed to be more time for councillors to get their head around and understand the nature of this report. I appreciated that we recently had a Council briefing as well as members of the Public Service have been available to answer questions. And so, I'll be...I'll be supporting it. I'll be doing so, supporting the work of the school divisions and the request of the school divisions. And I know we will continue as a council...in fact, citizens will continue to discuss, debate, and scrutinize the performance of the Winnipeg Police Service as we should always in a free and democratic society and appreciate the fact that we've got a chief who's open to that scrutiny and that debate. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise...I too will be supporting the main report. I will not be supporting the amending motion, really, very much for the reasons the Mayor has articulated. I share very similar views. The SRO Program really, as has been stated by others, is really an operational decision, you know, arrived at in dialogue with obviously the Chief of the Winnipeg Police Service and school divisions as has been said a couple of times. Really, the only reason this report is before us is because it necessitates...that program necessitates the City of Winnipeg enter into a third-party agreement which requires Council approval. And so, I know Councillor Eadie and Councillor Klein have identified the fact that in the...and the Mayor as well, that in provincial legislation, it's clear there's operational decisions. Those are not of the purview...for the police service, those are not of the purview of Council, those are the purview of the Chief of Police. With this before us...this report before us, is whether or not to authorize that the City enter into the contractual agreement with the school divisions on this matter. I'm not going to weigh-in probably to the merits of the SRO Program because I think really my view is, it's beyond the scope of what we're...in many ways, beyond the scope of what we're talking about today or are really here to do. I will take the opportunity in a couple moments just to, though, express appreciation, and I'll use the word encouragement to our current Chair of the Police Board, Councillor Chambers. I've been thinking what a remarkable time to be the Chair of Winnipeg Police Board. It's a...it's an environment that I don't think any of us have seen in our lifetime when it comes to the need for dialogue, understanding, a whole lot of listening, and I do appreciate, Madam Chair, that repeatedly, Councillor Chambers has said now in this new role that he's committed to that. He's said it again today, that he will give audience to those that spoke in delegation and others who share their view, concerned about the SRO Program but have broader concerns as well. He'll give audience to, you know, the school divisions as well and school trustees specifically. They said he'll give audience to the broader community, marginalized groups within the community. And the audience, too, are the men and women of the Winnipeg Police Service as well. So, I think we...certainly we all wish him and his board nothing but success in this very challenging, but on the other hand, very opportune time to serve in the role as a governance body with the...the Winnipeg Police Service. And so, I just take that time to articulate certainly that support for Councillor Chambers and the board and I will be supporting this report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any other speakers? Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to close. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, I'm wondering if after today, the operational versus financial oversight of Council might ring hollow, and so I'm going to close in a few different ways. Many of us that were democratically elected as school trustees did, in some of those moments, wish the City would do its policy and oversight job, and I'll point out that when, and as Councillor Mayes has indicated, and I quote, "I got into his face a few times". And really, Madam Speaker, built that relationship with Councillor Mayes. He made City Council look fun. The minimum of our oversight work couldn't be effectively done, Madam Speaker, back in July because we were without the basic financial impact statements at that time. The financial data was not before us. Today, we're being asked by over 100 community-based organizations to put a pause on this agreement and I, too, believe, like Councillor Gilroy and Councillor

Santos and, Madam Speaker, I don't think a vote has ever broken that way in this Council since I've been here. That limited, robust, mainstream discourse on race is a bit disappointing today. I want to acknowledge the work of my Council colleague, Councillor Chambers. He has agreed that a survey with respect to this is necessary. I heard him in his leadership on the Police Board. And I will support him in this work. My colleague has also been working to seek out those voices that have not been previously heard, Madam Speaker, because a councillor like him has not previously been seen in the City of Winnipeg. And I want to acknowledge, Madam Speaker, the additional burden he has in terms of the open door and all who are running through it in calls and in office visits. And it is because I don't think it serves the Police Board or its Chair, Councillor Chambers, to lay all the work at his feet, that I was going to support that referral. In particular, the referral that the Police Accountability Coalition work asks us to do, the community building programs, the newcomer welcome and inclusion policy work, the antipoverty work. Whether from youth alliance agencies, multicultural human rights forums, solidarity from Ethiopian political prisoners, Nigerian Association of Manitoba, Migrant Manitoba, Women of South Sudan, members of these community-based organizations and more are asking Council to delay and consider evidence and further enter into dialogue with them responding to calls for Police Accountability Coalition. The motion contemplates that authority be delegated to the Chief of Winnipeg Police Service to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the School Resource Officer Program agreements; that authority be delegated to the Chief of Police. I do not support delegating this authority, Madam Speaker. Some may say, all we have is the financial accountability without the operations, but we do have the function of time, and we've been asked for a report. Our Police Chair has agreed to a survey and a report that might bring evidence and context to this decision. A hundred community-based organizations working in coalition has asked us, this council to be accountable for these decisions. We always add at the end of motions that Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing. Mennonite Central Committee, Manitoba African Film Festival, the Mama Bear Clan, Ka Ni Kanichihk, Jamaican Association of Manitoba, Sister Shahina Siddiqui, Islamic Social Services and more are asking Council to delay and consider evidence and further enter into dialogue with them responding to the call for Police Accountability Coalitions. Madam Speaker, as a council, in consultation with our Public Service, we've extended many consultations in this time of pandemic, from OurWinnipeg to most recently the infill guidelines. They're being extended to the end of October. Why not this? This has no report of the kind the Police Board Chair contemplated in the meeting, and certainly none that highlights the diversity of voices. It was my hope that our actions today would not ring hollow as some, you know, may move this to another level of government, like school divisions or the Province, but they're calling on us today to ensure we find out the diversity of community experience here; that systems and racism sometimes coexist. It's not the subject of the debate perhaps, but we're being called upon to actually do something about these things. We do have to do the work of antiracism, and if you want to build that trust, today is that day that could have created the room. But Madam Speaker, I know that the Winnipeg Police Service, their annual report is destined to come to Protection, Community Services and Parks and up through Council as per our governance documents and so there might be yet room, yet room to have this conversation and more. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Chambers, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank all my council colleagues for the robust discussion that we've had this afternoon. I want to thank the delegations that appeared here this morning: Jackie Connell, Josiah Neufeld, Anna Weier, Cam Scott for their presentations this morning. You know, it was early in his career as President of the United States, where Barack Obama was required to resolve an issue between a black individual that was arrested very forcibly by a white officer. And what he did is he invited them to the White House for a beer. And at that meeting, they were able to get together and talk about themselves, and they realized how much more they had in common than their differences. And while I'm not comparing myself to Barack Obama, but that's the kind of leader that I want to be. I want to be the kind of leader that brings people together to have those dialogues, to have that conversation to find out how much we are alike. I know that there have been issues in certain groups of colour or Indigenous community, and what more fitting way than to get together with our police who are notably part of our community. To bring together in a room to discuss the issues that prevent us from moving forward. And I think provided those opportunities is what I'm committed to, to being that kind of leader, to work towards resolving these differences. So today, as we work on this file, the School Resource Officers and the contract that's in front of us, I urge my council colleagues to vote on this, to move it forward. And my commitment, and the Winnipeg Police Board's commitment to creating an atmosphere of dialogue, an atmosphere where we can speak freely in a safe space. And I am asking these individuals who spoke in delegation to reach out to me so that we can have these conversations that are so much very difficult but are so much necessary if we are to move forward as a city. So again, thank you very much for this time today and for the comments that have been made in this room. Again, I'm urging my council colleagues to support the report that has been provided by the administration to support this contract moving forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now vote on Councillor Rollins' amendment. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. That motion is lost. Moving on, motion from Councillor Chambers and Mayes regarding the School Resource Officer Program. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gilroy, Rollins and Santos

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 13, Nays 3.

Madam Speaker: Motion on the School Resource Officer passes. Moving forward, we're going to deal with by-laws now under Executive Policy Committee, Mr. Mayor.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY**

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law 20/2020 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 20/2020.

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

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following By-laws be read a first time: By-law 97/2020, By-law 98/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 97/2020, By-law No. 98/2020.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the By-laws No. 97/2020 and 98/2020 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 97/2020 and 98/2020.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 97/2020 and 98/2020 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have question period for the Mayor. Thirty minutes on the clock. Any questions for Mayor Bowman? Councillor Schreyer.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In dealing with the EPC item, Report 16, open data program, I did mention the un...speaking about the open data chart, I did mention that in Winnipeg in the budget, there's no specific categorization to explain what areas of the city we spend our pothole budget. His Worship immediately after in his closing remarks said that the pothole budget isn't a budget and it's a line item. Perhaps I would need assistance finding it. I'm not sure if His Worship understood my comment, so I'm asking again. Is he saying that the pothole itemization by area, by neighbourhood or by ward, is it...does he think that that's in the budget?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I thank my council colleague for the question. What I indicated was that the budget for potholes is contained in the operational budget. All members of council for the first time in the City's history have access to the general ledger for those following along. General ledger is line...is very detailed line by line explanations. Typically, that information has historically been accessed by the public service and presumably our Finance officials. Thanks to the efforts of Councillor Gillingham, that information is now accessible to all members of council. I would encourage my council colleague to access that to have dialogue with our Finance chair and...as well as our public service to try to get access to the data that he is seeking.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I just...I had one question as I understand that the governance review is coming to Council and a report, and I was just wondering in terms of governance, there is a whole aspect of how we get elected and wards and all that kind of stuff which plays into how governance roles. My question Madam Speaker is if the Mayor or the Mayor's office was it all consulted about election related issues related to the governance of the City of Winnipeg.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I want to make sure I'm answering the intended question. Perhaps Councillor Eadie can be a bit clear with the question. I'll do my best right now though. Firstly, I want to compliment him on not only wearing your orange shirt today, but the orange tie. It may shock people, especially members of the NDP, that I do not own an orange tie so I can't reciprocate nor will I reciprocate, but I want to thank him for that question. I believe all members of council were consulted with respect to the governance review. I participated in that consultation. I also understand that there is a council briefing for all members of council that's been scheduled so looking forward to getting some more detail about the results of that review and having some good collaborative discussions with my council colleagues once we've all seen that result of that review. I've not yet seen it, but perhaps councillor can be a little more specific with his question on election and I'll do my best to answer.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Madam Speaker, when I asked the person who interviewed me who was going to consult with me in terms of how many wards and how you might get elected whether...whether it's the first person passed the post or like they do in Vancouver where the top three or whatever might win. So I'd asked...and the person and our contractor who has talked to me about specific governance under organizational procedure, all that kind of stuff. I asked and he said somebody else in the office was handling that part of the City's governance in terms of how many people make up council and those kinds of issues, like are there 12 wards, 15 wards, those kinds of issues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Perhaps...perhaps, Councillor Eadie and I can talk after the meeting or in the coming days and I can do my best to answer his question. Not entirely clear. We will also be present...hopefully, we will both be present for the council briefing. Hopefully, the results of the governance review can shed some light on the question that he's raising.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for the Mayor? Seeing none, let's move to the next committee, it's the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. There's no report today, no motions, no by-laws, so we'll now have question period under this committee for Councillor Gillingham. Any questions? Okay. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes, on the report dated September 14th, 2020.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2020**

Councillor Mayes: I will move Items 1 and 2 inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Items 1 and 2 have been moved. Item 2 has been pulled. I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Award of Contract for Front Load Collection of Solid Waste from Multi-Family Dwellings and Other Establishments in the East Area of the City – Tender No. 390-2020

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes to introduce the item.

Councillor Mayes: I'll try not to get into too much detail here. A long...I think I've likened it to a Tennessee Williams play at EPC for which I was much praised, and it's probably accurate. This is a long running business that goes back I think to 2016 Council vote on whether to contract out garbage and recycle to two contractors, two zones instead of just one. Objection from CUPE saying that you've breached your own RFP, that you had to have looked internally just to see if it could have been done just as cost effectively. Grievance follows from CUPE. In the interim, I believe Councillor Eadie moves a motion to bring the bulky back in house. That actually passes, so the bulky pick-up would have been done in-house. Then, the resolution of the CUPE agreements; an agreement that we wouldn't bring the bulky in-house, we would bring one of the multi-family contracts in-house. By in-house, I mean the City would do it, unionized workforce as a pilot project. Then, the fog descends in that disagreement over what that grievance settlement made...meant. Much debate over whether the agreement was, it would be brought in, and then budget would be allocated or approved or whether the pilot project had to then fit within the then existing budget for the east end multi-family pick up. The years run like rabbits, and we end up a few years later with still no resolution. Ms. Geer and her team saying we have extended the east end contract too many times, we can't just keep doing it. We've got to go to tender, but we have another area in southwest that's similar, and we can just do the pilot project there if indeed the second CUPE grievance arbitration is resolved. So, as you may remember, we voted, I think correctly as EPC, to send the interpretation of the original grievance settlement to arbitration. That itself was then grieved by CUPE, so somewhere, someday, this is going to end up in front of an arbitrator, I think, and we'll know if we're doing the in-house pilot project or not. In the interim, we've got to have this garbage picked up at multi-family locations in the east end. So, this was the winning contract, the winning bid. My thanks to Ms. Geer for her work on this with good humour over the years. So, it is what it is as has been said. This is a long process. We're not finished yet with the pilot project. That's still set for arbitration, but in the short-term, I think we really don't have a choice. We've got to have pick up, and so we've gone to tender as approved by Council in a previous vote. This is the winning bid. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to Councillor Mayes for that Reader's Digest version of what's happening. I understand all of it. I was involved in the discussions at Water and Waste. I'm just...I'm going to be opposed to this again because I still have yet to clearly understand how much we've invested in this so far with the trucks we've bought. I don't understand and I haven't seen a letter from the union saying they're okay with us just finding a different area for them down the road. If that's the case where CUPE has just said, no, no, no, you know what, this has gone on this long, we're good with another five or ten years, don't worry about it. I'd like to see it. I'd like to read that letter and...because that would change the world for me. It just seems to me that we're taking another risk, and I really don't want to vote on something just because just we didn't get it done before, and that's what I feel like I'm voting on right now because EPC directed the department to send it to arbitration; well, I'm not going to support that. I wasn't allowed to vote on that. I wasn't even on that direction, governance or not. So, I'm not certainly going to criticize anyone for the work that has been done or hasn't been done, but it would be interesting for all of us to understand to take into account as we're looking at a critical time in our finances and what I suggest will be a very critical time in the next year or two with our economy across the country. Is this the...is this...I mean, we need someone to pick it up, but should we not have done the work to come to an agreement with the union because obviously none of you have had to pay, though some of you probably have had to pay for arbitration, it's not cheap. It's not cheap. It's expensive, and if you read the material that we've seen, seems to me that it's pretty clear-cut. So again, here we are just spending money on an item that we haven't come to an agreement with with the union and I think we should have done that first. We should have sat down with them. If you're asking me to support this, I would need to see that letter where they said, this is absolutely fine with them. They're happy to wait. No problem. We're all just in this great place right now. So, I'll be opposed to this for those reasons.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'll start off with, all due respect, do you need a break? That was Councillor Klein, sorry. Sorry, I digress. I just wanted...I'll speak really quick. It is getting late. I'm going to be voting against this particular report. Yes, the service does have to be delivered, but you know, people need to actually understand the private sector here when it comes to moving things along because we keep seeing how cheap the private sector is doing it for, Madam Speaker. And, I want you to know, we've even had the head of...one of our heads of Solid Waste, actually, working now in the private industry and made...anyway, I don't want to get into personalities, but I have to say that the private industry does not want any of our unions delivering any kind of garbage services because yeah, it might cost us a little bit more for the first contract, but once you have the equipment, it's not that hard to expand your operation for a much cheaper price. And so, Madam Speaker, what is happening here, it's my understanding, this contract's a bit cheaper than our administration thought it was going to be. So, I'm not voting for this contract only in that it could have been delivered through the Public Service, and ultimately, what's happening with this contract is the private sector is continuing to win. I don't...you won't all remember the fights and the battles of all that privatization that happened in the '90s, okay? I just want you to understand that. So, the private sector, they're smart people. They know how to keep things private, and that's what's happening here. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm also a member of the standing committee that dealt with this and Councillor Klein and I voted together, and it was a tie vote on this. So, consistent with my vote at the standing committee, consistent with that vote, I can't vote for this. The administration had this made no move to provide any extra information to those members of the standing committee that had concerns over the lack of information as Councillor Klein has pointed out. So...however, as Councillor Mayes makes the point, we do have to have a contract. It has been the case, various times over the years, that we have an extension of contract, and it is my understanding that's possible again here. I'm not looking forward to these things. That's the point. We weren't provided sufficient information. That's the problem. So now, once again, the onus is on the councillors to make a decision with lack of information. So, on that point alone, I have to say, it's dangerous. We're not supposed to do that. We as a city hall, the administration and Council, we are not supposed to be acting like that, making decisions without the proper information by which we can make those decisions. We believe...a few councillors, anyway, believe that that is what is happening here. So, Madam Speaker, I do want to bring in a little bit of information, some of which I've mentioned before. I've mentioned construction inflation a number of times, and I wish to express that in a pattern that applies here. Construction inflation and other aspects of high level of inflation that we deal with here at city hall in sectors that don't apply to other aspects of life. It's not part of the regular consumer price index. The inflation rates that...the inflationary pressures on taxpayers through their taxes at city hall is different. We have a high inflation rate for construction contracts, and we have a high inflation rate for other aspects of what the consistency is, is intense or high capital industries such as, as well, garbage and recycling collection including for the collection of solid waste from multi-family dwellings. It's a high capital intensive industry. And that's the commonality that it has with the construction industry and that's where you see the high rates of inflation. Councillor Mayes has made the point before that after five years...I believe it was five or six years; five years of a previous garbage collection contract, that after five years, there was an inflation rate of 30% after five years, but that's not what the consumer price index is, they say. More or less true. Not everything rises at 30% after five years, but that did. Were labour...were wages raised by 30% in five years? If you had started with that garbage collection company at the beginning of their contract, did your wage increase by 30% after five years? I dare say not. So therefore, we've got a dilemma. In these capital intensive industries, we've got an excessive inflation rate that puts pressures on our budgets year after year after year after year. And I never did specify...despite talking about this for five, six years, five and a half years, I never really did put emphasis on the fact that as Councillor Eadie had made the point, it started in the '90s and that's when the City of Winnipeg started privatizing...sort of privatizing its resources. I didn't ever mention...or I didn't mention often enough, I come from a family of construction contractors. I don't think it's a conflict of interest, but it happens to be part of my sort of family background. I'm not against construction contracts. Oh, by the way, former construction worker. But when it comes to representing the taxpayers of the city as His Worship mentioned before on an earlier item, when it comes to the issues of whether we apply the cost for Legal Services to deal with the fraud of the police station, do we represent the taxpayers? Well, I do on this one. And Madam Speaker, it's already been pointed out that other cities, when it comes to capital...other capital intensive contracts, such as garbage pick-up; in virtually every major city in Canada and more so, that there is at least one quadrant of the city where the City workers do the work. In Calgary, it's 100%. In Calgary, that great bastion of socialism, it's 100% in-house workers. I asked Mayor Nenshi, and I've heard this before why? And he said, two words...three words: because it's cheaper. So, that's what he said. That's what they do in Calgary and in Vancouver, too. I'm not saying we go that route, but what I'm saying is, once again, we've been given lack of consideration, lack of effort to be timely in providing the information to councillors for which it's their job, as members of the standing committee at least before it comes to Council, to make a responsible decision. So, out of caution and to be unfortunately responsibility in this case is to prolong this until we get greater information. And on that basis, because we did not receive that, to be cautious, I'm obliged to vote again against this, not only as a member of the Standing Committee for the Environment but...also Water and Waste, but also as a member of council and to send the message to Winnipeggers that we can't go on like this. We can't afford it. Other cities have already made that point. Show me another city in Canada that hasn't. Only

Winnipeg is my point, and we're doing it again right here, right now, and it's not okay. So yes, half of my decision here is a point of principle. We can't go on not providing that information for each other in terms of the feasibility for the City to do work that's done by the city in every other city in Canada.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a brief comment to point out that the previous estimate on this contract was \$1.2 million annually. It's coming in today at \$700,000 annually, that's a \$500,000 savings per year. That is significant. You know, the tender process doesn't always produce the results that...on contracts that we hope for, in this case, it seems to have done just that, so the competitive bid process here has worked out and so I'm glad to support this.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers on this item? Seeing none...Councillor Nason, yes go ahead.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to move layover to the October meeting.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That's layover without instructions. That's in order, Mr. Clerk? We'll now vote on layover of this item to the October Council meeting. Is there an opportunity for the Chair to rebut, please remind me? Yeah. Councillor Mayes, do you wish to speak to that?

Councillor Mayes: I'd like to close, but I don't think we should layover. This is not...this...we had voted earlier at some point on whether to go to tender, so we've gone to tender. As Councillor Gillingham directly points out, it came in much less than what the estimate was, the money stays in the utility, not alas, going into some other projects. But in any event, I don't think a layover would gain us anything. I think the issue here is, well, what about the dispute with CUPE? I don't think laying this over is going to solve that. We have had one arbitration that was settled...sorry, one grievance that was settled and then now there's the dispute over what the grievance settlement actually meant. So, this will resolve at some point.

Madam Speaker: Yes? It was a motion to layover the item to the October Council meeting. Yes.

Councillor Mayes: I'll have more to say in close if we get there. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now vote on the motion that Councillor Nason put forward to layover the item to the October Council meeting. All in favour? Contrary? The motion is lost. Councillor Nason, do you wish to speak to the item now?

Councillor Nason: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Okay.

Councillor Nason: Thank you. Wasn't paying attention because of the hour. The...it's great to hear that there's \$500,000 savings. You know, that will go good on east Winnipeg. The challenge that I have is, is that guaranteed? We see from many contracts there's change orders and supplementary costs that may not have been fully accounted for, so I do have concern. There seems to be concern about the members of the committee. This resulted in a tie at the standing committee, so I'm concerned that clarity on this contract was not received by the members of that committee or subsequent to that that still remain, so I do have significant reservations about the clarity of this contract, and as such, I don't think I'll be able to support it at this time.

Madam Speaker: Seeing none, Councillor Mayes to close.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. First, I'd like Councillor Schreyer to hang onto some of that resistance, some of that fervor when we get to the debate that's coming about whether we should bring some of the Handi-Transit/Transit Plus work in house. I'll perhaps quote from that or look forward to hearing some of that speech again. But that is not today's business. What's at hand here is pretty straightforward. We voted at some earlier point to go to tender. The bids have come in. This is just an award of the tender. The history I went through already is complicated. We are still either going to have to settle the new grievance with CUPE or just go to arbitration over what the previous settlement meant. That will resolve at some point and we will then either go forward with the pilot project or perhaps not, depending on the interpretation of what was meant in the original settlement. So, a lot of history here, but the arguments that have been made by Councillor Eadie and Councillor Schreyer have merit I think in some sense, and we'll probably be able to talk about some of those ideas when the whole Transit Plus debate is before us perhaps in a few months. But on this one for now, it's basically a straightforward awarding of tender. There were two questions that had come up at committee I believe. What do you mean by east end...east area, thank you Councillor Nason, fair question. And was everything east of the Red was defined as east area.

And the second question was, hey, weren't there trucks that were bought by the City to do the pilot project, and the staff are vehement in saying that there was no financial obligation there, that was returned. No financial impact on the City from doing that. If we do the pilot project, personally I hope we do, that will be sorted out through arbitration. If we do the pilot project then yes, we'll need vehicles to do that, and we'll need some time to assess that before the big contract rolls around again in a few more years' time. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. Councillor Eadie and Councillor Nason and Councillor Schreyer are recorded in opposition. Thank you. Moving on, we have no motions, no by-laws. We'll now have question period for Councillor Mayes. Any questions under this committee? Okay. Okay. Seeing none, let's move to the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. No reports, no motions today, no by-laws. Any questions for Councillor Browaty? Okay. Seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Gilroy, on the report dated June 16th, 2020.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JUNE 16, 2020**

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move consent agenda Item No. 2.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour of Item 2? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Gilroy, on the report dated July 13th, 2020.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JULY 13, 2020**

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move consent agenda Item No. 5.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay. Councillor Gilroy, on the report dated September 17th, 2020. There is an amending motion on Item 4. Item 4, I believe Mr. Clerk. Pardon me?

City Clerk: There is amending motions on Items 1 and Items 5, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Items 1 and 5, okay. So, those will be pulled. Councillor Gilroy.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE
ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2020**

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. I'd like to move consent of Items 2, 3, 4, and 6, and 7.

Madam Speaker: Yeah. It's just here for information. It's being laid over. Any other items to be pulled? I'll call the question on 2, 3, 4 and 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Acceptance of Gift – Flashing Amber Lights in School Zones

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy to introduce Item 1.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move...

Madam Speaker: Just a moment. I just need to clarify the motions that go with this item. We have Motion 4. Yeah?

Councillor Klein: We moved a motion, Councillor Nason and myself, earlier this morning that I want to withdraw.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That was Motion 4? So you want to withdraw that with the concurrence of your seconder, which was Councillor Nason. And with the permission of Council, you'd like to replace it with Motion...?

Councillor Klein: Motion No. 6. The council colleagues would have received upon returning from our lunch break.

Madam Speaker: The vote's happened, Mr. Mayor. It was just rescinding Motion 4, replacing it with some different wording, Motion 6. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to introduce the item.

Councillor Gilroy: Sure.

Madam Speaker: And following that, we'll hear from Councillor Klein on the amending Motion No. 6.

Motion No. 4
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

THAT Recommendation 2 of Item No 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated September 17, 2020 be deleted and replaced with the following:

"2. *That authority be delegated to Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the donation agreement and the Ancillary Agreements, in accordance with this report, including the terms and conditions attached to this report as Schedule A, amended as follows:*

A. *Delete all references to phases 1, 2 and 3;*

B. *Delete Section 4 and replace with the following:*

"4. *The Donor will determine the first school zones where beacons will be installed and all following locations will be prioritized based on the school zones with the highest level of ticketed traffic infractions."*

C. *Delete Sections 5, 6, 7 and 8 and renumber the remaining sections accordingly,"*

and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, there's been...

Madam Speaker: Yes?

Councillor Eadie: I have been trying to open up that Motion 6. Could...could I have the Clerks to read the be it resolved?

Madam Speaker: Sure. I'll have our Clerk read it into the record, please; Motion 6.

Clerk: Motion 6; moved by Councillor Klein, seconded by Councillor Nason. That recommendation 2 of Item No. 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated September 17th, 2020, be deleted and replaced with the following: 2. That authority be delegated to Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the donation agreement and the Ancillary Agreements in accordance with this report including the terms and conditions attached to this report as Schedule A, amended as follows: A. Add the following new Condition 8 and renumber the remaining conditions accordingly. 8. The donor will determine the first school zone where beacons will be installed and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, on the item please.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes. There's been a lot of discussion at our committee on this issue. It took many years to get here, and I'd really like to thank the donor for the generous donation. I will be supporting Councillor Klein and Nason's motion that is in front of us here today. They did review that with me, and I think it would be an honour to let the donor...all we're doing is allowing the donor to have the first choice of school. Because that is a generous offer, I would support that. That's all we're doing in the motion and I'd like to hear the debate on it.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, your opportunity to speak to your motion and the main item.

Motion No. 6

**Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,**

THAT Recommendation 2 of Item No. 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated September 17, 2020 be deleted and replaced with the following:

"2. *That authority be delegated to Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the donation agreement and the Ancillary Agreements, in accordance with this report, including the terms and conditions attached to this report as Schedule A, amended as follows:*

A. *Add the following new Condition 8 and renumber the remaining Conditions accordingly:*

"8. *The Donor will determine the first school zone where beacons will be installed."*

and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.

Councillor Klein: Well, I too have...I think I'll wait and hear from my councillor colleagues. There's been lots of public debate, social media debate about this offer that Mr. Lewis has made to the City and made previously, and I heard the comments during the EPC debate and so on, so I'll wait, and I'll speak at the end of it, but I do want to acknowledge the help of councillor...that was not me...the help of Councillor Gilroy in putting together this new Motion 6 to see these flashing amber lights be put up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our next speaker is Councillor Allard followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Allard: Yes. I'm commenting to say that I'll be supporting the motion as presented. I did check with the Public Service on the Public Works side. I wanted to confirm that the authority was with the Public Service in terms of the deployment, and I'm satisfied that that will be the case if we approve this motion as presented by Councillor Klein and Councillor Gilroy. So I wanted...I wanted...I wanted everyone to understand that. I also think there are some items that we need to keep...there's going to be more discussion on in terms of where...where these beacons should be placed, and I should say, if this motion is approved, where these beacons should be placed, and the...and also the question about future spending by the City. I think the way that this gift was originally presented to the City, it was either a very low cost or a very low cost or free to the City of Winnipeg. We see that there are some costs, and the report identifies that in order to deploy these lights the way that Public Works deems be acceptable, there would be an additional budget requirement of \$1.4 million. And so, I don't think we've had that debate yet, and I wanted to put...I wanted to put on the record that I still have...I still want to be convinced that that would be the right way to spend our precious tax dollars in terms of improving road safety. That being said, I think in terms of the motion in front of us today, I think we need to first accept the gift and then have those other discussions at a later date, those discussions being the budgetary impact for future work by the City of Winnipeg and also the issue of...where...where these...these beacons should be deployed. So, thank you to Councillor Klein, Councillor Gilroy for bringing this motion forward today, and I hope that we can get to a point where we can accept these gifts and then have other discussions later.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next is Councillor Eadie followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the amendment as well as the report. I just...so I will be voting for it, but you know, this did take a long time. I just want to say, if...just because we're getting a donation is driving the policy and standards that the City follows in terms of traffic control, traffic issues, I have to say, it's very problematic. And like, I appreciate that this gift is being made, but this is what's...like, this is not a standard that the City was following under...when...when the school zones were first set. Yeah, it's good to alert people. I think it's very important, Madam Speaker, that...that you're coming into a school zone. I've been blind for too long now. I don't understand why they can't see the signs as they are already. I mean, I used to be able to see...when I could see, I seen all the traffic signs. I don't...I never understand. But Madam Speaker, I digress though. I mean if it this is going to help, that's fine. The issues about traffic tickets is a donation, but I'm glad that our administration took the time to look at this thing, but I mean, I just don't think it's...to the people who are e-mailing me, telling us the City is just stupid and you guys are idiots like these are the e-mails that I'm getting. So like, I'm just saying, well, so you know let's say somebody wants to give us a gift that's valued at \$400,000, but in the end, it's going to cost the City \$20 million, directing money to something that, you know, we have more important things to spend money on, which is what I think I heard in the Chairperson of Public Works, where we're talking about traffic control and these things. P&D is part of this thing. But so, I will be voting for it. We'll get the lights

put in, and then, we'll find out if more people get ticketed or not. I don't know. Whatever. Like, I just...it's not a...it's not a good practice to take donations and just decide, but I think their administration has looked at it close enough, and I mean, it has the possibility of calming traffic better, so okay.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair. Quite a few years ago now, there was a motion that talked about doing traffic...dealing with...taking traffic tickets as an example of where we have a road problem and addressing it. It never really went anywhere. You know, I didn't put the 180 days come back on that motion. My error, I've learned now that you must do that or sometimes it just goes into the land of ether. So, I do support this. I think the idea that we could have some way to have...you know, I personally would like to look at more road modifications, a little more comprehensive look at it. So, the initial motion was to look at using the high levels of tickets as an indicator and then working our way down. So, my only question will be to the amenders is they can explain to me why we're not doing starting with the highest level tickets and working our way backwards. I like that model more, and this one seems to be, let the donor...and people, we all realize in life, nothing is free. The donor has been very gracious to be offering us a sum. I never expected that it would be 100%. But the idea that we're going to do something to use those tickets as an indicator. They did it on Grant Avenue, we did that there. They actually got some new signage eventually up, and I appreciate Public Works for doing that to try to slow...to try to remind people it's a slow down zone coming right up. That was great. But again, we have a...a lot of these...these calls that I get yes, there is a big building there. There's a big building there. You should know that's a school zone. It is a big building, it looks like a school, it is a school. But again, the idea that we're just going to ignore the fact that we are generating too many tickets, in my opinion, in those school zones; i.e. those tickets that have been generated represent unsafe. It's just unsafe, period. We have put flashing lights or extra lights on our crosswalks. I support that 100%. Using the crosswalks, they do scare me a bit, because people don't know, same thing goes with these zones. Anything we can do to remind the driver to slow down, and also hopefully not get the ticket, but my primary goal is how can we remind drivers these are really...these zones need to be safe, and you need to slow down. So, we've tried it this way for a while; sure, it's okay. But again, I think we still need to address a road design in some areas, but this one here, I do support because it does do both. It, hopefully, and I believe it will, if it does it for crosswalks, it should also do this for...also, for school zones, that will provide a safer environment, and will also help people not to get those really large tickets. We're not here for the ticket generating business. I believe we should not be doing that, that should not be our focus. Our focus should be providing safety. The tickets are there for a deterrent to make people adhere to the rules. But our main goal should be always providing that safe environment. So again, the fact that we still are generating too many tickets, which represents to me that the program's not working properly is a concern. Now...so I...my one question would be, and I hope I get an answer for it, it won't really matter too much because I'll still be voting for it, but I do would really like to know why we didn't...why we're not moving to the original motion, which I did like a little bit more, which was, will be priorities based on school zone to the highest level of ticketed intersection. Again, I'd be more than happy to hear why that's not there. It seems to be out now, but I may be misreading this. But the idea that when the donor provided this opportunity, to me, all he's doing is subsidizing something we should be doing. So, I know there are some costs. It's over a 20-year span. We're going to have to find some money somewhere on this. But again, if we're not going to do much more expensive things like road modifications, this to me is something that we should be doing. It's something that will create a safer environment. It will, hopefully, deter people from getting those big tickets, which is secondary to the safety. So, if we're doing it for crosswalks, why aren't we going to be doing it for these sections? Am I little concerned about the fact that some of these lights, and I was, until I talked to, I'm not sure who it was, I think it was Councillor Allard, that these lights, you know, they flash all night because some people in the neighborhood, that's...it's quite bothersome, especially if you lived right beside it. I've been informed no, it's just during school time. That's when that's activated there during that time. So, I do support this. I understand that the donation is not the full money that we need for it. But you know what, I think we need to do it regardless and I do appreciate the fact that we're not going to spend the whole money. We'll get some back from this resident that's willing to donate if they still are. Again, I'm not too sure about that. I've been told the motion is in order. Maybe by passing this, the donor will accept to come back and continue the donation. Again, I've been told that's really not up to this motion at this point. This motion is just to provide the direction forward, but again, it's still up to the donor to decide if he wants to come back into the program or not and I hope he would. But regardless, and I didn't say irregardless, for Councillor Mayes'...thank you.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: So regardless of that, I do believe that trying to find ways to make these school zones safer is paramount, and I do also concur that this is maybe not my best option. I believe more...we still need to be working at road modification as well, but this is a great start, so I'll be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Mayor Bowman followed by Councillor Nason.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to begin just by thanking this individual for providing this gift. I think it is very generous. It's one that I supported, and supported when we were first able to vote on this at committee I think about a week or two ago. I will be supporting the amendment. I think if there's a symbolic first school zone that can be done, I think that's a nice gesture. I trust, of course, that the Public Service safety engineers and traffic safety folks would provide the appropriate oversight as they're required to do. But that being said, I think it's definitely something that we should be accepting. I'm trusting, of course...I know this was first pitched as I understood it, to be at no cost and no conditions. We've since learned that there is a cost at approximately \$1.4 million. I am going to be supporting it today trusting that we have all the information that we need to make this decision, and I'll be voting it on that basis, Madam Speaker, both for the amendment as well as for the original one that I supported at committee. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Bowman. Councillor Nason followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Chair. It certainly has been a long time coming. I know this resident of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood brought this forward, as I understand, in the interest of safety. My understanding is he witnessed a situation at a specific school, which likely will be the school that he will choose. You know, listening to Councillor Orlikow with regards to highest to lowest, you know, the photo enforcement program is definitely one with challenges when it comes to enforcement in school zones. It's focused on areas where they can generate revenue. It is focused on where they go based on the contractors, I understand. The contractor gets a piece of the pie, so they're motivated. What we need to do, and as I understand, the Public Service is looking at is adding these two other areas of schools. Now, Councillor Orlikow again mentioned about the big red schoolhouse. You know, we look at the ward of North Kildonan and Murray Avenue, one of the third highest enforced school zones, the school is nowhere visible. It is at least two blocks away, and the only thing that's there is a...no sidewalk, unmarked pathway to a field. Again, you know, if it's about safety, we need to do things to make sure that the program is reflective of such. And I hope that we have further dialogue of ways that we can better operate this program. I've brought some motions forward in the interest of safety that have gotten defeated at the standing committee. I see this, I see a great opportunity to better accept gifts. There's definitely ways to speed this up. When we see situations of our trees being cut down, residents want those trees back on the boulevard. You know, we've got the Million Tree Challenge, what better way to encourage and enable residents to step up. If we're only replacing one for every two trees that we lose along the boulevard, we're going to be so far behind the eight ball, we'll never catch up in my generation; well, I am older, but my children's children's generation will suffer from decisions of not being able to have done this quick enough. I appreciate the wherewithal of the resident to push this forward. I hope that this amendment is amenable to them, and that it comes back, and we can move forward together on improving the safety of all children in those areas that are covered and mandated under the 30 kilometre an hour school zones. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise in support of the motion and the amending motion. I want to thank Councillor Klein for his perseverance on this matter. It is something that, in my ward, has been widely debated in...on social media. I sent a letter to our CAO back on September 8th to discuss the increased traffic that would be as a result of more and more parents driving their kids to school as opposed to using public transportation, more and more kids on the road, either walking or cycling back and forth to school at a higher frequency based on going home at lunch hour where they can no longer stay in the school to eat their lunch. So with this increased traffic, there has to be, you know, an intent for us as a city to stand by our policies respecting school safety, and our infrastructure ought to reflect the intent of our policies. So as we move forward with this gift, and I'm hoping that Mr. Electric will continue on with the City to install these lights, these solar lights, flashing lights at school zones, which will help increase safety, which will draw motorists' awareness to the fact that they are entering into a school zone, and will also answer that age-old question, is this a cash grab? Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be supporting this...this motion and the amending motion as well. And I, too, want to express what I expressed at the Executive Policy Committee meeting, my appreciation to Mr. Lewis if indeed the gift offer is still on the table. I'm supporting it because I...based on my understanding of the financial impact statement, which if I understand this correct, there will be a cost to the City of \$1.4 million eventually, but there will be no cost to the City in the first few years, and that the \$1.4 million can be I guess identified for...in the 2024 multi-year budget process. So I just ask that when my colleague, Councillor Gilroy closes, if I've misunderstood this, if she could please clarify that. But as I understand right now, there will be no immediate cost to the City. There will be a \$1.4 million cost, but those costs don't come till later on. I will maybe make a comment as I'll just...similar to what I said at the Executive Policy Committee meeting, this has taken too long. It just has. It...somewhere along the way, it seemed that, I don't know if it's a matter of common sense went out the window, but when someone puts forward an offer of a gift that we as a city think that perhaps there's...you know, this is a good gift, a reasonable gift, we should find a way to work with this private

sector donor. It...it can't be as complicated and convoluted as this has been. And so, if I recall correctly, there was a report that came forward to one of the committees about how to receive gifts and what to do with gifts. If that's the case, I believe that needs to be looked at again so that the whole process could be streamlined of vetting any gift of any...of any...of any kind, and then whether or not it's...if it's warranted, if it's a good gift, and we believe as a city this is a good thing to accept a gift or the generosity of a resident's kind of heart and giving spirit, that we find a way to make it happen and happen sooner. And so, I'll be supporting this...this report, as I said, this motion and the amending motion as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Councillor Klein, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much Madam Speaker, and I want to thank all my colleagues for their comments. I do want to address a few of the comments that were made because I assume they were made as a...directed at me, and I do want to address them because I understand, I get it. It's all part of politics. To be clear, when this was first pitched by myself at a PP&D meeting, it was two flashing amber lights at every school zone. The additional two was a requirement and a request added to this by the Public Service. Of course, they're right, they're the experts, and they've added it on. To assume that that had changed miraculously during the discussions and to use that as a sound bite, that's fine. Listen, this isn't for me or for anybody else except for kids. This for safety. So, if we truly want to make our school zones safe, is this the final answer? I agree with Councillor Orlikow, no. There's much more that we need to do. There's much more that we can do. We have different programs already being done. Councillor Rollins has one going on in her ward. There's other things that can happen. Ottawa just tested five different products to slow down traffic. Two of them came out on top, two of them less expensive than anything we're doing. I have the documents if you want to see them. Whether or not Mr. Lewis would accept the gift, again, I guess it makes for great comments during our time in this...in this building, but do you think I would have brought it forward if he wasn't going to? Would I have not spoken to it, because you had this motion this morning and no one sent me an e-mail or a text to ask me. You know, I'm here, right. Like, I do...I don't blend in. I'm here. I do try to make myself stand out. I'm not quiet or shy, so you could have called and asked. Look, I appreciate you guys supporting this motion. And I agree, and I've said long ago, this should have been accepted a long time ago. Should he dictate where they go? No. Never been said. Never been said. He wanted to pick one location. We did have in there that it should be where the most tickets are. Right. I was pointing at the wall. Councillor Orlikow blends in. But we did have in the original motion, but you have to negotiate. That's what deals are all about. That's what Council should be all about, going around, talking to individuals, and trying to come to an agreement. So, we took out the fact that it should go to the highest...the school zone with the highest number of tickets. We'll make that change. We made that change in order for this gift to be accepted and for it to go through. I'm okay with that, because really, at the end of the day, all I want is for that first set of lights to go up as soon as it possibly can and we can move on to the next one. So, thank you all for your comments. I look forward to a unanimous vote on this as we move forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. I will try to speak to what I heard today so...because there was a really good, robust conversation at our community committee so I will kind of talk about that to highlight some things that maybe people are concerned about, and some issues that we have. So, in terms of Public Service will have the authority to figure that out, we've already had the discussion about tickets, they know that. I think they're in line with all that. They also want to look at where the need is, so I think we're giving them the authority. All we're doing here today is we're letting Mr. Lewis who's the donor allow one school of his choice. With some of the concerns regarding funding, absolutely correct. There will be no extra cost to the City. There will be a cost in 2024 through the budget process, which we will all be voting on. What this does do though, is allows us to look at this...these beacons to see if they work in lieu with our road safety strategy that's coming through our system. So now, we'll be able to look...this will be able to inform our road safety strategy, and by then, when there's asking for funding, I'm hoping that our road safety strategy will say, okay, where's the highest best use of our, you know, of our signs or what type of strategy do we want to make roads safer. That's coming through. This will help inform that decision moving forward. So, all we're doing today is saying, do we want a gift or not, and allowing this donor to be able to have the authority to choose one school. Our administration will be doing the rest of the work, and in conversations that they know that we want to look at places where we are receiving tickets and where there is a higher need, higher volume of kids, and where there's more concerns. So in lieu of that, I'm hoping you will support this moving forward. I think it's a good motion. I think the amending motion that is here today gives a little thanks to Mr. Lewis. I mean, it was a very thoughtful gift. He's waited a long time to see this, so it's a nice gesture I think on our part as Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. With that, I will call the question on Councillor Klein's amending motion, Motion 6. And there's call for a recorded vote on the amending motion. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Rollins

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 1.

Madam Speaker: Motion 6 passes, the amending motion. Now onto the main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Rollins is recorded in opposition, and the item is carried. Thank you. We're going to take a recess shortly, possibly this is the right time or shall we start this item? Councillor Orlikow? No. Okay. How long of a health break? Is it 30 minutes? Okay. We'll have to wait then because there's some things that aren't quite ready yet, so we'll just proceed until we're ready. Mr. Clerk, Item 5.

Item 5 – Proposed Extension of the Transcona-West Joint Venture Agreement

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Gilroy to introduce Item 5. And we do have an amending motion. Correct, Mr. Clerk? It's Motion No. 5 that goes with this item. And that's moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Klein. Councillor Gilroy, you have the floor.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah. I will be supporting the Item No. 5, but I will not be supporting the amending motion. I think we had a good discussion on some of that stuff here today. I think that, you know, we...you know, our money goes into funds that help, you know, all wards. So, I wouldn't want to get into that debate today. I think we're going to be having that in the future, so but in lieu of the Item No. 5, I will be supporting that one.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And shall we have the motion read into the record. Mr. Clerk, could you do that?

Clerk: Moved Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Klein, that Item No. 5 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated September 17th, 2020, be amended by adding the following new Recommendation 4: That the proceeds from Transcona-West Joint Venture Agreement be allocated towards recreation and accessibility improvements within the Transcona Ward and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason, your opportunity to introduce your motion.

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

THAT Item No. 5 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated September 17, 2020 be amended by adding the following new Recommendation 4:

4 That the proceeds from Transcona-West Joint Venture Agreement be allocated towards recreation and accessibility improvements within the Transcona Ward.

and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly.

Councillor Nason: Great, yes. I'll be brief as possible. We've got a lot of priorities on our system. The east of the Red project is one that we're trying to find a way to afford in the multi-year budget, our infrastructure plan. There was a million dollars that were set aside just to keep it on the books. We've got aging infrastructure, you know, lead up last fall was the fear that our pool was going to be closed in Transcona, our one indoor pool. Sorely under-utilized from the fact that the programming is not being offered there to support the needs of the community. We lost our only shallow warm pool that was in a joint use agreement with the River East-Transcona School Division. They needed the space for their growing school population that have been there forever. So, we've got challenges. We've got parks that need to be renewed...renewed. This joint venture has been very well for the pocket of the Land Operating Reserve to this point. As mentioned in the report, was expected to be \$6 million, it's \$21 million, and there's still approximately 30% left still to be realized. So, I'm trying to find a way that this growth is reinvested in our community. That's the reason for this motion. I think it's an opportune time to have this amendment, and I hope that I have your support. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Next speaker, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I mean, it's similar to what we debated earlier, but I missed some points that I wanted to speak to. And I think that, again, I think it's appropriate that the ward and the area...actually, east of the Red rec complex is actually way more than...I think that's what I heard Councillor Nason talk about, if we were going to direct some money, is way bigger than Transcona. It's talking about serving east of the Red which includes Transcona. The...you know, all these projects and things that need to be done, Madam Speaker, they're very important. I believe, out of this particular joint venture, I believe the money is also directed into the Land Operating Reserve. And, you know, I think there's a real...let's forget about COVID, okay. Like, we have become dependent on the Land Operating Reserve which means, like...like, this joint venture is the one-time sale and there are profits to be made and that's shared jointly, these profits and whatever profits come to the City, they go into the Land Operating Reserve, but, you know, when we're using it, we're using it as a...it's a lot of one-time money. Eventually, we'll run out of land to sell, and then, your Land Operating Reserve isn't going to be able to provide the money for the, for example, the community centre renovation grants. It's a great program. We've had...I've served under two mayors who've utilized Land Operating Reserve to provide money to community centres all over the city. Very important. Including Transcona, actually. So, technically, you know, that joint venture money that's in there that goes to the Land Operating Reserve are good, but...so then, when you do come to COVID now, you know, the idea is you empty all of your reserves. So, the Land Operating Reserve is one that doesn't state you have to replenish it. Although, because of decisions made in the budgets, and now this is four years with the budget, that the reliance on the Land Operating Reserve is on, and maybe that's why we changed the policy about not selling properties anymore for \$1 to not-for-profits who are accomplishing things that are needed in our communities. But you know, really, it's lucky we do have this joint venture and hopefully there's other possibilities around the city. But there is a reliance, and I don't see...actually, so we have been using the Land Operating Reserve for recreational things, and at community centres and that, and I don't see a problem, then, of utilizing some of this money for recreation in Transcona with...which is what the amending motion is. So, I find it interesting. I'll be supporting the amendment. And on this one...anyway, I'm not sure how I'll vote on the report. I'll decide when the vote comes.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise, I will not be supporting Councillor Nason's motion. I'll be supporting the main motion though. My main reasons for not supporting Councillor Nason's motion here are kind of twofold. Appreciate...kind of...in recent dialogue with a member of staff, they did point out this that this fact that City's...the City's participation in joint venture agreements is enabled or made possible because of City funding that comes not just from the ward but from the entire city. And so, benefits derived from the joint venture, then it would, you know, it could be argued would make sense that the entire city could, you know, participate in reaping some of the benefits. That's not to say that Councillor Nason is not onto something. There's precedent as well that, you know, revenues generated from a joint venture in a particular ward have...you know, some of those revenues have been reinvested in projects in the local ward. And as I said earlier in the previous motion, similar to this, you know, I look forward to that discussion in the upcoming budget process. I think the second point I want to make as well is I don't know what rules, what policy has been already established in the original establishment of this joint venture when it was first set up. And so, the motion that we have from the Councillor from Transcona before us may actually be in contradiction of the original terms of the joint venture. I don't know that...you know, we don't have that in front of us here unfortunately. So, because...certainly, because we're absent of that information, I can't support this. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Well, you know, Councillor Gillingham raised the concern that it may not be in order. I did run this through the Clerk, so hopefully, that gives some assurance that it likely is. I don't know if the Chair or speaker wants to clarify that with the...with them. This is a...is something that is important. Renewal, we see it in Waverley West, you know, as a new and growing area, there's demands. There's demands from our residents. As was eloquently put forward, the east of the Red is not just Transcona. It is for a broad community if it were to go towards that. I'm just trying to find ways to find opportunities for our area because there's been very little, unfortunately, dialogue with regards to investment in Transcona. We know through budget 2019, there was a cut of active transportation in Transcona of \$1.7 million that was earmarked. It was much celebrated as part of the Active Transportation Master Plan. Number one item unceremoniously deleted. There was no dialogue about it. No conversation with me as ward councillor. There was no footnote with regards to it in the budget documents. It was only through going through the budget documents once we received them along with everybody else that received the documents when they were publicly released did we know that it was no longer there. It is unfortunate how some of these things play out. I hope that this update, the 2021 update, will be such...it will be different, the tone will be different. You know, Councillor Gillingham's office has reached out. We do have two one-hour meetings established. Two hours to discuss the concerns, and then, we'll go through our public delegation opportunities to present our case, not to ask questions of the Public Service unless you sit on the committee. But nonetheless, I'm doing what I can for my ward and for the residents of Winnipeg as a whole. There's many things that we vote on as councillors that are

not in our ward. There's things that we see that are in other wards that maybe it's a good approach, maybe it's not. The thing about councillors in the City of Winnipeg is we're councillors for the City of Winnipeg. So, in this case, I'm advocating for the community, but the definition of the community could be broadly interpreted. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Gilroy, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. I think there might be some further dialogue on this in the future. Right now, I have major concerns with us. We have...we have lots of areas that do not have the kind of level of development that we see in some of these other neighborhoods, and this money goes into a Land Operating Fund that makes sure that these mature communities can be able to repair their buildings, be able to build their parks. And these new communities will eventually become mature communities, and we will need that money for that. So, I'm very nervous about us taking money out of there. That's why I was very much in favour of impact fees as somebody who supported impact fees because I believe it was building in those communities that needed the extra things like community centres, like fire halls. Anyways, that debate is not in front of us here today. But I really think that we should be prioritizing on the need of our infrastructure from our Public Service and not be prioritizing here on the floor of Council on where those needs are. So, that's why I will not be supporting this motion today. I hope my councillor colleagues consider that. I think if we want to look at making sure some funds go into certain areas, we should have that debate, but we shouldn't be having that debate in these...in little pockets like this on motions on the floor of council. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. We'll now vote on the amending Motion No. 5. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. Motion 5 is lost. Onto the main item, Item 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Just seeing the hour, Councillor Eadie, would you move a motion that Council sit past 6:00 p.m.?

Councillor Eadie: I'm sorry?

Madam Speaker: We need a motion...

Councillor Eadie: Oh, I move to...motion that Council continue past 6:00 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, according to the procedure by-law, thank you.

Councillor Eadie: And can I add that after...okay.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Momentarily. I think we should do the by-laws here. Okay, Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes. I'd like to move that By-law No. 100/2019 be read the second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 100/2019.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that By-law 100/2019 be read the third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

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

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move the following by-laws be read the first time: By-law No. 88/2020, 89/2020, 90/2020, 91/2020, 92/2020, 93/2020, 94/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 88/2020, By-law No. 89/202, By-law No. 90/2020, By-law No. 91/2020, By-law No. 92/2020, By-law No. 93/2020 and By-law No. 94/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I move that By-law No. 88/2020 to 94/2020 both inclusive be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 88/2020 to By-laws No. 94/2020 both inclusive.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move the rules be suspended and By-law No. 88/2020 to 94/2020 both inclusive be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have a recess. I think we're going to do 20 minutes, that's what worked last time. Twenty minutes and we will meet in the wing on this side here and we'll reconvene in 20 minutes. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
September 30, 2020 at 6:38 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good evening, I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of September 30th, 2020. We are on the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. We'll now have question period for our chair. Are there any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Councillor Gillingham.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a couple of quick questions. One is related to the ongoing consultation process I know that happens with our department and industry which has been very important through COVID and so I'm wondering if those meetings continue the...I think the group that has consulted is made up of a variety of stakeholders and they talk about permit times and try to address issues that maybe hung up between that the Property, Planning Development Department and the industry. I'm just wondering if the councillor can let us know if that continues through this COVID period.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Madam...through you Madam Chair, I'd like to thank Councillor Gillingham for the question. I will follow up with the department on this. From my understanding I think they did have to stop the meetings due to COVID but I can follow up and provide feedback for all my council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Is the video inspection for electrical inspections going to...which has been implemented during COVID to make things easier...is that process going to continue because I've heard a lot of good feedback from the public, from electricians and from the Chamber of Commerce. Is this going to continue post COVID?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. Through you Madam Chair, that's a very good question. I think that we should be looking at our technologies online and seeing if we can use them following up from COVID. Some of the really good things that we've done is there applications are now accessible on the web, online. The request for information will be reviewed by a...by a coordinator and they will have appointment times available for them, auto emails to customers to confirm

appointments are going to be added. This new process occurs across all inspection disciplines and they are encouraging the online requests form. However, applicants may still call in and to call in for an inspector. So there are lots of really good things that are happening that are going through online and on the web. So I will follow up with the department because it's really neat if we are able to use this new technology moving forward especially if it is a success and I've heard a...I've heard some really great news coming from different developer communities that they are liking this online applications so we'll see how that goes moving forward and I will get a response for everybody and provide that to all my council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Seeing no further questions, we'll move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Rollins, the Chair, on the report dated September 16th...September 18th, pardon me, 2020.

**REPORT OF THE
 STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
 DATED SEPTEMBER 18, 2020**

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I wish to move consent agenda Items 1 through 3.

Madam Speaker: All in favour?

Councillor Eadie: Please record me in opposition to Report No. 3.

Madam Speaker: Just give you a moment to be seated, please. And we can pick up your message through the microphone.

Councillor Eadie: Please record me in opposition to Report No. 3 of Protection, Community Services and Parks.

Madam Speaker: So, I'll call the question on Item 1 through 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Eadie recorded in opposition to Item 3. There's no motions, no by-laws, we'll now have question period for Councillor Rollins. Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none, the next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard, on the report dated September 16th, 2020. We do have an amending Motion No. 3 on Item 3.

**REPORT OF THE
 STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
 DATED SEPTEMBER 16, 2020**

Councillor Allard: So, I'd like to move Items 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you didn't move 4.

Councillor Allard: Oh, I'd like to move 4 as well. My apologies.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So, Councillor Klein, you've pulled 1 and 4? One and 4. Okay, so, 1, 3 and 4 are pulled. I'll call the question on 2, 5 through 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 – Amendment to the Winnipeg Transit Plus Policy –Trip Priority System

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

Councillor Allard: I'll wait...yeah, I'll wait to hear from my colleagues on this one.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And this was stood down by yourself, Councillor Klein. You have the floor.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have the floor, but I want to share an e-mail that I believe we all received...all my councillor colleagues received. And I believe it requires being read on the public statement...public record. It's from John Barton. "I am writing this memo to express my extreme concern over the proposal to end Transit

Plus priority system for dialysis patients. I live alone and I am a dependent on Transit Plus to transport me three times a week. I need the priority system to ensure I will have the necessary transportation. Life expectancy without dialysis in one to two weeks and one to two days if other factors are present. We are advised not to miss one treatment." This gentleman contacted Brandon Transit and they advised that they have a phone-in system for all, with the exception of dialysis patients who are a priority using the subscription booking method. How do you get around the so-called ruling of first come, first served? Did the report contact Brandon for comparative data? If they can do it, there should be no reason Winnipeg can't. Was there a public meeting to discuss the level of need? The investigation into scheduling...into the scheduling system may be incomplete. His words, "Our health and lives are at stake. We need priority booking to ensure we have consistent access to dialysis. I understand this topic is coming up for a vote in the very near future, possibly within a week. I urge you and other Council members to amend the proposal to continue a priority system for dialysis patients. If Brandon can do it, so can we. Our health and potentially our lives are at stake. I have made my points which reflect on your incomplete study and recommendations. I would like to receive a response to this message before the issue comes to a vote." I wanted to read that in because that is who we are making this decision for. It's people like John who elected us. We have to think about that when we accept what the Public Service is telling us. That maybe, maybe, this is wrong. Maybe this isn't a decision that we should be making and we should say, you know what, John? Your life matters to all of us because I will be voting in favour of your life.

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

Councillor Nason: You know, I've spoke many times in the almost two years that I've been here on Transit Plus. This item is challenging because it comes out of the Ombudsman report. It is a matter that we're providing services that were deemed discriminatory with having a priority system. It's a challenge. The other challenge is that Transit is providing medical transport in these situations. These are persons with complex medical needs in some cases. So, we've got a balancing act. We've got to service those that have a need for life sustaining therapy with that of providing a service that is equal for all so that people that have to get to work are on the same scale as those going for shopping to get their food becomes more complicated in winter for many, but we have to have a system that is servicing the community. Now, you know, we've been assured as part of what I've seen leading up to this that the Public Service will have the capacity to deal with any changes to the priority system. The first come first serve will not end up causing chaos. What we haven't seen as part of this is part of what if? You know, what is their plan should the system come to a grinding halt? There were a lot of things that were in that Ombudsman report that are shortcomings. I thank the budget 2020 for taking care of the 500 metre rule. I wasn't able to vote on it, thanks to COVID, but you know, we took care of that problem and there's many more problems that we take care of. But I think we need to go back and talk with the Province with regards to providing ambulatory, medical needs through the Transit Plus service. I spoke to John and I spoke to many other residents in the lead up to this...coming to today. It is a concern of them, it is a real concern. It's an added stressor in a time of COVID that we don't need for residents to be worried about. How they're going to get for their dialysis treatment or whatever other medical appointment they need to get to. When they're in Transcona and they have to get to their dialysis treatment, if they were to take a taxi as an alternative, that is a \$100 round-trip. \$100 for seniors, a lot of times on fixed income; it's a challenge and a barrier. It's choices of whether they'll have food to eat that night or not. So, I think there is more work to be done on this and I hope that when it comes back, a lot of these concerns will be addressed and that we'll have a system that will be robust enough to support the needs of all regardless of the purpose.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Eadie, I see that you're on the list, but I must say, it is late in the day and an error has been made. This was laid over at EPC so it's not something we should be addressing at this time. Okay, so I...so I would like to move on to the next item.

Councillor Eadie: But I just want clarification. This report will be coming back, but it's actually going to IRPW's next meeting.

Madam Speaker: EPC laid the matter over to its meeting on October 20th.

Councillor Eadie: EPC did?

Madam Speaker: Yes, so it's really just here for information. So, it was an error to allow two speakers already. So we need to move on to the next item now. Okay, thank you.

Item 3 – Rebate –Taxi Per Trip Cost

Madam Speaker: Okay, Item 3. Mr. Chair, your opportunity to introduce.

Councillor Allard: So, do I speak first and then there's an amending motion?

Madam Speaker: Yes, you can speak first and then Councillor Nason will speak to amending Motion 3.

Councillor Allard: Okay, so this motion, I think, is in line with what was supported at IRPW. After much discussion, it was moved up to EPC where there was some further discussion and the recommendation from the Public Works changed. And here again, we have basically I think both options; what was discussed and heard at IRPW and the recommendation from EPC. So, I think that's the path this has taken. I'll probably...I will leave my comments for now until I can hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, were you...Councillor Allard was introducing Report 3, the rebate for the Vehicle for Hire.

Councillor Eadie: Vote on EPC's recommendation to refer it to their next meeting.

Madam Speaker: Yeah. It doesn't have to be voted on and we shouldn't have been speaking to it either, but thank you.

Councillor Eadie: It doesn't have to be voted on the recommendation?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, your opportunity to introduce Motion 3.

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

THAT Recommendation 1 of Item No 3 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works dated September 16, 2020 be deleted and replaced with the following:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to provide a credit for the month of April, 2020, to both taxi and personal transportation drivers, which is intended to support operations as well the drivers, equivalent to up to one month's value of the dispatcher licence fees in the following manner:*
 - A. *For small dispatchers with licences for less than 25 vehicles, and monthly licence costs less than \$500, a credit for the full amount of one month's dispatcher licence fee.*
 - B. *For those companies with dispatcher licences of more than 25 vehicles, and monthly licence costs over \$500, a credit of 50% of the value of one month's dispatcher licence fee.*
2. *That the dispatcher licence fee credits of approximately \$16,000 to the Vehicle for Hire industry, be funded through existing departmental budgets.*
3. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Councillor Nason: Thank you. You know, I had the opportunity to meet with many independent business owners to discuss the concern they had related to COVID. So, I introduced a motion that we're...that set this all off and there was great dialogue, as I understand, at the standing committee. Mr. Massey presented earlier with regards to his concerns about this being received as information. So, the amending motion will address some of the challenges that have been encountered by much...sorry, not much, many others in different lines of businesses. I've attempted, along with some of my Council colleagues, to introduce several other measures be it large or small, as an indication that we are all in this together, right. That we hear their concerns, that we understand their concerns. You know, the...if...whether or not they're successful or not in their attempt to recoup some of these challenges, we've brought it forward, we've had dialogue around the table, this is another one that I hope that we'll have your support on. It is nominal and I do think it is worth while to undertake for the ride sharing program that has...or vehicles for hire that has suffered a lot in the last few months as regards to COVID. The business still hasn't fully recovered but yet, we have seen a new business come to town and we hope that they are there to provide services and transportation when we have gaps that public transit isn't able to fill. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Any further speakers? Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I'll just be brief; I do support this motion, but again, I'm a little bit confused because we've put motions forward in the past to support restaurants and I understand that that's a business tax. This is a fee or a cost, but we've put a motion forward for food trucks, but we said no to that. And I'm wondering, you know, if

we're going to set the precedent for doing it for one, why we're not going to do it for all. There are a number of small businesses, local retail stores and the likes that are suffering because of COVID-19 and I think we can't be selective or play selective politics, we have to when we reach out to help, help everybody if we're going to do that. And in this case, I agree, let's help the residents that are in the industry that have taken a hit, but also, let's help the other industries of residents that are taking a hit. We know it's not that big, we know it's not that much money, we've had these conversations. Oddly enough, before today, just a couple of days ago, I had a phone call from a gentleman who runs a number of pop-up stores in malls throughout the City of Winnipeg. And he said there's probably not a good call to make, but he wanted to inform me that he thought it was interesting that pop-up stores don't pay business taxes and the likes because they're only here for three to four months. So they don't ask him to pay any money. Well, I don't know, is that missed opportunity or not? So, I'm going to support this, but I'm asking my colleagues to, you know, let's think about all these motions as they come forward. History's going to remember, so we should remember as we're voting on them. There's more than one group that needs support right now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Allard: Can I make...can I make a point of order, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: I'm just realizing that this is not in-line with the IRPW motion. And so at this time, without further information, I'm not really comfortable.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Allard, it's the exact recommendation from Public Works. We'll get on...

Councillor Allard: So, why's it worded that we delete recommendations from Public Works Committee then?

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Clerk, could you clarify that please?

City Clerk: I apologize, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure what the question is.

Madam Speaker: My understanding is, this is the recommendation that was...did appear at Public Works. EPC decided to receive it as information, but what's before us here is what the Public Works Committee had put forward.

City Clerk: The recommendation before Council is the EPC recommendation to receive as information. Motion 3 reflects what was passed at the standing policy committee.

Madam Speaker: That's what I meant, Mr. Clerk.

Councillor Allard: So, may I ask another question as a point of order?

Madam Speaker: Sure.

Councillor Allard: So, why does it say then that recommendation 1 of Item 3 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on IRPW be deleted and replaced with something else?

City Clerk: So basically, the recommendation...the motion deletes the recommendation to receive as information. So, it deletes the recommendation coming out of EPC and replaces it with the motion...the recommendations coming out of IRPW.

Councillor Allard: Okay, thank you. I wanted to ensure that was the case.

Madam Speaker: Yeah. Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I'll try to be short as well. I know we're all busy and related to that. Madam Speaker, when it comes to other industries, whether it's restaurants, the only other equivalent motion that I think may have come up was related to the outdoor cooking things. What the heck...food trucks. I had too much pizza from a food truck...or it wasn't, anyway. The only...that's a regulated under...I think that's doing business in Winnipeg by-law. I think that's food trucks, but really, in general, most of the other things that I've seen to try to help various industries, they're not ones that we actually regulate in a certain way. Yeah, we have permits that you have to take out for any kind of business actually; an occupancy permit and issues depending if you're a restaurant, there's all that kind of stuff, but this vehicles for hire industry is regulated under a separate by-law, separate by-law from even the Parking Authority. It's its own by-law. It's administered

by the Winnipeg Parking Authority. Food trucks are a bit different. I was actually supportive of the food trucks thing. So, to say we're not helping other industries...generally, the only other way to help other industries was just to cancel their...cancel their business taxes or whatever, those kinds of things. So, for me, I'm going to be supporting the amendment motion from Councillor Nason and yourself, Madam Speaker. Because, you know...and it's not much money. Like, really, I don't think it's going to improve the total health of the vehicles for hire industry. The only thing that really irks me is, you know, the personal vehicles for hire...you think Uber and Tapp are going to give money back to those personal vehicles for hire? I don't know, hard to say. But anyway, I'll be supporting this. I don't see it as being totally inconsistent. It's its separate own industry regulated and we've already, frankly, Madam Speaker, we've caused them a lot of problems with this whole personal vehicles for hire. Not ride share, personal vehicles for hire, right? Big companies, big corporations making huge money. Thanks.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Consistent with my votes at IRPW and at EPC, I will be voting in favour of Councillor Nason's, seconded by yourself, Madam Speaker, the motion before us here. Just as a bit of an explanation, in terms of my thinking and the reasons for my support, most bricks and mortar businesses that have been negatively hurt through this pandemic have been granted an opportunity to delay payment on their business and property taxes. So, there is a value to that. There is a cost to the City of Winnipeg for providing that delay in payments for those that have taken...wanted to take advantage of that particular program. Food trucks had the option of deciding to go out on the street this year or not go out on the street this year. Based on the timing of the pandemic, there was a choice that those businesses made and it was a business decision. The way it's worked for these ride for hires is...my understand is, is a pre-pay. They pre-pay for a quarter or something like that, their fees, so by the time the pandemic hit, they had already invested in their dispatch fees and that for the subsequent period. It's a relatively small amount of money. They don't have a bricks...they're not bricks and mortar similar to the businesses that would have received, you know, some delay in the payments which was a form of relief for property taxes and business taxes. That's why I'm voting in support of this particular motion. Again, it's hard to pick and choose, you know, the level of support is hard to quantify exactly, but I will be supporting this today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Nason, would you close?

Councillor Nason: Yeah, the only close I'll say is that I appreciate the comments around the table and I understand we are doing what we can to help everyone. Some are big, some are small, some are just emotional support to be there, to listen, to understand. There is more that we can do, likely, but in this case, we are trying to do something, and I hope that we can continue in this positive frame. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Allard: All right, thanks for all the comments and thanks for the clarification on this aligning the IRPW motion. I will...I would also like to stay consistent with my vote at IRPW. We had quite a bit of discussion, this is being done within budget and it's also not mill rate supported as money that has come from the industry. And our ride...our vehicle for hire program is structured in order to be cost recovery and confident that that will remain the case if we approve this motion today. So with that, I'd like to...well, I'd like to vote on the main motion.

Madam Speaker: Okay, we'll call the question on amending Motion 3. I'd like to call for a recorded vote or if someone can do that on my behalf. I'm not sure if it's...Councillor Browaty, thank you. So a recorded vote on the amending Motion 3; all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Allard, Councillor Browaty, Chambers, Eadie, Klein, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Gillingham, Gilroy and Rollins

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 4.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Amending Motion 3 passes. And the main item...I'll call the question on the main item as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Who did? Councillor Gillingham, we'll record you in opposition. Thank you. Councillor Rollins, that's two. Mr. Mayor, that's three. Okay, moving on, Mr. Clerk.

Item 4 – Budget Consolidation and Delegated Authority for the Wellington Crescent Riverbank, Path and Roadway Project – MM Ref No. 545-2020

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Allard to introduce Item 4.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I'd like to wait to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. And this was stood down by yourself, Councillor Klein. You have the floor.

Councillor Klein: Just real quickly, Madam Chair. Again, I feel it's my duty on behalf of the residents especially in the old Tuxedo area that continue to be very vocal about their displeasure with the work that is going to be done. I continued to share concerns that I did send to all members of Council where they clearly articulated that they did not agree with the communication that was sent out saying that there was a robust community discussion with stakeholders and that they were challenging all the information that was shared in there. So, for those reasons, I feel that I have to represent the concerns and desires of my residents in that ward, therefore, I'm not supporting any motion that has to do with the ongoing work at Wellington Crescent as it's laid out because it does not represent the involvement of residents living in the south Tuxedo Ward.

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

Councillor Schreyer: I will be voting with Councillor Klein against it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard to close on the item.

Councillor Allard: Yes, so just mention, I think...just on a high level, I understand that this project is important to protect our infrastructure. Both...it's both important for the road and, as well, for the water and sewer works happening...that exist under the road. So, there's been quite a bit of work that has been done on this. I would urge all my colleagues to support this project. I believe it's on the right track right now. I want to recognize that some area residents may not be in approval, but I do believe that this is work that needs to be done.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. With that, we'll call the question on Item 4. All in favour? Contrary? Okay, Councillor Klein recorded in opposition. Carried. Mr. Clerk, that's it for this committee. We'll now move into question period for the Chair. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Seeing none...yeah, we're just moving on to the next committee, yes. And I want to thank...just before we do that, I do want to thank Councillor Mayes for catching that layover that we weren't supposed to speak to. Someone was on the ball. Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Eadie, if I could ask you to take the Chair for the Governance Committee of Council, so I can move the by-laws.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We are on Governance and our esteemed Madam Speaker will introduce the by-law.

Councillor Sharma: Okay, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I move that By-law No. 101/2020 be read a first time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Anybody opposed? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 101/2020.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Speaker, I move that mister...no, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that By-law No. 101/2020 be read a second time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Anybody opposed? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 101/2020.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
September 30, 2020

Councillor Sharma: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 101/2020 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Excellent. All those in favour? Was that two-thirds? Anybody opposed? That's carried.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll move adjournment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You're moving adjournment? Thank you very much. All those in favour? All right, roll call.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 7:05 p.m.