COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, October 29, 2020

The Council met at 9:39 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Rollins.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF GUESTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Madam Clerk. We'll now hear from the Mayor on his morning statement.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good morning to my colleagues as well as all those that joining us in the gallery and remotely. I just have a few opening announcements. Firstly, I want to begin by echoing the words of Councillor Rollins during the morning prayer of appreciation for all those on the frontlines and working behind the scenes to battle COVID-19 in our community. We are absolutely in a storm right now. We need to continue to be vigilant as Winnipeggers. All three levels of government, including school divisions I should add, have a role to play. And government can and must continue to do what it can to ensure the safety and well-being of our citizens. I'll take this opportunity to remind all Winnipeggers of their role as well. Of course, stay home if you're sick. And of course, the fundamentals of washing your hands regularly, wearing a mask and watching your distance is a message that I and I know other members of council continue to communicate. I think right now is an incredibly important time for clear and consistent messages from public officials of the importance of mask wearing, the importance of watching our distance and washing our hands. And if we can continue to communicate in a clear and consistent manner, we will do our best to ensure that our residents hear that message and, more importantly, act upon it in a more fulsome way than we're seeing in the community right now. We know that the orange level restrictions came into effect on October 5th and with further restrictions on October the 19th. We continue to do our part and will continue to do our part to support the work of Manitoba Health to ensure that our citizens are protected as best we can. Secondly, Madam Speaker, I want to acknowledge and thank all those that participated in the recent Small Business Summit that was hosted by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce. This was a campaign commitment of mine back in 2014. We've had…each year, we've had a Small Business Summit. I want to thank the Chamber and their staff and their members for participating and for their support of this initiative. And excellent feedback from our business community, especially in this time in the pandemic as it relates to the needed supports from both federal and provincial governments as well as the innovation that city hall has been demonstrating. And so, we'll continue to lobby for those supports from the levels of government best suited to provide business supports. Of course, a lot of discussion about that. I want to thank the Chamber members and participants of the Small Business Summit. Small Business Week has just concluded, but our support and our dialogue with the small business community will obviously continue. And I know much of that dialogue is happening by members of council as well and I want to acknowledge and thank members of council for their ongoing outreach and accessibility to members of our business community. Lastly, Madam Speaker, I want to acknowledge and thank the federal government for the recent announcement this week made by the right Honourable Prime Minister Justin Trudeau of rapid housing initiative funds to be directed to the City of Winnipeg to the tune of $12.5 million. This comes after significant advocacy efforts by many members of Council, by FCM and the Big City Mayors Caucus as well as direct advocacy that I've been engaging in directly to the Prime Minister as well as the ministers…the Federal Ministers of Health, as well as the Federal Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank the federal government for listening to the request for direct funding to municipalities so that we can activate and get those dollars out the door. Council will have a role to play in the coming weeks and the coming month as we get the details. We're going to have to make some decisions on the deployment of those funds, but it's a welcome news and a positive step forward. And I want to thank the federal government for delivering for Winnipeg and for Winnipeggers in need. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next is Councillor Gillingham followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and good morning. There are men and women among us whose lives and careers become pillars within the respective sectors of our diverse city. They come from fields of education and health care, science, business, the arts and from the faith community. Their sustained contribution to our city through their lifetime is a stabilizing force, not only within their own sphere, but their expansive influence fortifies the broader community. And when one of these men or women dies, their death is a loss for all of Winnipeg. Reverend H.H. Barber was such a man. On Saturday, at the age of 98, he passed away. Pastor Barber pastored Calvary Temple in downtown Winnipeg, just a few blocks from city hall for 44 years. He was a giant in the Christian community and very well known beyond the church. He was a leader, an innovator, a plain-spoken teacher, an uncompromising spiritual shepherd and most of all, for more than seven decades, he was pastor to hundreds of thousands of people through his local congregation and through the TV program, 'Faith to Live By'. He was always one to deliver a message of hope. He was faithful to his god. He was faithful to his calling and he was faithful to his city. It's impossible to fully measure Pastor Barber's impact on Winnipeg. He will be missed. We extend our condolences to his family and to the congregation of Calvary Temple. I also want to note that very soon Remembrance Day will be upon us, Madam Speaker, this year it will be celebrated…wrong word, pardon me; it will be remembered, it will be commemorated in very different ways this year because we won't have the gatherings. And so, I do want to encourage all Winnipeggers to take time from their homes or from a quiet space to certainly remember those who have fallen, those who have served, those who still serve in our Canadian Armed Forces, who defend our freedoms and our democracy. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Moving forward, Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Rollins who is with us remote. Sorry, Councillor Gillingham, yes thank you.

Councillor Chambers: It's the hair thing. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise this morning to echo some of the comments that Councillor Gillingham has made with respect to Pastor H.H. Barber. My father had shared some time sitting on various committees with Pastor Barber and there is a family link as well. It was 40 years ago on this date that at Calvary Temple my parents renewed their 25th anniversary. So, today they are celebrating their 65th wedding anniversary. So, I just want to give a shout out to Pastor Milton Chambers and my mother, Lynn Chambers on their 65th wedding anniversary. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. We'll now go remote to Councillor Rollins for her morning announcement.

Councillor Rollins: I want to extend, Madam Speaker, condolences to the family of Karen Kepler. Karen Kepler was an educator, entrepreneur and community supporter. Her passing on October 12th was a loss. Karen believed in public library. In the 1990s, she was a member of the forward-thinking libraries steering committee. She then took the role of co-chair of the Winnipeg Library Foundation during the campaign that ultimately raised $21 million for the Millennium Library and its materials. It was quite the redevelopment that she co-chaired. There is so much more to say about her community leadership and volunteerism on many communities...committees including computer lending libraries in both Winnipeg and Selkirk. Needless to say, she was an exceptionally warm and kind and generous person. The mentor of many. And she is deeply missed by many. And my heart is with her surviving partner and family, the Kepler family. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Our final speaker this morning, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And it's with great pride today that I just want to rise and acknowledge Mr. Gary Epp of the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood community. I had the pleasure and great gratitude of joining our MP for the area and former councillor, Marty Morantz as we put up an honorary street-naming for Mr. Epp on Berkley, calling it Gary Epp Way. Mr. Epp has been recognized by residents for over 20 years now when he retired and he took to the streets walking up and down Berkley and a number of other streets over the years, picking up garbage. Every day for at least three hours a day. He continues to do that today. Acknowledging the neighbours along the way. Meeting people at coffee shops and talking to kids on their way, always watching for traffic for them. And it's not a job to him, it's just part of his everyday life. It brings him joy and it brings everybody in the neighbourhood such joy and happiness. And he's just a real treasure for all of us in Charleswood. So, it's my honour to stand and thank Mr. Epp, but also recognize his contribution to our community. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein.

MINUTES

Councillor Orlikow moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on September 30th, 2020, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now move into delegations. Joining us via Zoom is Lynne Fernandez on behalf of the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives who is appearing in opposition to Item 7 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2020. It's on the implementation of living wage for the City of Winnipeg employees. Madam Clerk, is the delegation on the line with us here this morning?

Clerk: Yes, she is.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Welcome, Ms. Fernandez. You have ten minutes to make your presentation.

DELEGATIONS

Lynne Fernandez: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning, Mayor Bowman and council members. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning to Item No. 7 on the implementation of the living wage for the City of Winnipeg employees. This motion to ensure that all City of Winnipeg employees make no less than $15 an hour is an important acknowledgment that the provincial minimum wage is not enough to support a family in Manitoba. And as we will see, in Winnipeg in particular. And while we acknowledge the good intention of this motion, it is important to note that $15 an hour is not a living wage today and certainly won't be by 2023. The Fight for 15 was launched by Manitoba's labour community some years ago when $15 an hour would have been a living wage. In 2016, we pegged Winnipeg's living wage at $14.54 an hour. Now, the term living wage is used by many and often very loosely, but at the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, we calculate the living wage using the Living Wage Canada Methodology, part of the Canadian Living Wage Framework. The framework provides a consistent living wage definition, calculation methodology and strategy for recognizing corporate and community members who commit to pass a living wage policy. The BC office of the CCPA developed and maintains the methodology, helping communities across the country with their calculations. The living wage differs from the minimum wage because it is based on the actual cost of living of a two-parent family with two children. Now, according to the 2016 census, almost 66% of families with children in Manitoba are headed by couples and close to 21% of families with children are single parent families. Now, we do calculate the living wage for a one-parent family as well and I'll circle back to that in just a moment. The 2020 family living wage for a Winnipeg two-parent, two-child family increased to $17.24 an hour, up 18.7% from our 2016 calculation. Expenses went up just over 16% from 2016, whereas the rate of inflation increased approximately 6.5% in the same period. So why is the increase for the living wage so much more than the increase in inflation? It is because expenses for food, clothing, foot wear, shelter, private health insurance and education increased more than the rate of inflation. The living wage for a single parent with one child is significantly higher at $26.09 an hour. Shelter, transportation and child care expenses are rather inflexible and having two incomes to cover such expenses goes a long way. Now, it's obviously not possible for employers to base their wages on family types, so we always promote the two-parent, two-child wage as the benchmark for all employees. We provide the single parent information to remind policy makers how much some families have to struggle and to encourage government to think about policies and programs that support parents and children. The living wage is calculated as the hourly rate at which a household can meet its basic needs in the community in which it lives once government transfers have been considered. And those transfers could be the Canada Child Benefit and also, we take into consideration government deductions like taxes and CPP. So, the living wage ends up being a complicated calculation of wages, provincial and federal government programs and living expenses in 10 different categories. Now, the living wage supports are very bare bones budget. It does not cover credit card, loan or other interest payments. It doesn't allow a family to buy a home. It does not allow the family to save for retirement or save money for their children's future education. It does not allow for more than minimal recreation, entertainment or holiday costs and there is no extra money to care for a disabled family member to deal with a serious illness or look after the elderly. A living wage allows the family only to provide basic necessities so that they do not have to choose between paying the rent or buying food or keeping the lights and heat on. It allows children to get glasses if they need them and to go to the dentist and the family to live in proper housing. The living wage is first and foremost a call to public and private sector employers, primarily larger ones to sustain families. This can be a change...achieved through wages or a combination of wages and non-mandatory benefits such as extended health benefits, subsidized child care, subsidized transit passes, et cetera. If an employee receives non-mandatory benefits, the hourly wage they need to be paid to reach a living wage rate will be reduced. While public sector employees such as those at the City of Winnipeg will have access to non-mandatory benefits, many private sector employees will not. This is why it is doubly important for living wage employers to ensure that the companies they contract work out to pay a living wage to their employees. Now, according to the Canadian Living Wage Framework, a legally binding contract clause should be inserted into all future, renewed…and renewed service contracts to ensure that all contracted service workers are paid the living wage. It is important to recognize that there are different definitions of applicable service contract and unique ways to calculate benefits contribution so that a living wage does not have be out of reach or onerous to calculate. Finally, given the gap between today's living wage and the $15 an hour proposed in the motion, we urge Council to speed up implementation of the living wage because that gap will be even greater by 2023. We also urge you to make it a true living wage as calculated in our new report and to include contract employees in the motion. There are resources available and

contacts with other living wage employers who can help with this aspect of the calculation. Proper implementation of this more rigorous living wage will make a significant difference for Winnipeg families and set the bar high for other employers. We wish to remind you that poverty is a dire problem in our city. According to the Winnipeg Without Poverty report and I quote, "Regardless of the measure used, the most recent numbers available for capturing the number of those living in low-income in Winnipeg are too high. 9.6%, according to the market basket measure, 10.1% according to the low-income cut-off after tax. And 13.3% according to the low-income measure before tax." Many of these low-income people work at minimum wage jobs and they have families. Some of them might well be working for companies the City contracts out to. We urge you to remember the high price of low wages and to work with these companies when designing your living wage policy. A proper living wage is a powerful tool in our fight against poverty and the negative effects it engenders. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Fernandez. If you could just please stay on the line with us, Council may have questions for you momentarily. We're going to go to the next delegation at this time. If I could please call forward Mr. Gord Delbridge. He's with CUPE Local 500. He's the president. And he's also in opposition to the same item. Mr. Delbridge is here in person with us today. We will have five minutes on the clock. Welcome to you.

Gord Delbridge: Thank you, Mayor Bowman and councillors for this opportunity to present before you today. First, I just want to open with saying that I just want to thank all of you. I want to thank Mayor Bowman and all of you on Council for the leadership you've shown during these unprecedented times with COVID and the challenges that I know all of you are facing. There is a lot of anxiety out there and I just want to let you know that CUPE remains committed to working to get through this and I'm confident with your leadership and us all working together that we will get through this. So, I just want to thank all of you for the challenges that you're helping us get through. Also want to thank...I want to thank Councillor Mayes for bringing this motion forward, the leadership and courage that you've shown in doing so. I want to thank Mayor Bowman for supporting the motion. I'd also like to thank Councillor Rollins for, you know, her comments that she made at the EPC committee…committee meeting. She spoke very eloquently as to what it means to be a living-wage employer. I also want to thank the administration for the recommendation that was put forward in their report. There's many things that we know that by lifting people out of poverty and, you know, paying people a living wage will do for our community and for our city. We know that there is a direct correlation with poverty and crime and we know that's an issue that we have within our city. We know that there's a direct correlation with drug addiction. We know that primarily immigrants and Indigenous people are impacted by lower wages. We know that there are retention issues when people are paid lower wages. We know that there is a significant impact on the morale of workers when they're not paid, you know, a fair living wage. And we see that we have that issue currently right now within the City of Winnipeg. I can tell you that morale is at an all-time low. We know that there are a segment of our workers that are paid well below a living wage. We know that folks that are going to be getting the increases, the folks that are earning some of the lowest incomes spend every single one of their dollars within our local economy. They're not spending money investing in stocks or vacations in the Bahamas or on their second home in Phoenix. Every single dollar is spent here in our local economy and that strengthens our economy. We know this. We know that in recent polling we've done amongst Winnipeggers, that 80% of Winnipeggers support a living wage and that's a pretty high level of support. You almost don't see that level of support almost on any issue that we bring forward. We're very specific when we did this polling. The polling was done by Probe Research. And we know that 80% of Winnipeggers support the City of Winnipeg becoming a living wage employer. That includes everyone that is providing public services and that includes contractors. Contractors that are providing City services often are encouraged to exploit workers with low wages. They are rewarded by being awarded contracts because they come in with the lowest bid. In order to come in with the lowest bid, they've got to look at cutting their big costs in every aspect and that includes what they're paying workers. I know from conversations I've had with various, you know, contractors that provide City services, many of them said that they would welcome provisions to be implemented and RFPs going forward that would have minimum wage standards so that they would know what the labour costs are amongst their competitors and they wouldn't have be to put in a position to have to exploit workers, pay lower wages. They wouldn't be faced with retention issues. They know that they would, as a result, be able to provide better quality services. But under the circumstances, there are no provisions that are put forward in any RFPs. We have the opportunity to do that. We could request that. There could be direction going forward that, you know, that's how we proceed going forward. We know that there is many cities across the country that have shown strong leadership that recognize these issues and have become certified living wage employers. We know that they recognize the social impacts and they've made their communities stronger. We all want to live in a strong, vibrant city with...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Delbridge, that's the end of the presentation time.

Gord Delbridge: I'll wrap up quick.

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

Gord Delbridge: I think we can all agree that we all want to live in a vibrant city with opportunity and where workers are treated with dignity. We know that is going to make...it's going to make a better city for all of us. The City is one of the largest employers and we should take the lead in ethical standards. And at one time I can tell you that the City of Winnipeg was considered an employer of choice. That currently is not the situation going from…at this point in time. I would encourage that, you know, Council ask the Public Service to do a study and report back to Council with the impacts, the costs of what it would be to become a certified living wage employer. To report back and at least take that into consideration and review that information. Make your decision then once you've got that information. I think you might find that it might not be as costly as you may anticipate. And at the very least, it would be important for us to get that information. And then base a decision based on information that we have. This is an important issue that I think really needs to be taken into consideration seriously. We know the federal government has just, you know, said that they're going to give us $42.2 million in relief funding. It would take less than 1% of that to become a living wage employer. I look at a lot of the motions and issues that are put forward and a lot of expenditures. I think that this is one that needs to be taken into consideration. At the very least, let's get the information and base your decision based on information that can be reported back to you. That's all I have. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Delbridge. We'll now see if there's any questions from Council for either of the delegations. Councillor Mayes? Ms. Fernandez, are you on the line with us?

Lynne Fernandez: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we'll now go on to questions from Council starting with Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Just two…one question for Ms. Fernandez and one for Mr. Delbridge. And thank you for the comments. And I appreciate…some people call…the term living wage and fair wage are used by different people to mean different things. It is a problem. That's a fair comment. Just, I…it's a bit difficult because we don't know what the Living Wage Canada folks, this is for Ms. Fernandez, what the index would come up with for 2023. It's an index that's calculated periodically. Between 2014 and 2017, it only went up three point something percent. It was actually slower than inflation. In the recent years, it's gone up 18%, considerably quicker than inflation. So, you give a very good detailed explanation of how that is derived, but I think it's fair to say, we know it's $17.24 in 2020, but we don't know in 2023 where that index might land. Is that a fair comment?

Lynne Fernandez: Yeah, because we don't know how much...we don't know how much the constant or ten categories are going to vary. And we don't know how government programs may change. To give you an example, when the Canada Child Benefit came in in 2016, it made a huge difference to the living wage. Living wage came down substantially...it actually decreased, I think a little bit, in the city of Vancouver of all places. So, that shows you the impact that government programs can have on the living wage and we don't know what is going to happen between now and 2023. I would say that that's an argument for bringing in a living wage now because you know what it is now and then you index it according to the calculations that are done on a regular basis.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. One for Mr. Delbridge.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Someone said to me, so it will be 15 forever? And I said, no my understanding is the parties will collectively bargain, that it will be in the collective agreement. I think most people, this is sort of for the record, in case someone looks back on this years from now if this does pass. Is it your understanding? Yes, the parties could bargain that wage to whatever cross the board index, special increase for the lowest paid. It wouldn't be locked at 15 forever, it would be subject to collective bargaining?

Gord Delbridge: No, yeah, clearly, you know, it's our anticipation to continue to negotiate wage increases for all employees. Unfortunately, what happens, though, is we see, you know, with various bargaining groups that are in the $80,000, $100,000 a year, that are often getting arbitrated contracts awarded to them with 4 and 5% increases, unfortunately, when these individuals that are making $13 an hour and, you know, as of recent are receiving 1% increases, I mean, you can do the math on that and you can see where that gap has significantly widened. I can tell you this, though, I know that there has been supervisors and management within certain departments that supervise some of the lowest income workers and they've come to us and they've said that, listen, we need to focus some attention on increasing that gap. It's too costly to continually keep retraining employees. We see that at 311. We see that with, you know, retention with the francophone 311 operators and various other areas. And so, there is a cost, you know, to you know retention issues and so they've come to us and they've said, you know, we've got to increase that threshold. I hope that you guys are going to push and bargain and we will. We will be looking to increase that threshold. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Moving on, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam speaker. Since elected six years ago to the week, I've been talking about how the highest rate of inflation at city hall has been the private contracts. It's been the construction inflation. Since the 1990s, since we divested ourselves of our own resources to do a vastly…considerably greater amount of our own private contracts and construction. Since then, construction inflation has gone up to a rate we've never seen before. It's not just construction. Even Brian Mayes in the last few years made the point. When it comes to what is another commonality to that, capital intensive industries that we contract out, like garbage and recycling. Now we're the only city in Canada that does not have a single quadrant of the city that provides the garbage or recycling. And we have not kept up with the rest of the country on this. Thus we see, as Brian Mayes has pointed out, a higher rate of inflation in garbage and recycling contracts. Now, I'm not sure if Mr. Delbridge has had to think of it like this in the past, but if we are to provide a living wage for City workers only, but not for taxpayers contract out those City services, how is Winnipeg supposed to keep up with the rest of the country in terms of being competitive for having at least one quadrant, if not half, if not all, like other cities in Canada, having in-house city employers provide those same services if we have to compete with private contract…private contracts that do not have to provide the same living wage?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Delbridge.

Gord Delbridge: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. And yeah, no, I would agree with your comments. I think it's...I mean, we have the ability here. I believe that it's incumbent upon us as a city to you know take some responsibility for anyone that is providing City services. Like I said, the City of Winnipeg is one of the largest employers, and we need to show leadership and we need to be able to treat anyone that's providing City services with dignity and we need to conduct business in an ethical manner. And I think that you can't just pick one segment or one portion or certain individuals. I think for anyone that is providing City services, we've got the ability to do that. We could put forward in any future RFPs, you know, provisions that states that, yeah, you can't exploit the earnings of these workers. There are going to be provisions. There are going to be minimum standards because that's who we are. Because that's who we are as an employer. We want to take this ethical approach. And I think it shows leadership and, you know, it sets examples for other employers. I think there is a higher expectation when it comes to government amongst the public. And we know that. Like I said, 80% of Winnipeggers support this. And so, if 80% of Winnipeggers support it, I'm wondering, do you support the wants of Winnipeggers? Do you support what Winnipeggers are asking you? I'm asking that. I mean, ultimately, you'll make that decision and we'll see whether or not you support the wishes of Winnipeggers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Delbridge. Second question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. And thank you to Mr. Delbridge. I do have a question for Lynne Fernandez. She did talk about expenses. And the rate of inflation of expenses and she had her own take on this in terms of cost of living, groceries. And I wanted to...for her to sort of explain again. I'm suspicious myself, you see, about what we call the consumer price index because it doesn't take into account for those living in poor communities, the disproportionately high rate of inflation in the cost of housing and mortgages and rent over the last decade and longer as well as the cost of vegetables and essentials like that. I wanted to know if Lynne Fernandez could expand a little bit on that.

Lynne Fernandez: Sure, I'd be happy to. First of all, we don't just look at the rate of inflation. We dig deeper into some of these expenses and we use the Market Basket Measure food threshold from Stats Canada to calculate increases in food prices. And it is important to realize that the CPI, the price index considers inflation across the board whereas we're just looking at 10 categories. And if you look at food, for example, it makes up 18.5% of the living wage families' expenses and the percentage change from 2016 is almost 27%. So, food went up almost 27%. If you look at shelter, it went up almost...almost 17, just under 17%. And we also allow the family to have a category that we call 'other' which includes things like household items and school supplies, things like necessities that a family has to buy. And that went up just over 23% from 2016. Adult education; we allow enough spending for one of the parents to take some…update their education and those costs went up 15%. So, you can see that this is far greater than the rate of...the CPI increase which was about 6.5% over the same period.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Nothing further, Councillor Schreyer?

Councillor Schreyer: That's fine, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, onto you. Your question, please.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank both delegations for coming here today and putting your points on the public record. I have to say, I'm surprised that both are here in opposition to something that I heard

both organizations advocate for, for many, many years. The living wage motion that a number of councillors including myself supported in advance of getting to the floor of council...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein moves extension for two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Bowman: My question...I'm surprised that both aren't coming in here today to say, thank you, this is a good first step for something that we've been advocating for. I appreciate the points that you're making about wanting index. I appreciate what you're arguing for in terms of additional support. And I appreciate you wanting to put that on the public record. My question for both of you is very clear. For me, I supported what is before us today. I will not be supporting additional amendments today. If you were in my shoes and you are voting on what is before us right now, notwithstanding any amendments, what I understand is you're saying that we should oppose it because you've registered in opposition. And I just would like clarity whether you're asking us to vote for or against the matter that is before us. Not amendments, but what is before us. Thanks.

Gord Delbridge: I'd be willing to clarify that. Initially, when you register as a delegation, you've got to register in opposition or in favour. So, I wasn't really sure on what position we wanted to take here. I support Mayes' motion and I would encourage everyone else to support. I thank you, you know, for the leadership and courage you've taken to get us to this point. So, I support that. So, I don't want any misconceptions to be made there. However, I did want to speak, I guess in a sense, to saying that is a step in the right direction, but I'm opposed that it doesn't maybe go far enough. And I think that we need to do more research. We need to have more information. You know, I requested that the public administration maybe could report back to Council with a study on what the impact would be for us to actually become a certified living wage employer. That would be something that we could become so proud of and that we could tout as a city. As many other cities have taken that position so.

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

Gord Delbridge: I would encourage that we support the motion that is before us, but I also think that it's important that we do some additional study and get some additional information that could come back to Council for your consideration on what this means going forward. I mean, what would it take to become a certified living wage employer? And so, that's the ask. And so, I hope that brings some clarification.

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

Mayor Bowman: My question was for both.

Madam Speaker: Ms. Fernandez, would you like to answer the question posed?

Lynne Fernandez: Yeah, thank you. I appreciate your point, Mayor Bowman, and I concur with what Mr. Delbridge has said. And if you're asking whether an increase to $15 an hour is better than nothing, yes it is. And it is better than probably what we'll see the minimum wage be by 2023. But you can't call it a...my point is that you can't call it a living wage. And my hope in giving this presentation was to educate Council as to what a living wage technically means. And to encourage you and to inspire you, as Mr. Delbridge said, to look into it further and to actually become a certified living wage employer as other cities have done. Fifteen dollars an hour is much better than $11.90 an hour, there's no question about it, but we just have to be clear; this is not a living wage. And there are other ways you can obtain a living wage as well. It's not just by increasing your hourly rate. There are other things that you could look at. There are other things, like perhaps subsidized child care. You could look at low-income transit pass for your employees. There is all kinds of ways that you can bring the living wage down. It isn't just a matter of bringing the wage up. So there is lots of material out there. We would be happy to provide more information to educate you as to how...

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Fernandez.

Lynne Fernandez: You also…

Madam Speaker: Ms. Fernandez, thank you. The clock has run out for question period. There…that ends our question period today. We thank you both for your presentation.

Gord Delbridge: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Our next delegation appearing together via Zoom in opposition to Item 5 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated July 13th, 2020. It's regarding the proposed lease agreement between the City of Winnipeg and Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc. The

delegates are Jason McRae-King from the Winnipeg Goldeyes, Tony Fletcher from Winnipeg Goldeyes Field of Dreams Foundation and Greg Dandewich of GDAN Solutions Limited. Mr. Clerk…Madam Clerk, are the delegations…are all online?

Clerk: Yes, they are.

Madam Speaker: Welcome, gentlemen. We'll have 10 minutes on the clock.

Jason McRae-King: Good morning, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Jason McRae-King and I'm a chartered accountant CPA working as the CFO for the Winnipeg Goldeyes. I will be coordinating the delegations today and directing questions as necessary. Joining me are Tony Fletcher, President of the Field of Dreams Foundation and Greg Dandewich of GDAN Solutions, author of the Shaw Park Community Economic Report. There has been a lot of hard work done on this file over the last five years, and we appreciate that a motion was brought forward to EPC last week. We're grateful to see some councillors take leadership and commitment to move towards a lease deal to ensure the Winnipeg Goldeyes have a future in Manitoba. My understanding is that the motion discussed at EPC last week was originally written in February, prior to the impacts of COVID-19. Financial situations of the Goldeyes has changed significantly. The team is facing a 91% reduction in revenue in 2020 and uncertain as to what 2021 will bring. So if the Goldeyes start play in May of 2021, 20 months will have passed since the last professional game at Shaw Park. The lease terms and conditions discussed in the motion started to take the current form after a meeting on May 29th, 2019, with Property, Planning and Development. The purpose of that meeting was to review the financial impact of the proposed terms and conditions on the Goldeyes operations. Five years of audited financial statements were provided on a read-only basis and a 10-year historical summary of the audited income statement incorporating the proposed new lease agreement was reviewed by Property, Planning and Development. August of 2019, a subsequent meeting was held with Property, Planning and Development and the Goldeyes were informed that the City would be hiring an independent assessor to work on the file and that audited financial statements would be required. Altus Group was engaged with the City and received audited financial statements for their appraisal report which was completed last November. Property, Planning and Development used the information obtained in the appraisal process to prepare the report originally scheduled for the SPC meeting in March. It was ultimately delayed until July 13th due to COVID-19. July 13th meeting, additional financial information regarding parking was discussed and requested of the Goldeyes. Internal information was prepared and provided within 24 hours in order to have it available to the July 15th EPC meeting. Internal information was not acknowledged by EPC and a motion passed requesting audited financial statements. Based on the discussions at standing policy committee and Executive Policy Committee, MNP, Meyers, Norris and Penny was engaged to provide specified audit reports on the non-proprietary financial information at EPC. More specifically, information as to whether the Goldeyes are profitable, what parking revenues are, what is the sign revenue, and what are the facility operating expenses that would be assumed by the City if the Goldeyes left town? The specified audit reports as well as other financial impact information were provided on September 14th and again on October 14th. Motion at EPC last week was based on the Altus report which incorporated a full review of the Goldeyes' pre-COVID-19 financial statements. Furthermore, administration's report indicates financial information regarding the municipal tax grant and entertainment tax was not provided. I believe there may be some miscommunication regarding this as the current lease specifically states that the municipal tax grant and entertainment tax rebate are provided by the City in consideration of the City becoming beneficial owner of the ballpark in 2023. City Council at the time of the current lease recognized the private contribution was made to construct the ballpark and request that the (inaudible) enter into an amateur access agreement whereby the City would grant municipal taxes back annually and rebate the entertainment tax in consideration of the City becoming owner of the ballpark. This was communicated with administration in Section 27, referring to the amateur access agreement of the current lease scheduled in the report, which provides to the City CFO on September 14th as was the breakdown of the $13 million private contribution comparing it to the total annual grant and entertainment tax estimated to be received back by the end of the current lease, totalling approximately $7 million given a private sector balance of $6 million. Administration's report failed to identify the City is receiving the ballpark, set with a replacement cost of $43 million for a annual municipal tax grant of approximately $43,000. Even with the grant, the Goldeyes still pay over $250,000 annually in property and business taxes. It's more than the other professional teams combined. The City's report anticipates rebate of $325,000 for entertainment tax in 2020, and I can confirm that that number will be zero. No baseball, means no entertainment tax. Goldeyes are also responsible for all capital improvements; repairs and maintenance, utilities, property tax and all operating costs of Shaw Park. An average annual cost in excess of $700,000. During the last five years of lease negotiations, many of the Shaw Park's planned capital maintenance improvements have been put on hold as the City has not provided their approval to proceed. One specific project has now been delayed over a year with no response to date. This compares to a lease in Ottawa where the tenant pays $125,000 in rent and the City of Ottawa covers capital improvements, utilities, property tax and other operating costs. Ottawa also includes a ballpark and 800 parking stalls built and paid for by the City. The proposed lease, terms and schedules were written prior to COVID-19. The closure of the border and public gathering restrictions being put in place. This has severely impacted financial operations. Early estimates anticipate it will take five to seven years to fully recover from the losses in 2020. Under the current lease, the Goldeyes cannot enter into any agreements past July, 2023, which means any sponsorship, suite, banking and other agreements

can only be negotiated for the 2021 and 2022 season. The Goldeyes have been in communication with the administration over the last week. Negotiations on a new lease have been ongoing and I think the administrative note sent this week reflects an arrangement that will ensure the future of the Winnipeg Goldeyes in Manitoba and a long-term tenant at the ballpark. The Goldeyes are willing to accept a 15-year lease with parking, property tax grant and entertainment tax rebate the entire term. The waiver of the sponsorship policy by Council also remains part of the deal. Major concession asked for from the City from day one of negotiations is to amend the current lease to remove the City's financial obligation of paying for the unadvertised capital improvements and repairs from August, 2018 to July, 2023, the costs that could exceed a million dollars if a new lease is not negotiated. Parties involved would agree to amend the current lease to relieve the City of this obligation now as well as in the new lease. We understand the impact COVID has had on City operations and the City's desire to mitigate financial obligations in the future. COVID-19 and the government pose restrictions on public gatherings has had a tremendous impact on the arts, music, entertainment and sports as well. Proposed rent by the City was pre-COVID and the significant impacts it has had on Goldeyes operations. Goldeyes ask that the City consider rent to $25,000 for years 1 to 5, $50,000 for years 6 to 10 and $75,000 for years 11 to 15. This represents an increase of $750,000 in rent over the current lease (inaudible). In closing, the loss of the 2020 season provided with the delays of negotiating a new lease with the City, severely impacted the ability for the Goldeyes to conduct business. Hopefully, Council will recognize the urgency of making a decision and finalizing a new lease deal. I'll now hand it over to Tony Fletcher, President of the Field of Dreams Foundation.

Tony Fletcher: Thank you, Jason. Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, councillors, as Jason said, my name is Tony Fletcher and I'm President of the Winnipeg Goldeyes Field of Dreams Foundation. Allow me, please to very briefly tell you about a relevant un-heralded Goldeyes related success story. Since its inception in 1995, the Winnipeg Goldeyes Field of Dreams Foundation has raised and distributed $2.6 million to children's charities in Manitoba. A total of more than 170 children's charities have benefitted from Field of Dreams Foundation funding since 1995. Although this year is certainly going to be unique, in the 2019 season, the Field of Dreams Foundation raised and distributed about $103,000 just that year to 44 different children's charities. In addition, as has been the case for many years, three $1,000 scholarships were awarded to members of Baseball Manitoba for continuing with post-secondary education and will be maintaining their involvement in the local baseball community. It's also worth noting that both teams from Baseball Manitoba and Softball Manitoba benefit from the sale of 50-50 tickets at Winnipeg Goldeyes home games. The Field of Dreams Foundation is an independent registered company run by an 11-member board of directors, which I serve…

Madam Speaker: We're just going to pause for a moment. Councillor Lukes moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Continue, Mr. Fletcher.

Tony Fletcher: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'll wrap up very quickly. The board of directors manages the foundation and makes all funding decisions in its own discretion and pursuant to an established criteria distributed to all interested children's charities. The Goldeyes are about much more than baseball, but baseball and the Goldeyes are responsible for the existence by ability and success of the Field of Dreams Foundation. Without the Goldeyes, members of Council, the Field of Dreams $2.6 million in charitable support and the work the foundation does to foster children's charities and amateur baseball in Manitoba would cease to exist. Thank you.

Jason McRae-King: Thanks, Tony. Finally, we have Greg Dandewich from GDAN Solutions who will discuss the Community Economic Development Report.

Greg Dandewich: Thank you very much, Jason and thank you very much to Council. I was asked to come on and put in a community economic development impact assessment of Shaw Park and the Goldeyes as its main tenant. The report is broken down into four parts: economic impact, downtown developments, supporting quality of life and giving back to the community of which Tony has just referred to. I'm going to just touch on a couple of points, I know our time is short. Collectively, the Goldeyes and Shaw Park are important contributors to both the Winnipeg and downtown economy paying over $300,000 in annual property taxes, creating over 300 full and part-time jobs with an annual payroll of $1.7 million, and since 1999, securing over 52,000 hotel room nights and purchasing over $63 million worth of local supplies and services. Shaw Park is a major destination and entertainment centre in downtown. Goldeyes games bring over 270,000 people downtown annually, with US visitors purchasing over 42,000 tickets and over 145,000 group tickets from outside Winnipeg purchased between 2014 and 2019. Finally, the Goldeyes enable Shaw Park to be an active and impactful entertainment...

Madam Speaker: Just pause for a moment. Councillor Klein moves a further extension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Greg Dandewich: Thank you. And finally, the Goldeyes enable Shaw Park to be an active and impactful entertainment node in downtown and The Forks. The teamed facilities to support the City of Winnipeg's ongoing efforts to create a high quality of life for Winnipeggers and for visitors. And built on the City's OurWinnipeg planning vision for downtown as a

connected set of nodes and coordinators creating…corridors, creating pedestrian connectivity between The Forks, Exchange District and downtown destinations. Thank you very much. And I'd be happy to take any questions.

Jason McRae-King: Thanks, Greg. That concludes our presentation. The group is now available for any questions.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you very much to each of you for once again presenting and representing on behalf of the Goldeyes and, of course, Field of Dreams. I actually just have a very simple question. I heard in today's presentation something I didn't hear the last time you presented at Executive Policy Committee. Why is COVID-19 at issue for the new lease when the new lease doesn't start until 2023? The lease that you enjoy right now has a lease of $1 a year. So just wondering why COVID-19 is part of the presentation today?

Jason McRae-King: COVID-19 is a part of the presentation because it's affected our operations. Like I said, we have had...assuming we play in May of 2021, that will be 20 months since professional baseball has been played at Shaw Park. And no baseball games in 2020. So it's…they're thinking the loss is going to take us five, probably up to seven years to recover from the losses of 2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Councillor Gilroy followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. The Mayor asked my first question, so I'll go into my second question. Just in terms, have you gone to other levels of government to ask for any funding? I know that...I know that the City does benefit from having the ball team here. But other levels of government, specifically, the provincial level of government would also very much benefit. So, I was wondering if you've asked them for any level of funding?

Jason McRae-King: Are you talking for specific funding or COVID-related funding?

Councillor Gilroy: How about both?

Jason McRae-King: No, we haven't approached the provincial government for any type of funding. COVID funding, we have had to access to some of the funds, but a lot of the programs repayment starts in 2023. So, without a lease deal passed then, the co-lending programs with our banks and BDC and Western Diversification will not lend funds until we have a lease negotiated that goes past 2023.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you very much. We're hearing that there is a new agreement that is proposed from you. And I'm just wondering why that wasn't brought forward at EPC or maybe at this standing policy committee. Why did we not hear about it until now?

Jason McRae-King: Things were being negotiated with administration at that time and information was being shared. And once the final details were put together, it was just a matter of timing.

Madam Speaker: Anything further? Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. This is a question, I guess, for Jay or whoever on the team wants to ask it. I know that Jay, you mentioned just a couple of highlights in your presentation about what was happening with the Ottawa lease. Do you think you could maybe highlight the difference between the Ottawa lease and the Winnipeg lease just so we can hear the differences? Just a highlight.

Jason McRae-King: Okay, yeah, I did provide a report to administration on some of the comparables on October 14th. The Ottawa lease provides a ballpark paid for by the City of Ottawa which includes 800 parking stalls. Majority of the ballpark in Winnipeg was paid for by private contribution, includes 243 parking stalls. The new tenant in Ottawa would pay $125,000 a year in rent for a 10-year period. They're exempt from property taxes and business taxes. And the City of Ottawa will pay the utilities, field maintenance and wages and structural repairs of that deal. The proposed Winnipeg lease currently has a rent proponent with the tenant paying all the repairs, maintenance, operating costs, property tax, business taxes. Those costs would be $769,000 more than what the Ottawa deal is or over the term…over the 15-year term, that is over $11 million, their cost in Winnipeg from Ottawa.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Anything further? Moving on to Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to clarify some of the information that has been provided by your group this morning, specifically speaking to the number of full-time and part-time positions. Can somebody advise how many full-time positions are directly attributable in terms of front office staff for the Winnipeg Goldeyes?

Jason McRae-King: It is a moving target, but currently, you know, in an operating year, we have 18 full-time positions. And we also hire on payroll in the summer, there is 300 part-time staff with over 100 part-time staff working at each and every ball game.

Madam Speaker: Second question, Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: And those part-time staff are game-day staff that are concessions, field maintenance. Can you just expand on that a little bit?

Jason McRae-King: Correct, we do hire some term positions that would be considered full-time for the April to October period. And then the other part-time positions are the game-day operators. So, there is probably about seven, eight other full-time staff that are hired for that April to October period. And the rest would be made up of.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now move on to remote to Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yeah, I guess it is a similar question. We had requested audited financial statements from Winnipeg Goldeyes and Riverside Park Management. I'm sure you understand that the Goldeyes facilities are located on City land and that essentially it's our determination what should happen with that land as a council, why not just provide the audited financial statements that was asked from Council?

Jason McRae-King: Well, Council did ask for the non-proprietary financial information, so we did give the specified audit reports which take detailed lines of the financial statements and specifically the revenue items that were requested in the July 15th, EPC meeting. We took those revenue items. We had back in...in May, provided the City. I sat down with a member of Property, Planning and Development, five years worth of financial statements, and we looked at the income statement to determine how the proposed lease conditions and…terms and conditions would affect the Goldeyes operation. So, they did have a review of those financial statements.

Councillor Allard: This is a second question. I understand you use the word 'proprietary'. I also understand the word proprietary to mean that it is fully within your power and purview to make those proprietary information pieces not for proprietary. There would be all sorts of mechanisms available like non-disclosure agreements. Why not…why not, if we had made the request, make the audited financial statements of Riverside Park Management and the Winnipeg Goldeyes available if you want to use our land?

Jason McRae-King: One, we didn't hear specifically from the City what they wanted to do with the financial statements, whether they'd be made public or not. We did do a non-disclosure agreement. The City just wanted to hire Altus to do a report that encompassed a lot of things. And the financial statements were made fully available to them at that.

Councillor Allard: So do you disagree with the report that says that audited financial statements that were requested by Council, both for Riverside Park Management and the Winnipeg Goldeyes, are you contesting our administrative report that says that those were not provided?

Jason McRae-King: They reviewed on…by the City on a read-only basis. We did not physically provide a paper copy for them to have and distribute.

Councillor Allard: Okay, so you're confirming that you did not...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard that was your third question. I do need to move on, but thank you for your questions. We'll now go to Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think I might have three questions. The first one, probably for Jason; could you please clarify for me and people who have not seen the new terms publicly, the 15-year request for rebate on your property tax, entertainment tax and parking and maybe kind of explain some of the numbers around that?

Jason McRae-King: Sorry, I don't think I understand your question. You want me to explain the ask in the current?

Madam Speaker: Just a pause, Councillor Klein moves extension…Councillor Klein moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Jason McRae-King: Yeah, so the previous...and I'm not sure if this is what you're asking. The previous terms and conditions we're looking at a 25-year term which was 15 years and two five-year renewals, parking was included in that. Entertainment tax and municipal tax was not provided for that entire 15-year term. We've come back to the City and through administration and said we're fine with the 15-year term. Let's remove the renewals. Just go straight 15 years. That gives us certainty and…but we would like to have the parking was already included in that 15 years, so there is no dispute. The dispute over the parking was in years 16 to 25. So, let's remove that. Just go with the 15-year term and let's make the entertainment tax and municipal tax for the entire term as opposed to stopping midway through and coming back to Council after that point.

Councillor Santos: Right. And so, with the 15 years, I'm assuming you would know what those numbers, those costs would be, the rebates...what the rebate costs would be? And I would like you to explain that to me, what those numbers are.

Jason McRae-King: Well, the entertainment tax is provided to all the professional sports teams. So in 2020, for example, the entertainment tax is zero, so that's an easy one. In 2019, it was $279,000. So, it varies from year to year. But I can tell you from the City's revenue side, when the Manitoba Moose moved away, it didn't affect City operations. When the Manitoba Moose came back and started playing, entertainment tax affected the City operations. So, there would be no net effect on the City for entertainment tax. Municipal tax, on the other hand, is a grant and that's ranged from between $34,000 and…$34,000 to $43,000 per year. So over a 15-years, an average of $40,000 over a 15-year period.

Madam Speaker: Just to pause, that ends our question period here for this item. There are a few other speakers, but I see no extension. Okay, we'll move on. We thank you for your presentation today, gentlemen. Thank you.

Jason McRae-King: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Our next delegation appearing via Zoom is Brian Walker. He is here on behalf of the South Plessis Road Residents Association in opposition to Item 9 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated July 13th, 2020. It's regarding the closing of Black Diamond Road east of Marius. Madam Clerk, is the delegation on the line with us?

Clerk: I see that he's joined the meeting. Brian, we just need you to unmute your microphone if you could, please.

Madam Speaker: Welcome, Mr. Walker. We'll have ten minutes on the clock for you. You can begin when you're ready. Take your time.

Clerk: Brian, can we just get you to unmute your microphone, please?

Brian Walker: I was trying to do that. How is that?

Clerk: Perfect. Thank you.

Brian Walker: Okay, thank you. Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Mayor and council members for...oh, I thought I had.

Madam Speaker: We can hear you.

Clerk: Brian, if you're listening to the meeting on YouTube, could you please mute the YouTube stream.

Brian Walker: Are we okay now?

Clerk: Yes, we can hear you. But if you're listening to the meeting on YouTube, please mute the YouTube stream.

Brian Walker: Oh, okay, I…sorry. I'm going to close…how's that? Is that better?

Clerk: We can hear and see you. Yes, you can proceed.

Brian Walker: Okay, are we there?

Madam Speaker: Yes, you may begin, Mr. Walker.

Brian Walker: Okay. Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Mayor and council members for giving me this opportunity to speak today. I've been asked by the South Plessis Road Residents Association to speak on their behalf. I would like to begin by indicating that in principle we're not opposed to the proposed closure of Black Diamond Road.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Walker, are you having some difficulties with...technical difficulties?

Brian Walker: Sorry, I'm getting a delay here and I'm having difficulty making my presentation.

Clerk: Mr. Walker, could you please stop the YouTube stream if you're watching the meeting on YouTube. Mr. Walker, could you please stop the YouTube stream if you're watching the meeting. There is a delay.

Brian Walker: Okay.

Clerk: You'll need to stop the stream completely and then you can proceed.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Walker, if you like, we can go to the next delegation and then a member of our team will call you. I believe they have your phone number or they can speak to you on the side remotely and we'll come back to you in a few moments.

Brian Walker: Okay, thank you then.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Madam Clerk, does that work? Okay. The next delegation is Ms. Penny Pugh who is also opposed to the same item. Madam Clerk, will you be able to...she's on the phone with us. Okay. So, Ms. Pugh?

Clerk: Penny, are you there? If you could please mute the YouTube stream and you can proceed with your...

Penny Pugh: I'm here. Can you hear me?

Clerk: Hi there. Yes, we can.

Madam Speaker: Welcome Ms. Pugh. We have five minutes on the clock for you to make your presentation. And afterwards, if you could stay with us, there may be questions.

Penny Pugh: Okay. Very good, thank you. Good morning. My name is Penny Pugh and I'm a resident of Plessis Road between Dugald Road and Camiel Sys Street. Plessis Road between the above mentioned roads and streets is also…is already taking far more traffic than it was built for. I'm very concerned that if any further development of the subject City property will only increase an already dangerous problem on our road.

Brian Walker: I'm really sorry about that. I'm not sure what I'm doing wrong.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Walker. Mr. Walker, could you...could you mute your...thank you. You've got it, Madam Clerk? Thank you.

Penny Pugh: We currently experience far more semi truck traffic than the road can accommodate. Many of these semis exceed the posted speed limits of 50 kilometres. Also, there is a very small shoulder that does not even accommodate a car. This leaves virtually no room for error should one these semi trucks need to stop quickly especially when they're already travelling at a speed exceeding the posted limits. Unfortunately, cars also exceed the 50 kilometres adding to the increasing problem we deal with every day. As a resident of Plessis Road, we are also…we also experience severe house vibrations from the semi trucks that travel the road. We're all very concerned what this is doing to the foundation, doors and windows of our homes to only mention a few concerns we have. The South Road Residents are asking for a traffic study to be completed so that the City can see how dangerous the road has become. Thank you for your time and giving me the opportunity to voice my concerns as a very concerned resident. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Pugh. We'll take questions momentarily. We're going to go to another delegation on the same topic, so if you just want to stay with us. Mr. Walker? Is Mr. Walker ready, Madam Clerk?

Brian Walker: Yes. Okay. Hello?

Madam Speaker: Hello, Mr. Walker. Your opportunity to make your presentation, are you ready?

Brian Walker: I am. Hopefully, I've got things straightened out. My apologies for my computer illiteracy here.

Madam Speaker: That's okay. Things can be tricky in this environment. We have ten minutes on the clock for you.

Brian Walker: Okay, thank you. Good morning and thank you, Mr. Mayor and council members for giving me this opportunity to speak today. I've been asked by the South Plessis Road Residents Association to speak on their behalf. These are the residents between Dugald Road and Camiel Sys along Plessis Road. There is about 50 people as members of our association and their families. I would like to begin by indicating that in principle we're not opposed to the proposed closure of Black Diamond Road, however, we are vehemently opposed to the closing of this road and declaring the land a surplus until after the significant promised upgrades to Plessis Road between Plessis Road and Fermor have been completed. I'd like to begin by saying that the residents along south Plessis Road have already endured many years of dangerous conditions, noise, shaking homes due to both vehicular and heavy-truck traffic. The issue has only been exacerbated by the decisions of former elected City officials and City staff. One example is when the City of Winnipeg paid CN Railway a million dollars as an incentive for them to move their Kenaston intermodal operations to Plessis Road. This was in direct response to residents in the Kenaston area complaining about the safety, noise and other issues associated with the CN's Kentaston intermodal facility. The mayor at the time indicated that this would, and I quote, "Eliminate the truck traffic problem". Well, in fact, it did not eliminate the truck traffic problem. What it did do was it moved the truck traffic problem from the...for the residents...for the benefit of the residents in the Kenaston area and saddled the people in Transcona and particularly the people along the strip with an even worse situation that had already existed prior to that. There are other decisions...there are also other decisions that the City of Winnipeg have made since this time that have also further worsened the traffic dangers along this stretch, but due to time limitations, I will not get into all of those today. I will say that the dangerous conditions are a daily occurrence and are very real. After coming home...and I'm going to give you a few examples. After coming home from driving my son to school, I signalled with the intent of turning into my driveway. What I heard was a loud screeching sound behind me, I looked in my rear-view mirror and observed a large semi-tractor and trailer skidding to a stop to avoid hitting me. The fact that I was able to respond quickly enough to avoid my turn into my driveway and speed ahead…straight ahead to give the semi more time to stop, probably saved my life or minimally a catastrophic event. I have pictures of the 100-foot long skid marks from the truck, which I would be happy to share. In another incident, which directly affecting my family…and there is many, many more stories from families all along this stretch…my…I was…I have two dogs and they're very attuned to when my wife gets home from work. And so, I was standing in the front window with my two dogs at around the time she arrived at home only to see her as she went to turn into our driveway, she was rear ended by a car along this stretch. Thank god she wasn't severely hurt, but the car was a write-off. These are the kinds of things that we experience every day with the traffic along this stretch. And that was years ago. One of my neighbours was not so lucky. She was making northbound on the stretch, making...waiting for the traffic to make a left-hand turn into her driveway when she was rear ended by a large truck. This resulted in hospitalization. She was off work for approximately two years. In fact, I'm not even sure whether she's back yet. And she had to go through years of physiotherapy to try and at least get some semblance of her life back. There are many more examples I'd be happy to share with you if you wish. These are very real dangers that we now face from vehicular and heavy truck traffic, to grandparents, parents, children and our grandchildren. There is no question that any further development along this stretch will result in further increases in truck traffic and vehicular traffic along Plessis Road, further exacerbating the very real safety issues that our residents experience every day. We are, therefore...and I just might add one other thing. When the underpass was built at Plessis Road and Dugald Road, the residents here were assured that they would twin Plessis Road and they would make this roadway into a service road to address the safety concerns of the residents along here. The things…and again, I cannot stress, these are real things. They can't be captured in traffic studies. You need to talk to the people along here to truly understand the horrors...like if you could imagine how I felt standing in the window...excuse me...watching my wife get hit from behind turning into our driveway. We, therefore, request that the motion put forward by Councillor Nason be reinstated as a condition to approving this change. Again, on behalf of the South Transcona Residents Association, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Walker. Ms. Pugh? Is she with us as well? Madam Clerk, we'll now see if there are any questions from Council. Councillor...Mr. Mayor. Councillor Nason. Okay.

Councillor Nason: Sorry, I saw the Mayor's hand up, so I was yielding to him. Thank you, Mr. Walker for your presentation. I know it was a little challenging technology-wise, but alas you got through it. I did put this motion forward at community committee, it was subsequently overturned at the standing committee. We've had lots of motions that have come forward that are at another standing committee with regards to traffic in the area. What would this mean to you and your residents should this go forward? Do you perceive that more traffic will be on Plessis a result of sale of this subdivision?

Brian Walker: Absolutely. You know, every time that the development…and we're not opposed to the development. So, I want to make that abundantly clear. What we are opposed to is that the development taking place before the necessary infrastructure changes are made in order to address the safety concerns, the very real safety concerns that we've endured for years now and have not had any luck with city hall in trying to address. And, in fact, I would ask...I don't know if this is the appropriate forum, but I would love to have a meeting with Mr. Mayor to explain to him and to share with him some of the...some of the pictures and some of the stories that we can tell about the people along here whose...I mean, that

woman, one of the neighbours of mine, she was close to death. And it's something…the planning needs to take place on the infrastructure before we start going full speed ahead on the development. And that's what our goal is. So, we're…to answer your question, we're already concerned about...we have significant problems now speeding. It's like a drag strip along here, cars racing each other. And just adding more and more traffic makes it so much more difficult. It's already difficult to get in and out of our driveways. We have people that just...just turning into our driveways, we have people that honk their horns and swear profanities at us and yell at us because we're turning into our driveways. That's how bad it is.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Walker. Second question, Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, I've had this thrown at me many times in the council chamber. I'll use this; are you aware that there's other developments that are being planned in the RM of Springfield along Plessis that may also have negative impact on traffic in the area?

Brian Walker: Well, that's a real sore spot because we learned only after the fact that the City had sold a parcel of the land that was pivotal to a development by the RM of Springfield to build an industrial park bordering on Plessis Road and St. Boniface Road. We found out after the fact and the reality is, they're looking at putting all of that...well, initially, they were looking at putting all of that traffic along…out on to Plessis Road. And there's like…I think it was 720 cars per hour, which is probably understated per rush per hour of rush hour. So that's times two...couple of hours in the morning times a couple of hours at night. And the City doesn't take any time to consult with residents before they make these decisions. And it is frustrating. And our group…that's one of the reasons our group is becoming more mobilized. We just put together this…our association because there is no dialogue. There is no discussion. It's just…okay, well, we'll just sell off this piece without looking at the repercussions to the people that live along this area. The interesting thing is, that the RM of...the Mayor and the Council from the RM of Springfield have agreed to sit down with us to talk to us about our concerns. We can't even get that same audience with our own City of Winnipeg staff and representatives.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Walker. Next is Mayor Bowman.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. Thank you very much for your presentation today. We do appreciate what you're able to communicate to us all here today on this issue. I have two questions. First question, I think a lot of us kind of perked up when we heard about a million dollars being provided to CN and the former mayor. If you could just provide some clarity to what...just because there…

Brian Walker: That was under Mayor Glen Murray. And again, we found out after the fact that the City had approved giving a $1 million incentive to CN to move their intermodal facility from Kenaston Boulevard to Transcona, their yard along Plessis Road, that you enter and exit off of Plessis Road. When I wrote a letter to the Mayor at the time...well, I did write a letter to the Mayor at the time expressing our concerns with this. Basically, the Mayor, and again I direct quote, he said "This will eliminate the truck traffic problem". Well, in fact, it didn't eliminate the truck traffic problem. All it did was picked it up and it moved it to another area that was already experiencing truck traffic problems. So, the people that lived along Kenaston were very happy with it, but the people along here, we have no choice but to enter and exit our properties off the Plessis Road. And so, the danger...it just exacerbated the dangers that we have every day from trying to get to and from our homes.

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

Mayor Bowman: You had mentioned that you were provided promises regarding upgrades to the street. I'm just wondering specifically who and when were those promises made?

Brian Walker: I don't have that...the who in front of me. But it was Russ Wyatt was the councillor at the time. Lawrence Toet was the MP at the time and Daryl Reid was the MLA at the time. And I actually have diagrams to show what the City provided, how they would develop...twin the road from the underpass to a four-lane...I don't know if it's divided or undivided...four-lane. And they would change our roadway, our current Plessis roadway to a service road because they recognized the seriousness of the...and that was done, obviously, in consultation with the Planning Department of the City of Winnipeg. But I do…Mr. Mayor, I would...and again, I don't know if this is the right forum, but I would love to sit down with you and just kind of share with you some of these issues. You strike me as the type of individual that really wants to know the detail behind it and the map and the pictures that the drawings that they provided to us as to what would occur with the twinning.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Walker. Moving on, any further questions for our delegation? Seeing none, Councillor Nason, did you have your hand up again? No? Okay, that would bring our question period to a close. Mr. Walker, Ms. Pugh, we thank you for your time today.

Brian Walker: Thank you so much.

Penny Pugh: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Our next delegation is Dean Scaletta on behalf of the Winnipeg Public Library Board who is appearing in support of Item 6 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated October 19th, 2020 regarding library fees and fines. Madam Clerk, is Mr. Scaletta here with us today? He's in person. Wonderful. We'll have 10 minutes on the clock. Welcome, Mr. Scaletta.

Dean Scaletta: Thank you. Not at all opposed to wearing a mask, but it's a nuisance when you wear glasses. I've had my glasses go flying more than once. So, bonjour, good morning. My name is Dean Scaletta and I'm one of the citizen members of the Winnipeg Public Library Board. I'm here on behalf of the board to speak in favour of the motion tabled by Councillor Rollins and my colleague David Robinson has joined by Zoom. I want to thank Councillor Rollins for bringing this timely and important issue before Council. The adoption of this motion will mark a positive first step toward the permanent elimination of all overdue fines in the Winnipeg Public Library system. Please note that we are not talking about levies for materials that are returned in badly damaged condition or not returned at all. These levies which bring in about $75,000 per year will continue. To date, 25 library systems in Canada have eliminated overdue fines, 15 of those in 2020 alone. A long list of American cities have also made the move, including huge library systems in places such as Chicago, Los Angeles, Phoenix and San Francisco. World-wide, more than 500 library systems have gone fine-free. They may each have had their own unique reasons, but there is one common denominator: it is simply the right thing to do. Winnipeg has a vibrant and progressive library system that is the envy of other cities and our residents are justifiably proud of it. We saw it during the last round of budget discussions, how passionate Winnipeggers are about their local libraries. But on this issue, the Winnipeg Public Library is quickly becoming an outlier. The board gets that revenues...the revenues are not insignificant in tight budgetary times. About $486,000 in 2019 representing roughly 2% of the total WPL budget that year, but notably, a 23% decline from the amount collected in 2013. As a side bar, this decline in revenues is expected to continue. Every year digital content represents a larger percentage of the material which WPL has in circulation. Checking out and returning these materials is an automated process, which means that no overdue fines are ever incurred, let alone collected. At our board meetings, we've heard a lot about people who stopped using the library services because they cannot afford to pay the fines already accumulated by their families or because they fear having to deal with those fines if a family member does not return borrowed materials on time. These stories are sad to hear. We all know how important literacy has been in our own lives and fines represent yet another barrier to families that simply do not have the financial wherewithal to buy the materials needed to stimulate and grow a love of reading. For children, most importantly, but for adults, too, especially those who were not exposed to literacy materials growing up and who now suffer daily from the effects of debilitating functional illiteracy. In the remarks which follow, I will be making several references to a 2019 survey of a cross-section of US libraries which have eliminated overdue fines in the previous five years. There are two basic arguments put forward by proponents of library overdue fines. The first is that fines ensure materials are returned on time, making borrowing fairer for all patrons. They serve as a reminder to return materials and are assumed to be an effective deterrent for lateness. The reality, however, is quite different. Many libraries that have done away with fines noticed both a significant increase in returned books and a moderate decrease in late returns. While the negatives of the ongoing pandemic far outweigh the positives, it has actually given WPL a window on what a permanent fine-free environment might look like. When WPL went into complete shutdown in early May…sorry, early March of 2020, it had about 200,000 items checked out. The shutdown meant that no new items were being checked out, no returns were being accepted and no overdue fines were being levied or collected. Since returns began to be accepted in early June of 2020, more than 95% of those items have been returned. Notwithstanding that the threat of overdue fines had been suspended. One American librarian has stated, overdue fines are a regressive method of raising revenue. They hurt the most...those who can afford them the least. And others have said that fines have become a privilege and they actually encourage the people who can afford to pay them to keep overdue materials longer. The second and most frequently cited reason for levying overdue fines is that it teaches civic responsibility. This is also the least tenable and the least compelling of the reasons. Here, there are basically two basic arguments advanced. Number one, that overdue books evidence the irresponsibility of the patron and their lack of respect for fellow users of the library. And secondly, that patrons who return materials late harbour selfish intentions and a disrespect for the library community at large which, in turn, evidences their abject lack of a proper sense of civic responsibility. This is serious stuff. Does failing to return one of 20 copies of a decades-old John Grisham novel by the due date mean that you are selfish, disrespectful and civically irresponsible? That you are a bad person? If so, you're in good company. At any given time, one-third of San Francisco Public Library card-holders owe money to the library in the form of overdue fines. Before it eliminated such fines, 10% of card holders with the Phoenix Public Library were blocked from checking out materials because they owed the library $25 or more in fines. These comments are not meant to trivialize or dismiss the importance of collective or individual responsibility in a civilized society, especially in reference to a shared collective resource. They are, however, intended to weigh the impact of a total suspension of library access against what I will call the moral turpitude of a patron, guilty of a late return. Maybe life got busy and they just forgot. It happens. Eliminating fines is a demonstration of trust in our community and it gives patrons the opportunity to reciprocate with the kind of responsible behaviour that we all want to see. I will now discuss the arguments against overdue

fines. First, overdue...sorry...first, overdue fines disproportionately affect lower income patrons. The US survey reported that for 15 libraries, the single most important motivation for eliminating fines was removing barriers to access. Two very large systems; San Francisco and Seattle, both reported that the highest percentage of patrons with blocked accounts because of accumulated overdue fines live in the poorest and most ethnically diverse areas of those two cities. This underscores a compelling reality. The elimination of overdue fines is not really a monetary issue at all. Rather, it engages issues of equality, of inclusion, of fair access and of social justice which I have to believe are important to everyone around this table. We all know that Indigenous people, people of colour, visible minorities, single parent families and newcomers are disproportionately represented among those of our residents who live in poverty. Sadder still, the reality is that Winnipeg continues to have 1 in 5 children living in poverty, double the national average.

Councillor Allard: Move extension, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Moved by Councillor Schreyer. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Dean Scaletta: Thank you. These are the individuals and families most impacted, most negatively impacted by a regime of overdue fines. Second, fines are punitive and are not effective in teaching people how to behave better. Even if overdue fines are being used as no more than a friendly urge…sorry, friendly nudge towards civic responsibility, it is difficult to view them as anything other than punitive. A librarian at Vancouver Island University once wrote, “Overdue fines do not turn irresponsible patrons into responsible ones, they only distinguish between patrons who can afford to pay for the common mistake of late returns and those who cannot”. Third, eliminating fines may improve circulation. Library use of its program services and collections is the life blood of every public library and anecdotal evidence demonstrates that library membership actually increases once fines are removed. About two-thirds of the library systems in the US survey reported an increase in the number of items borrowed following the elimination of overdue fines and 40% reported an increase in the number of library visits. Fourth, fine elimination engenders improved patron interactions. One might not initially appreciate the potentially tense interactions that can be associated with the fine collection. These interactions are undesirable for both patrons and librarians and can lead to uncomfortable, if not damaging interactions. And finally, eliminating fines can mean good PR and good free advertising for a library. It's a notable event that often garners the attention of the media. We saw that with the CTV piece and the Winnipeg Free Press editorial. This free publicity can be used as a springboard to welcome back former library patrons who may be staying away because of overdue fines. Those are my comments. Those are my comments.

Translation of French Spoken:

Dean Scaletta: Thank you for your time and attention.

Dean Scaletta: Thank you for your time and attention.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Scaletta. If you could just stay with us. We're going to go to the next delegation on the same topic and then we’ll come back to questions. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Can we get in line for questions?

Madam Speaker: Absolutely. We're just going to hear from the next delegation and Councillor Allard, you will be first up for questions. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have Mr. David Robinson on the line with us?

Clerk: Just joining by Zoom now.

Madam Speaker: Okay. He is here on behalf of the Winnipeg Public Library Board also in support of the same item. He's here with us via Zoom or will be momentarily.

Clerk: Mr. Robinson, can you hear us?

David Robinson: I sure can. Can you…I’m not visible yet, but can you hear me okay?

Clerk: We can. We've asked to start the video on your computer.

David Robinson: I have already done that. Hopefully, you know, it won't be too much of a lag. I can start my quick overview.

Clerk: Yes, if you wouldn't mind proceeding with your presentation. We can hear you in the chamber here.

David Robinson: Yeah, absolutely. So, good morning.

Madam Speaker: Just a moment, Mr. Robinson. Is he going to put his camera on?

David Robinson: Thanks to Mayor Bowman. Thanks to Council for the opportunity to speak along with my colleague Dean Scaletta on behalf of this matter. It's becoming increasingly important. I also wanted to thank Councillor Rollins for kind of spearheading this and bringing it to the table. Particularly in the increasingly daunting times that we kind of find ourselves in. And I guess, first of all, I would really like to thank Dean for his extremely well-researched, very thoughtful and detailed overview of the issue. There is a lot of layers to it that people may not be aware of. As members of the volunteer citizens board...I'll back up a little bit; my name is Dave Robinson. In real life, I'm a sales manager for a distribution company, but I'm here as a citizen member of the Library Board along with Dean. But I think that the depth of Dean's presentation…and I do know how difficult it was for him to keep it in the 10-minute range. And this is happening at a time when as he mentioned, a significant percentage of libraries across North America are all going in this direction. Very, very important. And again, I think it just speaks to the level of passion and commitment of lots of people in the community but also the members of the Library Board. We're a volunteer citizen committee and we care deeply about libraries and their relationship to the community especially now. So, I've been fortunate in my professional life to have been drawn into volunteering in other capacities, predominantly with Winnipeg Harvest for quite a long time. So, I became pretty connected to the level of poverty in the City of Winnipeg and more than that, the level of, I guess, the relationship between the levels of poverty as they align with the levels of literacy. And digging into those kinds of things made me look into stuff like terms that I would hear from either the library community or from teachers that I knew about the 30 million word gap, which is...when you're an old sales guy with no kids and you learn about a concept like that, it's kind of astonishing. And, pardon me, I would recommend to any of the councillors not familiar with it, to dig into it and the need to close that gap in our society. Mr. Scaletta already stated that the highest percentage of fines are owed by folks in low-income brackets. These are members of the community that have always had a harder time paying these kind of fines. With where we're at in increasingly depressed economic environment with the pandemic which has no end in sight, it's only going to be harder for these citizens to be able to make those payments. And this is a time where we need fewer barriers and more access to information and resources than less. So just really, really important. Particularly when a sizeable economic downturn has occurred, impacting low-income families the most. Really opening the gate and creating more of a bridge to the community is, I think, of increasing importance. As an aside, you know, Dean talked about the level of revenue which is certainly not insignificant. But it is noted that it's going to be steadily decreasing. And we also know…and I don't…this is what I don't know, the cost of managing a fine program. So, you know, Dean mentioned about the human cost of conflict interaction with library staff and patrons, but there is a cost of administering this as well. And whether that's the admin time to send out the letters that go out to staff members. And regarding that, I can only speak to, you know, several years ago when I was a member of the Library Advisory Council for City Centre, and we had our monthly meeting and one of my members…one of our members showed up to the meeting and this is prior to my time on the board. She came and she said, so I got this letter from the library and is this what we send out to people that have late fees? This is terrifying. Like, if I was a single mom who was poor with little kids, this would not make we want to go to the library because I would not have the resources and I would figure that the collection agency's going to be banging on the door. So, I'm not aware that that letter and the tone of it has changed at all, but I think that approach is sort of…it's from another era, right. I think that opening doors rather than closing them is more important now.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Robinson, thank you, time is up. Thank you for your presentation. We'll now go to questions. Councillor Allard, you have the first question.

Councillor Allard: Yes, it was for Mr. Scaletta. Thank you very much for the presentation. I think it's just mostly an 'are you aware' that was an excellent presentation? I had made a similar pitch for eliminating library fines for children a few years ago. And I find that your presentation was very compelling, makes an excellent case. And I was wondering if there was anything else that you would like to have? I would also like to recognize your own community service. I remember building Habitat Houses for Humanity with you, so clearly, you are a dedicated community servant and wanted to know if there was anything else that you wanted to add from your presentation?

Dean Scaletta: Well, I was going to say that Councillor Allard and I are not quite backyard neighbours, but he's certainly close enough to make a noise complaint about my lawnmower if he chose to. Do I have anything else to add? Well, I have to say that it took me longer to get from 16 minutes to 10 than it took me to write the entire presentation. And I did leave a lot of things out. But I think I did cover everything that was...I felt was critical. And basically, I'll go back to my earlier comment that, in my view at least, it's just the right thing to do.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions, Councillor Allard? Please unmute. Thank you. Go ahead. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Oh, my apology. I think that's all I had to add. Thank you very much for the presentation, Mr. Scaletta. I wish you had been there to make the pitch a few years ago to Council. Perhaps we would have had a different determination a few years back.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Moving on, any further questions for either of our delegations? Seeing none, I thank you both for your time today.

Dean Scaletta: Thank you.

David Robinson: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: That concludes our delegations for today, correct, Madam Clerk? Okay. We'll now move on to reports. The report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2020, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED OCTOBER 20, 2020

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda, Items 1 through 7.

Councillor Allard: I think there was one I wanted to pull on this one.

Madam Speaker: Okay. There is an amending motion for Item 6 and Item 7, so those will automatically…automatically be pulled. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: It was on the Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer, so I would like to move 30-day layover on that one.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you would like to stand that item down?

Councillor Allard: Well, I guess that for now, yeah and then I would like to move a 30-day layover.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie? They've been noted, okay. Great. With that, I'll call the question. Councillor Mayes? Item 3, 6 and 7 have been pulled. Item 3 – Economic Neighbourhood Development Officer, Item 6 – Temporary Parking Measures and Item 7 – Living Wage.

Councillor Allard: Can I speak to it, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: With that, I'm going to call the question first on Item 1, 2, 4 and 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Neighbourhood Economic Development Officer

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, yes.

Councillor Allard: Is it my turn to speak? Madam Speaker, is it my turn to speak?

Madam Speaker: Yes, Councillor Allard, go ahead.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. So, my desire to lay this over is that it's the Executive Policy Committee recommendation already seems to push the resolution of this item in a specific direction, specifically the language making...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, I'm sorry. I was speaking with a colleague here. You had mentioned, are you interested in laying this item over?

Councillor Allard: I am.

Madam Speaker: Okay, and are you doing that by way of motion or verbally…are you giving instructions so that we can vote on that?

Councillor Allard: I would like to lay this matter over to the next council meeting.

Madam Speaker: Okay, layover to the next council meeting. So, that is a motion you're putting forward without instructions?

Councillor Allard: Can I speak to that?

Madam Speaker: You can speak and certainly…yes, go ahead. You can speak to the layover at this time.

Councillor Allard: Okay, so the reason that I would like to lay this over is specifically because some of the language in the Executive Policy recommendation, I think pushes Council in a certain direction, which I don't think really has been resolved within the BIZ group specifically on the matter of an adjusted annual rental value. And so, I'm uncomfortable voting on this motion today because based on the information I have available, that basically means certain winners and certain losers within the BIZ zone…within the BIZ zone constellation, some which are big, some which are small and some which are everywhere in between. And so, with that 30 days, hoping that we will have the opportunity to have robust discussions and perhaps come up with a solution that can be endorsed by perhaps not all, but most…most BIZ zones, so those are my reasons for wanting to lay this over and not vote on this item today.

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

Mayor Bowman: No.

Madam Speaker: Okay, with that, I'll call the question on the motion to lay the item over for…until the next council meeting, correct? To the next council meeting? Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: Correct.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Item 6, Madam Speaker…Madam Clerk.

Item 6 – Temporary Parking Measures

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item. And we do have amending motion that goes with this, amending Motion 1; moved by Councillor Gillingham and seconded by Councillor Eadie.

Mayor Bowman: I'll wait to hear from council colleagues. I will thank Councillor Gillingham for his efforts. I know that he's going to speak to some matters that he's doing his best to work collaboratively with the members of the community as well as the Public Service and council colleagues. And we'll defer to him in a moment. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gillingham to introduce amending Motion No. 1.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Eadie,

WHEREAS Parking on residential streets around Deer Lodge Centre is subject to time restrictions,

AND WHEREAS the two hour time limit provides regular turnover of on-street parking spots, which is important for customers going to area businesses and for people attending appointments and day programs at Deer Lodge Centre;

AND WHEREAS Council decided early in 2020 to not enforce parking time restrictions on residential streets to assist with COVID-19 relief;

AND WHEREAS not enforcing on-street parking time restrictions has resulted in Deer Lodge Centre staff and others parking on the street all day long;

AND WHEREAS customers from local area businesses, seniors attending day programs at Deer Lodge Centre, family members visiting patients at the Centre and patients of the Occupational Stress Injury Clinic, including Canadian Forces veterans and RCMP veterans, have difficulty finding on-street parking and have to park several blocks away;

AND WHEREAS area business owners, the St. James Assiniboia 55Plus Centre and the Occupational Stress Injury Clinic have asked that parking problems around the Centre be addressed for the sake of their clients and patients;

AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Parking Authority has indicated that it is possible to reinstate time limited parking enforcement on the streets around Deer Lodge Centre to address the problem,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation 2 of Item 6 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee be amended to read as follows:

2. *That the Winnipeg Parking Authority be directed not to enforce parking time restrictions on residential streets, until December 31, 2020 but to continue to enforce all other parking restrictions (such as obstructing fire hydrants, parking too close to intersections, etc.), with the exception of streets around Deer Lodge Centre where there are ongoing parking availability issues. A map of the streets around Deer Lodge Centre where enforcement will continue is provided as Appendix A, which includes the following streets:*

    - *Moorgate Street (between Portage Avenue and Bruce Avenue)*
    - *Sharp Boulevard (between Portage Avenue and Bruce Avenue)*
    - *Duffield Street (between Portage Avenue and Bruce Avenue)*
    - *Guildford Street (between Lodge Avenue and Bruce Avenue)*
    - *Woodlawn Street (between Lodge Avenue and Bruce Avenue)*
    - *Belvidere Street (between Lodge Avenue and Bruce Avenue)*
    - *Portage Avenue (between Conway Street and Belvidere Street)*
    - *Lodge Avenue (between Conways Street and Sharp Boulevard)*

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The amendment is before my colleagues. I want to thank Councillor Eadie for seconding this motion. As many of you probably know, parking on residential streets around Deer Lodge Centre is subject to time restrictions. The two-hour time limit on the streets means that there is regular turnover of parking spots on the streets, which is important for customers going to local businesses, also very important for people and patients that are visiting Deer Lodge Centre, either to attend day programming or to go to appointments at the occupational stress injury clinic. We often think of it as post-traumatic stress. What's happened is that when Council made the decision earlier this year to not enforce on-street parking time restrictions on the residential streets as a measure of COVID-19 relief, it created a problem around Deer Lodge Centre. What has happened is that many of the Deer Lodge Centre staff started parking on the streets instead of paying for parking in the staff lot. Now the streets around the centre are full of cars that are parked there all day long, which means, of course, those individuals trying to get to an area of business and the people trying to attend the day programs or appointments at the OSI Clinic have to park more than three blocks away. What that means is that men and women, many of them veterans of our Canadian Armed Forces and also veterans of the RCMP that are attending the OSI clinic, the manager says they're individuals in chronic pain. They're walking more than three blocks. Day program is for seniors in the area, they're having to walk more than three blocks, having…or quite a ways away. And so, speaking with the area businesses, many who have contacted me, we're trying to find a solution and dialogue with our Parking Authority who also tried to work with me to find…work with us to try to find a solution. And so, it was agreed that the simplest thing to do was to go back to enforcements of time limits on the on-street parking. And so, that is what this amendment aims to do, is to address the problem by reinstating the parking time restrictions on the residential streets around Deer Lodge Centre.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers on this item or the amending motion? Seeing none, Councillor Gillingham, do you wish to close?

Councillor Gillingham: No, Madam, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, I'll call the question then on Item 6 as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk, Item 7.

Item 7 – Implementation of a Living Wage for City of Winnipeg Employees

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We have an amending motion with this item. It's amending Motion No. 6. We'll hear from Mayor Bowman first followed by Councillor Santos who has moved the amending motion.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos, over to you.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 7 of the Executive Policy Committee report dated October 20, 2020, be amended by adding the following new Recommendation 2 and renumbering the remaining Recommendation accordingly:

"2. That the Public Service be directed to review the Canadian Living Wage Framework (A National Methodology for Calculating the Living Wage in your Community) and use the Basic Living Wage Formula Calculation noted therein, and report back to Council or the appropriate standing committee with a living wage figure re-calculated every year starting in 2021 until 2023 and provide estimated costing associated with implementing a living wage Employer Certification."

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As you know, we heard from delegation earlier today with respect to Councillor Mayes' motion. I want to put on the record that I do support Councillor Mayes' motion, however, I feel it does not go far enough into the discussion of the Canadian living wage framework. I have e-mailed all of the councillors. Hopefully, you have had some time to review it, but I wanted to definitely highlight some of the statements that are within that framework document. The living wage gives families that are in severe financial stress by lifting them out of poverty and providing a basic level of economic security. And so, that's very important to my ward. And I think as civic leaders, if we can set a precedent and support the living wage, it will boost people who are living in poverty and as well it supports the poverty reduction that a lot of local leaders are coming forward with. The $15 an hour was based back of 2016 and 2017, and so obviously those numbers are going to change in 2020 and 2021. So that's why my motion, my amending motion, is just to add a second No. 2 that basically states that Public Service be directed to review the Canadian living wage framework and national methodology for calculating the living wage in your community and use the basic living wage formula calculation noted therein and report back to Council or the appropriate standing committee with a living wage figure recalculated every year, starting in 2021 until 2023, and provide estimated costing associated with implementing a living wage and four-year certification. That's my motion and why I would support it. And I hope that the rest of Council can support the amending motion at least to see the report come forward to see what the costs would be to the City. That's all I'm really asking for. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I presume I'm speaking both to amendment and to main motion?

Madam Speaker: That's correct.

Councillor Mayes: With reluctance, I can't support the amendment. I think we're starting to mix together two different concepts here, both of which are referred to as the living wage which is very frustrating in terms of definition. Certainly, my intent was to move the very real, very important $15 an hour increase that would take effect January 1, 2023 and thereafter be subject to whatever bargaining increases are negotiated by the parties. To move that, that will help a number of people who are currently earning less than $15 an hour who work for the City of Winnipeg. I'll come back to that in a moment. I think the amendment is starting to get into some other concepts and that is the…both defined as living wage, but we've heard today, well, $15 is not a living wage. Well, if you go on the Federation of Labour website, it talks about $15 as a living wage. If you look at what, at least, the provincial NDP and the liberals both tabled in the last election campaign in September of 2019, they both talked about $15 as being a living wage. So, and in fact, had an implementation schedule that in some cases was slower than what we're proposing for 2023. So, I think…I think we can debate what living wage means all night here, but the fact of the matter are this; the presentation today said, well, the way it's defined in one sense is $17.24 an hour as of 2020, up 18% from three years prior and then the index will take it, well, upwards, but we don't know where, over the next three years. That would be a major study. I would vote for that separately, but I think that's starting to get people to vote for two different things here. So, with reluctance, I would not favour the amendment. I would like to see a study of that sorted some time, but I think you're starting to mix two different concepts together. The actual wage rate for City of Winnipeg employees and a study of a concept...and let's be honest, the index has gone up

18% in the last three years. Seventeen an hour would cost us a lot more than 15 an hour. And if it goes up another 18% in three years, it could cost we don't know how much more. So, we would need quite a bit of research on that. I will remind everyone, we just had a study on this that was completed in December of 2019 by the City staff who recommended against implementing a fair wage based on their survey of other cities saying, well, some don't do it all, some do, some do it just for construction. So, I might be able to save us some time saying the City of Winnipeg staff will probably come back with a very similar report and then attempt to cost things out. So reluctantly, I'm not in favour of the amendment. The main motion would benefit real people. The main motion...I've had people saying, well no, it wouldn't alter a single wage rate. That is clearly not true in that we have people, currently employed by the City of Winnipeg in the CUPE collective agreement who are earning under $12 an hour. Rec tech A and library shelver are lower level are both earning less than $12 an hour. If a 25% wage increase is negotiated in 2022 between the parties, I guess I'm wrong and this wouldn't help anybody. But barring that rather unlikely scenario, my motion would help people. How much will it cost? There is a really quite excellent report from December of 2019, an attachment that says, going to 15 bucks an hour as of 2020 would cost exactly this. This is the classifications that would be affected. This is how many people work in them. This is how many hours. This is the gap, start multiplying. I did that, adjusted for 2023, estimating a 3% wage increase for '21 and '22. Perhaps overly generous some might say based on what we just voted on for WAPSO. That might be a valid criticism, in which case, the cost would be more than the 230,000 I calculated, it would be probably be somewhere between the 230 and the 380, which was the cost if we went in and did that in 2020. So in short, it would matter. It would increase wages for our lowest paid employees. If you're a student, the current wage rate is $13.74 an hour. If you're a library shelver B, it's $13.35 an hour. If you're a rec tech B, it's $14.13 an hour. This will increase the wages of those categories which have a lot of employees and some other categories like the rec tech A, which have relatively few people. The original report from the City said 13% of our employees are under 15 an hour. That's sort of startling. The next report, December of 2019 said, no, that was an error. Only 4% of our employees are under $15 an hour. So, it's a symbolic...it's an important symbolic step I think to say, yes, we believe in this concept of going to $15 an hour. Call it a fair wage. Call it a living wage. Call it a minimum wage. Call it whatever you want. It's real money in the pockets of the poorest people we have working for us. It's important if you're a student, we're saying to you, no we won't pay you $13.35 an hour, it will go to $15 an hour. Why 2023? Why not tomorrow? Well, 2023 is the last year of our multi-year budget. It's cheaper to implement this in a later year than it is now. If I could do it tomorrow, I would. But I don't think there is the support for that. So, it's a compromise. It's a step forward. I thank the Mayor for his support at Executive and hope he will support the motion today as well as Councillor Rollins, Allard and Gilroy all supported it at EPC. There is a cost to it. We can't say exactly how much because we don't know what the parties may bargain as a wage increase in '21 or '22. There is a cost unless there is a 25% wage increase negotiated, in which case everybody will float up over $15 an hour. I don't think that's likely. I'm trying to take a real-world step here to increase the wages for the poorest paid employees that we have. The indexing would then be whatever the parties bargained in the collective agreement. Perhaps it'll be 5% for people under $16 an hour and 1% for anyone over $16 and hour. Perhaps it'll be something else. We don't know. It's up to the parties to freely collectively bargain those wage rates. So, I appreciate the kind words from Mr. Delbridge and from Ms. Fernandez. Is it a measure that, I guess it's the eye of the beholder. Some in the community would say this is too much to spend. Some of the community would say, this isn't enough to spend. I would say it's a $15 an hour wage rate. We've heard, well that's outdated, that was years ago. No, if you look at the Saskatchewan NDP platform, they talked about moving to a $15 wage rate by 2024. If you talk about some of the Manitoba political parties, they've talked about going to $15 an hour basically after we would. If you look at the Manitoba Federation of Labour's website, they say write the premier for a living wage of $15 an hour plus some indexing at a later point. So, I think we're moving to what I would define in my heart as a living wage for people. If people don't like that terminology, fine, call it a new minimum wage because that's really what this campaign has been about, trying to get a province-wide minimum wage of $15 an hour. It isn't there. It's $11.90. Actually, one of our classifications had to be bumped up to match the $11.90, it was so low. I would say, let's remember those people at the bottom of our wage grade, let's move them up, let's leave the studies for another day and let's take some concrete action, put some money in the pockets of our lowest paid employees as of 2023. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And I will echo a lot of the comments made by my colleague, Councillor Mayes. And I applaud Councillor Santos and Councillor Schreyer for their amendment. I think a report is important. Whether or not it works in with this motion, I guess we can talk about and we can debate, but I think a report is necessary. I think we need to have the information that we're talking about. I want you to take a couple of minutes to think about this. On average, a full-time job is 2,080 hours a year. It's 2,080 hours a year. So as Councillor Mayes noted, we have some employees that are making about $11.90 an hour. That works out to less than $25,000 a year if they're working full-time, $25,000 a year, less. We have some executives that are making $80 to $90 an hour. We have some 311 operators or as the library shelf staff and rec staff making $11.90. We have some councillors at this table making over $50 an hour. So we're talking about a $15 an hour wage. I don't like the term living wage. I don't like the term minimum wage. I don't like any of those terms. I just look at it as respectful. So we have a respectful wage that we want to put into place. And if we know that the cost is $230,000 and we're having this long debate about it, but we had a debate of about a five-minutes for $2 million for our legal expenses. I don't get it. We're not talking about an awful lot of people. We got a report

that said 30% of our staff made under $15, right. Thirty…13% of our staff sorry,13% of it, but it was wrong. Now it's 4%. I've heard this before. Oh no, sorry, that was wrong, it's now this. No, that was wrong, now it's this. I'm looking at it from a different perspective quite frankly. It's 2,080 hours at $11.90 is less than $25,000 a year before tax. Some people here make over $90 an hour. We're arguing about this. It's less than $230,000. I want you to take the $230,000 now in your head and imagine how much it cost us to train because of the turnover in departments. How much are we spending on training because we can't retain staff? What is that costing us? How long have we been complaining about wait times with 311 because they can't fill positions? Or they can't get staff. Well, maybe that's part of it. This is coming from a guy from the corporate world. You have to look at your service, right? It's all about serving the needs of our residents or your customers. So, again, if we have a respectful approach to those in that position, we'll improve the service to our residents, which is what they're looking for. 2,080 hours, less than $25,000, because they're making $11.90 and we have some at 90,000…or at $90 an hour plus, $230,000. I think it was the last council meeting, we did $2 million for one legal case. So, I respect the motion that has gone forward and I would certainly support Councillor Mayes on this motion. It isn't until 2023. That's fine. I think the contract comes up in 2021. Seems odd that we're negotiating outside of the contract and putting something into the contract. I'm not a big fan of that right now. I wish that we could, you know, find a way to put this towards the Budget Working Group and put it towards HR and have them start having this discussion going forward, because there is a better way to do this. But since we choose to do it this way, then I think we need to consider what the facts are. Getting the report, looking at the actual facts and figures. Getting a report that comes from different sources. I would like to see that. I would like to see that. So, whatever direction it goes with the report, I thank Councillor Schreyer, I thank Councillor Santos for that and I thank Councillor Mayes for putting this one forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. We have many more speakers on this topic. Seeing the hour, we'll be recessing now until 1:30. Councillor Lukes, you're proposing a one-hour recess? All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Council will now adjourn and reconvene at 1:00 p.m.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
October 29, 2020, at 1:10 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our council meeting of October 29th, 2020. We are on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 20th, 2020, Report 7 – the Implementation of a Living Wage for City of Winnipeg Employees. Our next speaker is Councillor Schreyer, followed by Councillor Chambers, followed virtual by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, we're dealing with Item 7 and that has to do with a living wage and we're dealing with the issue of $15 an hour for City of Winnipeg employees. We also have an amendment to speak on. Amendment moved by Councillor Santos and seconded by myself. And that be that...amendment that the Public Service be directed to review the Canadian living wage framework and use the basic living wage formula calculation noted therein and report back to Council or the appropriate standing committee with the living figure wage recalculated every year starting in 2021 until 2023 and provide estimated costing associated with implementing a living wage employer certification. So, and Councillor Santos as well in providing this e-mail about the idea of having this amendment, which I know right off the top, I saw that a number of us support. It explains the national methodology for calculating the living wage in our community based on certain assumptions as well as what the expenses would be. As an example, basic living wage formula based on annual family expenses equals the income from employment living wage, plus income from government transfers including child care subsidies, GST, rebates, things like this, minus EI premiums, CPP premiums, federal taxes, provincial taxes, things like this. It's based…in general, in terms of the expenses for the community on food, child care, medical expenses, clothing and footwear, transportation, parent education, shelter and others and the contingency amounts as well. This is just a general framework. It's a little longer report or process than that for creating a...for basing on the Canadian living wage framework, but that is sort of the general…the generality of it. So, it's been said that we're dealing with two different things. We're dealing with implementing a $15 an hour living wage, so the issue of providing...bringing in an amendment on this maybe are two different issues on two different tracks. But I'm going to explain why I think it's important, why there is a relevance of bringing this amendment here today on this motion is because they are actually absolutely related when it comes to a couple of things in particular. They're very related when it comes to trying to figure out what we're going to do in the next phase once we accept the fact that when it comes to City services, not all City services are provided by City workers. They're not in-house services. They're contracted out. And in many cases, that hasn't always been the case. They've become contracted out in recent years, recent decades. And so, we can see now the effect of contracting out on the effect on the budgetary pressures of the City and on our taxpayers that pay for these services. So, we've noticed since the 1990s, we've noticed that construction inflation has been the highest rate of inflation at the City of Winnipeg, not just the City of Winnipeg, but at the City of Winnipeg. And it happens to be, one could say, well, it's just a coincidence, but I don't believe that. What we've seen is once the City has divested themselves,

sold off resources that we used for more of our City services including greater construction and maintenance that we've seen the higher rate of inflation come about. So, what I'm talking about is where we have City services not provided by City workers, where do they come into this? Where are they? Are they going to get the $15 an hour? Or are they going to get a minimum wage? So…yet, this is where we've had the highest rate of inflation, in capital intensive City services not provided by the City itself. Let's take a look at garbage and recycling. Councillor Mayes has made the point a few months ago, and a few years ago as well when we've had the new contract for recycling, that we've had an unusually high inflation rate in…between that last...the previous contract to the last contract we just signed a couple of years ago. So, we had an inflation rate of about 5 or 6% which is really high. Is that as high as the annual wage increases of these City workers that we're talking about, that we're looking at getting a living wage of $15 an hour? Did they receive a 5 or 6% increase per year? Did those employees of those companies that...now we're contracting out the services; did those employees that are taking the place of City employees, did they receive annual increases of 5% or 6%? That's the question, isn't it? So, I'll ask again; did those workers that are replacing City workers, did they get an annual increase of 5 or 6%? The contract went up by 5 or 6...the cost, what Winnipeggers paid went up by 5 or 6% per year. So what percentage of that went to the workers that provide those City services? The ones you literally see grabbing your garbage and recycling bins? Not only did they...okay, show me how I'm wrong. I'm going to say their wages didn't go up by 5 or 6%. And I don't think they're making $15 an hour. So, show me how I'm wrong because I'd really appreciate it. I hope I'm wrong. But unfortunately, I think I'm right. So that's why, what I really wanted to do today was provide an amendment that...so that what we're doing here today for City workers applies to non-City workers that work for the companies that receive the City contracts to provide those City services, that in other jurisdictions, in other cities, the city workers actually provide. So, what is going to happen next, and this is what is really important with 50 seconds left. What is really important, what I really fear for the taxpayers of Winnipeg and for the workers is that once we provide a $15 an hour living wage for City workers, now we magically won't be able to compete with the City services that other companies are going to be bidding for and magically we won't be able to provide...because we'll be uncompetitive. Meanwhile, these construction, these private contracts are going to go up and up and up relative to the consumer price index. I know they've come down, but relative to the consumer price index, it's still going to be about the same ratio. And the workers aren't going to get their fair share of it. And we're still going to be privatizing even though that's the highest cost of rate of inflation. So, bear that in mind, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Just a moment. Councillor Chambers followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to reiterate what we've heard a little bit this morning, a living wage is defined as a minimum income necessary for workers to meet their basic needs. The goal of a living wage is to allow a worker to afford a basic but decent standard of living through employment and without government subsidies. I do support a living wage as there are benefits that can be achieved such as and not limited to; it enables a working family to have sufficient income to cover reasonable costs. It promotes social inclusion. It supports healthy child development principles. It ensures that families are not under severe financial stress which is critical during this time of COVID. It is conservative and a reasonable estimate. It engenders significant and wide-ranging community support. And is a vehicle for promoting the benefits of social programs such as child care. What I struggle with at this point is the intent of Council to vote it in as opposed to it being part of a collective bargaining process. Council have voted to make changes in wage contracts which have not necessarily gone our way, so while I'm supporting of a living wage, I would ultimately like to see it through a proper collective bargaining process so that the agreed amounts are reasonable estimates given the context of Winnipeg's living...cost of living. And that it not just be established as an arbitrary number. So, with that in mind, I can't support the amendment, but I'm still struggling to determine exactly how to support the original motion that was filed. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Next, we'll go remote to Councillor Rollins, following that Councillor Gillingham and Councillor Nason.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you, I would like to thank my colleagues for the good debate on living wage today. In terms of good debate, I'm reminded that back in January of 2020, the prime minister walked into Oh Doughnuts. He walks into Oh Doughnuts, the shop on Broadway, and Winnipeg's doughnut-gate begins. And with it, the force of the living wage debate. Amanda Kinden was a leader in this debate. She is the owner of Oh Doughnuts. And she unapologetically took to social media, to national media, to defend her locally owned, locally sourced doughnut shop. Her 30 employees bake locally owned and produced food and they get breaks. And they are paid a living wage. And down the street, another living wage employer was watching; Fools and Horses. They pay their trained staff a living wage. So, their coffee is good for the ground up. They also use a triple bottom line model. Fools and Horses is using benefit corporation or BCORP guidelines to help structure how it manages its environmental and social impacts. The highest standards of verified social environmental performance, public transparency, legal accountability, balanced profit and purpose. This is their expectations of themselves. And this is why it should be the expectations of the City. In their wards, it's the difference between valuing the staff you hire, training them and having higher expectations versus having higher turnover and higher associated costs with regularly replacing staff. The City of Winnipeg has done some meaningful work toward supporting the vision that many corporations share in the City of Winnipeg and Councillor Mayes went over

many of these reports and reminded us how they serve Council as a road map. Serves…serves as a road map. And I'd like to consider Winnipeg without poverty as one such report that serves as a road map, including back in 2018 where a living wage was a significant part of this strategy. Employment equity was also a significant part of the strategy within all levels of the civil service and this council has made steps toward that. Adopting a living wage, paying direct employees a living wage, while I note as Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, the (inaudible), the library shelvers, maintaining them in our facilities is indeed part of my interest in this vote. And, yes, outside of the collective bargaining process this is over and above the collective bargaining process because it's towards a living wage policy for the City of Winnipeg. Understanding that workers at the City of Winnipeg including some of our contractors are making less than $15 currently and many of them are younger workers, women, racialized workers. I think that's very important for Council to be discussing. Working with local living wage advocates here in the city like the two businesses in my ward is also of interest to me as a councillor. And both presenters in delegation mentioned this work. My own comments at Executive Policy Committee mentioned the need to consider indexing, consider the work required to be a certified living wage employer. And so, I think that it's important that we're debating this at Council and we're considering. The three criteria for me are a consistent definition. Is a calculation of actual cost, and yes, indexed and recognition for those employers like Oh Doughnuts, like Fools and Horses, that also are doing those three ingredients. They have definitions. They have a calculation. It's indexed. And certainly, they're recognizing their own work. As a city, it would be helpful I think to have a report on all of this. It would be very meaningful to carve out and budget as I think the focus has been on Council and I think both presenters this morning commented the leadership of Mayor Bowman, Councillor Mayes and others along Council who have been working towards this debate oftentimes and in previous terms. It would also be very meaningful to say like cities of Hamilton, Kingston have done that we are celebrating and recognizing employers across the city. And so, there are many reasons to support the living wage motion forwarded by Councillor Mayes and the amendment that dives a bit deeper that Councillor Santos has moved forward to continue this discussion over time on living wage. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise…I will not be supporting this amendment nor the original motion. And I don't begrudge Councillor Mayes certainly for bringing this forward, but like others have said, I believe this matter should be part of collective bargaining discussions rather than be dealt with in this fashion onto the floor of council. Councillor Mayes rightly points to the administrative report that came to the Executive Policy Committee on December 3rd last year. The report states that, "Approximately 4% of City of Winnipeg employees earn less than $15 an hour. They are largely part-time, casual and summer student positions." Bumping up the wage for the 4%, these part-time, casual, summer students that work for the City, seems like a simple thing with low cost impact, $350,000 of cost in 2020 according to the administrative report. I would argue as I have before, that that is not inevitably the total cost of establishing a new higher base wage of $15 an hour at the City of Winnipeg. Establishing a new higher base wage is the proverbial pebble dropped into the pool of the City of Winnipeg's labour costs. The ripple effect on all other wages in all classifications is certain to follow. I'll give you an example out of the report from December. A library shelver, currently a step one library shelver, a part-time position, 8-12 hours a week according to the report, makes $12 an hour, $11.95, but for the math, let's say $12 an hour. A step two library shelver makes $13.50 an hour. If you move the step one library shelver to $15 an hour, I cannot for the life of me imagine that the collective bargaining unit would say, it's also okay to move the step 2 library shelver to the same $15 an hour. Inevitably, the increment between the wages will be maintained. At least that's what the argument would be. So, the step one library shelver will move to $15 an hour and the step two library shelver most likely will not move to $15 an hour, but rather, to $16.50 an hour. The real cost of establishing a new higher base wage will be the total labour bill that can only be calculated by adding up all of the cascading impact of this new base wage as it makes its way exponentially through every collective agreement. Stated another way, a rising tide raises all boats. A rising base wage inevitably raises all wages. That is where the true cost to the City of Winnipeg lies. We've worked very hard over the last few years to contain the rate of labour cost growth so that labour costs are affordable and sustainable for residents of Winnipeg. I hold in my hand, a set of graphs of the most recent collective agreements that have been negotiated and ratified at the City of Winnipeg. And to their credit, realizing the financial pressures the City is facing, the respective bargaining units have assisted the City of Winnipeg in that achievement. And I would argue that we have seen the fruit of the labour of making those efforts to control labour costs. So now, in my view, is not the time to drop the reins. Now is not the time to, in my view, lose concentration of the importance of thoughtfully and carefully managing labour costs, especially in the current environment we find ourselves in. Establishing a new higher base wage will have exponential impact on the City's labour cost. I'm convinced of that, and so I will not be supporting this motion.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In my prepared notes, you know, as I understand, the principles underlying living wages is to ensure that full-time workers meet a predetermined living standard as promoted by advocates. And I know Councillor Mayes did mention, correct me if I'm wrong in your close, Councillor Mayes, the NDP party being attached to this type of policy. But in both economic theory and evidence, likely suggest that living wage requirements like

minimum wage legislation actually creates distortions in the labour that over time would actually...and will actually have a negative impact on employment. This is generally in the private sector. There is a big different scale within the public sector. When us at a local governments who cry that many, many times we don't have enough funds for the core services we're mandated to deliver and couple it with a wage above the prevailing market rate, we should be expecting a result that fewer jobs will become available. And guess whom likely that is to hurt the most? Generally, it's the people who are lesser skilled that are most negatively impacted by this. This flies in the face of what advocates claim. Living wage policies are not the answer to the hardships experienced by many of the impoverished families, in part because the overwhelming proportion of those benefitting from a living wage laws tend not to be poor. And I believe Councillor Gillingham alluded to that, that this is going to have a cascading effect on our labour rates. We're negotiating through this with outside of the collective agreement. And it's my personal perspective that labour bargaining will now reset to a perhaps in 2023 to a $15 base wage. We heard earlier that $15 isn't enough. What is the true number? And in steps above that, will be just adjusted to match. It's not about awards and accolades. It's about doing the right thing around this table and delivering good public policy. Unfortunately, I don't believe these…the main motion and the amending motion aren't there. I suspect we can get there, but it's not today. Now, we also talk about other levels of government. Minimum wage standards are set at the provincial level generally. I know there is talk at the federal level, but provincially, they set the minimum wage. Advocacy should be done through there if in fact this policy is a good approach generally to be taken. And I would encourage that this dialogue be shifted to that. You know, we had a situation not too long ago about collective bargaining, about dictating terms and that was with the police matter…police pension matter. Again, here we are, dictating terms outside of collective bargaining. As I said, unfortunately, I don't think I can support these motions as presented today. And I do agree that we can do better, but this is not the answer that is in front of us today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting the amending motion and the main motion that is in front of us here today. And I really do want to thank Councillor Mayes for all his work on this and he's always championing these issues. And I just want to thank him and I have a lot of other colleagues that are doing the same. And I also want to thank the Mayor because I know he's been working on this as well. Just in terms of making sure that we're setting the stage I think is key…a key priority for me. I mean I think as a city, I think it's important that we take leadership in this direction and making sure that we are providing our own staff a living wage. And I know that we might have work to do to get there and there's arguments on what that looks like, but I think this is a really good first step. And I also want to note, what the amending motion I think will be able to do, when we listened to the delegation this morning, Lynne Fernandez, she says that the wages aren't always the…necessarily the only thing that makes us a living wage city. So, it would be interesting to know...and she talked about a low-income bus pass. We have a low-income bus pass. We also have a 12 and under pass that we are hopefully, I'm hoping, we're going to vote on today. If we can get support on that, I'm wondering if that could be included. So, it would be interesting on getting this data and learning a little bit about what programs we already have in place that could possibly be part of our package that makes us a living wage city. So, I think it might be a positive thing to get that information and to be able to find out what else we are doing that makes us a living wage city as we move on in the future. And I want to remember that…we also got to remember that we have a poverty reduction strategy. This is a key to poverty reduction. So, I think this is a really good step towards that. And I think it's important that we are a good employer, a good and fair employer. And I think that starts with us setting a standard. So, a lot of my...I won't go on too long because I know that a lot of colleagues have said a lot of the stuff I wanted to say, but I think this is a really good first step. And I'm hoping that we'll be supporting Councillor Mayes' motion today and I hope that we do support the amending motion because I think there is a lot of information that the City will be able to package with that. So, I want to thank everybody for all their work on this. All my councillor colleagues have been doing really great work on making sure that we are looking at poverty reduction and what we can do here in the city.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the amending motion as well as in support of Councillor Mayes' original motion. Some context; there are a lot of people struggling to live in our city. If we want people to be able to afford to live in the City of Winnipeg and to experience a good life, a decent life for themselves and contributing to their families as well, there has to be an ability for people to earn enough wages to do that. We're talking about giving a raise to people who, for the most part, many of the workers are not necessarily full-time. So, there is always that consideration as well who are making under the $15 an hour, Madam Speaker. But in context, when I was 24 years old and able to see, I was making $10.10 an hour, 1984 as a custodian. Even then, that was substantially higher than minimum wage which was about 4-whatever. I don't know. But the point is, that was a decent wage at the time. And I was working full-time making just over $20,000 gross a year. Now, my wife and I still struggled to pay the rent, try to save some money to buy a house, pay the car payments, and all the other expenditures that were involved. So, while it sounded like a great wage, it was still a struggle to make ends meet. Today, we're saying that the minimum wage, some 36 years later, the minimum wage is $11.90 by 2023 whatever it will be, but Madam Speaker, the reality is that we want the people who are living and working in our city to be able to afford to be here. And to participate. And have an ability to do it. Now I understand

we pass budgets with a lot of austerity and budget constraints, the envision into four years. Councillor Mayes has made a motion that starts in '23, which is the last year of a four-year austerity budget even before we got to COVID. Yeah, there are financial implications. A few hundred thousand here and there, but you know, people need to be able to pay to live and I think that when you pay somebody a decent wage, you get much better work out of somebody. There are a lot of people in the Mynarski Ward who are working for under $15 an hour. And they're working two, three jobs at those rates. They don't have any time for their family. They're working 16 hours at those lower wages just to help the family make ends meet. So where do you get your chance to be with your family? So, when we talk about a living wage, we're talking about people's ability to live both a working life as well as a family life as well as a social life. So, this is why I'm in support of both. Yes, we have financial difficulties with the City. And yes, we have these work classifications where people earn certain amount of money. But when I was on the Seven Oaks School Board, we were dealing with a new custodial contract, another CUPE union actually. And there was an issue that if you were a...only had so many years in and you were just basically a new custodial just got in, you really weren't able to make enough money to make ends meet. What we did is...and this is…this plan is to go to 2023. There is nothing stopping us. If you're worried about this change, what we did was, we gave those lower-down custodial workers...because they're all basically doing the same job. It really came down to, you know, we actually looked at it and said, well, why do we have these classifications? What is it we expect these workers to be doing? A shelver A and shelver B, like, what's…is there a huge difference? Like, really? So, you know, when we look at raising wages, there should be a dialogue with our labour unions to talk about, do these classifications even make sense anymore? They've been around for a long time, Madam Speaker. If we're talking about trying to bring people up, make a wage that allows them to be part of the City of Winnipeg in a better way for themselves and their families, I don't get the problem, Madam Speaker. I urge you all to vote for the amendment and to go with Councillor Mayes' proposal. I don't want to debate, you know, what is the exact living wage, but let's start somewhere. Let's please start somewhere and it is a start. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any other speakers in the chamber or remote? Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Allard: Can I get on the list too, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Orlikow is next and we'll come to you, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be voting for the original motion. I'll just speak on the amendment first. As we've heard today, there is some great concerns raised by some councillors. There is also other councillors that are very supportive of keeping this ball rolling forward. But in the end of the day, is this…with that type of comments I've heard today, there is no need to put this amendment through today. I think we need to have more dialogue with each other. This is a unique situation and I am, on Councillor Mayes' motion, quite happy we got this far. But I want to be able to move forward together. So I don't see the time restriction. I don't see tagging this to this motion being appropriate. Councillor Mayes did make some good points of why they are A and B, but I think we can have a better motion. We can have a more fulsome discussion and bring more people on board, including those that are quite concerned. So, that's why I won't be supporting the amendment. Now, I do…I have heard some concerns from my colleagues regarding the escalation factor. Yeah, sure, there is also remediation you can do to make sure that doesn't happen within the system. Councillor Eadie explained some of them about collapsing different classifications and red lining. There is a whole bunch of options. So, but again, it's a fair comment to make. We do have to…we have to lead, but we also have to be fiscally responsible at the same time. We have huge demands upon the taxpayer's monies, but we also have to be a leader. And we do want people, all people to be able to feed their children. We all want all people to be able to have a roof over their heads if they can. We want that for all and that's how we're going to make a better society so I respect that. I look forward to working towards that goal, but I also have to know the fiscal side and I also want to be working more collaboratively together. Again, so Councillor Mayes, I'll be supporting that motion. However, I won't be supporting the amendment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I'll be supporting the amending motion as well as the main motion and I'd also like to speak some French, so just notice to my colleagues who may want to use the interpretation services that are available.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So, I will be supporting the motion from Councillor Mayes. I would also like to recognize Councillor Mayes' for his variety of initiatives in the working world and in the world of approving union workers. I think that he has an impressive record in that regard. I frequently look at the actions of Councillor Mayes when I consider my own actions in regards to these issues for union workers. At the level of my approval of this proposition, it's crystal clear in my electoral ward when they asked me the question if I approved or not, a gauge for…well, in French…in English it's living wage, so, a gauge that assures the ability of a family to live. That's how we can possibly translate. I think that we should have and should work towards a society where questions like this…like these, aren't even a question. That we think that a family

needs to make a choice between essential needs of a family like groceries or pay rent or pay electricity, is exactly policy like this that will make sure that families won't have to make terrible choices like this. Also, the fact that all of us at this table are salaried at about $100,000 or more per year, I think that we really need into account the privilege that we have to be in a situation where we have a strong salary. I know that my in my family and my community, we are in the first 20% of revenue level. So, why approve this proposition? I think that we need to go in this direction. I think this is the right direction. I think it was already mentioned by other colleagues that, yes, there are cost considerations. Yes, a decision like this will put pressure to raise salaries all throughout the organization, but what we also saw in the union movement is that the benefits are augmented as the unions push to have benefits like weekends, for example. Like the 40-hour work week, for example. We owe a lot to our unions…to our union movements, and frequently their interventions are incremental. So, a little bit at a time, one victory at a time and the results are that everyone in society will find themselves in a better situation. So, for me, it was a campaign promise. They had asked me the question, yes or no; will you support a gauge to let…a gauge that lets a family live, I immediately said yes. So, I like to deliver on my campaign promises and this question was one of my election promises. So, I am happy, enthusiastic to approve this proposal today and I believe that if decide to approve it as Council, that not only will the employees of the City of Winnipeg be in a better situation, but we will also see – in English – a rising tide floats all boats. I don't have to idiom right now in French, but finally, if we do…if the wage augments at the City of Winnipeg, I think we will see the wage augmenting all over and the quality of life will augment everywhere. That's exactly what we need in Winnipeg. Winnipeg, that has the highest rate of child poverty, Winnipeg that has a (inaudible) problem, Winnipeg that is a methamphetamine and opioid crisis, so yes, we need politics like this and we need many more (inaudible), so yes, I will support the main motion and also the amendment because I think the amendment will clarify the question for the future. So, thank you for your attention.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Mayes for bringing forward the original motion which I supported at Executive Policy Committee. I note that, of course, this is a polarizing point in political circles. Some fundamentally oppose a living wage for reasons some of which have been...

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, Excuse me. Is this your close because I believe Councillor Santos needs to close first, my error.

Mayor Bowman: No, it wasn't my close.

Madam Speaker: I think that you opened on the item, so then you would just be closing, correct? There would be no speaking time separately. My error. I was asking if there was any further speakers? Okay, seeing none. Let's go to Councillor Santos for her close and then we'll move on to the Mayor. My apologies, thank you.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am so glad that we're having this debate today. It's such a great topic. And I want to commend Councillor Mayes again for your motion and bringing this to the forefront of our minds and having this debate and having this discussion. Without you, we wouldn't be, you know, just talking about it. We wouldn't about having people coming forward and talking about it. And my amending motion probably wouldn't be coming forward. So, I have you to commend, Councillor Mayes. And I kind of want to…I wrote some notes down and answered some of the questions and give some feedback and insight on some of the comments I heard from my council colleague. One of them was, you know, the living wage versus the minimum wage and the names of it. And I do believe they're kind of...they are different on certain levels. The minimum wage, again, it is very different. It is governed by the Province. And so, that is something different. Whereas the living wage, right, is based on what is calculated here in this document, this Canadian living wage framework. And the report that Councillor Mayes had just spoken to back in 2019, if I read the motion correctly, it was more to speak on the minimum wage rate. It didn't talk to the living wage rate in this framework. So, they are different. What I'm asking for is the living wage framework and having that discussion and that's why I wanted to move this amendment. So, speaking more on to the poverty, like we know from documents and people coming forward and me sitting on Protection, Community Services and Parks, we've been talking about the poverty and what can the City do to assist in reducing poverty? We have many, many reports that have come forward since 2016. And so, it all talks to the living wage. And what a better time to have that discussion now. I'm going to read some points here that are just really key important things from the Make Poverty History Manitoba. "The connection between income and poverty is clear. All Winnipeggers should have access to an income that enables them to meet all of their basic needs and to participate fully in their community and in the economy." You know, there is limitations to what the City can do to address these issues as the Provincial Government is responsible for setting the minimum wage and for setting EIA rates, however, the City can play a role in improving income and employment outcomes for Winnipeggers within its own hiring, compensation and purchasing practises. The City should also ensure that employees and contracted service workers are paid a living wage. The hourly rate at which the household can meet its basic needs based on the actual costs of living in a specific community. So with my motion coming forward, which I really hope you will support, is to have these discussions, have these dialogues, have public administration take a look at these numbers, take a look at our Canadian living wage framework and come

back with a report. That's all I'm asking for. I'm not asking, you know, to implement it. I'm not...you know, we'll have that debate and however many months it takes the public administration to bring it forward. But I think it's important that we look at these numbers. And to some of you who are thinking that, you know, costs are going to go skyrocketing within, you know, our collective bargaining agreement, I'd like to say that, yes, if we…if this is part of our poverty reduction strategy, you're going to find savings in other areas. If you're going to lift people out of poverty, you're going to find savings in policing. You're going to find savings in ambulance services, in social services. It's kind of...you know, they go part and parcel, and I think it's so important that we continue this dialogue and I don't want us to lose it because we're here talking about Councillor Mayes' motion which I am still going to support but continuing the dialogue and getting this report back, it sounds like a different (inaudible). Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Santos. Onto you, Mr. Mayor for the close. I am sure, thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Okay, thank you. Firstly, I want thank my council colleagues for all of the discussion and issues that have been raised this afternoon. I want to begin by thanking Councillor Mayes for bringing this matter forward. He worked collaboratively with many members of council, myself included, on a motion that had the greatest chance of success in passing. I think the original motion accomplishes a number of things. For those that have campaigned for a living wage for many years, it provides a light at the end of the tunnel and a beginning of that process beginning outside of the multi-year balanced budget. The balanced budget that was passed a few months ago did not contemplate this. And so, for that reason, as well as many of the reasons that advocates here today as well as members of council have articulated, I supported this at Executive Policy Committee for a couple of reasons. One of which was to get it here and the other was, I thought it was a reasonable compromise to at least have a beginning of that process as part of the next multi-year balanced budget. And so, I have and will support that original motion. I agree with Councillor Orlikow's comments about, you know, if additional information is warranted, that is something that certainly can happen, I don't believe it has to be part of this today. I won't be supporting the amending motion. Part of the reason why I think the amending motion is brought forward is I'm sure, you know, we see, you know, folks in the gallery would love to have this debate on an annual basis. And for Council next year and the year after to, again, have a renewed discussion and debate on whether or not the $15 as proposed in the original motion is in fact high enough. And so, I will oppose the amending motion. If the original motion as it currently stands is voted on, I'll support that to be consistent with my vote previously. If not, if the amending motion is part of it, I will oppose.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on amending Motion No. 6. All in favour?

Mayor Bowman: A recorded.

Councillor Santos: A recorded vote, please.

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

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Rollins and Allard and Santos, Eadie, Gilroy, Klein, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillor Orlikow, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Lukes, Mayes and Nason

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 8.

Madam Speaker: The amending Motion 6 is lost. Now I'll call the question on the main item, Item 7. All in favour? Call for recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Gillingham, Klein, Lukes and Nason

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 5.

Madam Speaker: Motion 7 passes. Just give me a moment here, please. Pardon me? Yes, I'm just getting to that page, thank you. We'll now have by-laws under EPC, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 95/2020 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 95/2020.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 95/2020 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 95/2020.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 95/2020 be read a third time and that the 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. Any questions for the Mayor? Councillor Lukes.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the Mayor, Madam Speaker, the City of Winnipeg provides Economic Development Winnipeg with I believe over $2 million a year to help with economic development issues. I'm wondering is Economic Development Winnipeg advising the Mayor and his Executive Police Committee on economic development opportunities in this new COVID environment that we're experiencing.

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

Mayor Bowman: Well firstly, I thank Councillor Lukes for the question, and I want to thank Economic Development Winnipeg for all of their incredibly important efforts to help increase and grow the economic activity here in the City of Winnipeg. Dayna Spiring is someone who has provided I think strong leadership for the organization. Yes! Winnipeg is an organization that I played a hand in helping it get off the ground when it was originally selling Winnipeg to the world. Private sector…partly private sector funded initiative to grow and attract businesses. And of course, Tourism Winnipeg, of course, tourism sector has been hit very hard as a result of COVID. The short response to Councillor Lukes' question is through the newly branded and restructured Innovation and Economic Development Committee led by Councillor Browaty, Dayna Spiring and EDW does provide updates through that committee. And I also understand that Members of Council…all members of council have access to and can have dialogue with not only Dayna Spiring, but members of the Economic Development team. I do regularly reach out and see how I can assist their efforts and give them feedback, and I would encourage all members of council to do the same as well, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. You know I've reached out to Economic Development Winnipeg and the question I guess to the Mayor is, I'm…I'm challenged. We're making economic decisions like we did with Starlight and like we're doing today with the Goldeyes, and I've not had any input, and I've not had any conversations or you know, guidance, and I've not had any advice provided to other members of council either, I don't think, through Economic Development Winnipeg. Would the Mayor be able to increase the opportunities that Economic Development Winnipeg could present to all of council in the coming days, weeks?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I welcome the question about how we can increasingly make decisions based on good data and good information to see what the return on investment is for some of the investments we're making. Of course, I know we're about to have a discussion and a debate on multi-million-dollar subsidy for a professional sports team in a few moments. That is a matter that I'll speak to more fully in a bit, but I think having discussion on how we can get better information on job creation and economic development as part of the committee and ultimately the council structure is a welcomed question. And so, I would suggest to Councillor Lukes that she may want to have some dialogue with the Committee Chair for Innovation and Economic Development. I know Councillor Orlikow in his previous role in that leadership capacity, and now as Deputy Mayor is also very much open to...I'm speaking for Councillor Orlikow right now that he's open for that level of discussion as am I about how we increasingly get better information from an economic development lens and to what extent, and in which manner could Economic Development Winnipeg be part of that advising. And I'd be open to any ideas that Councillor Lukes or any member of council has for how we can benefit from that information, and from Economic Development Winnipeg, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Lukes: I guess the third question is more of a did you know. We did actually, I brought a motion forward to the committee…Innovation Committee to ask for an update and the committee…next upcoming committee meeting was cancelled. So it is kind of frustrating in these times where we're looking for money to have the Innovation Committee cancelled when we were hoping to hear from Economic Development Winnipeg. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I was not aware, but I appreciate becoming aware and having that information and hopefully, the committee can meet and have discussion on this in an open and transparent way. I think it's a good discussion. One of the points that I've been making to Federal Ministers. I had a good discussion the other day with new official leader of the Opposition, federal leader of the Opposition, Erin O'Toole, wanted to congratulate him, wish his family well. I know they had COVID in their family. But one of the things I mentioned to him, I've mentioned to the Prime Minister and the Premier when we met, that increasingly I would like to see a financial or fiscal structure for city halls across Canada, certainly here in Winnipeg in which more of the discussion, more of the debates are premised on job creation and economic development. The way in which we are structured to collect revenues doesn't create that those conditions to the extent that I think it should happen. I think when you ask Winnipeggers, you know, are you aware that when there is economic activity, we don't directly cash in and help fuel the related services that come from that like the Provincial and Federal Governments do. And so I have and will continue to raise that, both outside of City Hall and I'll be open to good ideas on how we can try to speak to the concerns that Councillor Lukes is raising here today within City Hall as well and I'd welcome that discussion at the committee level.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works, the report dated September 16th, 2020. We have one item It's Item 1. And there is an amending motion to go with it, Councillor Allard…or we'll go to…Councillor Allard, there is an amending motion for the...

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

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

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

Madam Speaker: Yes, we'll…Madam Clerk. I have Motion 2 in front of me. Okay, is that an automatic referral one? Okay, it was circulated a little later, so apologies. Councillor Allard, on the item.

Councillor Allard: On the main item? I think we're requesting a layover until next month.

Madam Speaker: Yes, there is a 30-day extension. Okay, All in favour? Yes.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I wanted to stand it done, but I thought there was an amending motion.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, there is not. Councillor Allard, why don't you introduce the item, please.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to speak to this. I'm not going to speak to the whole report although I had some other things going on when it did come to the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee and then the added recommendations were tacked onto the Transit Plus getting rid of trip priority. Madam Speaker, what I'm noticing here in 30 days and somehow, I don't know how I missed it, but when this first appeared at EPC, they asked...they stopped and I think they asked for our Winnipeg Public Service to provide some sort of information, Madam Speaker. Now, I'm looking at this and when it comes to the getting rid of trip priority and then they added in some recommendations about adding staffing regarding trip cancellations and so on. Madam Speaker, getting rid of trip priority is going to cause a huge problem unless there is a big investment of dollars into Transit Plus to make sure that people who need to get to diabetes appointments, those people who have no other option to get to work other than by utilizing Transit Plus and so on. Because without a trip priority, you won't...I don't…the number of cancellations, Madam Speaker, are not going to be that many. But they're talking about adding staff to deal with trip cancellation...trip people not being there to take their trip that they booked one way or whatever. When you get rid of trip priority and I get in there first, I'm going to get my trip to groceries and back, Madam Speaker, because I'm in there first. There is no priority. So, I will get both there and back. So why would I not...why would I miss my trip pickup when I know...like, I'm ensured that I can get back home after? Like, there is a bunch of stuff in this report that just makes no sense to me at all. And, you know, these are one of the biggest…one of the issues that I weighed into and it was actually why I first spoke at city council in 1991 when they decided to add passengers who traditionally never used Handi-Transit at the time without some ability to look at how much resources do you have to ensure that people get to take the trips they do because ultimately, people with disabilities, they want to use the bus just as much as anybody else does on regular transit. And if you look at the analysis, it's a huge demand. So, there are still going to be people who will not get their trips, but they won't even be able to book a trip because all the resources will be taken first come-first serve. So that's a real problem. So, Madam Speaker, when the Chairperson of IRPW closes on this about the request for 30 days, I would like to know what...why are we waiting...why is EPC waiting 30 days before they make a recommendation? Is there some other report that's been called for? Another way of looking at dealing with this? Because, you know, ultimately you heard this thing about all the snow showed up this week, last week and you're hearing about that policy and there is problems. Well, Mr. Stuart who represents…proposes…represents a portion of Transit Plus users talks about a storm. Well, there will be a real storm if we just get rid of trip priority and we don't deal with it properly. So again, just to conclude, I'd like to know why the 30 days. What is the Winnipeg Public Service coming back with that is going to assure EPC that this getting rid of trip priority won't be a disaster?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Back to you, Councillor Allard to close.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Councillor Eadie, I think you've mostly hit the nail on the head. I had similar concerns which I voiced at IRPW. I think we are…well, I'm not going to speak on behalf of EPC. I'm going to speak on behalf of myself. I think there are a number of outstanding questions about how the cancellation of the trip priority system will allow for trips like dialysis trips which I understand are a very high percentage of the number of calls. If the Public Service is confident that they can deliver within budget by cancelling the trip priority system, they have a number of reasons why they have expressed they believe that they can. Some of the reasons expressed by the Public Service were things like efficiencies in their trip software which, if you eliminated priority system, will allow for more efficient use of the dispatch system. I remain personally skeptical about the ability of the department to deliver all of the necessary trips including those health care trips which we all know are imperative. And so, we have a layover. I'm not aware of any other reports. I think people have questions. And I think many of my colleagues have the same questions as you've just raised, Councillor Eadie and I think Councillor Klein last time we accidentally started debating this motion. I think there is a lot of questions that need to be answered before we move forward on this policy because of the issues that you've raised in your speech, Councillor Eadie. So, that's why I'm requesting a layover.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Just before we move on, I want to remind everyone in this chamber to direct their comments through the Chair for any items going forward.

Councillor Allard: My apologies, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: No problem, just a reminder for everyone. Next is the report, October 15th, 2020, under the same committee. Councillor Allard.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED OCTOBER 15, 2020

Councillor Allard: Well, I'd like to pull Item 1, 2 and I don't know if Councillor Gillingham wants to pull 3 again, but I think he had some nice things to say about report 3. So I'd like to pull 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: Okay, all three reports have been pulled. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – Providing Fare-Free Travel on Winnipeg Transit Buses for Children Under 12

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, so I'm thrilled to see this report reach this stage. I'm really, really hopeful that Council will endorse this policy. I think it is a good policy for so many reasons. One...well, what is the genesis of this idea? I talked to a group called Parents of Winnipeg and I said, Parents of Winnipeg, why is it that you don't use the bus more as a mode of transportation? And one of the responses that came up was, well, you know, I have three kids and so by the time I pay bus fare for myself and my three children, I end up in a situation where it might make more sense to get a taxi to do the trip. So that got me thinking. Okay, well, we have...we basically have a market of untapped clients or untapped people who might use the bus. And we might have a market there of fare paying customers who are not currently on the bus and therefore, they're not currently paying the fare. Part of the rationale for this being I think an excellent policy for Winnipeg is that Manitoba is one of the rare jurisdictions where there is a pretty hard and fast rule about having to have an adult with a child under 12. And so, you know, even if you've got your child trained up, I think most Winnipeggers don't want to be leaving their child at home. And so, you know, if they're talking about transportation, they're going to bring them with him whether that's on a taxi or on a bus. Another one of the reasons I think this policy is excellent is because I think that by bringing on this demographic that...by the way, anecdotally, I think is almost completely missing as a Winnipeg Transit user, you barely see kids between 6 and 11 on the bus. And so, I think that is that very demographic that we want to get that we want to train, that we want to normalize the use of the bus in order for them to make it a habit in the rest of their life. And as we know, we have a mode shift target of 50% by 2030. We need to make some extremely big strides and policy changes and we need to implement basically every action in the Climate Change Action Plan in order to reach those targets mode shift 30% by 2030. So, I think it's a huge win on that side. In terms of congestion, think of every one of those taxi trips that's not happening anymore because you have parents choosing to go on the bus with their kids who had previously decided to use a single...well, a private automobile, which when you compare the private automobile to the bus, takes relatively way more room on the road than a bus does. So, I think many, many reasons to support this policy. We know that Winnipeg is the child poverty capital of Canada. We know that mobility is a huge and important aspect to equal participation in society. And so, I think with one fell swoop, if we approve this policy, which by the way, is relatively I think inexpensive if you look at the Transit budget and if you look at the idea that we're building new clients for the future, we're also going to be bringing in new fare-paying customers immediately in the form of those parents that are not currently taking the bus. And we also have the COVID factor right now, which as bad as COVID-19 is, it is leaving some capacity on our buses. And so, I could probably talk about this policy much longer. I guess I am limited to my 10 minutes. The other thing I'd like to say is I'd like to commend the Public Service for the additional work that they did on how this policy would be implemented. I had originally pitched a policy where children under 12 would be allowed...that they wouldn't need any sort of identification, that they would just be allowed on the bus as we currently do with children under 6. They looked into the Peggo card system and what they found is that other jurisdictions that try and implement that sort of system get into all sorts of trouble. They get into trouble with people getting into fraud basically, passing those cards around and then being used by the people that they are not meant to be used. And so, I think this is the right direction. It's the right policy. If we vote on this, if it ends up being approved in the budget, we could have children riding for free under...11 and under as early as January. And I think that that direction will lead us to a more sustainable Winnipeg, a less congested Winnipeg and less child poverty in Winnipeg. And just generally, a better Winnipeg in general as we move to be a city of one million by…well, sometime soon. I won't say 2030 because I know Councillor Mayes will correct me. So with that, thank you very much for the opportunity to introduce this motion.

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

Councillor Nason: Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. I applaud the efforts to get this here today. I am…I do struggle with it though because we have what is called a Transit Master Plan that is currently being reviewed. There seems to be two tiers of stuff that…some stuff goes through that process. That would be improvements to transit use in Transcona. We've seen budget cuts that have resulted in less transit opportunities to be delivered in Transcona. But yet, we're offering this not through referral to the master plan. I do applaud it though and I'll likely be supporting it though. I do hope that we can straighten some of these matters out that we don't have two different streams of how major policy shifts are delivered. I know it's a passionate one of the chair of that committee. He's drove it. I believe he's mentioned in past meetings that this was yet another campaign commitment that he had made. But it does appear that his role as leader of that committee seems to be only to deliver on campaign promises, not for process as a whole that should be delivered through some of these master plans, these long-term vision programs that we have. And I hope that he might be able to address that in his close. Thank you.

Councillor Allard: Oh I can, Councillor Nason. Oh, my goodness.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Speaking of campaign commitments, I didn't campaign for this. This is something I've been listening to my council colleagues. Councillor Allard has been an absolute champion for this since the day he was elected. I know other members of council also have spoken forcefully, not just in campaigns, but over many years for why this makes good positive progressive policy for a city that is growing to a million people. And I want to thank and applaud each of them. You know, Councillor Nason was I believe an employee at the Province, literally working on Broadway when the Province unilaterally ended the 50-50 transit cost sharing. Something that was an absolute attack on public transportation here in the City of Winnipeg. There has been a lot of effort put in by previous councils as well as this council to support modernizing a public transportation system that we can be proud of. The master transit plan that is out for community participation and input right now is an excellent plan. The plans for Union Station alone are absolutely inspiring and they're an effective way to use existing infrastructure in a really smart way that builds a really…a transit hub that can be used by pedestrians, by those using active transportation as well as, of course, Transit Plus and transit. So I want to commend the leader of our IRPW Committee for his efforts. I've tried keep an open mind about this particular initiative to offer transit for children under 12 for free. And I want to thank the Public Service for all of their advice and their input and their research to get us here. I think this is a really exciting day. And I think it's an exciting day because we're about to…if we vote for this, it will really be historic and it will indicate to our community that this council is there for public transit at a time when other governments may not be so to the same extent. Of course, the completion of the rapid transit route, the first dedicated route at least, is one that opened to zero fanfare because we're in the middle of COVID right now. But if you haven't been down there, certainly the active transportation amenities are incredible. The reason why I'm supporting this, Madam Speaker, is public transportation, if you're modernizing a city, if you're growing a city, the importance of public transportation has to be amongst one of your top priorities because it is a way in which you can keep the economy moving and you can do it safely in a way that is also sensitive to climate change. And so, there is a number of good public policy reasons to support this today, Madam Speaker. The…I would urge all members to support…the members of council to support this. I want to thank Councillor Allard for his commitment to public transit. Our work is not complete. There is ongoing work to continue to modernize transit. One of which, I have to thank all members of council, every single member of council when we were recently asked by the Provincial Government to transfer millions of dollars from the transit fund in Ottawa to help support the North End Sewage Treatment Plant, this council was united. This council was unanimous in asking as a condition for that support to transfer the funds, asking the Province of Manitoba to not further deplete the transit fund in Ottawa and also to match it. Because we're going to need those dollars to help implement the master transit plan. And I'd ask all members of council to not only support this, but to support those efforts in the coming year. It's incredibly important for the City of Winnipeg. And finally, Madam Speaker, I'll just say, in debating whether to support this, I had conversations with other mayors across Canada, and the impact of similar initiatives; low-income bus passes and free transit for kids, the real impact on working families and families in every corner of one city was impressed upon me. How this will make a real difference in the lives of parents and children in our community. That is who we're here to serve. That's someone that will benefit from this vote here today. And I'd urge members of council to support it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I can see again in this council meeting like last council meeting, things sort of coming full circle over the last six years that most of us were elected six years ago and how things change. We had an NDP government at the time that...we kind of took for granted. It was like sort of assumed that the Province would share 50-50 when it comes to bus acquisition. It was almost…it was…they did it so well as a cheer leader for the city, the Provincial Government, that NDP government, that we just assumed that's just the way it is and it's not. It was the decision

and a priority of that government over years. And this current government never made the same pledge. And so, here we are. We now have to deal with the fact that although the City did and asked for money from the Province and the Feds to help, an unprecedented investment, hundreds of millions into Transit, but not...but less buses and less bus routes because we put it into an extra transit infrastructure, into bus corridor. Now, I'm not saying that's wrong. Other cities have them and they're beneficial. What I was always saying…what I was always saying is we can't afford it, unfortunately, given when we're doing it, how construction inflation over a generation had put it to a point where when Winnipeg builds a bus corridor, it's so much more expensive relative to our tax budget compared to other cities that had done it earlier. Why? Because construction inflation is unaccounted for. We don't understand it, it just is. It's at a rate of inflation that we couldn't cope with. And why am I the only one saying this? It's just…can we all just say, we can't afford construction contracts the way we used to 20, 30, 40 years ago because it's the truth. Why am I the only one in this chamber that's going to say right now that our Chief Financial Officer had said to me years ago and said to members of council two years ago, that a bridge that would have cost 12 million in 1990 would cost over $200 million today. Check out the rate of inflation of that. So, don't say it's, oh, Jason's just making this stuff up. I got that from the Chief Financial Officer back, well, four years ago. All right? And I'm not the only one to have received that information. I'm the first to have published that, having quoted the Chief Financial Officer, Mike Ruta at the time because I published it in the Herald. But I know I'm not the only one that gets that information. So, now we know why bus corridors have…this bus corridor cost us so much more than it had other cities that them built before. So, now we're in trouble. So, what did we do? We were diminishing our financial reservoirs including from our water and waste reservoir…reserve fund…our reserve, excuse me, planned on saying reservoir, but the reserve fund. Taking money from our water rates that should have gone into increasing that reserve fund for when we had to create our new sewage treatment plant and diverting that into our regular tax fund…our regular tax base. Which is, well, unfortunate. So, what was the extra costs that we're paying for? Well, what is the big extra cost? The biggest construction cost at a time when we had construction inflation coming to a point where it was untenable. Therefore, we had to divert money from water rates to put into general coffers. Well, what is the big difference? I'll say, the bus corridor. And what do we have for it? Less buses. Less bus routes. So I'm saying, right now, we're doing the right thing because we have to make the point we have…we need to encourage people to take the bus. People say it's going to be encouraging those university students to get into the idea of using the bus by creating a bus corridor for them from downtown. Okay. Well, I don't know about that. What I do know about is working people that might not have university degrees, we need them to take the bus. We want them to take the bus and we need more buses. And it would be nice to have a government like the previous NDP government that does the 50-50 on bus purchases and things like this. But that was then. And so, what we need to do is at this point, just like a bus corridor as a form of subsidization to get people to take the bus because you have to wonder whether it's worth it or not, at least in this case we're subsidizing those young people and parents to take the bus so that there is a feasibility to it for them and that in this case children, whether they go to university or not, will be raised on the idea that they can take the bus and it's a good thing. So, this all comes full circle again just like we put the money…we're putting…trying to put the money back into our water and waste fund like we're supposed to do, and put the money back there because we have to build...or rebuild an existing…a pre-existent one that's been there for almost a hundred years, one that we have to do, it's like a bridge…like a bridge downtown…like the Louise Bridge or something like this. You got to do it. It's not a choice. You've got to actually plan for when you're going to build a new bridge. So, in this case, we're putting the money back into our sewage treatment plant. Good idea. It took sort of six years to get back to this, but it was the right decision. It's a little dysfunctional, actually, highly dysfunctional if you want to analyze how it is. We're putting our money back into our sewage treatment plant.

Mayor Bowman: I'm just wondering if we're debating sewage treatment or Transit?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, let's stick to the topic, please.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure, as Mayor Bowman also mentioned the sewage treatment plant. So I will do the same, but I'll bring it back to sort of some clarity. Because I do not understood actually why His Worship mentioned the sewage treatment plant. I'm talking about the money going to where it's supposed to go. And so, in this case, I'm saying, how do we best get people to take the bus? Well, taking money from a sewage treatment plant isn't the right way to do it to build bus corridors, but having more buses on the road is the way to do it. As the Mayor mentioned, we no longer have the 50-50 formula with the provincial government. That's what he mentioned that, and I agree. And also, by putting more buses on the road and subsidizing when we have to, people using the bus, just like people under 12 years old. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just real quickly, yeah, I absolutely, 100, wholeheartedly agree with the fact that to be a successful city you need to have an effective and an efficient transit system. Absolutely. And if we want to work towards saving our environment, you need to have an effective and an efficient transit system. And we have one of the leading electric bus companies right here in Winnipeg, Manitoba. We need to have a vision for an effective and efficient transit system. And we have what we call right now ongoing, and we're taking a look at it and we're debating it, a

Transit Master Plan. But what I see happening right now is we're doing little bits and pieces at a time. There are some projects that…or motions that will come forward that we automatically refer to the Budget Working Group. Not that this is a big-ticket item. And there are some items that will move forward and we debate an awful lot, like the low-income bus pass. But we know from a couple of months ago, asking in this very chamber that less than 100 people at that time had actually qualified for the low-income bus pass. And at the risk of being labelled anti-Transit because I'm not. I want an effective and efficient transit system. I would prefer that we spend our time putting in an effective and…an effective and efficient transit system together to find out what is the best system, what is going to work. Because as we put band-aids on or we put in different plans now, it may not come together in the end. And we're just going to keep doing the same old thing over and over and over again. I don't support the motion today. I support the concept 100%. But I would like to finally see a plan come through in its entirety. So, if we have a Master Transit Plan coming through, let's put it all together as one and put it on the table. And hopefully, that will see some more engagement with the electric bus company here in Winnipeg, Manitoba. And it will be a truly efficient and effective service that students will use, that children will use and that has a vision for down the road. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Allard for all of his hard work on this motion. Since day one, I know that he's been supportive of having more and more children on buses to ride for free. I was watching Jeopardy! the other day and there was a question on there with regards to the Staten Island ferry. And at one point when the ferry service was initiated, it was 50 cents for a ride on the Staten Island ferry. And then Mayor Giuliani, one of the good things he did when he was the Mayor of the City of New York, was to reduce the cost of the Staten Island ferry to free so that more and more people would utilize it, realizing that there are some people that could afford it and others that couldn't. And it increased the amount of usage of the ferry because of the fee that is now charged being free. Since COVID, we've seen a reduction in ridership on our Winnipeg Transit. We have to look at the sustainability of Transit which is ridership. And part of the way to do that is what Councillor Allard is proposing here by mechanisms that allow parents to bring their kids on transit. And if cost is a barrier to that, this is one of the ways that we can consider getting our ridership back up to the levels that we enjoyed prior to COVID having such an impact on our transit service. So again, I commend Councillor Allard on this motion. I will be supporting it. I think it's something that a progressive city does in looking at the needs of its residents and those that…as we grow towards a million people population, we have a mechanism in place to move people around our city effectively and taking the burden off our streets by the amount of cars that would continue to rise as our population increases. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to thank my colleagues for bringing this motion forward today. I know they were very well intended in doing so. That said, though, I will be...I won't be supporting the motion before us today. Again, we are going through a whole transit master planning exercise. There is going to be all sorts of ideas and dreams and proposals in there and they're all going to have price tags attached to them. By removing transit fares for children under 12, there is going to be a loss of revenue. We made a financial choice that is going to make implementing the Transit Master Plan that much harder. We had a great update at the last IRPW meeting. Transit electrification; New Flyer Industries is one of the biggest electric bus manufacturers in North America. Very exciting that they're going to…we're looking at a program to start testing different types of electric technologies here in the City of Winnipeg. The works…we've previously…this council has budgeted money to look at how that is going to be rolled out and implemented and a trial I think is probably imminent which is quite exciting. Federal government, maybe even the Province will get on board with that. I'm quite excited. So when it comes to children under 12 though, again, it's a nice thing to do. I recognize that it would help a lot of working families be able to get their kids on the bus, but a lot of buses aren't going to be there because we're starving with revenue in some cases. I know it's unfortunate. You know, the 85 bus up in North Kildonan Ward that, you know, went out to Kildonan Place on the weekends, we had to cancel it because ridership wasn't there. Did I want to do it? No. Did it hurt some families where they're, you know, young working people that want to get out to Kildonan Place Mall for a job? No. We had to drop it. It was a tough decision. This is another decision which, you know, yeah it's nice to have, but I don't think it's a priority. I won't be supporting it today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I was looking for an opportunity to rise and let the Mayor know that I'm wearing my nice orange tie again today that NDP who did have the foresight to know that a city that is growing and wants to be big requires an affordable, sustainable transit system. Mass transportation system actually. And so, I want to say that I listened to the Mayor and I'll be voting as he has suggested on this report which is, I am in support of this and it's great that Councillor Allard and others have ensured that these affordability and what I call convenient issues...because ultimately there are those in Winnipeg who have really no choice. They're using the Winnipeg Transit system because that's the only alternative that they have. And if the prices get too high, they're not going to be using it. But so there are

those families that, Councillor Allard introduced this, that can really use the reduction in the cost to bring their kids onto the bus. And I think that's really important. But it will also...well, one councillor used the term “effective and efficient”, but convenient. It will now become more convenient and cheaper for someone who has an alternative to use a car, but now I don't have to pay extra for my kids, so you know what? I’m going to save the money on parking. And I’m going to pay my bus fare and I’m going to use the bus. There are those people who will make those choices now. These are the kinds of things that you build a transit system on because ultimately the more people on the mass transportation system, the better and the cheaper as a matter of fact. And so, I hear other colleagues, Madam Speaker, talking about costs and having to make cut decisions because...but that's a perspective...it's a perspective that actually doesn't drive growth, Madam Speaker. If we want to see growth after COVID is over, there will be...as long as the system is convenient for those who have alternatives, Madam Speaker, if we make it that way, then more people will use it. But if we keep reducing service in certain areas, it makes it inconvenient. And, therefore, we're going to see less passengers. You're creating a negative growth, a reduction in service. You're sending the line the other way. We want the line to go that way. We want more customers. COVID, yeah, through a thing...like even myself, I’m noticing there is COVID exposures on the bus. I’m taking the bus less now because of the rate of COVID going up. But you know, once it's over and it will be over, over the next months, hopefully, you know, six months or whatever, but if we're going to be cutting because, oh, the economic downturn and all of a sudden we're going to start cutting, if we're cutting more of the bus service, you're not going to see the growth we need to continue that robust Transit Master Plan that talks about more buses more often on streets like Main Street, McPhillips, Pembina Highway, you know, so that people can get places quicker because that is the convenience that you need to add. Oil prices aren't going to help us. That was a really good effect. You know, when gas prices go way up, people say, oh, the bus is more affordable. I’ll take the bus. It's a little less in…a little less convenient, but it’s way more affordable and that's a decision they'll make. So, I’ll just point that out. And I would be remiss if I didn't mention this. That orange tie, Madam Speaker, I recall in '99 when they started moving, finally got that 50-50 agreement moving forward for the transit and that was good for three mayors. Part of our current mayor's term, but…and two other mayors really appreciated that 50-50 percent. But if you look at the voting record of the councillor…the previous councillor from St. James to our current councillor who happens to be the head of the Treasury Board for the Province of Manitoba, you'll understand why they decided to break the 50-50 agreement because, frankly, that former councillor really didn't care too much about transit and wanted to jack the prices way up so that we had less users on it. You know, more money into roads, which you know, we do need roads, Madam Speaker. But it was no surprise to me that the new provincial government has been making the kind of decisions that they have when I look at the voting record of that past person. Anyway, thank you, Madam Speaker. I’ll be supporting this. And thank you, Councillor Allard for making sure that (inaudible). You know, there are steps that we can take before we do pass a final Transit Master Plan. This is one of the things we can do before we pass the plan. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll now go remote to Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. Yeah, there’s…we hear this a fair bit and there are arguments for both sides of, you know, let's wait until we have a plan before we implement anything. And then we have other councillors that say, let's get it done. I understand both sides but for myself, I’ll be supporting this one. Because part of that plan, fundamentally, this should be there. This is one of the ones that I fight for in that plan. The stress that parents have that must take the bus to drop off their kids in a daycare that’s halfway across the city, and then come back again and then go back yet again, it pretty well takes up all the funding. It's a massive, massive impact on many, many people. So, they make other choices either it’s food choices or it’s not going daycare or not work, there’s a whole bunch of choices they have to make. It's an incredible burden…financial burden for parents that are just on the edge. I’ve seen it. I’ve witnessed beautiful people who are just incredibly under stress because the only daycare they have is halfway across the city to get into. And they must use up their funds to take bus passes, heaven forbid, that they have to actually do an errand in between. So I think we can in this case, you know, walk and chew gum at the same time. This is another step the City is doing to address some of the inequality issues that we do have that are prevalent. So again, I am very supportive of this idea. I do hope to see a lot more children on the buses with their parents and using this as a mode of transportation and cycling and those kind of more mobile choices because not everybody has a car. And parents that are making choices, a lot of parents have to make the choice now that not to have a car because they just can't afford it. So they must take the bus. So again, using a taxi, quite prohibitive, so you can make more choices. So I do understand that we have to be careful. Electrification of buses is great, but if no one is on the bus, it doesn't matter. So, you have nice electrical buses whipping around, but it costs you way out of the league of what most people will be able to afford it, then it's really not a good service. Environmentally it may be good, but again, we have to look at the user. And the users in this case are a lot of people that are taking the bus by choice or not choice, but this is the only source of transportation they have. And they also have to make some other choices about taking their children with them because it cost too much. I believe, and I hope, the numbers will play out that you're going to see an increase of usage with the kids. We're going to have more people getting around. More people being mobile and enabled to fulfill their dreams. And also, we won't see it, but my hope would also be they'll have a few more dollars on the table to pay for food, pay for rent, pay for heating. So, all those other costs. So again, this is a wonderful motion. Very proud to support it. And, again, I think Council should unanimously support this one.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm rising to speak to this motion. I'm a very strong supporter of transit. I have been for many, many years. And I think we all know that when youth and children start a behaviour and it becomes a habit, odds are they'll stick with it throughout their lifetime. So, seeing kids on the bus at free fare is something that I am very interested in supporting. I'm challenged that it isn't part of the Transit Master Plan. The Transit Master Plan indicates that it will come forward in spring of 2021. There are other things that have been identified that need addressing, one of them I'll mention is in south Winnipeg we have people standing on just the shoulders of 80 kilometre-an hour roads. You know, requests have gone in to have pads of concrete so that they can stand on them just to be a little safer. And that gets referred to the Transit Master Plan. So you know, to Councillor Orlikow's point, you know, there's arguments for both sides included it in the Transit Master Plan or vote on it today. So I just wanted to put that on the record that, you know, we're so close to having it in the Transit Master Plan. We've got such challenges with Transit currently. And I mean, I'm optimistic, too as Councillor Eadie pointed out, but I think that we're be feeling, in transit anyways, the fallout of COVID for many, many years in the future. So, I wanted to put those comments on the record.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you very much to everyone who's weighed in on this. And just a few comments. On the Transit budget in general, we as a council, have a huge, huge challenge especially for 2021, where we have a $22 million projected shortfall in our Transit revenues. That's mostly because of the ridership fall, so our Transit budget is about $80 million in fares. So our transit ridership is cut in half, so we're at about $40 million in fares. That is a big gap that we have to fix. Now the federal government is hopeful to see what transpires with the federal government in terms of fixing our current situation. I would love to see a provincial government step up to the plate in the same way as we've seen the federal government step up especially since they've eliminated the 50-50 transit funding agreement which makes Transit that much more difficult to fund every single year. I mean, in terms of getting election commitments delivered on, I mean, I would expect every one of my colleagues to fight tooth and nail to achieve the election commitments that they run on. And if you're not doing that, I would suggest that you're doing a disservice to the people who elected you. So I mean, I will continue to fight tooth and nail for my election commitments and one of those was free transit for kids. And so, I'm quite proud...well, I'm quite proud…I'm quite hopeful, I'm happy that it's gotten to this point and I really hope that it can get into the 2020 budget. But that $22 million…this policy of free transit for kids is not going to make or break a $22 million problem. So, I would suggest to anyone who is considering voting against this policy, that you're not...you're voting against free transit for kids. That's what you're voting on. We've got a $22 million Transit budget problem next year. Yes, we have a Transit Master Plan, but we're independent thinkers at this table. Do you think free transit for kids is a good idea or not? That's the only thing we're voting on right now with this report. So, to anyone considering voting against this report, make no mistake, you're voting against free transit for kids. It's black and white. So, I really hope we can have a unanimous vote on this. And I really hope that there isn't one member of council who doesn't think that kids shouldn't be able to ride the bus for free. And I'd like a recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That was the close. There is call for recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Klein and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. Item 1 has passed. Item No. 2, Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Winnipeg Parking Strategy – A Conceptual Framework

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard to open on Item 2.

Councillor Allard: Thank you very much. Pleased to open on Item 2. And thank you, Council, you've just made history on that last vote. Thank you so much. I know I'm out of order, Madam Speaker, so I'll stop right now and get into the

current…the current question. I wanted to raise this because it really is a transformative document. If we approve this document, it's going to do the things that we want it to do to modernize parking forever. I didn't have the opportunity to attend the Dr. Shoup tour. For those who don't know Dr. Shoup, he's basically the parking guru of North America and highly recommend getting informed about Dr. Shoup's theories and concepts and applications to how to better parking in cities. One of the concepts that I think we ought to strive for as a city is this concept of 80%, 80% of parking being occupied and 20% of parking being available. And in order to do that, you need to use market economics and supply and demand. The way to do that is to...is to be able to nimbly block by block determine what the supply and demand is for that block. So, that's not the decision that we're making today, but we're setting a framework for having a much, much broader debate about how we do parking in Winnipeg and there is some extremely exciting opportunities. There are opportunities to do...there are opportunities to further our use of electronic over physical pay stations, which not only will allow us to save in terms of the dollars required to upkeep and maintain and install those pay stations, but it will also give us the ability to be quite nimble in this application of supply-demand parking economics. And perhaps counter-intuitively, we might find a place where revenue actually goes up when parking rates go down. So, we're setting ourselves up to have the tools that will allow all of these things to be possible. And I wanted to recognize the author of the report because I think the author of the report has been doing tremendous work. So Donna has been with the City of Winnipeg since 2003, starting with Fleet Management Agency and came to WP in 2014. Given the parking strategy report, it's her last report going to Council. It is a great way to end her parking career on a very high note by providing the road map for the next five years of parking improvement for the City of Winnipeg, the first city in Canada and one of the first in North America to implement digital or virtual permits. That's us. She has driven the adoption of our mobile payment platform, Pay by Phone to above 50% usage. This has elevated the customer experience and convenience with parking for all citizens groups. Her work has allowed us to successfully develop many types of permits to address specific service requirements such as the mobile vendor food truck permit, Food Trucks as an example. And I wanted to take the time to recognize that member, that exceptional member of the Public Service who is bringing us this far on parking. And you know, as we know, parking in Winnipeg is one of those third rails in politics. It's incredibly dangerous to talk about it, but there is also some incredible opportunity. So, there is in terms of what we're approving today, I think there are some benefits to the public today. And in terms of what we're approving in terms of the medium and long-term parking in Winnipeg, we're approving what is a world of possibilities to make parking better for the City of Winnipeg. So that's my introduction to this report.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next speaker on this report, Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just had some…I just would like clarification because I want to make sure. I've read over this a few times and didn't have the opportunity to send an e-mail to Councillor Allard. It appears that we're accepting this as information. On the other hand, it appears that there is some actions that are within this. So is this just information or is it a mixture of both?

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

Councillor Nason: In review of this...you know, I've seen several challenges, Madam Speaker, pertaining to pay stations. We have areas without pay stations. They're in around areas where seniors may go, seniors that may not be adopting technology as quickly as others. So, it presents a problem for finding parking close to locations. And I know it's about removing an underutilized areas, not a very good definition of what that may be. I am challenged by that. I'm more challenged though with the parking notices by mail. I understand this is a new approach. One that has been utilized quite heavily with photo enforcement where weeks after people receive notices of infractions. How are we to ensure that we're not going to reward deceptive signing practises, that areas that are highly enforced perhaps because they're not properly signed that people get multiple infractions if they have to have repeated visits to the same area. You know, we see this time and time again where we have challenges with areas. I'm hoping that this is not the case with this. I hope that we have a situation where this would be closely monitored. And that if there deems to be areas that are heavily enforced or over-targeted for infractions, that we look to see what is going on in those areas and not continue bad practises like we have with photo enforcement. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason. Mr. Mayor followed by Councillor Lukes.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to commend Council for having the political courage to look at this. This is something that, you know, when you're talking parking, it's a hot topic in coffee shops and kitchen tables throughout our community. And I know previous councils, I'm not sure really wanted to take as comprehensive a look at this as this council. And I think it's...it is certainly time for us to do this work. Heard questions about what we're voting on, what we're not voting on. I would just say to the councillor that raised questions, if you look at the standing policy recommendation, it's pretty clear. It's that the Winnipeg Parking Strategy, a conceptual framework...and I'm just reading from the document, if you can read it. The parking strategy attached as Appendix A to this report be received as information. 2) that the Public Service be directed to report back with the revised Winnipeg Parking Strategy document no later than 120 days following the conclusion of the stakeholder and public engagement. There is also a recommendation that Saturday complementary

on-street parking policy which is attached as Schedule C, Madam Speaker, to this report be formally adopted. This policy will come into effect in 2021 when all applicable signage has been posted accordingly. And there is a few other measures that are just spelled out in the report. Again, I just want to say, I think this work has been needed for some time. I think there's some improvements we can make in terms of the...not only the signage, but also the policies. And this is something that has been called for by many business groups for some time. So, I want to thank Councillor Allard for his stewardship and leadership on this as well as all members of council who provided input not just through the committee process, but again here today, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Lukes followed by Councillor Santos.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I want to echo the comments of Councillor Allard. I didn't realize Carole was going and that's a huge loss. She's retiring, I gather. So, she has been outstanding to work with. I have…I work with the Parking Authority I'd say on a weekly basis and they've been outstanding to work with. It's an amazing SOA. It's, you know, the can-do positive common-sense approach that they use in the majority of times that I've ever dealt with them is just so refreshing in this environment. I'm going to be supporting this. I'm very pleased to see that the parking will be updated and progressive parking processes will be implemented. I had the opportunity to spend time with Dr. Shoup when he was in town. As we grow as a city and as we build denser and denser neighbourhoods like we're doing, there is many, many interesting parking challenges. Parking is so tied to land use and to transit, to empty parking lots. There are so many opportunities that we can do better with our parking in this city. And, you know, I'm very supportive of this and I'm looking forward to the public consultation. And I'm looking forward to people understanding more about how parking is tied to land use and transit. And I think that is something we've really not embraced or understood in the past as much as I know we will be going forward in my conversations always at the Parking Authority. So, very supportive of this. Looking forward to the public engagement on a very hot topic. Thank you.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to also put in my full support behind this report and the recommendations of the Public Service. I want to put it out there and thank the businesses, the Exchange District BIZ and all the residences who were affected with this policy. Back in 2017, I brought a motion forward that we reduce the rate by 50 cents. And here we are today, we hear voices from the community, hearing voices from the business community and it's amazing to see how this has transpired into something that, you know, the public administration has been listening to in the community. I want to thank Councillor Allard. I echo some of your sentiments as well. This is really great work. I look forward to continue to working with you as well as the public administration as we kind of take that conceptual framework and turn it into a strategy. This is something that is so key to our city. I think it's important to know that businesses are being heard. And I am 100% in support of this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos, are you done? Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Councillor Santos. Moving on to Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm basically in favour of this as well. His Worship bothered to mention sort of the chronology of this and the meaning of it. To give clarity, no fault of his I don't think, I just would prefer if Councillor Allard in his closing statement explained what is to be acted on immediately, what is a subject, what is to be taken as information and, therefore, not to be enacted. And also...

Councillor Allard: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Jason, if you just read the first page, you'll see what is being acted on immediately.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, it is Councillor Schreyer's…

Councillor Allard: I know I'm out of order, but I thought I would give Councillor Schreyer the information he was requiring.

Councillor Schreyer: I'm looking at the first page. I'm glad to quote the first page to enumerate what it is that is happening and not happening. Like, what is being treated as information, thus not happening. Because it says these things will be treated as information. Okay. But then it says in the same...in the same report, in the same motion, some things would be acted upon. So, I'm looking at the first page, all items; one, two, three, four, one, two, three. three A to C, four, five six. And so, I just...those things…put it this way, those things that are going to be going through public consultation, my understanding is, they can't be enacted upon until after the consultation comes back to Council unless the perspective on what the consultation was is determined outside of this chamber. So I guess my concern is, did…the administration is going to interpret the consultation on their own? Or is that which is going to consultation, is it going to come back to the council chamber? What am I voting on, on that item itself that is the subject of public consultation? That's what I need to know. I think we all need to know that. And if it's not certain...again, if there is miscomprehension. That…No. 2, "That the

Public Service be directed to report back with a revised Winnipeg parking strategy document no later than 120 days following the conclusion of stakeholder and public engagement." So that means this isn't going to happen until that comes back to Council. That makes sense to me. As long as that makes sense to Councillor Allard.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Prior to COVID-19, Winnipeg downtown faced a wonderful problem.It was becoming successful. For many years, parking rates were frozen. Why? Because there wasn't that much demand in our downtown. The idea with charging for parking isn't to raise tremendous volumes of money for city coffers, it's about managing the on-street space. If you're going downtown for the full day, if you're working downtown, you shouldn't be parking on the street, you should be going into a lot or taking the bus downtown or whatever. The idea for on-street parking is; close to where you're going, high availability and high turnover. Maybe you can have lunch. Maybe you can go to the doctor. Maybe you can go and do a little shopping. But the idea wasn't to park there all day. Downtown has come a long way in the last 10-15 years. We've got a professional NHL hockey team in our downtown arena. We've got a great cultural district right over here with phenomenal theatre groups. I know these all sound wonderful in pre-COVID times, but regardless, more and more people are living downtown. More people are living downtown than ever. Downtown is changing, yes, it's not the retail hub as it used to be. But downtown has, prior to COVID-19, was very much happening. And the reality was, the old parking regime of, you know, Monday to Friday parking only. You know, one or two rate categories only wasn't really working. Successful downtowns charge different amounts in different areas. If there is higher demand somewhere, you charge a little bit more. If you want to promote longer term visits in certain neighbourhoods, you can allow longer periods of parking, even different days and different times. I remember a number of years ago looking at the downtown Minneapolis parking map. There were…every block face had different hours of operation, different days of the week and different prices ranging from 50-75 cents and hour to like $3.50 an hour. So again, the idea is, at any given time there should be 15% of availability on a given block face. What we're proposing here and what the Parking Authority is working towards, you know, working with the ideas presented by the guru of parking, Mr. Shoup...Dr. Shoup, is exactly that; moving towards a more dynamic pricing structure. And what is wonderful about it is because…it's because our downtown is successful. So, I'm excited to be voting for this today and where this is moving. It will make some changes and it will, you know…the idea is like you shouldn't have to spend forever going around the block to find an available parking space. But sometimes those spaces that may have been free at certain times may be charged. There may be spots that, you know, are more expensive, but the other hand, there may be some that are less expensive. If you're willing to walk a couple of extra blocks lunch to go have your shawarma, you know, there's a spot three blocks away, but you're only going to 50 cents an hour instead of the one at the front door that's $2.50 an hour as an example, hypothetically. So again, my pleasure to move this forward today. It's a long time in coming and quite excited.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Any further speakers at this time? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be short. I just wanted to clarify what I'm…I'm voting for what is a strategic direction. Look, there aren't any changes. As Councillor Gillingham and motion that I seconded to amend how we enforce parking rules and stuff, it's quite different all around the city. And so, there is no one way to do parking anywhere in this city. So, the strategy is looking at different ways of dealing with things. I do have concerns about adding paid parking to areas which involve some collector streets and various things, Madam Speaker. Because I think that is one of the ideas that, you know, where we have high demand for parking, then you want to start moving people and then, so you say, well, we'll metre it then and that's a way to, you know, get movement on the street. Well, I have some great concerns in how a city might go ahead and look at changing on-street parking structure in different areas and adding paying for parking in different places. So, Madam Speaker, what this is, is it is a strategic direction. When things are going to be changed, I believe they come to Council for a vote and that will be fine. So, I do think it is time for the Parking Authority to re-look and re-evaluate parking. We've heard a lot of that. Ever since I've been elected, parking is always a very difficult issue. And I think the Mayor acknowledged that and you would, too, Madam Speaker, I'm sure. But this is about looking at taking strategic direction and trying to do paid parking in a manner that best serves all the people who want to use these areas. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Allard for the close.

Councillor Allard: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. There has been a lot of comments made. This is a huge report. It's very comprehensive. The question was posed earlier, you know, what are we doing when we're voting for information versus non-information? I must admit that earlier in my career, I saw voting for information as being basically saying we're not doing anything about something. And I guess I owe some apologies to Councillor Browaty who I've criticized in the past for voting against information. And he…I don't know that he ever really explained why he was voting against information, but the reason that you vote against information is that embedded in these reports is all sorts of administrative direction. It's the administration that's letting us know what they plan on doing. So that's what information is. In terms of...you know, in terms of answering any specific questions, in terms of what this report does or doesn't do,

please do your homework, please do the report. Sorry, not do the report, please read the report. If you have any questions about the report, please feel free to ask me or the Public Service about what is going on. I'll be happy to look into it. The Public Service will be happy to get back to you. If I recall correctly, the Climate Change Action Plan that I so often cite was a report that was taken as information at Council. Well, it was taken as information, but it's also a document that has many, many, many pages of actions and recommendations from the Public Service. And when we vote for something for information, the Public Service starts using that as a base in order to make future reports. So no, information is not just saying we're throwing this in the trash. Information is saying, this is what we're doing. So if you vote for this report, this is the direction it's going to happen. And if you don't like what is in the report even if it is information, I would welcome my council colleagues to suggest amendments to the reports because that's how you change reports. And I mean, to some extent I've learned some of these things through my...I guess now six years on council. And perhaps…perhaps we need to have some…sort of some basic training in council to know, you know, what votes are and what votes aren't. Because yes, information is an endorsement, especially when it says that the Public Service will be doing something very specific. So, I welcome the question. I have to admit that it took me a little while to figure it out myself. Apologies again to Councillor Browaty who I've criticized probably a few times in the past for voting against information. I think my line was, why would you vote against information? That's all it is, is information. Well yes, it's information, but it also has, you know, a substantive document behind it that informs the Public Service…it informs what the Public Service will do today and it informs what the Public Service will do in the future because it then becomes a Council-endorsed report. So in terms of this report, it's a very good report. It will open up doors that we have never had the possibility of opening in the future. And in the short-term, it has some benefits as well. So please support this report. It's good in the short-term. And it will open up huge possibilities for the future. And, thank you for the questions from my colleagues about how Council works. I'm always happy to answer those.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2.

Councillor Nason: I'd like to raise a point of order. With regards to the close, I'd like to have the Clerks provide us a better understanding of receive for information if it's an actionable item that the Public Service will go forward in action or if it's a dead issue. Because several of these items are for information, but it sounds like they will go forward and actually action and implement said items.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, I appreciate your point. I think that's a discussion to have offline. Quite frankly, there's been some comments made. I think we should move forward with the meeting at this time. We're on item 2 right now. And I was going to call the question. You're asking for…to vote on the recommendations separately? Which one specifically, and we'll make sure it's in order. There are six. Six recommendations, Mr. Clerk? And that is in order to vote separately. Councillor Schreyer has requested that we vote on each recommendation separately. That is in the order. We shall do that. Okay. All in favour of recommendation 1? Contrary? Carried. All in favour of recommendation 2? Contrary? Carried. All in favour of recommendation 3? Contrary? Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Nason recorded in opposition. That is carried. That was 3, Mr. Clerk? All in favour of Item 4? Contrary? Carried. All in favour of Item 5? Contrary? Carried. All in favour of Item 6? Contrary? That is carried. Thank you. Moving on, Item 3, Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Delegation of Authority to Award Seven (7) Public Works Regional Street Renewal Contracts Exceeding $5,000,000 Including Multi-Year Contracts – MM Reference No. 639-2020

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard to open on Item 3.

Councillor Allard: I'll wait to hear the wonderful comments of my colleague. I expect Councillor Gillingham.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. At the risk of dashing Councillor Allard's expectations as called as being wonderful, I just simply wanted to pull this to raise the attention to the fact that early on in the COVID pandemic as the City was looking at what we could and should do to assist our local economy, and given that the City of Winnipeg has limited tools to assist the local economy compared to other senior levels of government, we've made the decision to go ahead with the capital program. And that was an important decision because by going ahead with the capital program, it meant and it means that jobs are still available for people who are, as the case is before us here, building roads. And there is obviously a trickle-down or spinoff effect when people have jobs in road construction, then their suppliers have work and have jobs. And those people can take their paycheques at the end of the day and support our local businesses like our restaurants and our gyms. And they can attend an appointment at a chiropractor or massage therapist, whatever the case may be, provided all of those places are open during COVID. So, this decision that we have before us today, looks ahead, it looks into 2021. And subject to the 2021 budget approval, it will position us once again to let out and go forward with the contracts for road construction. Simply reading the recommendation, the implications of the recommendation in the report, the purposes of the recommendation is to expedite the award process for construction contracts expected to

exceed $5 million. You can see all the contracts that are there. This report also represents what we've been able to achieve in dialogue as a city with the construction industry also. That the awards get out the door sooner rather than later, so that companies can line up their employees and can line up their jobs and can set themselves up and know what is coming in the coming months. So, it seems like it's, you know, something that we've really passed. I think a report similar to this in the last few years. But I wanted to highlight the…it's an important action that the City is taking, again subject to the adoption of the 2021 budget, but it's an important action that the City is taking to try to continue to stimulate and keep activity going in our local economy.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further speakers? Seeing none. Councillor Allard, back to you for the close. Councillor Allard, do you wish to close?

Councillor Allard: Yes, my apologies. I had to hit the unmute button. I believe Councillor Gillingham has said everything that needs to be said. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I'll call the question. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We now have Motion No. 2. That was circulated. It's moved by Councillor Browaty and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. It's an automatic referral to the standing committee and it's regarding Transit Plus. Okay. Now we'll move into by-laws, Councillor Allard.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS Council recently changed the policy for winter-only eligible users of Transit Plus from a system where users would be eligible for Transit plus service automatically on October 15 annually; AND

WHEREAS The original policy didn't recognize that often our roads and sidewalks are free of snow and ice significantly later than October 15; AND

WHEREAS the discretion to start access to winter seasonal Transit Plus service now lies with the Manager of Transit Plus and that power has not been utilized as of today, despite there being significant ice and snow on streets and sidewalks; AND

WHEREAS many in the community and on Council believe that given today's conditions winter seasonal Transit Plus service should now be available.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the public service develop a policy for consideration and approval of Council for determining when winter Transit Plus service should be initiated based on a defined metric of "appropriate conditions of our roads and sidewalks based on ice and snow and or other conditions worthy of consideration for safety."

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

Councillor Allard: Yes, this is typically where I stumble. My apologies. I think it's in the...one second.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, you move that By-law No. 96/2020 be read a first time.

Councillor Allard: So moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 96/2020.

Madam Speaker: Will you move that By-law No. 96/2020 be read a second time.

Councillor Allard: I do and I found my script.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 96/2020.

Councillor Allard: I move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 26/2020 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Good catch Mr. Mayor, thank you, 96/2020. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Question period for our chair. 30 minutes on the clock, please. Any questions for Councillor Allard? It's actually not 30, it's less. Yes, thank you, 15. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Okay. Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We'll go right into question period. Any questions from Councillor Gillingham? No questions. Let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Councillor Mayes, on the report dated October 13th.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED OCTOBER 13, 2020

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Item 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Any questions for our chair, for Councillor Mayes? Okay. Seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development. Any questions for our chair, for Councillor Browaty? Seeing none at this time, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. 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: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll be sharing my time with Councillor Mayes. As you may know that this agreement came up through EPC without recommendation and I was not in favour. And I will not be in favour of the motion that's in front of us here today. So, I'll be…in lieu of democracy, I'll be sharing my time so we can make sure that we have a proper debate on this item.

Madam Speaker: Thank you Councillor Gilroy and that is in order. Councillor Mayes, motion…

Councillor Gilroy: Do I get to make any…like, share my opening? Do I get to make any comments?

Madam Speaker: Just a moment. Madam Clerk, what is it that you wanted to do at this time? Okay.

Item 5 – Proposed Lease Agreement between the City of Winnipeg and Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, is that it for your opening? And you'll share your time with Councillor…

Councillor Gilroy: Well, I would like to say a few more words and then we'll be able to share the time if that's okay.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Let's put the clock on, please. Thank you.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'll be watching and Councillor Mayes will make sure that you cut off here. Okay, so just in terms of why I will not be supporting this and I do want to highlight the concern. One main concern is we're finding out a major change. Major change in cost that's in front of us here today that we were not aware of prior. Our administration doesn't even have...has not even had the opportunity to look over that and what that would mean, so that's a huge concern for me. A huge concern is that we're going longer than...we're going…they're asking for a longer time period, 15 years. I think it's our responsibility to look at the agreements that are in front of us in terms of the amateur access agreement and make sure that we're asking all the responsible questions, Madam Chair. And this is our opportunity to make sure that this

agreement would coincide with the True North agreement so we would be able to have an opportunity to really look at these agreements, see how they're working, if we want to make any changes, and so, I would be very concerned if we would extend it over that time. I also want to talk a little bit about the fact that we are being asked more and more and more at the City to take on more and more responsibility from the provincial government. And yet, they weren't even asked to participate in any kind of subsidy towards the Goldeyes. And that is a huge concern because, Madam Chair, I'm dealing with calls that talk about poverty, addictions and fire paramedics dealing with all these issues that are the responsibility of the Province that are downloaded on me, and now I find out that the Goldeyes are not even asking the Province for any form of money when they have more money. And when we talk about the economic benefits, which they listed here today...and I go to those games. I enjoy those games, but the economic benefits far benefit our provincial government, Madam Chair, than they do us. When we talk about all the amounts of sales tax, all the amounts of income tax that they receive, all the travel expenses that they…that we generate are not just on the City. We...the Province benefits greatly from that. So, I would hope that we would share the subsidization of these teams with our provincial counterparts. So, I'm very concerned with moving forward on this. I think that we got a lot of other things that we need to worry about. And I will save my other comments because I know that Councillor Mayes will have opposing view to mine. I'll talk more when I close.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes to speak to Motion 3 that's been circulated. Moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Chambers.

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

WHEREAS on October 20, 2020, the Executive Policy Committee forward the Proposed Lease Agreement between the City of Winnipeg and Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc. to Council without recommendation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the following recommendations be adopted:

1. *That the proposed Terms and Conditions (attached hereto as Schedule A) for a lease agreement in favour of Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc. for the City-owned property located at or near 1 Portage Avenue E, as shown on Misc. Plan No. 11140/11 (attached herein as Schedule B), be approved, with the following amendments:*

   A. *Replace 'Initial Term' with 'Term' and delete "July 27, 2038" and replace with "December 31, 2038"*

   B. *Delete 'Extension Option' in its entirety*

   C. *Replace 'Rental Fee', with the following:*

Rental Fee:	*Years 1 – 5: $25,000 per annum* *Years 6 – 10: $50,000 per annum* *Years 11 – 15: $75,000 per annum*

2. *That, subject to the approval of Recommendation 1, the City of Winnipeg Sponsorship Policy (attached herein as Schedule E) be waived as a requirement for the Proposed New Lease.*

3. *That, subject to the approval of Recommendation 1, a grant be provided to the Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc. equal to the entertainment tax remitted to the City of Winnipeg each year, until the expiration of the term on December 31, 2038 and such grant shall be established in accordance with the intent of the existing Amateur Access Agreement (attached as Schedule F).*

4. *That, subject to approval of Recommendation 1, a grant be provided to the Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc. equal to the municipal portion of real property taxes paid on land which relates to the presentation of baseball games (i.e. the ballpark parcel itself) until the expiration of the term on December 31, 2038 and such grant shall be established in accordance with the intent of the existing Amateur Access Agreement (attached as Schedule F).*

5. *That the City enter into, execute and deliver a lease agreement with Winnipeg Goldeyes Baseball Club Inc. 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").*

6. That authority be delegated to the Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate and approve the final terms and conditions of the lease agreement 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.

7. That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll try and be brief. A number of thanks, first to Councillor Gilroy for being quite decent in ceding some time to for me to open here, and she will close after I close. Thanks to Councillor Chambers…

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker. Point of order.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Allard: May I move automatic referral to committee?

Madam Speaker: No, you cannot.

Councillor Allard: What is my opportunity to do that?

Madam Speaker: We need to let Councillor Mayes introduce Motion 3…speak to Motion 3, that's the…

Councillor Allard: Yeah, I'd like to move referral…automatic referral after Councillor Mayes' speech, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I think I was denied a little bit there, but we'll come back to that. Thanks to Councillor Chambers for seconding and thanks to Councillor Klein, Councillor Lukes for quite a while ago supporting the motion at…when I was still chairing at planning. So, thank you to the Mayor. If anyone is tuning in and thinking wow, everything is just a block vote by EPC, this is your day to tune in because we have not seen that today. And the Mayor has said there are a number of good arguments to marshal on both sides and I think that's fair. I'll try and be calm and objective here and try and go through this. Number one then; the process. How did we get here? It has been five and a half years. My thanks to Kiernan and Gord Chappell and Julian Roberts for bargaining for all these years with the Goldeyes. They have moved substantially from the position they started in. We now have before us a tentative settlement. One of the problems at EPC and before was, well, the Goldeyes had said they wouldn't take what was recommended in the admin report. We now no longer have that problem. We can vote yes today to what is being moved by Councillor Chambers and myself and we will have a settlement, we will have the Goldeyes confirmed through to 2038. So that's an important distinction. Number two, what has happened over the years is the two sides of bargain back and forth. If this motion is defeated today, there is nothing out there. There is radio silence. There is no contrary position. We will after five-and-a-half years have nothing as our position. The parties will be at odds and we will have not progressed in the five-and-a-half years of talks. What has…what you see before you is different than what was the admin recommendation that was defeated at EPC. Most notably, I want to get on…now that we've talked about process, talk a bit about the finances here. And again, so the vote here today is, we have a settlement, the team stays or nothing. We do not have anything on the table. The team may choose to leave. But in any event, what are the financial implications? With respect, the Goldeyes did table a written offer through the admin, not through the media, not through the politicians. They presented a position. The public admin has had a chance to comment on it. We did get that e-mail a couple of days ago. Frankly, Parmalat…or not Parmalat rather, Starlight, there was some substantial financial moves made between EPC and getting to Council and that was approved as Councillor Orlikow sometimes reminds me, you lost that vote. And that is absolutely fair, but it's also fair for me to say, well, millions of dollars were increased between $5 million at EPC, $20 million at Council for a subsidy on Starlight. So, let's remember that. Let's try and treat different players here equally and fairly. What is before you in terms of the finances of the settlement? The Goldeyes have moved from wanting 25 years. So, it's not a shorter term, it's a…it is a shorter term, it's not a longer term. They wanted 25 years of entertainment tax and property tax returned to them. We were at six. The parties have met at 15. One could say that's millions more to the Goldeyes. One could equally say we talked them out of millions more. They wanted 25 years. Mayes' motion with Chambers actually gives them several million dollars less. 10 times 300,000 a year. So, that's one important change. They have moved to 15 years from 25. We can then access the land after 15 years. Second major item is, yes, we will continue to give them the rebate on the property tax on the stadium and on the entertainment tax for that 15 years. If there is no tenant, we don't get the entertainment tax. If there is no tenant, we take over the ballpark. We would be paying property taxes to ourselves. So, the temptation will be to say, we have all these millions of dollars going to the Goldeyes, we could use it for running tracks or to address child poverty or housing. Let's be clear; it's not a gift. It's not a blank cheque. If there is no entertainment, we don't get the entertainment tax. If there

is no tenant, we don't get the property tax. What this really comes down to is the parking lot. We have agreed, as was in the admin recommendation, to continue for 15 years with the Goldeyes would get the revenue from the parking lot. What then do we get? We get a team that operates with as you've seen in the financial report; full-time jobs, part-time jobs, there are hotels, there are a number of visitors who come downtown, more than 200,00 a year to use the Forks, to go to the stadium. If the Goldeyes leave, yes, we get the parking lot revenue. What do we…but what do we assume? What is the risk? We have to take care of the vacant stadium. That costs hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. That information has been provided. B) We lose the game day parking revenue that we get at Parcel 4 right now. C) Anybody who gets on a bus to come to a Goldeyes game pays some money, we get that. So, we would lose all of that if the team moves on. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we had a team that would pay us a million dollars a year in rent and say, no, we don't need property tax rebated. No, we don't need the entertainment tax rebated. That would be grand. That, however, is not before us. We don't have that offer. You can say, we'll get another team. Baseball is in a contraction mode. There are minor league teams folding. There aren't minor league teams springing up searching for a city. So, we have a team. You could say, well, let's do a request for proposal and take a few years now that we've been bargaining for five years. Let's do that. Well, Ottawa just did that. Lo and behold, who did they choose? Sam Katz. And you heard the deal explained earlier, Ottawa takes care of the stadium. We don't take care of the stadium. All of that risk is on the Goldeyes. In fact, there is a clause in the current lease that's been taken out where the City is on the hook for some of the capital improvements in the final years of the lease. So, is it a settlement? Yes, it is. I never once had a settlement when I was a union staffer that I thought, I love every single thing about this. So, it's…I don't love everything about this, but it does retain the team. Councillor Gillingham has said, I want baseball not at any cost. I think we have a reasonable settlement here. They've moved. That should be emphasized. We are not giving them a subsidy for the last 10 years. It's a 15-year deal.

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

Councillor Mayes: So, it's important to think of this in economic development terms. If that stadium had sat empty for a while and somebody came to us saying, I want to operate a baseball team there, green jobs, no pollution, I want to create employment. You'll need to refund the entertainment tax, we'd say, well, it's kind of like other deals we've made. Well, we won't get any of that if there's no team. That sounds good, what about the property tax? And yes, well, we aren't getting any of that if we're running the stadium. So, sure. So, I think you have to look at it as an economic development. If you look at the economic development tweet a while ago from Economic Development Winnipeg, what is the opening image? I have a photo of a…there is the stadium. Lights on, teams going. Be part of the recovery is what Economic Development Winnipeg says. So, look at this in an economic development lens I would say. It's not a blank cheque. It's not a gift. Did we give a blank cheque to Parmalat? Did we give a gift to Starlight? No, we made an economic development decision. So, we know the implications here. No team means no entertainment tax. Do we really think this has been a good year because we didn't have to pay back any entertainment tax? We didn't have to pay back any entertainment tax because there were no games. Ironically, if the Goldeyes have a really great season and get 300,000 fans, we're paying back more entertainment tax. I don't think that's a problem. I don't think that's a huge additional subsidy because there is more people coming downtown to drink a craft beer from a Winnipeg brewery. There is more people coming downtown on a bus. There is more people paying for parking at Parcel 4. It's in our interest as a city to have a thriving downtown enterprise that is privately run at that stadium instead of an empty stadium. So, that is the deal before you. That is your choice. Do you want an empty stadium that we will have to maintain, but we'll have a parking lot? Or do you want to say, yes, let's go for 15 years then we'll have the land back, we can develop it. We are getting more money than we were. It's not a buck a year lease, it's hundreds of thousands of dollars. So, we're getting more, we're not getting less.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Look, I have an open mind to this. I do have concerns how taxpayers…

Councillor Allard: Councillor Sharma, I thought I had moved automatic referral. Is there an opportunity for me to speak to that?

Madam Speaker: Yeah, Councillor Allard, I will recognize you in due time. It was out of order when you mentioned it earlier. And we have a speakers' list here as well. I will be getting to you shortly.

Councillor Allard: I was not...was I not added to the speakers list when I asked to speak? What is the process to be added to the speakers' list?

Madam Speaker: You were out of order. Councillor Mayes was introducing the motion. Okay. I will get to you momentarily. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Allard: What is the speaker's list, Councillor Sharma?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer followed by Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Schreyer: I appreciate Councillor Allard's frustration here. This happens in Council. I think I realized what happened, council…anyway, I'm not allowed to speak on this. It's not a point of order. But look, I mean, I'm open-minded to Councillor Allard's…what he is going…predicted to say when it comes to his turn to speak. And I wasn't sure if I was going to be speaking. I put my hand up. I was recognized first. So, there it is. What I am open-minded to Councillor Allard's projected motion to refer this. I'm not against that idea. We're told new information is come about here. And so, if that is the case, if Councillor Mayes' explanation isn't sufficient, I would suspect to those that have any further concerns that we...that we move in favour of his motion. Having said that, you know, I'm here to speak so I will. I often...I'm concerned about how systemically we as a society, we can overcompensate sports industries. Those that are owned by billionaires and who pay millionaires and it concerns me greatly. Should really concern us all. In this case, it's a little different. We're not talking about...we're talking about millionaires who run…people that are pretty working class when it comes to…when it comes to the Goldeyes, and there has to be some differentiation, understanding of the difference between that and other levels of sports that we've subsidized, a heck of a lot more than what this is considered to be and please note that. There is no comparison really. You can't say, well they're the same. They're not the same at all. You can't compare the Goldeyes to the Jets. You just can't. We can all talk about how they're not in the same league at all. Excuse the pun, that's not what I meant, but nonetheless, there it is. Just remember what we just did in terms of what I consider a real giveaway. We say we're going to give millions of dollars, $20 million, in the name of...what we're told, to Starlight, and this is a comparison. Again, for those that aren't…where I'm coming from, it's a comparison of what we do with our money. Kind of like when we're talking about buses, but we have to deal with, you know, the sewage treatment plant. So, in this case, we asked Starlight who are here answering our questions, when it comes to this $20 million we're going to give them, and you know, which includes affordable housing, they could not answer the questions. And they had weeks to show due diligence. Remember the term due diligence when it came to that issue. We were…the City of Winnipeg was going to pay if we didn't show due diligence. But we couldn't get Starlight to show due diligence in asking…answering the questions to which we are providing the money but we are going to be the ones paying them. But they had no obligation to show due diligence in answering these questions. How much affordable housing units? They couldn't answer us. What was going to be the equation by which they would consider a proportion of one's income to go towards rental? They couldn't answer us. How much would...oh, and could they give us an example of what they thought were the difference from where they were located in Toronto compared to what it costs for affordable housing in Winnipeg. They couldn't answer us. And Councillor Eadie and I were giving them hints. Well, you know, it's about a quarter of one's income goes toward…would go towards the core affordable housing, that's an equation (inaudible) deal with. Couldn't deal with that. Couldn't give us an answer, even though we were providing them information. When we gave them the information that maybe affordable housing in Winnipeg was about half the cost of Toronto, they still couldn't run with that and give us answers. We were trying to help them, and they couldn't answer why they're receiving $20 million. In this case, Councillor Mayes is providing us information on how it works and it's a proportion. Yes, it's a subsidy. But if there is no income, there is no tax that they're going to refer to us, the entertainment tax. So, there is the difference. It is a form of subsidy, but in this case, when it comes to sports subsidies that we've done in the past, when it comes to sort of subsidies we've been doing really lately, this one to me I'm kind of comfortable with. I'm not often comfortable with this stuff and still, you know, it's a 60-40, 70-30 kind of thing. But Councillor Mayes explains it very well in terms of why this is actually sustainable for the next 15 years given the...given the infrastructure that is already developed there. What would we do with it? It's a baseball diamond. It's a really good one. Kind of amazingly well positioned in terms of its location. So what would we do with it? Do we have any better ideas? I'd like to hear that if we're going to vote against it. I'd like to know. Like, seriously I'm open-minded on this. What would we do with the place for the next 15 years? And so, these are questions that I guess we have to ask ourselves when it comes to this vote. Please don't ignore this. But if it happens to be that based on we're not getting all the information, we could get more information in the next month then by all means, I think we should consider what I predict is going to be Councillor Allard's proposition on this. I'm okay with this motion as it is. But then again, maybe we could have greater information. Sort of like we should have done with Starlight when they couldn't answer their own questions on affordable housing and why they're getting $20 million. This is not that. This is providing a service for...it's an entertainment service, yes, for an existing infrastructure. You know, I'm not saying now that we spent half a billion dollars on a bus corridor from downtown to the U of M that we should get rid of it or something like this. Let's face it, we're forever subsidizing for a long time…subsidizing that bus corridor for the amount of service it provides us. Saving five minutes during rush hour. So, bear that in mind. So, in this case, I think we've got a pretty…it's pretty small scale when it comes down to it, trying to make use of an existing infrastructure for the benefit of Winnipeggers that choose to use it and Brian Mayes has already explained that. However, if we want more info, I'm not opposed to the referral.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Firstly, let me just begin by acknowledging I think every member of council are, I hope every member of council are fans of the Goldeyes. I certainly am. I know a lot of families including my own, have spent a lot of enjoyable times and evenings watching and cheering on our hometown team. Also, of course, the Field of Dreams charitable organization, I want to once again thank them for all that they continue to do in our community.

Madam Speaker, I want to just, for those that are tuning in now, I just want to kind of walk through for…and put on the public record, you know, what…how we got to today's vote because I think it is important. And it's certainly one of the reasons why I'll be voting the way that I will today. About a year ago, October 28th, the Public Service presented a lease for the Goldeyes to the Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development that included the City of Winnipeg keeping all parking revenue and offered a fair market value for rent with no additional subsidies for entertainment tax or property tax. At that meeting, my understanding is that there was an instruction...I think it was Councillor Klein initiated the instruction to the Public Service to, and I quote, "Continue negotiations and report back within 120 days with terms and conditions for a new lease." And interestingly, Councillor Klein provided very specific criterias that amounted to a total subsidy over 15 years of approximately $8 million. And this was on addition to what had come forward from the Public Service. So eventually, of course, the Public Service carried out their instructions and in July after a few extensions, July 15th of this year at Executive Policy Committee, the Public Service reported...and reported back based on the instructions that were given to them at committee, they reported for a lease which included the $8 million of total subsidy, albeit in a, I believe, a slightly different configuration than what was initially proposed at the committee meeting last year and they were sent back. We sent back the Public Service to review financial information from the Goldeyes so the public could better understand the use of the proposed subsidy. That's been something that I've been open to supporting some form of a subsidy. I know the entertainment tax has been cited and that's obviously…is a controversial essentially flow-through that goes back to many professional teams in our community. I'm not opposed to that, but there is additional subsidies. Notably, the parking revenues that were added, that take up a significant portion of that $8 million that was part of the administrative report follow-up. So, we're here today with...sorry, before I get to that, the Public Service then came back with additional information because that was the one thing that I know I wanted to see. I wanted to see, Madam Speaker, what is it that we would be getting for approximately an $8 million subsidy for a professional sports team. Just so that I could keep an open mind and also know what the money is going to be used for and I could certainly look Winnipeggers in the eye and say, okay, it's $8 million over this term, here's what you get. What we heard back, and I am quoting the administrative report that followed up and I'll just read the executive summary, "On September 14th, 2020, the Winnipeg Goldeyes supplied selected audited financial information to the Interim Chief Financial Officer. The financial information supplied to the City does not represent a full disclosure of the 2018 and 2019 audited financial statements of the Winnipeg Goldeyes and Riverside Park Management. It does not appear that financial information provided includes any financial disclosure concerning Riverside Park Management. As such, a complete review of the revenue of the Winnipeg Goldeyes and Riverside Park Management cannot be completed. Further, in the audited schedule supplied by the Winnipeg Goldeyes, no financial information has been supplied in respect of the financial support the City has provided the Winnipeg Goldeyes through the historical granting of municipal taxes and entertainment funding taxes under the master lease agreement." And then this is the part that I noticed, "As such, the Public Service is unable to comment on how this subsidy is being utilized on a go-forward basis." So that is concerning, of course. Are we requesting more information than historically has been requested in similar arrangements with for-profit professional sports team? Yes. This is more. That is something that many of us ran on. We told voters in numerous elections that we wanted to be more open and transparent so that we could be held accountable for the decisions we make. And so, there is an added level of information that is being requested. And I'd like to see that for other arrangements with for-profit professional sports teams. We're here today now with an amending motion that proposes approximately an additional $3.8 million in further subsidy by way of increased rebates on the education and municipal taxes as well as a further reduction in rent. Including this amendment, we would then be voting on a total of $11.8 million in combined subsidy over the life of this lease. It's a significant amount. Again, I've taken a pragmatic approach to considering this. You know, if I were to have seen today details that would better explain how the subsidy is to be used, if the requested information had been provided, I certainly would be open to that, but we don't have the information that we requested. And as a result, I'm not in a position that I could support either the amendment or the original. And I just keep in mind, I mean, again this started a year ago with the City of Winnipeg Public Service bringing forward an administrative report that had no additional subsidy for entertainment tax or property taxes. And as a result of continued dialogue, much of which hasn't been on the floor of Council, the millions of dollars have added up over the last year to roughly $12 million in subsidy that's being considered today. So for those reasons, I won't be supporting it, Madam Speaker. And respect there's very many different views on this around the council chamber. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, I thought…I thought I was after the Mayor. Are you missing me again?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, no, I did not say that. I will be getting to you momentarily, Councillor Allard. I would like to…

Councillor Allard: Madam Speaker, may I have the speakers list, please?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, you'll be called in short order. Okay. You are next, in fact, okay? And followed by Councillor Chambers after that. I'd like to continue.

Councillor Allard: I understood I was after the Mayor.

Madam Speaker: No, I did not say that. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Allard: That's what I understood. Can we check with the Clerk, please?

Madam Speaker: Maybe someone should come and check my list that's in front of me. Councillor Klein, you have the floor. Thank you.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I do this for Councillor Mayes. I'm going to quote the 1974 number one billboard song by Billy Preston, "Nothing from nothing leaves nothing" which really explains in great detail what is happening here today. I'm going to talk to some of the points that His Worship mentioned in his creative wordsmithing that we were all privy to just moments ago. But number one, the one thing I want to talk about is we have been discussing this for over a year and I have to say, quite frankly, the number of murders is on the rise in the City of Winnipeg. The number of violent crimes is on the rise. I didn't see us reporting that anymore. I'm not sure why. The number of domestic violence calls is on the rise. The number…the wait times for a land…ambulances is on the rise. All of these issues going on in the City of Winnipeg and this is getting the most of our attention as city councillors. This agreement is getting all of our attention. Murders are up, crime is up. This really shouldn't be getting the attention that it's getting today. So, let's talk about what happened years ago. Some will call it a subsidy, I call that creative wordsmithing. Because if you don't have anybody there, you're not getting anything. Let's talk about the entertainment tax because we throw it around an awful lot. Get rid of it because we don't really get it in the first place. We hand it over to everybody else. If they want to up their tickets by a dollar, then up it by a dollar, and stop saying we're giving them this money. Eliminate it, let them up the price. My objective one year ago when this file came to the desk was putting personalities aside and trying to do what was best for Winnipeg and start moving us in the right direction. You can't go from zero to 120 in seconds, you have to walk in that direction. Look what's happening to some of the community groups in the city that were starting to bang on their door saying, you have to start paying big rents. They're picketing outside, seniors picketing outside. Meanwhile, violent crime going up, murder rate going up. We're not talking about it. The motion that we put forward at PP&D that yes, I was…it wasn't for an $8 million subsidy, it was actually giving the City more money then than you're going to get today on these…on this motion. So, I was actually asking for more money, which they seemed to be in agreement with at that time than what you're going to get today. But we couldn't do that, right? Maybe because it was Klein that put it forward or whatever, but we can't let that one go through, that wouldn't look good on everybody else. So, let's change that. Now fast forward a year, and here we are, giving them a bit of a better deal, and arguing about it. The reality is quite simple, and we brought up Starlight. Starlight's great. One hour before Council I had an amending…I had a motion going forward for $18 million, and there was a $10 million motion on the floor, it changed. That was the third change. It went up to $20 million. It was like we were negotiating against ourselves. Councillor Mayes wanted to ask a question, and he wasn't allowed. And then we passed the $20 million one because the $18 million one, well, we had to do better than that because that was Klein. We can't let that one go through. Creative wordsmithing. We say that it's a subsidy because we pick the rent. I have not yet seen a document that proves to me that that is the rent; that that's the reasonable rent; that that is exactly what a baseball team would pay for a stadium for using that stadium that is responsible for all of the maintenance at the stadium and all of the repairs. Take personalities aside. Let's look at the reality; they pay all of that. So, with the motion that Councillor Mayes has brought forward, we'll get $750,000. That's a 750,000% increase from what you got today. So why would you walk away from it? You just put this big parking thing through because we want to bring people downtown. I don't know if you realize this, we voted to put a historical designation on the Bay building after receiving a letter from the Vice President of the Bay saying, please don't…don't do it on the inside, just the outside because we'll have to close it down and now they're closing it down. So, we'll…we'll have people coming downtown to park and look at the boards? We've got to be thinking about these decisions. This is good revenue for the businesses downtown. It sparks downtown. It brings people to The Forks. Is it a better deal than what they should get? Anybody could argue that. You're all going to have different opinions on that. Everyone's going to have a different opinion on that, but is it a step in the right direction? Yes. You can't argue that. It's not a dollar, it's not $1 million a year. We're not going to get the financial records from the Thompson family and the Chipman family. I want to be in the room when you ask because they're not going to give it to you. And any corporation with any salt in their financial department can give you financials that show them losing money. Please, we're asking things that are just not reasonable at this particular point in time. We give grants to organizations, actual grants, where we don't ask for financials. We're debating this, and meanwhile murders are going to be higher, at this rate, higher than last year, last year was a record one. Record year for murders in this city. We're on the path higher. Violent crimes; we don't even know how much higher we are anymore because we're not reporting that. Domestic violence calls, up. Ambulance wait times, up. That's what I am...that's what we should be talking about. We're going to get $750,000 more. Can we just take this and move on? Because Councillor Mayes said something that was bang-on accurate. Let it sit empty and we can say, yeah, we gave it to them. We showed them. And in three years, a team might come along and say, we want to put a baseball team there, but it's too expensive, we're going to need a deal, and then what? Listen, they give back to the community and as Billy Preston said, "Nothing from nothing leaves nothing." If it's the entertainment tax that's bothering you, let's stop playing that game. We give it to the Bombers. We give it to the other

teams. I mean, they pay property tax, great. Some don't. Let's just be reasonable about this and say it's a step in the right direction. That's what this is. Is it the best deal? No, it is not. Is it better than what we had? 750,000 times better than what we had, and I think that's a step in the right direction. Thank you.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you. Just, I would like to move automatic referral. Do I get an opportunity to speak to that?

Madam Speaker: There's no automatic referral. That's not in order. Is there something else you'd like to move?

Councillor Allard: Can I get confirmation from the Clerks on that? I thought referral was always in order.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I think he means a referral to (inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. I think Councillor Allard can speak for himself, but thank you. Councillor Allard, are you trying to refer the motion?

Councillor Allard: I would like motion…the motion, motions to be referred to the proper standing committee, and my understanding was that that was always in order.

Madam Speaker: That is in order, so it would be the item and the motion would go with it to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Okay, you do…

Councillor Allard: Do I have an opportunity to speak to that?

Madam Speaker: You can. You have three minutes.

Councillor Allard: Okay, and then after that, do I have an opportunity to speak to the main item if this motion is lost?

Madam Speaker: No, because I'll be calling the vote. Councillor Mayes, you'll have an opportunity to rebut. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Just for clarification, Madam Chair, if I lose this motion, will I then have my normally allotted time to speak to this motion after that?

Madam Speaker: Yes, you will. You will.

Councillor Allard: Okay. I mean, I think my pitch to Council is fairly simple. We've had some last-minute conversations. I've heard interpretations by various councillors. I've heard Councillor Mayes who I understand knows this file probably very well, and he's made some…I guess some strong arguments in favour. I've heard the Mayor say that ballpark, we're looking at anywhere between an $8 and now maybe $11 million subsidy. I was a member of the P&D committee when we requested the audited financial statements of Riverside Park Management and the Winnipeg Goldeyes. This is our land. The non-accessory parking lot which is part of this lease would have other opportunities. I believe the updated terms...and please, someone correct me if I'm wrong, but the updated terms would be that that parking lot would be in possession of the Winnipeg Goldeyes for 15 years locking up that land that we may need for other things such as our rapid…our Transit Master Plan, which I definitely don't want to be compromising. And then fundamentally, in 2014, I was elected on fixing the roads and fixing accountability at City Hall. Since then, I've had the opportunity to...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, let's stick to the referral, please. Thank you.

Councillor Allard: So, you do want me to explain why I believe this should be referred? Because I thought that's what I was doing.

Madam Speaker: Yes. You've got a minute left on the clock.

Councillor Allard: Okay. So in terms of accountability, if we refer this, we can have the Public Service provide a written report with all of the new information that has come together in I think the last week. We have not been provided the financial statements that had been requested by Council. Personally, and for many of us, this is the first time we vote on a professional sports team, and I can tell you the complaints that come in whenever there's any subsidy to a sports team, and this is my first opportunity to do that, and I want to make sure that we're doing it right. And right now, all I have for information is a few e-mails and a few speeches, and I would like to see an administrative report with a deal that is ready

to be signed by Council, and that's not what I have right now. So fundamentally, that's why I would like to see this moved back to committee so we can have a formal recommendation from the Public Service and another debate at that level.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Allard. Councillor Mayes, your opportunity...pardon me, Gilroy. Okay. I'm sorry, Councillor Gilroy, you have an opportunity to rebut.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd be open to it moving…moving because I think it is important that we do have greater dialogue in terms of the new information that was just given to us. So, I would be...I'd be very open to that. And I think that in terms of the conversation, you know, that Councillor Klein…Councillor Klein raised, in my mind, this is why we should be debating this. We have lots of issues in the city that we're dealing with. And you know what? We're asking for a longer deal than our amateur access agreement with the True North, and I think it's prudent and responsible of us to make sure those coincide so we can have the debates on...some people would like to see us get rid of the…get rid of the entertainment tax altogether. Some people might say oh, maybe we should take some of that entertainment tax and put it into community services. But if we're going to extend it, then we're not going to be able to have that dialogue and have that debate here, and we should be having the debate because we do have a lot of important things that we need to deal with, and we can't always be afraid that a team is going to leave. Those are always the issues when we're dealing with any kind of contracts. So I think that we should be debating this, and we should be talking about this, and I'm open to a move to refer it so we can have greater scrutiny on the…on what's in front of us here today because it is new and it's different than Starlight because Starlight's main ask was Starlight's main ask. We were jumbling up at the balls and who should pay for what with the different levels of government, but their ask was the same. And their ask was in terms of affordable housing when we're in the middle of a housing crisis. So I think they're, you know…I do think that they're different, right. But we're not all going to agree on that, but maybe we can agree on sending it back so we can have further dialogue and further debate on this, and I'll look forward to the conversation on this one.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. With that, we'll call the question on the referral. All in favour? Okay, call for a recorded vote. All in favour of referring this item and the motion to committee, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Santos, Allard, Gilroy and Schreyer.

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: The referral is lost. Councillor Allard, do you wish to address Council at this time on the item?

Councillor Allard: I'd like to hold my speaking until later in the debate if that's appropriate.

Madam Speaker: Okay. You'll have to raise your hand then a little bit later when you're ready.

Councillor Allard: No problem.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a great debate that we're having today. I rise to provide my perspective on the report…or on the motion that we have in front of you today and the recommendation to support the deal negotiated between the City of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg Goldeyes. The landscape of our city would contrast sharply in terms of vibrancy if we did not have professional sport teams that add to our sports identity, our bragging rights and who we are as a city. This year because of the pandemic, I am certain that a lot of Winnipeggers missed the Winnipeg Jets hockey, missed the opportunity of the Winnipeg Blue Bombers to defend the Grey Cup, and obviously missed the Winnipeg Goldeyes and the crack of the bat at Shaw Park. While I acknowledge that everyone is not a sports fan, this also speaks to the arts that makeup our cultural enlightenment and entertainment of our city. Winnipeg has a downtown ballpark that is second to none and ranked among the top five in North America in minor league professional ball parks. In negotiating a deal with the Winnipeg Goldeyes as part of Winnipeg's entertainment offerings, it is critical to be mindful that we are negotiating with taxpayer dollars for private for-profit businesses, so we must do our due diligence to ensure

that investments are made within the best interests of all Winnipeggers. I want to ensure that the proposed recommendations that are provided are within scale of what is provided to other sports teams and other cultural entertainment entities here in our city. We must also recognize the fact that these businesses do not operate in the same fashion that other business operate on a day-to-day basis, but operate either weekly, biweekly, monthly or seasonally. Their ability to generate revenue on a daily basis is impacted by the sport…type of sport or entertainment that they provide. It is for these reasons that they come to government to help keep them operational for extended years through operating grants. We must also acknowledge the revenue brought in by these entities that would not be realized if they were not in existence as other councillors have spoken to today. From the part-time concession jobs to the front office staff that are full time and groundskeepers, to the hotel stays of visiting teams, to the revenue generated from fans who utilize transit to come to games, to the restaurants and bar visits before or after games. All of these revenue opportunities would not exist if these entities were not here. So, in review of the recommendation that had been provided and the negotiated deal that we have in front of us here today, I ask my council colleagues to consider all of the above when deciding whether to support this motion. There's also one additional consideration at stake here. Sitting outside at the ballpark on a Winnipeg...beautiful Winnipeg summer day at the price that is affordable for a lot of Winnipeggers is something that can bring us together. While the cost to attend some of the other professional sports teams in our city are cost prohibitive for some of our citizens, the opportunity to be part of a professional sporting event is something that all Winnipeggers should enjoy. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I will be supporting Councillor Mayes' motion. I really agree with much of the rational that the councillor from St. Vital has laid out today. And I would agree with many of the other reasons for support that some colleagues around the chamber have already stated. It's been said before, and I'm in the same place where I'd agree that ideally, this matter would have come...this administrative report would come before us, and it would reflect an agreement that is reached between the City of Winnipeg and the Goldeyes already. We don't have that before us, and we...after many, many months, years of back and forth, we have a motion before us that, though not ideal, at least allows us to make a determination and decision. I do certainly respect my colleagues and the reasons for and against that have already been stated, and I know some of the other...you know, I anticipate some of the other reasons that will be stated by future councillor speakers, but I, for one, am trying to look at what it would be...the impact would be on the City of Winnipeg to have an empty ball diamond in...in a two to three to four years' time if we cannot get a deal. As Councillor Mayes pointed out, minor league ball is contracting, not expanding right now. The current pandemic has only exacerbated some of the problems that some pro-sports teams are facing. There is a…what I have not heard from anybody…I have not heard from anyone in my community through phone calls or e-mails, you know, please, we don't want the…you know, find a way to get out of this deal. We don't want the Goldeyes anymore. Quite the opposite. The only thing I've heard is, please find a way to keep ball in downtown Winnipeg. There certainly is the spinoff economic impact, and to me, probably that's, and frankly, as big an argument to find a way to get a deal and achieve a deal and a new set of terms for an agreement. It's probably as big an argument as any that when I look at this, when there's no...if there's no baseball being played in that area, well, then as Councillor Mayes already pointed out, there's that many less hotel room nights. There's that many less meals eaten in restaurants. There's that many less people taking transit to downtown to get to the ball game. Many people enjoy baseball. I got to thinking, well, if not the Goldeyes, what if this deal couldn't get done, and so then we go looking for another tenant for the beautiful ball stadium that we have? If we go look for another minor league baseball team or professional team in some sort, I as sure as I stand here, my…I believe that we would be faced with wooing a ball team or discussing a deal with a ball team or the agreement of a lease with a ball team that would want some sort of incentives to play ball in Winnipeg. Somebody used the term bird in a hand, and you know, that old saying, a bird in the hand is better than two in the bush, perhaps not a completely fitting analogy or use of the term, but it somewhat makes the point. Is it ideal, the deal before us? No. Is it an improvement for a taxpayers' over the current deal? Yes. Yes, I believe it is. And to reiterate, again, if there's no entertainment going on on that site, there's no entertainment tax that comes in, and there's no…therefore no entertainment tax rebated. So, I wish it was an easier decision to make, but it's not. And so, I, for one, will be supporting Councillor Mayes' motion, and hopefully looking forward to the vote and frankly, hopefully looking forward to baseball continuing in downtown Winnipeg for many years to come to the enjoyment of our citizens.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to take just a little bit of a different tact to this conversation. The tact that I'm looking at, it's a risk. I'm doing a risk analysis where we're at now and what will happen tomorrow. So, when I look at the risk involved, and sure, if some councillor here says, I got somebody right in my back pocket who's going to pay us all the fees, take care of the building, take care of the lands, do all that, fantastic, but I don't believe that's out there. So, that idea, that thinking there's someone who is going to come in there and not give us a better deal than the one we have now, I think that it's quite naive. Is it possible? Absolutely, but it's a huge risk. And what are those risks by having an empty baseball diamond? I'm not going to get into more of the secondary ones that are very important for both

sides, such as economic development, having a neat ball diamond and those factors. Yeah, we could say, oh, we'll just rip down the stadium and put up some condos. Well, you know, we have Parcel 4 next door, we have, you know, other properties downtown, the Bay was mentioned already, that are going to take some substantial amount of work. And, you know, as we've figured out already with the Public Safety Building, demoing is not cheap. So, how much actually value we get from the land after. And now, the department is quite clear that it is 50…they have no need for the land at this point. Maybe in the future, but right now, they're focused on more of the rail side and trying to get that project going. So, when I looked at it, and we hear even today, the huge subsidies that are going on, but again, in a risk analysis, those subsidies don't exist. We don't get any property tax or other subsidies…refunding property tax on the baseball diamond part. Yeah, well, if there's no one in there, we're getting no taxes. So, that's kind of a wash. But we do get about $400,000 a year in other taxes that are related to the ball diamond. Those are gone. You can take those and just disappear those. We do, the City will revenue from…increased revenue from the parking, that is a…that would be true. So you do that, and then, we minus out the lease that we've been offered today, and then you minus out the loss of property tax, and then, you also add in the cost of hoarding this building,which will be absolutely amazingly costly. They've already…the report already siphoned out anecdotally, I think. I think it would a lot higher, about $400,000 per year to hoard this building. So, that's been before me. And upgrade the subsidy which is the parking revenue, that is really the only subsidy that I see that is independent of this. And then you put all the other costs involved, the City is going to be facing…the risk is, the City is going to be facing somewhere...and again, my calculations, about a $500,000 a year minimum loss that we're going to have to backfill from general revenue because we have no other revenues coming in here. So, that is a huge risk. We need that money to go fund other projects. So, do I want to put, you know, $500,000 a year into an empty ball diamond? No. Again, I think the idea that we're negotiating in public like this is ludicrous, but that's what we have today, so I couldn't mention this stuff before because the negotiations weren't over, but in my opinion, negotiations are over. We have a deal in front of us. I've looked at the numbers as best as I can. At the end of the day, this deal is not bad. We'll probably have to subsidize, you know, 50 to $100,000 a year net when you take in the other taxes that we're getting, and that excludes all the other stuff; the economic development, having an empty baseball diamond, the buses, the restaurants, the hotels, that doesn't even include any of that. So, it's going to cost us a few bucks in this regard, but don't go there and say we're going to…oh, we're subsidizing with the property tax, but we're not because there's no one going to be there. We're subsidizing with the entertainment tax. That's just a flow through money. Oh, let's put this on hold until we talk about the entertainment tax. No, we've got to move forward. I do concur with Councillor Klein and other councillors who've said, this is taking up an enormous amount of our time, when we have so many more important issues. I see this deal. I would love to get more money. I would love it, but this is the deal that we're at with today. I do not want the Goldeyes…if we leave, it's going to be financially very costly for the City because we have a single-purpose building that we have no use for. We're going to…again, it would be lovely to have concerts in there some of my friends have told me, those will be one-off, they're not going to be…but none of the kiosks would be open up top because they'll probably be all rotted out by that time. What about having a dog park in there? Fantastic. Would the dog park be able to pay for everything? Absolutely not. Minor league baseball, they won't be able to pay for all of this stuff. It's a very large building. So again, would I love to get more revenue out of this? I'd say, everybody would, but at the end of the day, I see this…the proposal that's in front of us today...Councillor Mayes has done a very good amending motion. People are going to say, what about this, what about this? If you read the motion, it's very specific. This is the administration's motion minus three things, not 25 years, 15 years. Entertainment tax, it's in and out. Property tax, it's in and out. So again, what we have really was the parking revenue. We had some lease money. We also get the other taxes that are associated with. So, I believe at the end of the day, while I for sure would like to get some more money, and I'm sure the Goldeyes would pay less…would like to pay less, we have a deal in front of us. This I believe is fair enough that we should be moving forward, so I'll be supporting Councillor Mayes today.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In some baseball lingo, this league ain't the bigs. This is a semi-pro ball league that is not a farm team, so there's no big professional dollars coming in to cover off costs and make more money. I believe that Councillor Mayes is moving forward an amendment that I would support with this agreement that's been actually negotiated with our Winnipeg Public Service. It's the best deal that's on the ground. This isn't like competitive negotiations here. There is only one team. It's the Goldeyes and I love the Goldeyes. I…you know, I had season tickets at the stadium. Those seats weren't the greatest. I'll tell you, those cold benches when they're early in the season, and it wasn't the most conducive to catching baseball games. But Madam Speaker, the Goldeyes and the owners put on a good product in a league that is actually, the vast majority are American teams in cities like Fargo and Sioux City and so on. Unlike Ottawa that's a different league that's…the Canadian league where many of the happenings will happen in Canadian dollars. I'm sure the business people that are behind this…behind the Goldeyes, they probably have a way to handle the US dollars, but the players…if you want to put a quality team on the field, I'm sure, like other places, they're paying the American dollars rather than the Canadian dollars, but they're generating Canadian dollars at the game. And I have to agree, many people have said it, there's no entertainment tax if there's no Goldeyes. So, we don't lose anything. The rent agreement is good. What I do also like about this is that stadium now is what, 20 years old? By this…with a 15-year extension with changed items under the new contract, new lease agreement, goes to 2038, I think that there

may...and there's always good possibility some major repair, renovation things will have to happen in this period of time between 2020 and 2038. We, under this new agreement, are not responsible for any of the infrastructure if, for some reason, it needs repair. I don't know. It's pretty close to the river. You never know, over time...we have climate change happening. Who knows what kinds of issues can arise. Yes, in the end of the agreement, we will have a stadium that probably has seen its day. I don't know what the future of baseball is past that, but what we do have is a guarantee of baseball, and if there is no baseball put out on the field, the Goldeyes aren't out on the field, there are provisions in the agreement, our Winnipeg Public Service made sure those kind of provisions are in there to cover off various aspects. The only thing I'd mention on this...but, you know, it doesn't happen that often at the Goldeye Stadium versus at the Jets facility or even at the football stadium in terms of concerts and other things other than baseball that generate entertainment tax, so there are some of those issues in terms of...I'm not sure if the owners of this will be receiving back entertainment tax related to outside of baseball. If it is, it's probably minimal as calculated in here. But you know in the future, when we look to the hockey arena, there's tons of concerts…there's all kinds of non-hockey...actually, there's two teams that playing out of the hockey arena now. You've got the Moose and the Jets. Boy, they're getting back a lot of entertainment tax back, eh? Wow. But they're also getting back the concerts. And we know that you couldn't put a roof over the football stadium because they have a guarantee that no covered stadiums would be there, so in the winter, there's only place to do big concerts. And yes, COVID will be over. There will be big concerts going into the future, so Madam Speaker, you know, I don't see how you can draw, talk about those professional sport teams versus the Goldeyes, semi-pro, not even a farm feeder system there, although the odd player will get picked up by the bigs if they demonstrate they can play well. And…but in no fashion do the…does the big league teams fund Goldeyes. So, there's no stream of revenue in that regard. So yes, it's a pretty good deal for the owners. And I just want to conclude...like, if you're voting against this because you want to get even for Crocus or you want to get even for what you think may or may not have happened in the past, you know, that's not what this is about. People want baseball in Winnipeg, they do. I hear it from lots of people. And you know, it does provide jobs. Those people, they live in houses where they pay property taxes. If they're not making money, they can't pay their property taxes. We just talked about that in the living wage, Madam Speaker. There's jobs there. People earn a living. They make money right here in Winnipeg. They spend it in Winnipeg. Yeah, we don't get the money that the Province and the feds do, but you know what? Ultimately, people need to afford to be able to live in Winnipeg, and you know what? This place provides jobs, and that's one of the things that I like about it, and so really consider that, too because, you know, the Goldeyes could just go away. You know, they don't necessarily...like, you know, it is a business. All sports is a business. Professional, semi professional, it's a business. And you know, nobody is getting charitable tax receipts if it starts to cost them a half a million a year to put a team on the field for Winnipeggers. But the ticket price is cheap, remember that. It's a good price, good family entertainment as our Mayor has pointed out quite eloquently. So, you know, I think we should be voting in correspondence. I don't want a white elephant like we had across the street here on King where we've got an empty building that's costing us tons of money to maintain.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. So, this has been almost five years in negotiations with the Public Service and the Goldeyes, and I'd like to thank the Public Service for their good work on this particular file in the interests of taxpayers of Winnipeg. I'd also like to thank Councillor Mayes for his solid leadership on this file. Firstly, for being the catalyst in kickstarting the negotiations, keeping the discussion moving over the five years and then this week for sharing his motion with a tremendous amount of lead time, three days. Doesn't sound like a lot, but in the reality of what happens here at Council, it's a heck of a lot of time. Gave me time to ask questions of administration, of other councillors and to consider this versus it being…appearing on my desk the morning of. For someone who's not privy to the private Executive Policy Committee discussions, I can tell you I greatly appreciate this time to review. Far more time than we saw with impact fees and Starlight just weeks ago. And I will reiterate, I'll take this time to say that it is incredible that we don't have Economic Development Winnipeg weighing in on any of these multimillion-dollar decisions related to economic development and providing advice to Council. I think this is a huge problem and really question the funding and reporting process that we currently have set up, and I look forward to seeing some kind of change in either funding or communication to Council going forward. There's an incredible amount of history here with these two polarizing perspectives. I will be supporting the motion brought forward by Councillor Mayes. The Goldeyes are a part of our city's make up; an entity that offers affordable family activities. I, too, have received many, many calls asking to ensure I find a way to keep the Goldeyes here. And as per Councillor Orlikow, this is a single-use facility. If the Goldeyes don't remain, quite frankly, we won't be able to find another team to replace the Goldeyes in Winnipeg, and we'll be left with huge costs and far more issues to deal with. The Goldeyes deliver a quality product that we need to keep and after five years of discussion, we need to make a decision, and I will be supporting Councillor Mayes' motion to keep the Goldeyes in Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Allard: Thank you. I think I'll keep my comments fairly brief. I think I can read a room. I did read through Councillor Mayes' motion and I want to point out that Transit did indicate that they need or that they may need the parking lot that we're about to lock in for 15 years if we approve this motion. We have an ambitious Transit Master Plan coming. If

funded, would be amazing, transformative, and we've already locked up Portage and Main through referendum, there's only so much land in the downtown and if Transit says they need that parking lot, I don't think we should be locking it down 15 years. You know, people can use transit to get to Goldeyes games, and people…if people do that, that will help us with our mode shift objectives which are 50% by 2030, and we really need to do many, many things to get to that mode shift number. The other reason I will not be supporting this is because as I said earlier, I at P&D, with my colleagues at P&D, had requested audited financial statements from Riverside Park Management and the Winnipeg Goldeyes in order to better understand the financial relationship between the City and these entities. Those were not provided. The rational in terms of why these were not provided was that this is proprietary information. Well, as is customary with proprietary information, that propriety can be signed over with appropriate safeguards such as confidentiality agreements. That was not done, and...and, I mean, this is the first time I get to vote on a professional sports team. I can't recall the number of times that I have received correspondence asking me why are we funding professional sports team when our recreational facilities are falling down, for example. And you know, the answer to that that I was able to give at the time was, well, these are multi-year agreements that were signed much before my time. Well, I'm not comfortable with this agreement at this time. I moved and was defeated to have this motion go back to P&D so that it could be formally vetted by the committee, so that it could be formally vetted by the Public Service, so that we could have had a full administrative report on the issue, so we could have really understood without parsing text and trying to figure out what the deletions meant. We could have read it in plain text. I lost that vote. I appreciate that. I…you know, if those conditions had been met that I had requested, I would have considered supporting this agreement. They clearly have not been met and I'm very concerned about what this might mean to the Transit Master Plan. None of us have the information at Council right now in terms of what the implications are and so if we vote for this, we may be significantly impacted our future Transit Master Plan. And so, I think I'll keep my comments at that. I will…I'd like to commend Councillor Mayes for putting a tremendous amount of work into this. I wish we could have sent this back to committee so that it could have been properly vetted. And I wish the Winnipeg Goldeyes and Riverside Park Management would have provided the financial documents that had been requested by Council. I was elected in 2014 on a promise to better accountability at City Hall, and I believe that part of accountability is transparency, and yes, we were requiring or asking for a higher level of transparency, and yes, this was the first time I had to consider voting for a multi-year agreement for professional sports team. I personally did not get the level of transparency and accountability that I wanted on this file, and so, I will be voting against Councillor Mayes' motion. And I think that's the end of my remarks on this one. Thank you everyone for your consideration of my referral and for your consideration of my remarks, but I don't think we should be voting on this without understanding what the impact might be to our Transit Master Plan which is right in the report that's before us today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Seeing no further speakers, I'd like to go to Councillor Mayes for the…for your close, followed by Councillor Gilroy. There'll be eight minutes on the clock.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Thanks, very good debate. It…there is a reference to if we build a BRT line, we may need a portion of the parking lot at a future date. There is no BRT line currently funded. There…I think it's…and frankly, I think, as I read the agreement, we could take that land at the discretion of the City. In any event, I certainly don't think the potential of a BRT line going in and us needing a small portion of parking lot is grounds to lose this opportunity to nail down the lease until 2038. So, often we come here and you feel like your vote doesn't matter. So often you come here, and well, this has already been decided. Or yeah, we'll pass this motion asking the provincial government or the federal government for money, but it's really just symbolic. Not today. This is a chance for everyone to vote how they see fit on a matter that will have pretty lasting impact for the City of Winnipeg, so I'd encourage everyone to take that opportunity and to think about what's before us. I have to say, a perfect summary, really, by Councillor Orlikow at the financial arrangements. That was extremely detailed and correct, that if you net everything out, maybe there's 50,000 going from the City, but in return, we get an employer with lots of jobs, part-time, full time, not polluting jobs, economic development activity. People going to The Forks, people riding the bus, people parking in Parcel 4 and paying for their parking and the City getting that revenue from that employer. So, there is an economic development aspect to that. The Chair of the economic…of the Finance Committee has indicated, his position has always been, I want baseball but not at any cost. He has said on the floor here, he is happy with the cost that has been agreed to. This is a straightforward vote and I appreciate people saying, well, I still want them, but, you know, I want more disclosure or this or that. Well, that's…it has been five and a half years. It hasn't been a year, it's been five and a half years. This was going to come to the May meeting of Downtown Committee, May 2015, but there were two different May meetings, so was it going to come on May 7 or May 25? Much debate. It never came. Whatever was being discussed at that point got put aside and this long voyage began. So, five and a half years to get here today where we have a chance to say yes or we have a chance to say no. So, I would encourage people to say yes to the Goldeyes. As has been said by many people, ideally, there might be some other team out there that would say, we don't need the entertainment tax. We'll pay you hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in rent. I don't think that's realistic. I don't think there's any sense of that in the baseball industry right now as it contracts. And I am old enough to remember going to Winnipeg Whips games at the Winnipeg stadium, which I think Councillor Eadie may have referenced. When the Winnipeg Whips left in 1971, no one showed up for 20 years, so that's quite possibly the risk as Councillor Orlikow has talked about, the risk you face. That stadium could go dark for 20 years or it could be torn down at quite a cost to the City as well. So, that's the risk. So we have an established business that's willing to pay

us 750,000 times more than what we got in rent over the last number of years. I think we should seize the day and seize that opportunity because otherwise we may end up…I didn't go to games in high school. There was no team in high school. There was a period where there was no minor league baseball team playing here. So, here we have an opportunity. We have an opportunity I think, too, if you think in economic development terms, let's say there's some young entrepreneur wants to put in a business in Point Douglas or St. Vital or St. James, and comes and says, what's there to do in the summer here? And you say, come on down to The Forks and I'll show you. Look, you can…look, there's our parking lot. You can look at the parking lot. And then, the entrepreneur, she or he says, what's that thing next to it? Oh, we closed that up. That's the baseball stadium. No, we…you know, nothing's going on there, we pay a half a million dollars a year to keep it boarded up. And you go, well, that's not a great economic development incentive if you're thinking of moving your business here or building something here. Let's be able to say to the world, yeah, we've got the Jets, we've got the Bombers, we've got the Goldeyes. And speaking of the Jets and the Bombers, it is worth pointing out, we…if the Goldeyes leave, what's a realistic view to get them back? Well, the Jets left in '96 and came back in 2011. We pay $8.5 million a year in taxes, mostly entertainment tax, some business tax back to the Jets. I haven't heard anybody demand we get out of that or that this has been a disaster for the city. That was the cost to get an NHL team back here. All of this, all 15 years is less than one year for the Jets, so I think as Councillor Eadie has said, this isn't the bigs, this is something else. And I think there's no parent ball club here sending money to the Goldeyes. They're an independent business operation that have operated and been a big part of the Winnipeg fabric over the last couple of decades. So I guess, you know, people on the floor of Council talk a lot about their residents and what would their residents say, what would the residents want? So, I think I'll conclude...and I will say, I like the Jets, I like the Bombers, I like the Goldeyes. I think it's good value to give the Bombers 1.4. Bombers getting five times what the Goldeyes are again, we haven't heard of any push to get rid of the Bombers and let's recruit another team of the CFL to move here. No, we have these teams that are part of our fabric, I think it's money well spent. But in terms of our residents, to come back to that to conclude, I would like to think people can go to their residents and say, you know...you can say to your residents if anyone calls you, you know, I want to be able to say to my kids, to your kids, to other peoples kids or their parents, we can go down to The Forks and look at a parking lot or we can go down to The Forks and watch a baseball game in this fantastic facility that had private and public funding. I choose to say yeah, I want to take my kid to a baseball game rather than going to look at a parking lot. And I think that's ultimately the vote you have before you. Thank everyone for their supports and very eloquent and I think brave positions put forward. And I would encourage you to approve it. It is not the ideal, it is a very long, drawn-out process. The Goldeyes have moved. We have not caved in in any respect. The Goldeyes have moved substantially in the course of this bargaining. So again, I hope to be able to say to my sons tonight, you know, we're going…we're not going to have a parking lot to look at in a couple of years. We can all go down and watch a baseball game. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And like Councillor Allard, I can read the room too, but I am going to add my thoughts to this debate, and maybe somebody…it'll ring true with somebody. This agreement doesn't end till 2023. So, if this doesn't go forward today, we would still have time to work on another agreement. You know, I'm hoping that when these teams come to us, and we help support them and we get agreements together, that when we go to renegotiate, we renegotiate and they're more self-sufficient, and the City is doing…paying less of the subsidy. So that would be my hope. And I think the City should play a role, I'm not...and I'm not suggesting that they don't. I'm suggesting how much, and I'm concerned at the timelines that we're seeing here. So I, too, like to go to Jets games and ball games, and football games and all the other things that everybody else likes to do, but I am concerned about making sure that we have fairness and equity, and making sure that we're looking at those long-term agreements, and being smart and wise about it, and making sure that...that when we're doing these agreements, that our end date is going to meet True North, so that we can have a debate on what an agreement access agreement will look like because right now, if we vote on this, we can…we're kind of saying what True North is going to get, right? So, another thing I want to talk about is there's been talking about risk analysis. So, you know, in my mind, a lot of it is parking. I mean, we know we're going to need that parking lot for Transit at some point. The administration was very reluctant to add that in. We also know that we're asking other businesses to get rid of parking lots, so that's a policy that we'll have to decreasing parking lots, and yet, for $330,000, we're worried about them walking away. So, I guess my question is, I think there's bigger concerns if they're walking away over $330,000 in parking lot revenue. Like, you know, there's more problems going on there that we would have to worry about the ball team if they're walking away for $330,000 in parking revenue. So…and I don't even know what the parking revenue truly is because we never had the information provided, so we're going off of what they've told us. So, the risk analysis that I'm hearing from everybody, the team is going to walk away. They're going to walk away for $330,000 if we don't give them the parking revenue? But on the other side, I can say, I've got a lot of things that I can spend $30,000 on that's needed. That is really, really needed, and I think each and every one of us councillors could say where we could spend $330,000 on. So, I think that we need to make sure that when we're doing these agreements, that we're…that they're making…that we're making sure that we're making the right decision. We're making sure that we're setting up these teams that they're going to be more self-sufficient. And that we have better agreements for all Winnipeggers moving forward. That doesn't mean we're going to leave these teams off on their own. We're going to support them, but I think we should debate on what that support should be and what level of support. The City of Winnipeg needs to be moving in a direction where these

teams are more self-sufficient and they're not relying on us as much for the subsidy. And at the end of the day, if there's an issue, why aren't they going to the Province and asking for more funding? They talked a lot about all the great things that it is for the economy, and we know in this room that the Province benefits way greater in the economy than we do. And we're putting skin in the game, and I think we should put skin in the game, but I also think we need to make sure that we're being wise. And we have a responsibility. We have a responsibility with these amateur access agreements to review them, and not just to say, let's keep going with them. Like, we should be…like, saying, up to True North, and then sitting down and deciding, the new Council, deciding on what that looks like and what we're saying is, let's just keep going, right? And we're saying that we're scared that they're going to walk away, when I look at the numbers, really, are they going to walk away from, like, parking revenue? And I don't…and I want to remind you that they're getting sign revenue, that they have rental…rental…people renting in their space. And I know that there's been lots of talk about COVID, but our own departments are dealing with COVID. So, we're dealing with COVID, too. So, I just…I just want to talk about the risk analysis because I've been hearing lots about it. And from what I see with the numbers, we're not going to have a ball team walk away on that final…and if that's the case, then there's more problems going on with the ball team and, you know, then we should be concerned. So, I don't know if I'm going to win it, but I've had my say. And I hope we…you consider, you're extending this agreement past True North's agreement. You know, you're setting a precedence here. So, that's scary. So, anyways, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. With that, I'll call the question on Item 5, with Motion 3 before us. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Rollins and Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman and Councillor Gilroy

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Motion 3, that goes with Item 5, passes. Next is the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development, the report dated September 17th, 2020. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, can I move consent of agenda Item No. 6.

Madam Speaker: All in favour?

Councillor Allard: One second. Councillor Mayes, is this the one that had flipped at P&D?

Councillor Gilroy: No. No, that's the…

Madam Speaker: All in favour of Item 6? Contrary? That's carried. Report 'A', dated September 17th, 2020. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move consent of agenda Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Klein will be recorded in opposition. And that is carried. Next, Councillor Gilroy, the report dated October 16th, 2020. We do have an amending Motion No. 4, which goes with Item 9.

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

Madam Speaker: So, Item 2 and 9. Item 2, Councillor Gilroy, did you...

Councillor Gilroy: I think…I just…Councillor Nason, I think, would want...that's amending motion for…sorry, I'm just looking at No. 9.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Item 9 is pulled. It does have an amending motion. Councillor Klein has requested No. 2 and 3? Not No. 2? Three – John Blumberg. Okay, Item 3 has been pulled. Any others? Okay, well that's what I was asking, Councillor Gilroy. Did you move the report or…?

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, moved consent of agenda Items…I'll just…1 through 11 with whatever has been pulled.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you've moved 1 through 6.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Just a moment. 1 through 11. Sorry, 1 through 11. Okay, we've already gone through that 3 is pulled…9, 11. I'm just looking remotely here as well. So, I'll call the question on Item 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – Proposed Sale of the John Blumberg Golf Course located at 4540 Portage Avenue

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

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Just briefly on this particular item, I want to talk about the proceeds of the sale. I know that we haven't quite finalized where the proceeds will go. We're talking about that particular account. But I want to highlight the fact that this may not be in any particular ward because it is situated in the RM, but it is…it's across the road and maybe just feet away from the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Ward and more specifically, the Westwood Ward. And having said that, I would like the group…as we move forward with this sale as we're starting to have conversations about where some of the funds would be allocated to, I would like us to consider strongly that a portion of that money go to the community. It has been underserved for quite some time. For many years. Not a lot of work in the community centres or within the Westwood Ward, quite frankly, has been done. And I would like to see some of those funds…I know that Councillor Gillingham and I are talking about sharing some of our funds to do some work in that area. But there is more that needs to be done there. It's been a long time coming for that ward. And I would ask, not that we need to open up the floodgate on the money, but let's start having that conversation because it is a community centre if you will. It's an activity place for that community and a portion of that funding should be set aside to do some work for the area community centres. So, I want to put that the...not that I want to change the motion. I'm going to support the motion, but I want that on the record so that we can start having that conversation as the sale proceeds.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know it's getting to be a long day, but this is an important report. I'll actually be supporting this particular report. I did not support declaring John Blumberg surplus originally, but it is surplus. That was decided a long time ago as you know, Madam Speaker. I just have some levels of concern here in that partnerships are interesting and...but moving forward, it talks about the money going into the new fund and that that money would go for the area which...the area, from the way I understand it, Blumberg is kind of served the west side of the city out there on both sides of the Assiniboine River from what I know. And I do know a fair bit about the area, Madam Speaker. So, I think that any funds...it's not just about investment in Westwood, the neighbourhood. But you know...so I was a little concerned when I seen just the word "area". Like, what is the area? I think that could be open to a lot of debate because by the time a lot of the money is realized out of this property, it will be a different council. It's not like all this money is going to flow all of a sudden. And actually, any joint venture, Madam Speaker, that moves forward in the sale of…remember,

the unelected land use government of metro Winnipeg is still not in place. And they will be coming up with a land use plan. But right now, Headingley, they have provisions in their expectations for land use in that area that wouldn't coincide necessarily with any joint venture that the City might enter into. So, there is a lot of complexities. This is us just saying to move ahead, do the RP or whatever. It also talks about waiving any LDR that might be related to what happens out there, although, remember it's not in the City of Winnipeg. It's just outside if I recall. And so...but I'm sure there's provisions for LDR in all municipalities, but I don't know, it could be waived. I don't know if it's the Winnipeg calculation or what it might be but it's talking about waiving it. So, this is more than just a decision about the west part of the city. The Assiniboia Area which includes the Westwood neighbourhood and, you know, Charleswood and even south of there and north of there up into Crestview for that matter. So, anyway, I just wanted to point these things out in that I think there could be some difficulty and arguments happening in the future as the new councillor from Transcona has indicated how that area is kind of being not prospering in terms of parks and those sorts of things out of the millions of dollars that have been made out of those joint ventures. So anyway, I'll leave it at that. I just thought I'd point out some of the problems, but it's my understanding that the councillors for that area, the community committee area are in support of this. So, who am I to vote against it? I just wanted to point out all these problems. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Very briefly on Blumberg. It is true that this is just a golf course, not the park. The park is one of the five orphan parks that we know all too well, Madam Speaker, from our…and Councillor Lukes from various activities of Little Mountain and at La Barriere. Yeah, I mean, I remember this from 2013, this vote and the idea was, I think at the time, to hold the money back to help with the Sherbrook Pool. As it turned out, Sherbrook Pool got fixed up anyway. So, here we are seven years later. Yeah, I do think there should be some role...I am supportive of the motion. I do think just as we go forward with some of these land sales, it's always a balancing act to try and keep some of the money in local area recreational activities. I remember in '13, that wasn't the specific idea, we're just going to drop it in that Assiniboia Downs or something. Here we are all these years later. I do think there should be some consideration given to the local needs. This one's a bit idiosyncratic in that it is outside the city boundaries proper, which is really why it's on our plate here today anyway. But yeah, this is...I'm supportive of going ahead again, I guess, and…but, yeah we should certainly be taking a look at what recreational needs can be addressed with the funding.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy to close. Call the question on Item 3. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Madam Clerk.

Item 9 – Closing –Black Diamond Boulevard, East of Ray Marius Road – DAC 4/2020

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy to introduce the item, followed by Councillor Nason who has put forward amending Motion No. 4 which was seconded by Councillor Klein.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you very much. This item came forward to us, it actually started with through the community committee making changes. This is a piece of land that the City has acquired and it's going to be industrial lands. So, there is some investment that we need to recoup, so they are looking at what they can do with the land. I know there was concerns raised by the councillors and he did put a motion forward. The administration had concerns regarding making sure that what the councillor was wishing was before there was any work done in the area that they'd have to do significant work to Plessis Road and Dugald Road and I think you heard from delegates this morning on that issue. I think that it's really important. I'd be open to moving this along to our committee. But I think it's really important that we allow the administration to do the work. I think in a lot of our communities, when we see new development, it's going to add traffic. And I know that, you know, with me...with my inner-city wards as soon as there is a new development happening, like, you know, it all filters in through as people work downtown and you do see that increase, but I think that we've got to leave it up to our experts in our departments and the Transportation Master Plan to see how we're going to move people around. And where we're going to...where we're going to increase and what we're going to do in terms of our road construction and where we should be doing and implementing any changes. So…but I know that it is a concern to the councillor so I would be willing to have this go back to our committee, so…because I think at that committee the one thing that we didn't have is we didn't…it was just PP&D, so we didn't have anyone there from IRPW that could maybe talk about this further.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Councillor Nason, your opportunity to introduce the Motion 4 and speak to the main item.

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

WHEREAS the area of Plessis Road from Dugald Road to Fermor Avenue has experienced a considerable increase in the conversion of agricultural lands to industrial uses;

AND WHEREAS the existing roadways at the eastern edge of this area are already overutilized and do not meet the needs of the area;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 9 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated October 16, 2020 be amended by adding the following new Recommendation 3 and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:

> *"3. That any development of the subject city property as identified in Appendix "B" shall be prohibited until significant upgrades have been made to the transportation roadways of Plessis Road from Dugald Road to Fermor Avenue."*

Councillor Nason: Thank you. We have these things at community committee. We have it on the agenda. The experts should be there to talk to us when we put that forward, when we talk about these changes. This is an industrial subdivision. It's been around for quite some time. This is a road that was on the map to be installed. So, if planning was being done, the planning was done, but they've changed their mind. They're deleting the road. At the standing committee, there was a point made by the Public Service that traffic will not be coming off of Plessis. It's closer to Lagimodiere was the representation that was presented. That is factually incorrect. This is closer to Plessis than Lagimodiere. We have seen promises time and time again. We've seen plans time and time again. There was a plan to have an Ed Schreyer Parkway that was to be part of an inner ring road. Subsequent councils prior to this deleted that. They put a park there, then they sold off the land that would have connected it. Now we have this little road that is supposed to be a parkway, that is going to lend itself to really nothing in the area, but it remains on the books for now. We have an intermodal terminal that's been moved from one side of the city to the other that's greatly improved the Tuxedo area. Without a doubt, it's brought a lot of improvements to that area. Promises were made at that time that when CN came over, that traffic from CN was going to be using Fermor. We've just finished a major improvement to Fermor. I am waiting to have meetings with CN to talk to see if we can improve the way that they move traffic. Because it is negatively impacting the residents that this project, this latest move by the City of Winnipeg will again have negative influences on the area. There was a report that we were provided with closed capital projects that had money from a twinning of Plessis Road that had nearly $2 million in it that will go into the Budget Working Group that may or may not come out. That could support it. There were plans when Plessis was being done, when the underpass was put in, that sound barriers were going to be put up in future roads for the Plessis Road, that twinning was going to be to done. It was going to move over into the golf course as part of the redevelopment of the golf course. There was a lot of stories, a lot of communication, a lot of promises that have been made, that have been asked for. All I've been doing for the last several months, I've put several motions forward. They've been referred to the Transit…Transportation Master Plan with regards to truck travel. Engine retarders that are going on in the area. It goes from an 80 to a 50 just south of where this road, Camiel Sys where you would enter into this. People will be working there. They will be coming into this area either by regular vehicle or by larger vehicles to support whatever may come into that subdivision. There is going to be an impact regardless of what the Public Service said at your standing committee. It is a challenge for these residents in that area. There is a large multi-family at the very corner that will be negatively influenced by this. The residents' association are primarily those that own homes along that strip of land on Plessis. However, I am not diminishing the dozens of residents that are in that multi-family there at that corner. I want to read into an e-mail because Mr. Walker made reference to a resident that had a very life-changing experience on there and she wrote to me on this. And she was sorry that she couldn't be at city hall for this meeting. She works as a nurse and could not get the time off due to COVID, and lots of work to do. But she is writing to bring forward to you at Council that we really need to do further consultation on the plans on Plessis. She's lived on the street for five years and in the first year, she had a serious accident turning into her driveway. Now, just so you understand, she's going northbound. Because a person was speeding down from Fermor to get to Dugald, rear ending her. Traffic was heavy at the time because it was around 5:00 p.m. in the afternoon. She sat there for about two minutes trying to turn. This incident has cost two years of her life. A torn rotator cuff from her being hit so hard that it tore her shoulder back due to the impact. She also sustained a ruptured bladder and soreness everywhere. Plessis Road from Dugald to Fermor needs to be studied for quite a while and the traffic is so heavy for long periods we can never let kids play, ride a bike or walk down the street to people having no regard to speed limits through the area. The police do their jobs, patrol speeding to charge speeders, but they can...but the problem still resists. It's a heavily enforced area. No matter which way she turns into her driveway, she has people honk at them as if she's being an inconvenience to them, to slow down so she can be safe. As I've mentioned before, CN has lots of traffic that goes through there, be it proper or not. We need to work together to make sure that the communities are safe. What, you know, the $5.5 million as I understand that the Public Service presented that they've invested in this

area. I understand that. I understand that they want to recoup that. But we need to understand what the traffic patterns are going to be and what the negative influences are on the residents. As we've mentioned and heard earlier today that the RM of Springfield is building an industrial subdivision just south of this property on their…in their property. It's in their RM to private subdivisions being built. The builder of the subdivision is willing to work with them. The RM's willing to work with them. I think it's important that we also try to work with the community to ensure that they are safe in their homes, that their children are safe. This area has not seen improved sidewalks. It's falling apart in that area because the investment hasn't been there because there has been so much talk about future investment. If the golf course, which lease expires I think next year or the year after, I think it may be 2023, makes for more development in that area. OurWinnipeg is out there. This area in question is being identified for heavy redevelopment for residential and, gosh knows what other investments we'll see in that area. I'm just asking for rational thought that we look at it closer with regards to transportation in that area. We know we have problems. I believe the head of transportation will agree that there are significant deficiencies with regard to the transportation flow in that area. So, I leave it at that. I do hope that you'll accept my motion and that we can continue on with some of this development we are seeing in our community, but rationed…rationalized. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Something like this doesn't happen too often, but it does happen in the case of the local councillor making his points that I'd say in this case that correct the Public Service. Now, first of all, I don't do this very often, but it's not done very often on my behalf either in terms of all the work we do. I do want to commend the Public Service in general for all the good work they do. For all the good money that's put into good brains and a lot of time and some quality time of providing excellent information to this council. If you don't believe what I'm saying, you can bet that it's pretty obvious I rely on the administration for my decisions. We don't always vote the same, but I rely on it. I depend on it and I'm willing to say that. Having said that, we're all only human and we depend on each other in this process here at city hall in general to keep each other on track, to challenge each other on the information. Happens to be that I believe Councillor Nason who is my fellow councillor of the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee. I've seen this before, this issue, where he's providing information to the administration and to Council that ought to be part of this process. He's offering corrections and perspective. Offering some insights into that. I'm saying it's important. And on that basis, that these decisions should be re-evaluated based on the information he's offering and if you're saying he's not true, then prove it. At least he's offering some information in terms of why he was right, why this information is right and previously not provided in the evaluation process. So, on this basis, I'm supporting Councillor Nason's motion to the benefit of all including the administration's due diligence.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am rising in support of Councillor Nason's motion. And if the amendment doesn't go through, I won't be supporting Report 9 if it's not amended. I just wanted to speak quickly. It's kind of a general employment lands issue in that there is so much employment lands around Plessis in this particular area. And actually, I'm the one who actually back in the day was the one pushing for that renewal over on Fermor from Lag out to the perimeter just because, you know, many Winnipeggers, when we go to Ontario to enjoy the lakes, we have to go through there. And the improvements to the intersection and all those things, it's a good thing for all Winnipeggers in this particular area. But I have to say, if we can…before the Transit Master Plan comes forward, if we can actually vote to put kids on the bus for free with their parents, why can't we put this amendment into this motion? It's just calling on us to do more work to try to help deal with some very...I heard the presentations, very serious traffic problems. And I see no reason why we can't amend this and put it in there before the transportation plan comes forward. It's not totally dissimilar to putting kids on the bus for free. This is…this…we're putting this in there so that we can deal with a real, immediate issue that is happening there. I don't know about all these promises and stuff like that, but you know, that's what happens when you put in an underpass. You know, you actually increase the ability for more traffic to keep flowing back and forth, north and south, up and down there. And yeah, the trucks will go that way or whatever, but hopefully given those renovations on Fermor and the intersection, hopefully, the intermodal trucking can switch over. That would be a good thing. And as an individual city councillor…for an individual councillor to negotiate with CN to try to accomplish things like that, it gives more weight. Let's give the Public Service and our Public Service experts a chance here to work with those industrial offerings in the area. And let's see if we can get something resolved for Winnipeggers. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise, of course, to support the motion that I seconded for my colleague, Councillor Nason. We have 15 communities that have come together to be one city. And I think it's important that we start listening to residents and to other councillors. We have to listen to what we're being told and take these things into consideration. If we say we're going to do the work and then we wait until a certain time to do it, we've now found out what happens, it's called a future services account and it becomes 40 years before we finally get to that work and we then

try to determine whether or not that work was done. I don't also want to go down the path of well, if you don't vote for this, then this poor person is going to get hit by a car every day and you're voting to let people get hit by cars by not supporting this. Let's not do that. The reality here is, is that the residents went to their area councillor. The area councillor put a motion forward that is reasonable and he is doing what the residents asked, and the residents came here and spoke to us today in a reasonable manner. They presented a reasonable case. We want to get trucks off the road. I spoke to a very large trucking corporation here in the city not long ago that has trucks on the road that irritate all of us that they would be happy to get off the road and move where they're located, but the City hasn't done the work to Saskatchewan Avenue that they promised to do years ago. And they're still waiting. And they can't move from where they are to where they want to be; they've moved some of it because we haven't done the work yet. Well, we're moving on to other projects. Here we could save an awful lot of time spent in traffic because of these trucks. So, of course, I support this one. I supported it when it came to me, based on the fact that the residents came forward and they've been talking about this for a long period of time. And now is our opportunity to listen and to put this into place and say, look, if we are going to have future development, let's take care of the issues first, not after the fact when it's much harder to do. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I think there is an opportunity to maybe take another look at this a little bit. I'd just like to move referral back to the Property Development Committee without instruction.

Madam Speaker: Okay, that is in order. Would you like…without instructions. Okay. We'll vote on the referral. All in favour? Contrary? Okay, the referral is…carries. Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Item 11 – Broadway Neighbourhood Centre Insurance Costs

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy to introduce the item.

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'll wait to hear from my councillor colleague.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins. Who would like to speak to this item?

Councillor Nason: I'd actually like to ask questions of the CAO on this matter.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, you would like to ask a question of the CAO? Is it a time sensitive question?

Councillor Nason: Well, it's a matter…the matter before us doesn't really have a lot of detail and I'd like to have a better understanding of the workings of this or…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. The CAO is not with us at this time, he had to depart. Would you like to speak…

Councillor Nason: Could we move…can we move layover then, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: You certainly can, of course, that's in order. You're moving layover to the next…

Councillor Nason: Council meeting.

Madam Speaker: Council meeting? Okay. Councillor Nason moves layover of Item 11 to the next council meeting. All favour?

Councillor Rollins: Call for a recorded vote.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins' calling for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Rollins and Santos and Councillor Mayes.

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

Madam Speaker: Motion 11 will be laid over to the next council meeting. Okay, we'll now go to motion 5. It's on…it was circulated earlier today. It is a motion moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Lukes regarding residential medical cannabis. This is an automatic referral to the Property and Development Committee. It will appear on next month's…next meeting agenda. Councillor Gilroy, by-laws.

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

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

WHEREAS the cultivation, possession, acquisition and consumption of cannabis for medical purposes has been permitted in residential properties under certain circumstances pursuant to federal legislation for many years;

AND WHEREAS the federal Cannabis Act came into effect on October 17,2018 and made Canada the second country in the world, after Uruguay, to formally legalize the cultivation, possession, acquisition and consumption of cannabis and its by-products for both recreational and medical purposes;

AND WHEREAS there are properties within the City where hundreds of cannabis plants are actively cultivated at any one time, ostensibly under the authority of one or more federal registrations to cultivate cannabis for medical purposes;

AND WHEREAS the cultivation of hundreds of cannabis plants within a single residential dwelling has the potential to create or contribute to negative impacts within neighbourhoods, including but not limited to: odour complaints, long-term damage to buildings, and increased likelihood of criminal activity;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to Council within 120 days with options legally available to the City to regulate or prohibit the cultivation of cannabis for any purpose, including for medical purposes, in residential neighbourhoods and/or in properties with a residential zoning designation.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, I would like to move that the following by-laws be read for the first time: By-law No. 102/2020, By-law No. 103/2020 and By-law No. 104/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 102/2020, By-law No. 103/2020, By-law No. 104/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move number…By-law No. 102/2020 to 104/2020 both inclusive to be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 102/2020 to 104/2020.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I would like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 102/2020 to 104/2020 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 question period under this committee. Questions for Councillor Gilroy? Councillor Chambers, you have the floor.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you to the Committee Chair, earlier this week I sent a letter to the CAO of the City requesting information on surplus municipal accommodations to find out if there is an opportunity for physicians who have been tapped by our Provincial Government to open testing clinics, if there is an opportunity to enter partnerships with the City of Winnipeg on surplus buildings for that purpose. I have still yet to get an answer. What are you…I'm wondering if the committee chair would be able to provide…when I would be able to receive a response on that request.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you Madam Speaker, through you, Madam Speaker, I can definitely follow up with Councillor Chambers on this and get a response for him.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Chambers: Second question. Today, we've seen through the information provided by the Province that Winnipeg is or Manitoba set yet another record in terms of highs, a 193 new positive COVID testing. I would suggest that urgency is…this matter should be done very urgently to see if this is indeed possible where surplus buildings can be, you know, leased back to physicians who have been tapped by the Province to set up COVID testing clinics.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Absolutely, I would concur with Councillor Chambers on that and through. I know the work that…the updates we're getting through, the COVID updates that we are getting through administration, I know that there's been…councillor colleagues making sure that the administration is following up. We do have many community centres and different avenues that we could be doing to help support the efforts with COVID. So I know those conversations are taking place and I know that the administration is willing to look at those locations and those conversations are ongoing as where ended, I will follow up and get back to Councillor Chambers.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated October 19th, 2020. Councillor Rollins.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED OCTOBER 19, 2020

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I'd like to move consent agendas Item 1 through 5 and pull 6, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Six has been pulled. I'll call the question on Items 1 through 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 6 – Library Fines and Fees

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to open on the item.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I know it's been a long day. I also, because it's been a long day, I want to reflect some of the passion that we saw earlier today from the delegations from the Winnipeg Library Board. The Winnipeg Library Board presentations that we heard were amazing and I just really want to reflect some of that in my

opening statements, Madam Speaker. The number of public libraries that have permanently eliminated overdue fines has significantly increased. As a matter of fact, while we were in the chambers today, two more municipalities; Richmond, BC and Oakville eliminated their fines. Literally today while we were in chambers debating and waiting for this moment. A positive vote carries with it us joining municipalities like Thunder Bay, north Vancouver, Edmonton, Hamilton, Vaughan, Calgary and more, Whistler in eliminating fines and fees. And we heard that passion from the speakers that when families are unable to pay fines, children and young adults may have their borrowing privileges suspended and that there are many reasons to adopting the fine-free trend in Winnipeg immediately. And most importantly to address sustainability goals and we as a city adopted that mypeg.ca report and the readiness to learn as an indicator on how we were looking at child poverty. And this is...this is the policy move you make. The suspension of overdue fines, DVD/Blu-Ray fees during COVID-19 really has provided us an opportunity to move directly to a fine-free model without ever reinstating or reverting to charging of fines, and it's a policy window that shouldn't be ignored. There are benefits. The fine-free library services model really aligns with the City of Winnipeg's goal to reduce poverty in our city and improve equitable access for individuals and families. The fine-free model, again, that readiness to learn is really important in Winnipeg especially where children come to school without the skills and abilities and attitudes for learning and as a result, obtain poor education levels. 66% of children who entered kindergarten in Winnipeg were not...were considered ready to learn. That represented a decrease in 2016-17, a 2% decrease. That's a difficult statistic for us to contemplate, I know. But eliminating overdue fines removes that significant barrier for families who can most benefit from access to library resources. There is no question that I, as well as other councillors, hold the ambition to do a lot for Council families today, Winnipeg families today. Impoverished families are most in need in early literacy supports. They're most likely not to be able to pay library fines, too. And public libraries help close the gap in opportunities including the digital divide. And we heard today the work of Karen Kepler and how she, early days, gave out computers to address that divide. And that has come to the forefront during COVID-19 where school divisions are partnering with families and giving out technologies so that students can learn during the pandemic. We've heard as Council that these fines and fees are experienced really differently in our city for people who have different economic conditions. Winnipeg has doubled the national average of children living in poverty and that is something as policy actors, as policy entrepreneurs, we should think about. It drives my last motion that I called for a recorded vote on and this one that I'll be calling a recorded vote on. It absolutely drives me to act and I know it does others. Fine-free public libraries; why is it a trend? Because fine-free public libraries consistently report removal of fines as not leading to an increase in the amount of library material being returned late, and we heard that through the pandemic, didn't we? But what they do report is an increase in families registering for library cards and in the amount of material checked out. That is a more literate community. And as the former Vice Chair of Literacy Partners of Manitoba, as a former literacy tutor who tutored people who were functionally illiterate, that is really key in terms of what a city can be doing to alleviating fees. So I hope that you, like me, want to make history today on quite a few motions today that support families and you, like me, want to build back better from COVID. Because that is what we do when we have a policy window open like this. When we have the evidence for us that we have. And support really great folks that serve on our boards and commissions in the City of Winnipeg and the policy that they want reflected through council. We have an opportunity to do that today. And I hope you join me in supporting this motion. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Klein followed by Mayor Bowman.

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, I would like to move that we lay this over so we can get some more information from the Public Service.

Madam Speaker: Okay. And laying it over to?

Councillor Klein: Next council meeting.

Madam Speaker: The next council meeting. Okay.

Councillor Rollins: Call for a recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: All in favour of the layover, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Chambers, Gillingham, Klein, Lukes, Nason and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Rollins, Allard, Orlikow, Santos, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes and Schreyer

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

Madam Speaker: We'll continue with our debate here. Councillor Klein, do you wish to speak to the item or I can move on? Okay. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Browaty followed by Councillor Chambers. I'm sorry, yes, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: It's been a long day. I know we just started a mere about eight, nine hours ago. It's been a lot of work done today. I think everybody probably has some votes that they're really happy about, some that they may not be. But that's what you want in…that is...I'm sure we all want to win every vote. But I'll just say, we've had some historic votes here today and this is one of them. I want to thank Councillor Rollins for initiating this. I remember she came…we had a meeting this year and she said this is something that I'm really passionate about. Here's the public policy reasons to support this change in policy and I advised her recently. My first response was, really? Why would we want to do that? You know? Shouldn't we want to, you know, hold people accountable? And it's really through listening to her and my colleagues as well as some of the representatives here today. I want to thank Dean and David both who presented today. I've known both of them for many, many years. These are incredible Winnipeggers with hearts of gold. And I want to thank them both for their advocacy and also the input from our Public Service. You know, I grew up...I was born on Logan Avenue, not literally, but when I was born, my family lived on Logan Avenue and we moved to Charleswood. And some of my fondest memories as a kid were biking to the old Charleswood Library and little tiny, cramped space. I know Councillor Marty Morantz and Councillor Klein know that space well. You know, it's in a beautiful pocket in our community. A community with lots of trees and space and just an area that I still live in and am raising my two boys right now. Of course, they have the benefit of going in and seeing a much more modern library, the new Charleswood Library. And I was very proud to open that with our former colleague, Councillor Marty Morantz who is now serving our country in Ottawa and I know many of the councillors that are here, we've also opened new libraries in many corners of our city: St. Vital, Transcona, the Bill and Helen Norrie Library is being built as we speak right now which will be an incredible tribute to all of both Bill and Helen's incredible community work over many years. Libraries matter. And the reason why I'm supporting this is, you know, I was in Calgary recently and...not very recently, last year before COVID and I walked through the new library with Mayor Nenshi that they have right across from city hall. It is an incredible building. And he and I were just talking about how libraries are becoming more important. Some that haven't visited some of the new libraries in Winnipeg may not realize that they are one of the great equalizers in society where people of different abilities and means can gather knowledge and information. In the Millennium Library's case, you can use idea mill. You can go in there and you know, there's so many modern services that weren't there when I was a kid visiting the Charleswood Library. It was books and probably microfiche. And I'm dating myself, there probably was tablets. I mean, it was a long time ago. Modern libraries now have the ability to help people improve their lives, gain knowledge, entertainment and if this is...this is a modest expense, I think it is roughly $60,000 that...for this waiver, for this year. And, you know, not everybody comes from the same backgrounds that many of us come from and there are many reasons why people may not be able to pay their fines. I'm trying to take an empathetic view, I'm trying to listen, I'm trying to learn from my colleagues who have better educated me about why this makes good public policy grounds. And so, I'll be supporting it and, of course, referring...this is really just waving it for this year. But there is a broader discussion and debate to look at it going forward. So, I'll be supporting it and would urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You know, look, libraries are a great equalizer. They allow people of all means to access all sorts of wonderful knowledge, whether in print form, electronic form, online, spaces to talk to people who are, you know, writers and residents, for example. Libraries are really a great equalizer. My very first campaign office was next to the Henderson Highway Library. It was wonderful to see, like, mothers lined up with their kids to go in for, you know, reading with kids. Love of literacy, love of books. People all sorts of hours. You know, I'm working late in my campaign office and there are people sending books down the chute. At that point, apparently, the Henderson Library was the busiest branch outside of downtown in terms of material lent out. Libraries are, you know, such a great equalizer. You can come from a broken home, but you can still get away from whatever bad is happening in the world, your personal world, the world around you, you can go to a library. You can sit, you can read, you can explore, you can grow your mind. You know, library cards are free. Borrowing is free. As long as you return materials on time, it's free. You know, the budget of the Winnipeg Library system right now according to the service-based budget is around $33 million. Materials budget is about 10%. I mean, it's stressed. New electronic materials and that are, you know…the percentage of the materials budget going to electronic materials now is growing and those services are expensive. But there's still a desire, there's something about having a book in your hands and those popular books are still going to be in somewhat

short supply. By not having return dates on them and having fines to return them on time, what is stopping people from keeping them an extra week, and extra two weeks? The predictability about going online and searching oh, this book is going to be back on the 14th of November. Odds are, I'll probably get it, I'm next in queue, you know, by that time. By eliminating fees, there's less of an incentive…less of an incentive to return things on time. You know, literacy is important but so is also personal responsibility. This is just a piece of that. It's a way to, you know…you know…you know, following rules. Following authority. We see, you know, riots and anti police things these days. I mean, this is obviously nothing like rioting against police not returning a library book. But it is just so basic. I see no reason to go down this road. I've really tried. You know, I appreciate Councillor Rollins and some of my colleagues' passion on this file. Ed Cuddy from the Library branch and the delegations this morning. I've done some reading. I still don't see this as a priority and even a smart thing to do. So, I apologize but I will not be supporting your motion, Councillor Rollins.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Sitting here looking at my computer screen, back on June 28th, one of the residents in my ward, and I'll just refer to her by her first name, Janet, opened up a little free library. And it's a...looks like a door with a shelf in it or a cupboard with a glass door in it that has library books inside. There are others that are in Riverpark South as well as St. Norbert where basic premise is to go, grab a book and return a book. And as Councillor Browaty has said, you know, a library card is free. The use of the material is free. With a simple caveat to return the material upon usage so that others may use it as well and it is the same concept here as these little free libraries that are popping up in neighbourhoods. The fine exists to reinforce the rules necessary for social living. As it's used as an incentive to remind people about the social contract that is entered to, that reminds us to be mindful of others who also depend on this free service. And as Councillor Browaty has eluded to, libraries are the great equalizer. The social contract is unwritten and it is an inherent at birth. It dictates that we will not break laws and that there are certain moral codes and that, in exchange, will reap the benefits of our society. Security, survival, education and other necessities that are required to live. Thomas Hobbs opined about the basics of a social contract. Protection of life and property, establishing prohibitions against loss and vandalism. Other rules are needed to secure the benefits of social living. This means there will be prohibitions on breaking those contracts and, in general, a requirement for truth-telling. You know, there are other alternatives to fines that we can also consider to reinforce the social bond that we've entered into with the public. Consideration of alternatives to fines such as community service that benefits both the library and patrons alike. Some libraries are allowing patrons to read away their fines or donate canned goods in exchange for late fee waives…fee waivers. Or alternatively, choose a day, a week or a month when patrons can bring back any borrowed materials as an amnesty no matter how long they've had them to avoid paying fines. An amnesty period would be a great way to recover materials for the library and reduce the cost of replacing items that do go missing as a result of people forgetting or losing these books. Again, these are options that can be considered. I don't think it is necessary to go down the road to totally eliminate fines at this point in time. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I rise on the…to move a motion to extend…suspend the rules to go past 6:00 p.m. as it looks like a number of more people are going to want to speak on this issue.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are correct. Council is to adjourn at 6:00 p.m., so we've got to vote to continue the meeting beyond 6:00 p.m. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Klein followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I do appreciate the motion that's gone forward, but I…you know, I guess I'm missing something because we often seem to be jumping back and forth. It's like a leaf fan. We're on and off the bandwagon here sometimes because we're...we talked sometimes about closing and more recently, closing the Westwood Library and I've been in discussions recently with the Public Service about closing the Westwood Library and combining libraries and looking at ways of reducing the size for more modern ones, yes but, again, these are community libraries and we find them so touching to all of us, we find them so important to all of us, yet we're looking at ways of really reducing the footprint of libraries. At the same time, we're reducing the hours that are available. As opposed to being open on weekends or a lot when kids and young people can use them and get more use out of them, we tend to be closed and open on a Wednesday so when they're at school, they can't really benefit from getting to the library. I really would rather see less of this discussion and move this to a different time where we can discuss the better path forward. I think the one thing that COVID has taught us is that we don't need to be using all of this. Oh, we're going to have a recorded vote for this or oh, this is what this means and that's what this means. COVID has taught us that we can find new ways of doing anything. Absolutely anything. Everybody that has said, you know, the world has changed, absolutely it has and we have found a new way to do everything we do on a daily basis. So, we can find a new way of making this work that isn't just a one big, this fixes everything because it doesn't. It doesn't. So, it's not a slight against the motion or any one person that supports the motion. This requires more discussion. I have seen and watched and heard councillors

around this chamber many times say we can't vote on a motion when we don't have input from the Public Service, yet here we are. And we can't…we need to have debates about this where there's a process, how motions go through. Well, here we are. It's not that it's a bad motion, but we're not following the critical path for this. We're not having the discussion. We're not looking at other ways. We're hand picking a couple of jurisdictions and saying, let's make history. Well, let's do it right. And I would just want to put the…not want to throw it away, let's just put it off and have a better discussion. We can find a way. We have found a way to have council meetings and let the public participate without putting them in danger of COVID. We've brought them in digitally. Yeah, we have hiccups, but here they are. We have four councillors right now in different parts of Winnipeg that are participating in a council meeting. Five years ago, that would have been unthinkable, yet here we are. Here we are. You know, we have members of parliament in all different areas of the country that are participating in their sessions from different parts of the country, which would have been impossible two years ago and never thought of, yet here we are. So, I think that this is a motion that we can certainly say, great idea. Let's do some more talking about it and thinking about it, let's do some more thinking about it. It doesn't have to be an us against them, it needs more thought, it needs more discussion because we can find a better way. I just don't think a blanket this is the answer. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. Councillor Allard and then we'll go to Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Allard: Wow, thanks. I…first of all, congratulations Councillor Rollins for getting this debate to this point. As Councillor Rollins I think noted in a previous speech or maybe she didn't, I had brought this...not this motion, but a motion to look at eliminating library fines only for children, which at the time, perhaps through not, you know, getting through that educational process enough, did not find the support of Council. But what I see today here I think is an incredible opportunity for us as Winnipeggers and for councillors. And I guess I would go all the way back to my university days in sociology when I went into my intro to university sociology was one of the topics that I could choose from. I ended up minoring in it, not majoring in it because at the time I didn't think I wanted to be a university professor which seemed to be the only path that would really be favorable to, you know, to a masters and then doctorate in sociology. But I learned a lot about society when I studied in those courses and I was really, really passionate about sociology in university. And some of the things you learn about is socioeconomic status and one of the ways to define it is based on the education and the income of your parents. And what became apparent to me in those introductory courses in sociology was that basically, yes, we live in free country, yes we have freedom of opportunity, but what tends to happen is that the socioeconomic conditions of your parents have a very high likelihood chance of being the same socioeconomic conditions of your children. And so, many of us come from places of privilege. I…when I look at my socioeconomic status from Durkheim's lens, I probably rank lower middle-class in where I came from and that is because at the time my mom was a stay-at-home mom and my dad incredibly supported our family while pursuing a teaching degree and so if you add up the income and the education of my parents, what Durkheim would say, I was lower middle-class probably. What I've seen in my work when I worked for MLAs, when I worked for clients of employment and income assistance, working with single parents who lived on budgets that barely allowed them to live, let alone consider the possibility of having to pay a fine over and above not being able to pay for their grocery bill, and for us who grew up…for us who grow up with a certain level of privilege, we take for granted things like calendars. We take for granted things like getting to meetings on time. We take for granted a lot of things and the people who need this policy the most are the people who might not basically remember when it is the time to return their library books. But what they might get, if they're not scared of the collection agency letter that you get if you don't pay your library fine on time, at least that's how the library used to do it and that is pretty scary, what they get is an opportunity to take out books without fear. And if you are low income, and I've never been in a position where I was really low income, but if you are in a position where you have to basically choose between rent and food, the idea of taking a risk of a library fine is probably not one risk you are going to be willing to take. Especially if you know that you're not organized enough in your life. You've got too many commitments, too many things going on. So, I mean bottom line is you know, I know the counterargument to this is...you know, we need to teach people responsibility. Well, the people who we need to teach responsibility are not these people. These people who are going to benefit from this policy are the people who need the education that they're going to get from reading these books. They're the people whose children are going to benefit from the education of reading these books. You know, when I went to the fire hall for my fire hall tour, I wasn't a big baker. I wasn't big into baking. But they…you know, they told me, every recruit, they come in and they ask them...they basically let them know that, you know, it's communal kitchen. Everybody has a responsibility to prepare the food and a typical recruit says, well, I don't know how to cook. And so, the answer from the fire department was, well, do you know how to read? And implied in that response obviously is if you know how to read, you can learn how to cook. Because all you have to do is read a couple of books and maybe read a recipe and follow a recipe and there you go. All of a sudden you know how to cook. And in terms of my own experience, I was blessed to have a mom who stayed at home who not only who taught me how to read, but she taught me how to learn and I'm now in a position where given enough time, I can learn almost anything as long as I have access to the materials available. So, I'm giving my own life as an example, this…the firefighters who said, well, if you know how to read, you know how to cook. The people whose fines we're worried about, I guess in terms of the rank of the importance of the two things, we want people to read way more than we should be worrying about them paying for their library fines. And if you're worried about the fines themselves, if you look into the studies around this as per the presentation earlier today from the delegates is you don't actually have big problems with

compliance because you have follow-ups and you have supports and the other point that I had never heard before is actually the people who benefit the most from the fine system are the people who can afford to pay the fine. Because then you can sit on your book as long as you want and the maximum fine is still probably lower than if you'd bought the book in the first place at McNally Robinson or any other book purchasing establishment. So anyway, we want people to read. We want people to be educated. We live the child capital poverty of Canada and this is exactly the type of policy that is incremental, but that will bring us in a more positive place in Winnipeg. I hope we can support Councillor Rollins' motion. And Councillor Rollins, if you get this through Council, I will sing your praises in terms of getting this policy through because I think it might be one of most important policy decisions we make as a council this term. So those are my words of support. Please support this motion. Please consider the position of privilege that many of us on Council have come from and please consider that the idea of returning your library book on time, for some people, is a whole lot of stress, for some people it is about not being able to get to the library because they don't have the transportation. For some people it is not about remembering the appointment. There's so many reasons why people could be stressed out about not returning a library book and then they make the choice to not read, they make the choice to have their children not read.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: We need people reading. Please support this policy. It's the right one. Please join Councillor Rollins and I and I hope we can make this vote unanimous. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this motion. I really want to thank Councillor Rollins. I know she's been a huge champion on this and Councillor Allard, you before, and I just really want to thank both of you because I think this is really, really good. So, in terms of my knowledge on this and my background on this, it's my understanding that actually the fines…when we do away with the fines, actually, the books get brought back. So, in other cities…that is why I think we're one of the…like, one of the last cities in Canada to actually even get rid of our fines, that these books actually get returned because people aren't worried...they're…end up going back to the library so they're bringing the book back when in other instances, they just…the don't bring the book back if they can't afford the fee. Then it gets lost and never...it never gets back to the library. So, in some ways the City could be actually saving money. So, another thing that, you know, I just want to say ditto on all the remarks in terms of Councillor Allard. So, I won't continue on that. I think he made a lot of the comments I wanted to make. But this is really I think good public policy in what we're seeing across other cities and other jurisdictions and I think this is a really positive thing for the city and hope that we can get this passed today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Six years ago, I was a member of the Protection, Community services and Parks Standing Committee and was a member of the Winnipeg Library Board, I believe, at that time with Councillor Allard. And the Library Board came up with this concept that Councillor Allard championed and brought forth to Council and, on his behalf, because I was at…I was a member of PCSP, I moved the motion on his behalf. And that at the time, was to do with forgiveness of fines for children's books, just books for children at the time. And despite the good intentions of the Library Board and Councillor Allard's motion, couldn't quite muster the support at the time despite the inherent logic and fairness of it. Still…it's still a matter of opinion as it is right now. This time I'm on the Library Boards again or still, a number of years now. Councillor Rollins is now the other member of the committee. But since she is the Chair of PCSP, she can move this motion for herself at standing committee and congratulations to our councillors as well as the vigilance of the Winnipeg Public Library Board which continued…which, to be honest, they're always wondering what their role is in terms of advocacy. In terms of this issue, the vigilance and the consistency by which at least this issue has been brought up, now stronger than ever, not just for children's fines but for all fines in general. Now, there was a time back maybe 20 years ago during the time of Glen Murray, my understand was, there was a temporary forgiveness of book fines. And so, at least if we pass this today, that's at least what we'll get because of the different parts to this motion. One is forgiveness up until December, 2020 and then we'll look at bringing the…having this part of the budget. So at least we'll be able to do what we've done in the past and that will be a temporary window of forgiveness for which that communal lot just unto itself, I believe. And I'd like to...well, I certainly acknowledge the unusual but insightful speech by Councillor Allard on this one, giving insights into his sort of sociological perspective. Actually, you know, when I was a student at College Universitaire de St. Boniface, studying sociology at St. Boniface College, yes, these issues enter into it, but in terms of sort of my upbringing in politics, kind of the same thing. What I learned at university or what they talked about there paralleled sort of what I already knew. And that is disadvantages can lead to further disadvantages. And I don't want to put words in Councillor Allard's mouth, but I think that is what he is talking about. You can have this vicious circle that you can't get out of and when it comes to self-education through literacy and the availability of those resources, if they are available to you because you can afford it for whatever imperfections we have, a lot of imperfection in the city and the society, bear in mind. Look at all the library fines there are throughout North America. You could add it up. Okay, so that is a lot of human

imperfection. Yet, at the same time, how important it is that people have those access…that access. He made the point that we're not the one…the people on this council are not the ones that are disadvantaged by a library fine. But I did make the point six years ago that when I was 4 years old I got my first library card and I was at the Henderson Children's Library and I got my first book and then I misplaced it. Now, my mother was upset with me. My sisters goaded me. I couldn't find the book. I didn't go back to the library for over a year and that is a fact. So that really happened to me. It really happened to me so no one could say I didn't happen. It really happened. Why didn't I go back? Well, because it was a question of well, shame and also Jason, you're 4 years old, can you afford it? I mean, I was being taught a lesson. But this could have been another family. My mother was trying to tell me something. But, you know, I didn't go back for a year. That is me. My father was premier of Manitoba at the time. What were the other circumstances for people who weren't nearly as empowered? Now, again, I don't know what kind of socioeconomic circumstances I belong to, but one is, although I've made more than a city councillor when I was working on the oil rigs as a roughneck drilling for oil, made more money than I do today, but waiting for that job seasonally…waiting for the job, going to Edmonton, thinking this is going to get picked up. And I'm waiting, having to work as a day labourer, living out of soup kitchens for a few months to make sure I paid my rent and stay healthy because sometimes when you're there at 6:30 in the morning, sometimes you don't get the job and that is just a fact of people that are day labourers or trying to find…re-find their way back into the workforce, which I was a witness to. And what I saw people working as day labourers, not just in Edmonton, but in Winnipeg, I did it, too. Wasn't the same circumstances. Edmonton I was waiting for my job. Did this in Vancouver, too, just out of curiosity. But in Edmonton, I was dependent on soup kitchens and my major source of information, education and entertainment, which to me is all sort of kind of one thing was the Edmonton library. I depended on it. I didn't have any other money. That is where I went. That's where I did everything including access to the internet. So, the library was incredibly important to me and useful to me and I never thought the library would be that important until I was…I was living...I was living…I chose to stay there waiting for my job on the oil rigs, had so little money I couldn't go to movies. I couldn't...I wasn't going to spend my money on cable. Like, it just wasn't worth it. And so, the library was that important. So, I'm just letting you know that this has come full circle. We're making decisions now, six years later that we weren't making six years ago. It's happening before my eyes. Not just here as a member of the Winnipeg Library Board, but as a member of this council. So I, again, support this. I commend the...what looks like a turn, a perspective. Not just on this, but on many other things. And I hope that this is a sign of things to come. I still see resistance on some fundamentals that are stopping us from doing the right thing on other things. But I'm glad we are on this one and seeing it before my eyes. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. We do have amending Motion 7 that has been circulated. I'd like to ask the Clerk to read that in the record.

Motion No. 7
Moved by Councillor Nason,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 6 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks be referred to the Winnipeg Public Service for report back with a detailed cost estimate on the cost to the City.

Madam Speaker: This was moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Klein. Councillor Nason, this is your opportunity to introduce your motion and then I will re-open the floor for anyone that has spoken could speak once again if they wish.

Councillor Nason: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, did you…you are coming right up. Yes. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, I did…you know what, had the CAO been available, we probably could have dispensed this today, but I'm hoping to get a little bit more detail on the financial impact of this. I look at the motion that there doesn't seem to be any report from the Public Service at all pertaining to this. I'm not sure of the history…it looked like it was probably brought on at the standing committee then brought up to EPC. So, I'm looking to get additional information as simple as the motion goes.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. We're speaking…we're not speaking on this motion, we're speaking on the original report, right?

Madam Speaker: The original report or the motion, both. Whatever you wish.

Councillor Gillingham: Yeah, I can support the…Councillor Nason's motion to report back. Speaking to the main item before us here though, yes, it does come without I guess any analysis. I appreciate my councillor colleagues talking about the benefits of it and, you know, sharing anecdotal evidence, but I…there's no, I guess, documents and studies that have been provided to kind of back the position. I look at it…I find myself somewhere probably in the camp that Councillor Browaty articulated. Within the last 12 months, some of it today, we have I think made some good steps provided…we will be providing free transit for kids 12 and under…under 12, a low-income pass. Library cards are free to anyone without charge. Borrowing materials from the library, there's no charge…I…free in Winnipeg. I don't believe that it's onerous or undo to ask people to return the things that they borrowed at no cost to our libraries and if they don't, that there is a nominal charge. I heard, you know, talk of people fearing the library and I've never talked to anyone who has explained that. I don't know how many people that is, there's no indication of the numbers of people who are not using our libraries because of a fear of an overdue book. I think, in fact, over the last 12 months, and again, as I've said, some of the actions today, we have made it easier for people to get to and from our libraries. People can walk, people can ride bikes, children now can get on a bus and if they're accompanied by a parent, and those individuals are from low-income families, then very soon even the affordability of public transit will be even more affordable then the barrier will have dropped even further. I've supported those, but I don't think it's unreasonable to ask individuals who picked the responsibility of a library card whether young or old to also bring back the items that they borrow so that other people can use those items as well, and I think that's fair. I don't think it's an undue hardship that we're thrusting upon our residents.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Actually, well, I'd like to start off, Madam Speaker, by saying because the members who did sit on the committee; Councillor Santos, Eadie, Rollins and Orlikow, we did get some verbal answers in terms of numbers, but it's not actually in the report as it's pointed out, Madam Speaker. So, I'm thinking about it. I may support the amending motion. I don't think there's an immediate need to pass this. Although, the opportunity is now and I understand Councillor Allard and probably Councillor Rollins' frustration. But Madam Speaker, I rose…I don't want to go into too much detail because I want to follow former Councillor Harvey Smith's perspective on libraries and try to be as short, but as clear as possible on this issue. We have a library at Cindy Klassen, it's named after Harvey Smith. His early career was as a librarian. I believe the odds are since he was elected from '98 onward, the odds are that he actually moved a similar motion about waiving fines or penalties for late books. So, alls I want to do is talk about, just quickly, there's the social contract, but there's a social understanding or understanding of human behaviour. Now, you'll see that there's a revenue flow from fines. Those are people who can afford to pay the fines and pay the fines, but the real question you need to ask, and maybe this is why I'm going to vote for the motion. It has instructions; what are the outstanding fines over what periods of time? Because those are the people that will not come back to the library to take out a book because, for the most part, they can't afford it. For most of the human behaviour related to fines, I understand…I'm not going to go into great detail about my family and kids, but I'll tell you what, sometimes you know there's fines, you aren't done with the books, life is crazy, but the point is, is that then it comes time, you want to take out more books, but you've got to pay a fine, so then you wait another week or another two weeks till payday so you've got the money to pay the fines. Those are the people who can afford it. The ones who can't, they're not going to go back because they know there's going to be a demand for them to give their fines. So, that's what I'd like to know about, the outstanding. I think that's an essential thing. I don't think anybody really thinks that they're breaking a social contract which I think was mentioned, but you know, nobody's really thinking of it that way, Madam Speaker. What I do find interesting is though, is there is a category…there are some people in East St. Paul or West St. Paul who pay for library cards to use library services in Winnipeg because they find it very valuable and usable. And what's not factored in here is, are those…if they're not returning their books on time, and remember, our materials budget is quite low and it's also quite low because the Province…we have a cap on our funding from the Province, whereas, other municipalities, it's not really capped based on a per capita and usage, but because we have the most population in Winnipeg, that kind of revenue is there. But so I understand it. And I was supportive of moving ahead and waiving away those fines because I think the ones that are continually outstanding are the ones that…are the ones that are being affected. It's not the ones…you are delaying the return of the book though when a family who knows it's late, but then has to wait till payday, so it's going to be even later because when they…they have to go back and the fines before…and pay their fines before they can take out more books. So, that's it. So, I will be actually voting for the motion. I do support the waiving of fines, but I'll be moving this motion just so people really get a good understanding. The outstanding fines for how many months, that's the kind of report you want. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Yes, thank you very much. I appreciate everyone's comments today and the presenters, the delegations speaking. And this is a…I think it's a very positive, I just think that I need to have the financial data on it when people ask me, when residents ask me, I just need to have an idea of what the amount would be that we'd be waiving, a bit of history on what has…what the fines were in the past, what has been paid, what hasn't been paid. I just feel I just need to have something to answer to the public on in relation to the cost of waiving the fees because I have no idea what

the fees are and the fines what they accumulate to over the…over a year. So, I just…I wouldn't be supporting this just so that I can speak to it and have a knowledge when people ask me…when constituents ask. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Schreyer, and then we'll go to Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm open minded in terms of whether we pass this today or later. I think this is going to be…I think this is going to pass. And I don't…I'm pretty open minded in terms of whether we have open discussion about this because I think it would be a good thing. You know, we just mentioned how there's no documents or studies to back this position. Madam Speaker, when it comes to the pressures on our budget because that's what we're talking about, our concern over budgetary pressures, I've asked for years to have a report on construction inflation because we do not have the documents and the studies to back our position, why we just go with the flow on the highest rate of inflation that's putting the greatest amount of pressure on our budget every year. We're paying the piper right now. We're paying the piper this term, last term too. Before that, if you'll want to admit to it, but what about next term? What about the 2020s? Because we don't know. We know the…we found out a few things; labour is half the cost of construction. But they're well…what I'm saying is, there…it doesn't go up by 7% a year like construction inflation has over the past 10, 20 years. So, there's our money…that's where our money is going. So now, we're worried about forgives…forgiveness of book loans so that people can use the library. This is where we're at. Now, we say, I don't think it's unreasonable to find out why we have this budgetary pressure so that we have to debate over whether we can forgive book loans so that will people will use the library, use these pre-existent resources to the benefit of our society. This is where we're at. And I don't think it's unreasonable to find out why we're having these budgetary pressures, not due to library…library books. Library books are causing our problems? No, construction inflation is. And I don't think it's unreasonable to find out why. And when the price of oil goes down by 40% and the cost of construction contracts doesn't go down at all, it still goes up by 5%, I don't think library books are causing our budgetary problems. In fact, maybe we get a few high quality engineers out of the fact that they can use a library. Happens to be when I was…I was sort of a day labourer construction worker, I was using the library. It was really important to me. So, it's undue hardship to the taxpayer that we want to know all this stuff about library book forgiveness…library fine forgiveness. And I'm open minded. I don't think it's wrong to find about it. What I think is wrong, is we want to find out all this information, delay this vote today as if this is going to cause our problem…budgetary problems, we want to delay the vote today to find out more about the undue hardship. Okay, I think there's undue hardship to the taxpayer when we don't find out why construction contracts are so expensive. Remember what I said this about this morning, and it wasn't coming from me, I'm quoting the CFO of the City of Winnipeg, "A bridge of a cost of 12 million in 1990 would cost over 200 million today." And why am I the only city councillor mentioning that? It's not…you got a problem with that? Tell it to the CFO or you know what, you can just commend me for quoting it. Haven't heard that yet. Haven't heard a commendation for giving you these stats, but you're welcome nonetheless. So, we need the financial data is what we're told. We need the financial data in order to make a decision on this. I think that makes sense. We need the financial data to know more about forgiving book loans. Not that this is going to cause us budgetary problems, this is going to stop Winnipeggers from utilizing…optimizing these pre-existing resources called the Winnipeg Library system. But we don't need…for some reason, we magically…we don't need the financial data to find out why we've had this enormous construction inflation. Two to three times higher than the consumer price index for 20, 30 years including the last six. So, bear that in mind. I'm open minded to have more information on forgiveness of library loans. How on earth these fiscally responsible concerns cannot be translated realistically…just realistically into the big one that's causing most of our budgetary pressures at City Hall and that's construction inflation. If you can explain that to me, well, you know what, I won't run again. But I think it's really important. And I don't think anyone's really arguing with me anymore, but I'm really curious to see where we're going to go from here. All right, you know what, I'll go for…well, first of all, I think this should have been itemized…one is, we're going to have a temporary forgiveness like we did during Glen Murray which was really beneficial. I think we can have a temporary forgiveness and communal (inaudible)…give back their books and then they can start over. The other one is…the other segment to this is, bring it back into a…being a part of the 2021 budget process…or the 2021 budget. So, I think they're two different issues. Maybe someone that wants to sort of make a sub amendment and separate these two things, I don't know. I really don't care. There's no…I've got no problem with people finding out more information on this. I think it's great, actually because let's parallel this to the real things that are really causing us budgetary problems and it's not, you know, sort of the imperfection of using the library…the library system. When we have cost overruns on a construction project, by the way, and it happens all the time, when we have cost overruns because of mistakes that are made by a construction company, is it too much to ask that they give the money back when we give them extra money? Well, we don't. They're not loans. We just renegotiate. They have…they may have been the lowest bidder, but it ends up when there's construction overruns, they're no longer the lowest bidder. What kind of penalties are there? What kind of penalties are brought into this thing? So, I don't know what to say, but we're willing to apply this to a 10-year-old kid or whatever because he didn't pay his…he can't find his books. Well, I don't care how old they are really, 60-year-old. It doesn't matter because they can't find their books. It's going to…it can change their lives, and I know, you know, Councillor Gillingham says he doesn't know these people and fair enough. I mean, they don't go around talking about it to everybody all the time, but I've been on the Library Board and I hear stuff. So, it's not really anecdotal because it happened to me when I was 4-years-old. And that's…why would I make up a story like that? I mean, it's kind of embarrassing. It just happened to be the case. So, bear

that in mind. I don't care which way this happens. I would like to see the forgiveness until December for sure. And yeah, and then have the discussion on anything further. Well, there should be a discussion because it's going to be part of the budget. So, I don't know what to say, but there's some insights for you. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Yeah, thank you councillor…Madam Speaker. And thank you Councillor Schreyer for some good points there. Yeah, the motion really has two big parts to it. One part is the waiving to December…December. And then the second one is going to the budget for consideration. Definitely, I support number two and I also support number one as well. I am convinced after the talk that…being on the PCS committee with councillor…the councillors. And we've had information, but unfortunately, you're right. I'm a little dumbfounded that I'm no longer on EPC, why this wasn't picked up at EPC. But so be it, it wasn't. Why didn't' I go to EPC and ask for that information or any other councillor, why didn't we go there and say, hey, you know what, we kind of need that financial information at that time. So, I always…the way I can kind of look at these deferral motions is how time sensitive is it. Well, I think the time sensitive part is I do want to get into the budget discussion, that is time sensitive. The first one, yeah, I am concerned about the fact then I hope Councillor Rollins will be able to explain the funding or the cost in the Motion No. 1. And I believe she will. I see her head nodding, so that's fantastic. So, I'll wait to hear about number one. But again, I do not want to delay this for the Motion No. 2 part of it because I do believe this is a very important issue. You know, and councillors that aren't going to support this in general because of their, you know, however…is it a cost item? Councillor Lukes made some very valid points about how are we going to cost this and that's fine. But other councillors I know that aren't going to support this because they have a philosophy or an ideology or whatever it is, and that's fine too. So, the idea to postpone this or move this through, is that something to try to get it out of the budget so that we don't have that within the budget discussion? I don't know what timeframes we have on that, so I'm going to wait to hear Councillor Rollins and see if she can clarify Motion No. 1, the cost. But definitely, I do not want to lose that opportunity to have point number two be discussed within the budget of a whole. So, those were my comments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Nason, I will go to you for closing on your motion. Councillor Rollins will close following. Councillor Nason will first close on his motion. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Nason: Yeah, just very simply, with regards to my motion, again, there's lots of committee meetings. The challenge is, is that the only meeting that's documented on what is said in a verbal report is this one. So, unfortunately, the CFO's not here to directly answer on behalf of the Public Service, so that's the reason for this. Let's lay this matter over, get the Public Service report, and then we could have a better discussion pertaining to it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. And now, Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank my colleagues for debating. I believe we debated it for more than almost 40 minutes and I think that that's really critical and important. And in terms of the trajectory, Protection, Community Services and Parks did have the benefit of hearing from Cindy Fernandez and Mr. Ed Cuddy with respect to the 2020 costs and the yearly costs of fines and fees. And this does have…and so, in terms of the motion today, look, I appreciate the concerns of colleagues. If I didn't have those facts and figures, and I'll give them to you in a minute, I'd be doing exactly what Councillor Klein, Councillor Nason is doing here. But I do think, as my colleague Councillor Orlikow explained, that there are two different figures; one for 2020 and one for the 2021 budget process. In terms of fines and fees, on a yearly basis, depending on the component of the fees, these fines and fees add up to as much as $600,000. So, in terms of the 2021 budget process, what Ms. Fernandez and Ed Cuddy explained is that as much as $600,000, depending on the year, are collected in terms of lost or damages. So, given what we have before us in 2020, and given that Council on June 26th directed the Chief Administrative Officer to waive late charges and fees and fines imposed by the City, the 2020 figure is a lot less. It's estimated at anywhere between $80,000 to $100,000 given that we simply didn't collect fees this year due to COVID. So, that's a separate…that's a separate piece and the finances there are, you know, up to about $100,000. Difficult to say given that we're simply not collecting fines and fees. But Council, in their wisdom, really good policy move by us, we didn't collect them. So, I think those are the figures that councillors are looking for is that this is a budgetary item to be considered in 2021 that is upwards of $600,000. And that in 2020, it's between $80,000 to $100,000 depending on what we've indeed collected because as I said, we decided to waive the late charges on fees and fines imposed by the City of Winnipeg. So, I want to close by saying this; I'm ready to vote on the full motion today, but…and I am because, substantially, this council and a majority of councillors who were back in 2016 saw a full report on fines and fees being eliminated. That report was provided to the previous term council and on children's fines and fees. And that looked at a figure of $300,000, roughly half of what's before you today. And so, there is a report that previous council contemplated at the time. But the time has really come and that's a substantial issue before us today. Public Service, librarians, even an executive from the Manitoba Teachers Society, teachers have come before this council and maybe they did prior council too, to ask for this, our city, to eliminate fines and fees for library. Something that

councillor…Madam Speaker, that Councillor Schreyer said, triggered a flashback to my university days spent at the Millennium Library, Madam Speaker, I could not afford books as a University of Winnipeg student. Moreover, university libraries, as one of the first in my family to graduate from university, university libraries scared me. But what didn't scare me was public libraries. And so, I studied as a U of W student at the Millennium Library. I couldn't afford my text books as a student, but I could be in that library and get through my bachelors. On June 26th, we moved with the bushes of the Winnipeg Public Library Board and we suspended collection of overdue fines and fees. And that was really welcomed because they had watched other cities, large and small across Canada; Thunder Bay, Edmonton, Hamilton, Vaughn, Calgary, Barrie, Ontario, Whistler, Halifax, Innisfail, Oakville, Saskatoon, Regina, London, Ontario, all made this made this move. The fine free trend is on the increase and Winnipeg may be one of the last major Canadian cities to have permanently eliminated overdue fines. And that doesn't sit well with the Library Board and it shouldn't sit well with us for the reasons many of us have already stated in terms of equity and that substantially, the people that collect fines and fees and the people that have the fines and fees do look different. There is an equity argument here. There is an argument for evidence-based children's policy and literacy policy. As COVID-19 branch closures happened, Library Services came crystal clear to many of us on how much people love their libraries and wanted to get back for their request. Library users returned their check-out items even though the overdue fines were suspended. And after library returns were restarted in June, residents returned items in large numbers. With almost 200,000 items being returned, the evidence is that people continue to reserve…return. Library staff also told Protection, Community Services and Parks that we will still have return dates, we still will have reminders, and people will still continue to be cut off. That's really important to state here, that it isn't a sense of, you know, that social contract isn't completely broken. That there's still…people will still have return dates. There will still be reminders. And people will still continue to be cut off from the library. I think that's important, but what's also important is that we have double the national average of children living in poverty and families with children living in poverty are most in need of early literacy supports and they're more likely not to be able to pay fines as Councillor Allard so eloquently has held in his heart, ambition since last term to this term. The fine free library services model really aligns with many of our goals to reduce policy…poverty, sorry and policy. It aligns with more equitable access in terms of our community services and library's perspective for individuals and families with Indigenous people, people of colour and newcomers.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins, that's the end of the time on the clock.

Councillor Rollins: Well, that will do then. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. And with that, I will call the question first on the amending Motion No. 7, that was moved by Councillor Nason. All in…call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Chambers, Gillingham, Klein, Nason, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Rollins, Orlikow, Santos, Allard, His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Browaty, Eadie, Gilroy and Mayes

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 6, Nays 9.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Motion 7 is defeated. We'll now call the question on the main item, Item 6. All in favour? Okay, another recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Klein and Nason

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 10, Nays 5.

Madam Speaker: Item 6 passes.

Councillor Allard: Congratulations, Councillor Rollins.

Madam Speaker: Moving on to the next committee. Councillor Eadie, would you take the Chair, please?

Councillor Eadie: Are you not opening questions for the…

Madam Speaker: There aren't any.

Deputy Speaker: Oh, there aren't? Okay. All right, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll take over the Chair, thank you. So, Madam…

Councillor Sharma: We'll see why I'm saying that. Go ahead, Councillor Eadie.

Deputy Speaker: So, Councillor Sharma, you have one report to move.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

Councillor Sharma: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's the Governance Committee of Council, report dated September 23rd, 2020. The item has been laid over by the Executive Policy Committee. So, this is just for information.

Deputy Speaker: Oh, I missed the report. All right, so then, there's no required vote on that to vote on the EPC's recommendation to lay it over?

Councillor Sharma: No. By-laws.

Deputy Speaker: Yeah, by-laws, sorry. We have a by-law, Councillor Sharma?

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Councillor Sharma: Yes, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll move that the By-law No. 99/2020 be read a first time.

Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Those opposed? Nobody, all right. That's passed.

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2020.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll move that By-law No. 99/2020…

Deputy Speaker: Okay, are we all clear? All right, so, you're moving…

Councillor Sharma: It's an item from July, 2020, Mr. Mayor. Thank you. I'll move that the By-law No. 99/2020 be read a second time.

Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Anybody opposed? That is carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 99/2020.

Councillor Sharma: I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 99/2020 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Deputy Speaker: All those in favour? Anybody opposed? I guess the hands are up on the screen, right? Okay, nobody's opposed. Thank you, that by-law passes.

Councillor Allard: I'll speak up if I'm opposed, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Sharma: You sure will.

Deputy Speaker: Are you moving adjournment, Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: It would be my honour, Councillor Eadie to move adjournment. Yes, I am moving that.

Deputy Speaker: Thank you. All those in favour? Nobody is opposed? That is carried.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may, I would like to wish Councillor Chambers parents, on behalf of Council, a very happy anniversary, their 65th milestone. And Councillor Mayes, I know you're trying to get to your wife's birthday party. Anyways, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you'd like to do the roll call.

Deputy Speaker: Yes, I will call on roll call, but that should have been made in announcements, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: I got some leeway. Others did today.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 6:54 p.m.