COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, February 25, 2021

The Council met at 9:43 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 Chambers.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll move onto morning announcements. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning to my council colleagues as well as all of those that are watching these proceedings. Madam Speaker, I want to begin with some opening comments on our community's ongoing efforts to combat COVID-19. I want to, once again, thank all those on the front lines of battling COVID-19, especially those healthcare heroes in our community and those that are supporting the efforts and working for Manitoba Health. We have had 17,589 cases in the City of Winnipeg as of February 24th. Since our last Council meeting, 890 new cases in the City of Winnipeg. To date, sadly, we have had…we have lost 625 Winnipeggers as of February 24th, 52 new deaths in Winnipeg since our last Council meeting. Our test positivity rate remains at 4%. And I want to take this opportunity to encourage all Winnipeggers continue to be vigilant to protect your safety and the safety of our community, wash your hands, wear a mask and watch your distance. I want to thank our Public Service as well as my council colleagues for all of their efforts to support Manitoba Health and the outcomes that we all desire as Winnipeggers. Since our last Council meeting, I have participated in Big City Mayors council meetings with the Prime Minister of Canada, with the leader of the official opposition, Erin O'Toole, the leader of the NDP Party, Jagmeet Singh, as well as our Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance, Chrystia Freeland, and Intergovernmental Affairs Minister, Dominic LeBlanc. Also, I had discussions…ongoing discussions, as I regularly do, with Minister Jim Carr. I am looking forward, along with you, Madam Speaker, and members of Council to celebrating International Women's Day on March 8th and recognizing Jessie Kirk, the first woman elected to City of Winnipeg Council. Over the last month, I have had the opportunity to visit the still in construction mode Bruce Oak Recovery Centre with our Finance Chair. And I was really, really pleased to see the progress. This was a, I think, a good example of partnership. When we received the request from the Province of Manitoba, Council acted in support of those that need greater supports for addictions in our community. And I was pleased to tour with local councillor, of course, Councillor Gillingham has been a strong supporter of the project. I have had very productive calls with numerous other leaders including Grand Chief Arlen Dumas and Assembly of First Nations Regional Chief Kevin Hart, and had, again, on Zoom and Teams, another successful meeting with my Youth Advisory Council. Also, I had the opportunity on behalf of Council to welcome the new United States Consul and Principal Officer, Mr. Bryan Koontz to Winnipeg. And we've also, as a council, we've had the opportunity over the last month to recognize World Cancer Day, the Lunar New Year, Louis Riel Day, Pink Shirt Day, the Festival du Voyageur's events. I know many of us have been participating in I Love to Read events. We've recognized Heart Month. And, last but not least, I want to recognize Black History Month. I want to thank Councillor Chambers. He has been leading on some of the shirts that some of our council colleagues are wearing today and some of the other efforts. And I want to thank all those members of Council who have participated and all those community leaders who have been participating including…including even our captain of our beloved Winnipeg Jets who I know donned the same shirts that many of you are wearing. And with that, I want to wish him and the team all the very best tonight against the Habs. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Our next speaker, Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today just to acknowledge five Manitoba teams that are playing right now in the Scotties Tournament of Hearts out in Calgary; the women's curling championship. Manitoba is well represented by Mackenzie Zacharias, Chelsea Carey, Jennifer Jones, Kerri Einarson and their teams. And St. James Team: Beth Peterson, Jenna Loder, Katherine Doerksen and Brittany Tran and Cathy Overton-Clapham. They curl out of the Assiniboine Memorial Curling Club and they're having a great run as one of the wildcard teams right

now. So, we just want to wish them all the best and good luck. We are very proud of them in St. James. Beth Peterson actually happens to be the daughter also of the City of Winnipeg's Heritage Officer. Our City historian, Mr. Murray Peterson, so there is a City of Winnipeg connection there as well. So, anyways, just all the best and good luck to Team Peterson.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. We have a few more speakers that had registered prior. We have a long meeting, so I will remind you of the time limit. Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Mayes: Jennifer Jones I think has had some success over at the St. Vital Curling Club. Yes, thanks for Councillor Gillingham knocking off the…all five teams so we don't all have to do that. I rise to have a good news, bad news announcement. The bad news is our Food Council Coordinator, Jeanette Sivilay is leaving as Food Council Coordinator. The good news is she is joining our somewhat short-staffed Office of Sustainability. So, that is certainly a gain for the City of Winnipeg and the Office of Sustainability. But Jeanette's been terrific as our Food Council Coordinator. A good sense of humour. Incredible knowledge. Really having to direct herself in all of these actions. I think she has really become the face of the Food Council. And we needed that organization. We needed somebody in there full-time during the pandemic. So, I think…I want to thank Jeanette for the work she's been doing for the Food Council. When Rob Moquin with Food Matters had said to me before we hired her, I think I got somebody. I think I got somebody who is really good. And a few months later, I saw him up in the lobby here and I strode across the lobby and said to him, you were right on that. That was excellent. So, she has been terrific. So, I want to thank Jeanette for her work. We've got our Food Council meeting in this room tomorrow and then we'll get to work on figuring out how to staff that. But mostly it is unfortunate for the Food Council, but it's lucky for the City of Winnipeg. She's going to be one of our folks in the Office of Sustainability. So, my thanks to Jeanette.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise first on a somber note of residents that are sleeping rough in my ward, Madam Speaker, and some who have sadly passed away in the last couple of weeks. And I want to rise with respect to them and really issue a rallying cry that we can all do better with respect to the displaced people that are in our city. I also want to rise in recognition of Black History Month. It is 24/7 in my house, Madam Speaker. Past, present and future. And I want to acknowledge the very hard work of everyone at Council, but in particular, my council colleague, Councillor Chambers who has been working tirelessly throughout this month and more. And I want to stand and recognize his efforts to really bring a conversation about black inventors this month, but in the future, you know, the inspiration that he's provided to students in my ward and in wards across the city and really, provincially and national discussion this year. And thank Black History Manitoba. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

MINUTES

Councillor Chambers moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on January 28th, 2021, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now move onto delegations. Our delegates will all be joining us remotely via Zoom today. First, I'd like to invite Ms. Kate Fenske. She is the Chief Executive Officer of the Downtown Winnipeg Business Improvement Zone who is appearing in support of Item 11 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 17th, 2021. It's regarding the Community Incentive Grant for the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ Improvement Zone. Ms. Fenske, welcome. We have 10 minutes on the clock for you.

DELEGATIONS

Kate Fenske: Thank you Mayor and councillors. I really appreciate your time today to hear about some of the challenges we are facing in our city's downtown. You know, we hear folks say, well, in a normal year, a lot these days so that is where I'd like to start. And I will share, I do have notes today because this really is a collaborative effort. And I want to make sure that I don't to miss anything. In a normal year, you know, I wouldn't be coming to you via Zoom from my Downtown BIZ office, but here I am. In a normal year, I would be making a plan for dinner, probably tomorrow after work, of course, at a downtown restaurant. In a normal year, I might even be making a plan for a trip out west to go visit my cousins. In a normal year, all of you would still be facing many tough challenges and having to make very important decisions for our city, but your plans would probably look very different. In the past year, so many of our plans have changed. We've all learned how to adapt to be innovative and flexible and this really isn't a normal year. We know that. Some of us have learned how to

make sourdough and others maybe have built tables. I do want to say, I have none of those skills. I haven't done a noon hour yoga class. Where my focus has been this past year is really…and the focus of our team at the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ as well has been how do we help? How do we help when everyone had to throw their plans out the window? So, today I am here to talk with you about the "p" word. And I will say it is a small p – plan. How together we can put a plan in motion that focuses on economic and social recovery that is so urgently needed in our downtown. We all know businesses, especially small businesses, and especially in the retail, restaurant, hospitality sectors are struggling. Businesses downtown have an even tougher go. More than 40 of our businesses have…in our downtown have permanently closed their doors this past year. Our last Downtown Winnipeg BIZ member survey, where the primary respondents were small businesses with 1-20 employees, showed that nearly 60% of businesses are making less than half of their usual sales. And we are coming up on one year since they were first shut down. Their top challenge for generating income is not enough customers due to many downtown workers still working at home. According to our latest results through Probe Research, only 18% of workers who used to be downtown working everyday are still here full-time. And in a normal year, we would have about 70,000 people working downtown. They come from each and every one of your wards. And they also represent the primary customer base for downtown businesses. We know there is a direct link between the city's economic success and the health of our downtown. Our downtown is the economic driver that benefits all Winnipeggers and all Manitobans, but we are struggling. This isn't just about economics though and it's not just about business. It is about people. It is about everyone who calls Winnipeg home whether you live in a downtown apartment, whether you live in a house in the suburbs or whether you don't have a roof over your head. A plan for Winnipeg's downtown is critical for both economic and social development in our city. Yes, we want to talk about encouraging financial investment to generate revenue for the city. Yes, we want to figure out how to support existing businesses and also attract new ones. But we also want to talk about investing in people. No matter where you are, where you come from, who you are, what your background is, we want everyone to feel welcome and safe downtown and that they find their place here. If we look at residential growth, downtown is already anticipating another 2,000 residents in the next two years. That is a 12.5% increase in just a couple of years for a population that hasn't seen that kind of growth in some time. We know a strong downtown means a strong city. And a great city has a vibrant downtown that bring business, arts, culture and people together. Well, we can't do that right now, but that's why we need to be planning right now. We also understand that anything we do or plan must be through a lens of social equity. In her MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning thesis, Amanda Martin points out that cities should harness sustainability to meet the needs of low-income neighbourhoods while promoting new development. She goes on to say that even cities with few fiscal resources can implement equitable sustainability efforts through development review processes and by leveraging external private and public investments. However, it's unlikely that city sustainability efforts will result in social equity improvements without a directed effort to do so. So, what does all of this mean? What are we hoping to do? City-led downtown plan; capital D, capital P, Downtown Plan, also known as a secondary plan has already been initiated as part of a key action from the City's draft Complete Communities 2.0. But the pandemic has created a greater urgency in our downtown. Together the three downtown councillors along with CentreVenture, Downtown Exchange District and West End BIZ's, and the City of Winnipeg Public Service, we've initiated a collaborative framework to respond to our downtown's rapidly changing needs. We have not worked like this before. But this year, it has to be different. The need is so great that we are pulling everyone together. And the City can leverage us as resources to do the work. The first critical piece is a recovery strategy for downtown which is focused on economic and social recovery and delivering a strategic action plan within 12 months that will provide recommendations to create a vibrant downtown and encourage investment. This downtown recovery strategy along with the Exchange District area plan will inform and be integrated into the City's long-term Downtown Plan By-law. This is about building a foundation. It is about getting the data to see where we are at after these last 12 months. We don't have the answers right now. There are lots of ideas out there and every single city that I've chatted with across North America is trying to figure this out too. We are not naive enough to think that this will be the silver bullet that will just simply jump start the economy after the past year that we've faced or that it will solve all of the challenges like homelessness, poverty, mental health, addictions that our community has faced for years. I would like to take some time to acknowledge the great work happening in those areas, especially to End Homelessness and all the community groups that we have seen come together like O.P.K., Mama Bear Clan, Main Street Project, the Downtown Community Safety Partnership and others. Their work is critical to the health of our downtown, especially this year. How they have come together is exactly what we are talking about here. We believe a downtown recovery strategy can be a road map that collectively puts us all on the same path. It will give us the tools and mechanisms needed to solve some challenges that we simply just didn't have a year ago. It will include research and market analysis, engagement and consultation, and it will identify countless projects and, of course, produce an action plan with recommendations for a downtown recovery strategy that we can get to work on right away and have it still integrated into the Downtown Plan By-law. This collaborative framework gives our city a chance to build on the momentum that we had downtown including the new capital projects underway in Winnipeg…in downtown Winnipeg that have a combined construction value of an estimated $1 billion. And all of those projects are still happening. They haven't been pulled. This is a chance to do things differently. A chance to lead and work together, following a wild year with so many uncertainties. We will work and consult with the private and non-profit sectors, residents, all levels of government, and of course, other key stakeholders who have a vested interest in the health of our urban centre. With the leadership of the three downtown councillors, and I hope all of Council, we can bring everyone together and do the work so our downtown is strong for all Winnipeggers to benefit. Our downtown is so beautifully diverse both in terms of people here and also the

places to go and the things to experience. We can all take pride in the heart of our city. It is where business, arts, culture, government, community, all come together. Without a plan we are leaving our downtown to fate and we simply cannot let that happen. And if you have been following along the last few minutes you may have noticed that I only used one p word and that is plan – small p. Planning now is critical for our recovery after. I have specifically chosen not to use the other p word because I think we have all heard it a lot this year. Thank you very much for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ms. Fenske. Do we have any other delegations with this item, Mr. Clerk? No, we will take questions then at this time. Any questions for Ms. Fenske? Seeing none, we thank you for your time today.

Kate Fenske: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Mr. Bruce King. He's here on behalf of McCOR Management, Manitoba Public Insurance's property management for 333 St. Mary Avenue. He's appearing in opposition to Item 1 of Report 'A' of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It's the report dated January 17th, 2020 regarding List of Historical Resources – the Nomination of the T. Eaton Company Mail Order and Catalogue Building at 333 St. Mary Avenue. Mr. King, welcome. We have 10 minutes for you on the clock today.

Bruce King: Good morning, Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, and members of Council. Thank you for allowing me to present to you today. My name is Bruce King. I am with the law firm Pitblado LLP and I am coming to you live from downtown Winnipeg today. I am the legal counsel for McCOR Management and McCOR Management is the property manager for 333 St. Mary Avenue, a building currently known as City Place. And I'm going to refer to it throughout my presentation today as "the building". And the building is owned by Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is an agency of the Crown. A fact that is set out in the administrative report which is part of the package that you have today. I come before you in opposition to the first element of the EPC recommendation, namely, that the building be added to the City's list of heritage resources. I don't oppose the second element of the EPC recommendation, namely, that the City request that the Province designate the building under the Heritage Resources Act. The opposition to this designation is not based on any disagreement over whether or not the building embodies heritage values. Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation acknowledges and agrees that the building has historic and architectural significance, that it's a highly conspicuous building and the defining features of it should be conserved. Why then do we oppose the designation? The opposition is based on the simple, clear, unarguable fact that the City has no jurisdiction to make a designation. The City has no authority at all because the building is owned by an agency of the Crown. The Heritage Resources Act is the empowering legislation. Part three of that act allows municipalities including the City of Winnipeg to designate certain heritage sites. The sites they are allowed to designate must be either privately owned or owned by the municipality. The act does not give municipalities any power at all to deal with sites owned by the Province or an agency of the Province. The authority to deal with those sites is reserved exclusively to the Province itself. The City's Historic Resources By-law is the mechanism by which you implement the powers granted to you under the Heritage Resources Act. The City's Historic Resources By-law can only apply to sites over which the City has been given jurisdiction. It can have no application to any property owned by the Crown or an agency of the Crown. If a designation were to be made, it would surely be struck down if it were subject to a legal challenge. The administrative report before you discusses the lack of authority of the City and seems to leave open the possibility that the City could make a designation but just not enforce it against the current owner due to the fact that the owner is an agency of the Crown. I'm going to quote from the administrative report. It's on page 8 of your package when you get there later today. It says, "In summary, as an agent of the Crown, MPI would not be bound by a historic designation, which means that they would not be obliged to comply with the Historic Resources By-law. In short, the City would not be able to enforce the designation." That statement is not quite accurate. The administration are correct in saying that MPI would not be bound by a designation, but that is because the by-law doesn't apply to the building. The administration should have said in the report that the building is not and cannot be bound by the designation. You shouldn't interpret the administrative report as allowing the City to designate property over which it has no jurisdiction in anticipation of the facts possibly changing in the future. For example, the City couldn't designate a property located in Headingley or East St. Paul just in case that land someday became part of the City of Winnipeg. The City doesn't have any jurisdiction over property outside of the City of Winnipeg. Similarly, the City can't designate this in building…this building just in case someday it isn't owned by the Crown or an agency of the Crown. The City has no jurisdiction over sites owned by the Crown or an agency of the Crown. What the City can do now is what is recommended in the administrative report. It can add the building to the commemorative list. Now, this shouldn't be seen as a lesser designation, rather it provides the message that I think the City wants to send that the City recognizes the historic and architectural significance of the building. The City can also request that the Province, the level of government which does have authority, designate the building under the Heritage Resources Act. Now, what's even more important is what the City has already done and that is to create the Sports, Hospitality and Entertainment District, the SHED. Reading from the City's own documents, the SHED is a pivotal initiative in the City's commitment to a downtown revitalization. The SHED's development and design framework contains the statement that development in the SHED District should maintain a respectful relationship to heritage buildings, ensure their preservation and leverage them as part of the district's attraction. The City should be reassured by the fact that Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is interested in the very same

objectives as the City, including both historical preservation and revitalization. This is a very important asset of MPI and they intend to preserve and enhance the value of this asset. MPI would look very much forward to sharing ideas with the City on how it might sustain and revitalize this property in a manner that's harmonious with the SHED vision developed by the City itself. This building is featured prominently in SHED documentation, and the depictions are remarkable. This building can and will be a keystone of the SHED vision that the City itself has adopted. We therefore respectfully request that the City not attempt to add the building to the list of historic resources. Such a by-law could have the unintended effect of frustrating MPI and the City in developing shared vision for the future of this building. We do invite the City to add the building to the commemorative list and we invite the City to work with MPI in a cooperative and timely way to help realize the vision you both share. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Having worked in this portfolio at the provincial level, Madam Speaker, I don't think a lot of people realize that MPI actually has a couple of private enterprises that it operates. It operates an insurance business that insures semi tractor-trailers, probably the only insurance provider in the province as far as I know. It is a private offering. As well as, Madam Speaker, they…City Place is actually…they used profits from that private insurance industry to buy this building called City Place. And they are actually running a private business in the property management and leasing business. So, my question, Madam Speaker, is does the legislation that creates the MPI, does it include those private operations as a Crown-operated business?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. King.

Bruce King: I am here to speak to this designation. And I am speaking on behalf of the property manager. I don't pretend to know the nuances of the business of MPI. I know I got a refund this year and I'm real happy, but that's about it.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. That is the public operations of the Crown Corporation called MPI, is the automobile insurance that is in the legislation. So, help me out here, Mr. King. I am trying to…Madam Speaker, through you to Mr. King, I'm trying to understand how MPI is insisting it is a Crown Corporation when it comes to the private aspects versus the public insurance that is in the legislation of this province of Manitoba.

Bruce King: Madam Speaker, notwithstanding the activities of MPI, there is no question at all that it is a Crown Corporation period. What powers it is given in its legislation is a completely different matter. If as a Crown Corporation, it is allowed to participate in businesses, and I suspect the councillor may be quite right if he is familiar with that, that is fine. But it doesn't change the fact that it is a Crown Corporation period.

Councillor Eadie: I'm wondering if Mr. King could describe to me if there is a difference between City Place and the MPI garage operations on Main Street at Anderson?

Bruce King: Sorry. It is a different building. Are you asking me what operations take place in those buildings?

Councillor Eadie: I'm asking what is the difference between City Place and that particular building property on Main Street?

Bruce King: Well, any property owned by Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation located in the City of Winnipeg still is a property owned by a Crown Corporation. And a property owned by a Crown Corporation, an agency of the Crown, is exempt from this by-law. You have no power to deal with MPI properties in respect of a heritage designation. I am sure you have other authorities as the City zoning and otherwise, but the power to do a heritage designation is very specifically granted in part three of the Heritage Resources Act. You are bound by that act.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. King. Question from Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you, I ask the delegation as a…myself as a former employee of MPI at the seventh floor of said building, what specifically has the Public Service in dialogue leading up to this motion that is before us today or report before us today, what dialogue have you had to encourage them to change said motion?

Bruce King: You are asking me what MPI has done?

Councillor Nason: I will rephrase it if I may, Madam Speaker. Has the Public Service and/or members of the elected members of Council spoke to you on this matter for different dialogue, different language?

Bruce King: Madam Speaker, I am advised and it is mentioned in the report, that there have been two prior delegations by MPI at prior committee hearings. And notwithstanding those prior delegations providing what I believe to be the same message, matters have continued. I am not aware of any…I'm not aware of dialogue that would change the nature of the motion. My client did realize, and it was the recommendation of the…recommendation of the administrative report that what I have just suggested today, that it…the property be added to the commemorative list. That was the recommendation made by administration. And MPI assumed that recommendation of administration might be followed and was in support of that.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I am hearing correctly, the only opportunity that you or your client had was through a formal mechanism and not outside of the bounds of the 10-minute speaking time. Is that accurate?

Bruce King: That is my understanding.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. I will follow up with Councillor Nason about the HCD process and how they work on that. My questions are…just want to confirm. The…there is a...I was told…I heard today that the MPI would be supportive of being on the commemorative list. However, I believe that is also the same by-law, isn't it?

Bruce King: Yes, I believe it is the same by-law.

Councillor Orlikow: So, they are okay to be on the commemorative list as part of the by-law, but not okay being on the historical designation list as part of the by-law, is that what I am hearing?

Bruce King: That is a correct interpretation. In, I guess…in anticipation of the ensuing question, why not the case, Councillor Orlikow. It's…I mean, MPI does share a vision with the City. And MPI doesn't want to be seen to, you know, not recognizing and appreciating the very good intent of Council in recognizing this building. The commemorative designation was thought to be something that they would be comfortable not opposing. Let me put it that way.

Councillor Orlikow: Which…thank you very much for that answer. That leads me to my second question which is, what I'm hearing today is that MPI is wanting to maintain the building as a heritage building, is not opposed to that, I'm hearing, the ideas there. And that if the City of Winnipeg, for example, does do the designation, they can still adhere to it unless they wanted…they want to do a legal challenge. So, are they…is that correct? Like, they can actually…we can do the designation even though, yes, within the by-law you can say it is not bound. That is fine. But unless MPI does a legal challenge towards that, would not we be working together to preserve that building for the future?

Bruce King: The MPI, I would defer to them to make the decision how they will react if the designation is made. They are opposed to the designation. And councillor, as you know, if there is a designation, and in case there is some confusion, everybody on Council today will have heard what I said. But five years from now, 10 years from now, will administration…will future councils understand that the designation effectively has no meaning, no effect, will that perhaps lead to conflict as…if at some point in the future development takes place and the City thinks that they...again, the mechanisms provided for in the by-law weren't adequately followed. So, again, if you do something that you don't have the power to do, you could confuse people in the future. And the City doesn't, I presume, want to do that.

Councillor Orlikow: No, the City does want to make sure that asset is protected. So, we do want that. Okay, I think that's…oh, my last question is, you referred to it, but I don't believe it is eminent, just maybe you referred to it as a possibility in the future. Are there development plans for that building that are public or imminent?

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Lukes moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Mr. King, to answer the question.

Bruce King: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Orlikow, there are no plans at the moment. However, my client was just recently appointed as property manager. And part of the mandate of my client is to look at the revitalization, especially of the retail space in that building. I mean, you see the dynamic development that is taking place across the street at Hargrave Market. Fantastic, great for downtown. The first few floors of City Place aren't as dynamic. Let me just say that. It is the City's objective. We've header a prior speaker today that downtown Winnipeg be continued to be revitalized. I know that that is on the mind of MPI and part of the mandate given to my client, but I can say no plans at the moment.

Councillor Orlikow: Very good. And I'm sure…and you heard of the other group today that has been joined I think as well. That's great. Thank you very much.

Bruce King: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, followed by Councillor Schreyer. Mr. Mayor first, Councillor Schreyer. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. I'm mindful of 44 seconds left in the remaining time. I want to thank you, Mr. King, for your presentation today. It is good to see you. You're…you did clarify for us that you represent the property manager and not necessarily MPI. So, I am mindful of that. In reference to the Province, are you or your client aware of any efforts by the Province of Manitoba to protect the property in the way in which we are being asked to consider today?

Bruce King: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. And Madam Speaker, I am not aware of any discussions. I presume that that would be the City that would initiate that. The City…in the motion today, part of that is that the Province be requested to make the designation.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers moves extension. All in favour? Two minutes. Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Schreyer, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, is Mr. King questioning the process in general, how we go about making these decisions or just how it is applied in this case?

Bruce King: Madam Speaker, I am not questioning the process. As I have looked through the report that you have today, it appears the process has in fact been appropriately followed. So, no question at all about process. Yes, application of process. And again, my understanding is that…and I have just been told this. I did not listen to the discussion myself at EPC, but the person that advised me was under the impression that EPC and Council is aware that they can't make this designation, but again, perhaps it was under the understanding that they could make the designation and it might apply it sometime in the future. And that is why I've tried to explain that that is not the case. If you make the designation now, again, go designate someplace in Headingley and then when it becomes part of Winnipeg when it, I don't know, rejoins Winnipeg, does that kick in? No, it doesn't. It didn't have authority over Headingley. And I don't know if there's any buildings in Headingley worth preserving. And if Headingley is online, I apologize to them. But if there were, you wouldn't designate now because you know you don't have authority. Well, again, designating this building has no meaning. It has not authority. Arguably, the commemoration…sorry, the other designation, commemorative list, similarly doesn't have authority. But again, MPI has told me they would be comfortable with that designation, again, because they don't want…they're not pushing back against the City. They want to work with the City.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, four seconds on the clock.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, just one question is…is the…do you represent a private, for-profit business?

Madam Speaker: Councillor…

Bruce King: I represent many private for-profit businesses. That is how I earn my paycheque. In this case, I am representing a private, for-profit business called McCOR Management that's managing a property that's owned by Crown Corporation, a Crown Corporation that has a variety of activities including some for-profit activities.

Madam Speaker: Mr. King, that brings our question period to a close. We do thank you for your presentation today.

Bruce King: Thank you for the time, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Have a great day. Thank you. Next is Monsieur Alain Laurencelle, President of Les Amis des arts visuels du Manitoba, together with Alexandra Keim, Director of La Maison des artistes visuels du Manitoba as well. They are appearing before Council in support Item 9 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 18th, 2021. It's regarding Jardins des sculptures. Monsieur Laurencelle and Madam, we have you livestream with us. You may begin your presentation.

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: Good morning Mayor and councillors. I am Alain Laurencelle, President of the Sculpture Garden Foundation accompanied with Alex Keim who is the manager of the garden and the Director of Les Maisons des Artistes,

the art gallery, for 20 years at 219 Provencher Boulevard. We would like to express our support of the decision of the Standing Policy Committee on PPDHD, Item 9 of the report. We are happy that the City approves the protection of area in which the Sculpture Garden is found in St. Boniface. We thank Council for listening to our concerns about the possible future sale of this plot of land for the garden. You, councillors, and the Standing Policy Committee have heard us and you were sympathetic to the fact that the garden is a shared project with the City for over 15 years, it merits special protection. We would like to underline a specification that is necessary to the proposition today that you will hear and deliberate. If it's acceptable to the members of the committee, that us as managers and custodians of the green space, we ask that the proposition includes a precise boundary of the Sculpture Garden and guarantees no disputing the encroachment.

Alain Laurencelle: Avoid any encroachment unto the Sculpture Garden lands.

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: In the eventuality of development of the space. It is essential to determine exactly what the surface area is for the Sculpture Garden. This should also be accompanied by a technical staking drawing.

Alain Laurencelle: A staking certificate.

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: That indicates the measures of the exact boundary in a clear way that define the physical boundaries.

Alain Laurencelle: We support the motion to take the Sculpture Garden lands out of surplus, but given the serious public discontent caused by this RFP, we urge Council to reserve the right to approve the boundaries of the Sculpture Garden parcel as determined by a certified land surveyor and shared with the principal stakeholders, us included, before a final decision is made.

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: We would equally like to declare that the area at 219 Provencher where there is a luminated sign, the bronze vaulted sculpture of Marcel Gosselin, the foundation and the infrastructures are put in place for future sculptures, lands and amenities are protected. They should be included in the total surface area of the garden of non-surplus revenues of the City or at a strict minimum, protected by the service agreements.

Alain Laurencelle: The City should retain ownership of the entire Sculpture Garden lands and amenities including the ones in front of city hall without the necessity of moving anything or of protective easements. It seems nonsensical for the City to have to incur moving costs which are now estimated at over $400,000 for a significant historical and public use building it wishes to sell for $10,000.

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: These sculptures received the support of the City. There was a time when this land was declared surplus without knowledge or consultation wit us or the community. Thank you for your attention and we hope that you support our recommendations in your deliberations. Alex?

Alexandra Keim: Hello. Thank you, Alain. My name is Alexandra Keim and I am the director of the gallery La Maison des Artistes and the custodian of the sculpture garden. Thank you, Mayor Bowman, Madam Speaker, and councillors for this audience today. In addition to Alain's request we would like to express our concerns vis a vis the proposed schematics for the development of RFP 9822019 and its impact on the Sculpture Garden. The project as presented poses a real danger to the existing installations and this public greenspace. These schematics suggest a density of multiple high-rise buildings that would dwarf the historical St. Boniface town hall and encroach onto the existing mature landscape. We believe that the designs publicly shared to date indicate a disregard for the surrounding streetscape as well as the historical aspect of the existing buildings and garden as important destinations in their own rights. The current design seems to exceed spatial limitations for the size of the property and would, if permitted to go without restrictions, shadow, overshadow a well established and free to all greenspace. The environmental impact from the imposing new constructions may or would have lasting negative effects on the landscape and we hope that any future negotiations would include shadow cast and density studies to minimize or mitigate any harmful impact. In closing, in 2019, the Provencher BIZ engaged the ft3 Architecture and Interior Design to develop a cohesive design package of ideas for the enhancement of streetscaping. The master plan states, and I quote, "The Sculpture Garden is used as a venue to host various summer outdoor events coordinated by La Maison and partners from the community like the Festival du Voyageur and Alliance Française. With the Sculpture Garden's central connection and as a key destination for the BIZ, it is important that this public space is

maintained and celebrated. Moving forward if proper steps are taken into consideration, it would demonstrate at the very least a willingness to protect the Sculpture Garden, a unique developed and much loved public green environment." Miigwetch, thank you, merci.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. I'd like to ask you to stay on the line and we will hear from the next delegation on the same topic and then call you all back for questions. Our next delegation is Ms. Carole Freynet-Gagné who is also in support of the same item. Are you with us here on the line? Yes, thank you.

Carole Freynet-Gagné: Yes, I am. I'm just going to…

Madam Speaker: We have five minutes on the clock for you. Welcome.

Translation of French Spoken:

Carole Freynet-Gagné: So, thank you to all. I am Carol Freynet-Gagné and I'm the Vice-President of the World Trade Centre one of the tenants of 219 Provencher. I am also speaking to you as a member of the francophone community of Winnipeg. I am here to support the motion of Councillor Allard for the preservation of the Sculpture Garden in the heart of St. Boniface. The Sculpture Garden is a point of pride for us at World Trade Centre. How many times has our PVG, Mariette Mulaire, heard the praise from business leaders and commercial delegations from all over the world when they reach our building at 219 Provencher.

Carole Freynet-Gagné: Talk about curb appeal.

Translation of French Spoken:

Carole Freynet-Gagné: The civic campus in St. Boniface has been an assembly point for over 100 years. The Sculpture Garden has given it new life. Not only has it attracted innovators in art and tourists, but it puts on evening cinema events and god knows we are excited to go to back once the pandemic is over. So, for all these reasons and more the World Trade Centre implores you to vote in favour of the motion to protect the Sculpture Garden for future generations. And surely, the Sculpture Garden counts on the Maison des Artistes visuels du Manitoba for their good management. Today, we are protecting the garden, but don't forget that the Maision des Artistes absolutely needs to be on this site.

Carole Freynet-Gagné: The St. Boniface civic campus was built for the community by the community. Ensuring the Sculpture Garden remains a public space is the right thing to do. That is exactly what St. Boniface City Council intended back in 1971 when they handed over the keys to the city of Winnipeg.

Translation of French Spoken:

Carole Freynet-Gagné: I want to take advantage of this opportunity to speak to this Council about our confusion concerning the process around the RFP 9822019.

Carole Freynet-Gagné: The sale of St. Boniface city hall as part of the RFP 9822019 was arbitrary, rushed and completely unnecessary. The outcome could have been so much different if City officials had simply consulted the community. How is it that City consults vigorously for other projects like Market Lands, HBC and public golf courses, but not this one? The City of Winnipeg has held more meaningful public consultations to move sidewalks than it has when considering the future of one of its most prized historic sites. I will never understand how the future of a culturally sensitive landmark, one of Winnipeg's historic gems, is now in the hands of a City administrator. No public consultations, no appeals process, and no oversight from elected officials, either standing policy committee, EPC or council. How can that be? Furthermore, significant shortcomings concerning the City's obligation to provide French language service reflect an organizational culture that in some departments systematically disregards Winnipeg's French speaking citizens. For francophones, it is a bitter reminder of decades of trampled rights. Saving the Jardin des Sculptures is one bright light in a dark chapter of our community's history. St. Boniface City Hall could have remained in the hands of the City, and by extension the community without compromising the project put forward by Manitoba Possible. There was a willingness on all sides to find a solution, but the City's RFP process did not allow any flexibility in terms of finding a win-win-win for all parties. At several committee meetings we heard administration say this is not ideal. We've learned a lot from this RFP. We would not do it like this again. Well, as we same in French…

Translation of French Spoken:

Carole Freynet-Gagné: It's a shame.

Carole Freynet-Gagné: What a shame. The City's learnings have come on the backs of Winnipeg's francophone community.

Translation of French Spoken:

Carole Freynet-Gagné: With that, I thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. We'll now have all three delegations back with us. Are there any questions? Councillor Schreyer…oh, Councillor Schreyer, followed by Councillor Allard.

Councillor Schreyer: Are we communicating in French today?

Madam Speaker: You may, yes

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Schreyer: I would like to know…well, I need to say, it's very sad, it would be damaging if something like this passed in this case. But I have a question, when I see the motion, the resolution says that there are two options; that we're going to move the sculptures or we will cancel the declaration. So, for me, I must say that the motion is not clear enough. I would like more clarification in the motion to vote on it. So, I would say that it's two different sorts of motions. I would like to say that it should be in two separate motions. Anyways, they are here in one motion. So, I at least would like some clarification on the topic of what we would like to see exactly on the subject of these two motions. Would we like to see the sculptures moved to another spot, or would we like to cancel the declaration of surplus?

Madam Speaker: Thank you for the question, Councillor Schreyer.

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: I think…thank you Councillor Schreyer for your comments. I think you make an excellent point and I thank you for making it. So, I think what's essential is that we recognize the site where the Sculpture Garden is should be definitely removed as surplus to be sold. To us, it's a sharing…a collaboration with the City and the community, and the Sculpture Garden and La Maison des Artistes needs to be preserved. So, I agree with you on the point that the surplus designation needs to be cancelled. That is without question. Regarding your second point, I raised the same concerns as you in the sense that there is no definite that will pass with the part in front of the city hall and also, what will happen at the level…it gives many options that aren't really a definition of what the City will do or wants to do in regards to what is in…what is not exactly in the garden. I also have to tell you, the concerns that we have is that someone has drawn a line, a barrier, on a piece of paper, but this line is very arbitrary. It's not something that gives us security with what's happening right now with the precision of the limits of the border of our garden…of your Sculpture Garden. So, I agree with you on points two and three. There needs to be precision and it's for that reason that we are asking to reserve…

Alain Laurencelle: Please, reserve the rights to approve the boundaries of the Sculpture Garden.

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: Because there is no indication in what the administration has presented.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Schreyer: That means that we need to re-analyze these motions at this time…in the future. If I'm going to vote for this today, this could indicate that I support the relocation of the sculptures. So, that should tell you that I support the declaration of surplus. So, I have a conflict because I don't want to see this. So, what do I do?

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: Well, in these circumstances, you have two choices. You can either come back to the motion and say that all we want to do at this point is to qualify or remove the spot that the Sculpture Garden is on, to remove this surplus designation, period. In regards to the other, it's to ask the administration to come back with recommendations. And I think that the boundaries that we have asked for are reasonable and I think that the worries and questions that you have posed

are also very reasonable. So, I think there's a way to cut the cake to assure that eventually, at the end of the day, we have a complete cake.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Schreyer: That's to say that if we pass this motion, it means that we immediately, tomorrow, next week, we need to immediately work to assure that we don't approve the surplus declaration, right?

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: It's that you should accept the motion that the site is not surplus that you can sell. I think that is essential in the motion. In regards to the question of whether you will relocate the pieces that are outside of the garden that you have defined or if you will keep that land there, that is a question that has not been presently defined. So, it's for that reason there that I ask you to approach the question in an attentive way like you are currently doing, councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard, your question.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you very much for the presentations. I think this question is more for Mr. Laurencelle, it's probably more of a strategic question. At this point in time, I have (inaudible) the support of many councillors in regards to this motion and the support of our Public Service and Chair of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. I suppose that I would ask you, given that I think the chances are pretty good that this motion will pass today how it has been proposed, do you think it would pose a risk to refer the motion back to committee and have another round of discussions? Or should we take…in English…

Councillor Allard: Should we take the bird in the hand?

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: Or should we put the motion that has been supported by Council at risk?

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: I think there are two answers to your question, Councillor Allard. And I thank you for asking. It's that you have already mentioned that you have the support of most of your colleagues to be able to pass the motion as it is presented. In principal, people are alright with the fact that the Sculpture Garden should not be a part of the surplus list and be subjected to sale. So, the special protection that you want to give it is something that I believe is a benefit according to your colleagues. The thing that is not necessarily stated in the resolution is what approach do you want you want to do with the surplus that is in front of the city hall knowing the cuts that are now implicated with that. And so, this is really a question that I need to pose to you as councillors, what is the best way to assure that our concerns and our worries are recognized, heard and treated in a way that's fair.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: So, I'll ask you the question directly, later today, do you want me to refer this back to the committee knowing that it puts the motion, as it is written, at risk?

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: I think that in these circumstance, Councillor Allard, if you think it's in the best interest of the garden that the motion passes as it is, I think you should move forward. I think you need to raise our concerns and worries that I have indicated with your colleagues that there is not a precise border that has been made for the garden and there has been no decision made on whether you are going to relocate or will you keep this plot there. And to ask them for borders to be given to you so that you can then consult with the garden and concerned parties.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: Are you aware that since all of your delegations, I have asked the Public Service to revise the documents that you have shared with us and it was the final recommendation that they had after having revising the documents?

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: Yes, I am aware.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: Okay, thank you for the delegation. I would like to see how you feel about the strategy and the opportunities for the garden. I think the chances are good if we vote today. I don't know how things would change if this came to the next Council, but I will consider and I'll wait to hear what my colleagues say.

Translation of French Spoken:

Alain Laurencelle: In that measure, I think what you have said, Councillor Allard…

Madam Speaker: Mr. Laurencelle, I thank you for your presentation. We have run out of time here on the clock.

Alain Laurencelle: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: We appreciate your group coming here today to join us. Thank you.

Alain Laurencelle: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next, we will hear from Mr. Tom Simms. He is the Co-Director of the Community Education Development Association together with Kayla Stubbs, Acting Director of Ndinawe. They are appearing in support of Item 3 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It is the report dated February 12th, 2021 regarding Proposed Sale of Vacant City Land at 379 Selkirk Avenue. I see you on the screen here, welcome to both of you. And we have 10 minutes on the clock today.

Kayla Stubbs: Good morning, City Council members. Thank you for having us this morning. My name is Kayla Stubbs, I am the Acting Director for Ndinawemaaganag Endaawaad and I'm joined here today by my colleague, Tom Simms, the Co-Director for CEDA, the Community Education Development Association. We are here today to discuss the request for the sale of a vacant lot located at 379 Selkirk Avenue. I'd like to start by providing some information on our partnership. The Winnipeg School Division data indicates that on average every year 400 students in the North End are disengaged from school and no longer attend school. The Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre, Ndinawemaaganag Endaawaad and the Community Education Development Association have performed a partnership that is now known as the Indigenous Education Caring Society to provide wraparound culturally-based supports and assist Indigenous youth in the North End in completing their high school education. Each off-campus site will serve between 15 to 20 youth in order that a stronger relationship-based setting is established that is built on developing a sense of belonging. The programming in the off-campus sites will be rooted in Indigenous knowledges, ways of knowing and being. It will be holistic, and focused on meeting the physical, mental, emotional and spiritual needs of our young people in our community. The curriculum will be culturally based with an emphasis on land-based education, individualized youth centred programming and project-based learning based on the passions of the identified participants. A memorandum of agreement has been signed with the Winnipeg School Division to work with the Indigenous Education Caring Society on this initiative. Two social service facilities will be built in the North End to provide space for daytime and evening support programs for young people. Each site will be approximately 2,000 square feet. The construction of the two buildings will involve the employment of social enterprises to the maximum extent as possible as subcontractors for this project. The total budget for the construction of two sites is $1 million. To date, the Winnipeg Foundation has granted $500,000 and the Thomas Sill Foundation $25,000 with the balance of the capital funding to be financed through a commercial mortgage. The Indigenous Education Caring Society partnership is asking the City of Winnipeg to sell the vacant lot located at 379 Selkirk Avenue for $1 in order to build a social service facility at this site. I would now like to pass it over to Tom for additional comments.

Tom Simms: Thanks Kayla. And thank you for the opportunity to present before City Council. I think this is a really good example of a whole range of partners coming together to collaborate for the…the central piece is how to support young people in our community. One of the challenges with the young people that are disengaged from school and one of the strategies that the Winnipeg School Division likes to work on is to set up off-campus programs that's got a lot more one-to-one attention and in the smaller setting so that young people can get more direct attention that they need. Winnipeg School Division for many years has worked, for example, with Rossbrook House in terms of off-campus programming. The big challenge that we saw around this issue is in the North End. The buildings available on the Selkirk Avenue strip and then there's sort of the north end of Arlington are in really challenging conditions in terms of their structural foundation. We have looked at a number of facilities. And that is a real challenge for working in this kind of a way. So, one of the things that we saw was a real important opportunity is how can the community sector work in partnership with the school division

to look at developing facilities so that these off-campus programs can be successful. A good example of this challenge is, for 15 years an off-campus program was operated on Selkirk Avenue, the Songide'Ewin off-campus program. Two years ago, it had to move out of the building because the building was structurally deficient and there were safety hazards there. Songide'Ewin couldn't find a facility to continue its off-campus program and actually had to move back into Niji Mahkwa School in the staff room of Niji Mahkwa School. And so, that we just see this challenge of finding adequate facilities in the North End is a huge one. We really appreciate the partnership with the philanthropic sector on this initiative. The Winnipeg Foundation has seen that this as a huge issue. And the Winnipeg Foundation has been very positive in the North End in helping redevelop facilities along Selkirk Avenue including the former Oretzki's building, the former Merchants Hotel, the former Apple Store and looking at how we can develop education facilities in the Selkirk Avenue. And so, they were quite interested in supporting this idea for high school students as well as the Thomas Sill Foundation. One of the challenges for the non-profit sector is that we are going to have to get the commercial financing for the balance of this capital funding. So, we really appreciate the partnership with the City of Winnipeg in terms of vacant owned City lots. And I would really like to thank, in terms of the spirit of partnership, the local city councillor, Ross Eadie who has been very helpful on this initiative. We appreciate the local Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee who has supported this initiative. As we've moved through City Council, we appreciate the support of the Standing Committee on Property and Development which has supported this initiative. And last week, we appreciated the support of the Executive Policy Committee on this initiative. So, we really appreciate how the City of Winnipeg, to this stage, has seen that there is an important partnership that can come together to support our young people. And, I guess, you know, the last thing I'd like to just talk about is, you know, we see this as a strategy to demonstrate how, you know, other opportunities could be developed in the community like this. There is an additional property that we were initially bringing forward on Dufferin Avenue that was laid over at the Property Development Committee because there's some outstanding legal issues on that. And I assume that that would be followed up in the next 30 to 60 days that we appreciate, you know, potential interest on that. I think the key picture here is how do we support young people to be successful in completing their education? We know with the COVID crisis that there are going to be more…even more young people that are disengaged from learning. And you know, there is a human cost in tragedy around that that is the central part of the issue. But we also know there is a societal cost around that. In 2008, Simon Fraser University did a national study that looked at what is the cost of not graduating from high school. And their study indicated that on an annual basis, it is $15,000 per student as a cost for not graduating from high school. For the 400 students that we've documented in the North End, that is equivalent to a…annually, a $6 million challenge around healthcare costs, justice costs, EIA costs and other costs in terms of society. So, we do believe there is a cost of doing nothing. CEDA is partnering with the Manitoba Centre for Health Policy to do a detailed study for the Province of Manitoba of the costs for not graduating from high school. We think those costs are going to be even higher than the study that was done in the federal study. So, that we really appreciate the partners coming together around this: the Winnipeg School Division, the community organization partners, the philanthropic sector and the City of Winnipeg to meet the needs of young people whose needs are not being met in the local neighbourhood schools and that we know that will be of benefit for the individuals, but we know it is also a benefit for society as a whole. So, we thank you for your…the opportunity to speak, and will be more than welcome to answer any questions if there is any clarifications regarding this request.

Madam Speaker: Thank you very much for the presentation. Any questions? Seeing none, again, thank you and have a great day.

Kayla Stubbs: Thank you very much.

Tom Simms: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Ms. Shohan Illsley. She is the Executive Director of the Manitoba Harm Reduction Network who is appearing before Council in support of Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks, the report dated February 10th, 2021 regarding the Establishment of a Consumption Site. Welcome, Ms. Illsley. We have 10 minutes on the clock for you.

Shohan Illsley: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Mayor Bowman and councillors for your time today. So, my name is Shohan Illsley. My spirit name is Sacred Bear Woman, and I am the Executive Director of the Manitoba Harm Reduction Network which was established in 2002 primarily here in Winnipeg. We are a provincial organization and our main office is here in Winnipeg on Broadway. Our mandate is to coordinate efforts and support harm reduction within and across jurisdictions. And our work focuses on harm reduction, improving access to health and social services, community building, and the inclusion of people impacted by substance use and the services and decisions that affect them. We believe that harm reduction services, equitable access and safer service delivery are important parts of supporting healthy communities. We are committed to the philosophy of nothing about us without us and support 11 peer advisory councils in the province which include people who use drugs and are impacted by colonial and structural violence such as homelessness and manufactured poverty. We have a Winnipeg peer working group that was established in 2007 and has been working to improve their lives and the lives of their relatives. The Manitoba Harm Reduction Network also coordinates 11 local harm

reduction and sexual health networks in the province in collaboration with the respective regional health authorities and the tribal councils. The goal of the network is to enhance an integrated approach to addressing STBBIs, sexual health, substance use and harm reduction. Networks consist of a multisector team of over 30 members from government, non-government organizations, tribal councils, private, non-profit, public service…public services, community groups and individual community members. I will introduce the Winnipeg network in a minute. Harm Reduction is an integral part of all of our lives. It includes a vast continuum of interventions and activities including upstream approaches that address systemic harm such as policies and practices that maximize harms. This, of course, can include criminalization and institutional racism to name a few. Harm Reduction also supports downstream approaches to addressing drug related harms such as HIV and Hep C transmission and overdose or drug poisoning. These approaches include meeting people where they are at to engage them in reducing the harms associated with their substance use as well as providing support to survive structural violence. Due to the illegal market, we have continued to experience overdoses and drug poisoning in Canada and in Manitoba. In 2016, we began experiencing our most recent overdose crisis. With the implementation of the pandemic responses, we have witnessed the exasperation of social inequities and structural harms for people who are impacted. This has in turn impacted the overdose drug poisoning crisis and resulted in a significant number of deaths due to drug poisoning, not only across Canada, but here in Manitoba and in Winnipeg specifically. On November 4th, 2020, the Chief Medical Examiners Office released overdose death numbers specific to Manitoba. The number of deaths due to drug poisoning continue to rise. In 2018, there were a recorded 187 deaths. In 2019, 191. And in the first six months, so January until June of 2020, there were 137 recorded deaths. The Medical Officer of Health for the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority predicted that the opioid overdose deaths for 2020 could reach as high as 3 to 400. Although we currently are waiting data from the CME to confirm 2020 numbers, this estimate is supported by data from the Winnipeg Police…or sorry, Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Services who released data showing a 66% increase in overdose calls and 73% increase in administering naloxone, which is a response to overdose between April and May of 2020 in comparison to 2019. Further, the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Services reported an increase in naloxone administration with 2,018 doses administered in the first nine months of 2020, which compares to 1,500 in all of 2016. As an organization, we're working hard to understand the complexities and nuances of substance use for people who are impacted. Harm Reduction includes a continuum of services at the individual level that include; education, access to supply distribution and access to safe consumption services, which would address the overdose crisis. It's important to note that the spaces in which drugs are consumed have significant impact on drug use practices and the conditions for drug-related harms and benefits such as overdose. Manitoba Harm Reduction Network supports this motion and thanks the City for inquiring on behalf of us many community organizations and health services who have increased our own advocacy to support safer consumption services since the onset of the most recent overdose crisis and drug poisoning crisis here in the province. At the Manitoba Harm Reduction Network, we coordinate a Winnipeg harm reduction network, which engages approximately 30 Winnipeg based organizations and institutions. Memberships on…membership on the network includes stakeholders from many health service organizations including Winnipeg Regional Health Authority and Klinic, and Nine Circles to name a few. Membership also includes many community-based organizations including Main Street Project, Sunshine House, Sage House, North End Women's Resource and West Central Women's Resources, again, just to name a few. And most importantly, it also includes people who use drugs and are impacted. The network identified the need for a subcommittee dedicated to safe consumption services which shows support for this initiative. Unfortunately, we do not have the capacity or human resources to conduct this necessary review. Conducting a review of applicable federal and provincial legislation governing the establishment and operation of both a safe consumption sites and managed alcohol programs will provide us with the information required to move forward and inform appropriate policies, programs and practises in Winnipeg. This motion reinforces the City's commitment to save the lives of our relatives here in Winnipeg. And with that, I'd like to thank you for your time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions? Or we'll go to the next delegation first, Mr. Clerk. Okay. Ms. Illsley, if you could just stay on the line. I'll now call forward Michael Payne. He is the Executive Director of the Nine Circles Community Health Centre. He is also in support of the same item. Thank you, Mr. Payne. Welcome. And there is five minutes on the clock for you.

Michael Payne: Thank you and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. For those who don't know, Nine Circles is a community-based health centre located in West Broadway. We deliver health, social and wellness services to people who are living with HIV and Hep C throughout the Province of Manitoba. We also support the downtown Point Douglas area in providing primary care services, safer sex and safer drug use supply distribution, overdose prevention resources, opioid replacement therapy and recovery services. A growing number of our clients are people who use drugs and many of those folks are really struggling right now. Nine Circles has, like many agencies, experienced significant increases in the number and complexity of community members who need our support. I'm really proud of the Nine Circles team and how they've been able to adapt services to reach out to folks in need. I'm proud of the West Broadway and Wolseley business leaders and community members for their willingness to lean into this issue and try to help with the focus on reducing harm. A harm reduction approach is a continuum as my colleague has mentioned. There is no choice to be made between harm reduction and recovery. This is about matching the right programs to the individuals who need them starting with where those individuals are at. We are not achieving this right now effectively because the full range of potential

interventions are not accessible to us. This is the primary reason why our drug poisoning deaths have grown from less than 200 to approximately 400 over the past few years and will continue to grow if agencies like Nine Circles can't do more. Everyday my staff walk to check behind dumpsters, local businesses in areas throughout our physical building in hopes that we don't find another human being who has died of drug poisoning. Regularly, our staff administer life saving interventions to individuals who would have otherwise died. And we're not a hospital, the community we serve is tired, stressed and scared. As a community health centre, we look forward to improving resources to support people who use drugs, but for this, we really need your hope. Nine Circles supports this motion not because we expect the City to assume the responsibilities held by the Provincial or Federal Government. I'm confident that there is enough support out there in the community, charitable, private sector and in the federal environment to allow Winnipeg to provide that full range of services that we need to save lives. What is preventing us from moving forward right now? We're on the front lines through an opioid crisis, crystal meth and now COVID, it's a lot. We don't have the capacity to review federal and provincial legislation, complete jurisdictional scans, consult stakeholders and funders on our own. We can bring forward the voice of people with lived experience, but we need your leadership to assist in opening the door to meaningful discussions between community leaders and potential funders. There are resources out there that we can't engage right now because of the environment we're in. And this simple motion could allow us to move forward to explore all of those options. So, in supporting this motion, you can also trust that Nine Circles and our sister agencies will help take the lead so that we can all do better and save lives. Thank you for the opportunity to present that.

Madam Speaker: Questions? Any questions? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, thank you for your presentation on safe consumption sites. And I'm just wondering if you've had any chance to do some data research with respect to, especially this pandemic, and since the closing of our borders interprovincially, and the I guess the difference in the drug of choice for individuals, whether that has resulted in the rise of opioids being introduced into whatever drugs that are being consumed currently locally? And whether you've had a chance to get or receive data and analyze data in other jurisdictions with respect to similar rises in the use of naloxone for those purposes?

Shohan Illsley: Thank you. Madam Speaker, I'll start with that and then I'm sure Mike can comment as well. There…we have not received any formal data about change in substance use, but we have been told by both people who use drugs as well as other organizations that provide services to people who use drugs, that there has been a change and influx…or sorry, a change and disruption of drug availability during the pandemic due to many of those public health measures including border closures. It of course has not resulted in people not using substances. It has resulted in people finding alternative substances to use. And so, I just received data from the CME's office yesterday, which I have not had a chance to look at, but that is some pretty strong data that will provide insight into what substances people have been dying of. The early data released by the CME was that there was a significant relationship to opioids, of course, which is what we've seen across the country. So, we're in the process of just trying to look through some of that data, but there hasn't been a formal study done to look at the changes in substance use. But what we can say is that since 2016 our opioid related deaths have increased and that, you know, is related specifically to fentanyl and some carfentanil in the early rise of it. And I'll turn it over to Mike to see if he has anything to add.

Michael Payne: All I would add to that, and again, to the motion is, it is difficult for organizations like ours to get access to the data that Shohan is referring to. We get it late and we're not well resourced to do the kind of analysis that we want to do to be able to do a…be able to build a quicker response. And that's part of the reason why we're supportive of this motion today.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you very much. Just a follow up question, you saw yesterday the Winnipeg Police Service in tandem with other agencies produced one of the largest drug busts in Winnipeg's history. Over $11 million between two provinces in asset seizures, $4.6 million in local seizures. There was quite a large amount of cocaine that was disrupted in terms of its flow on to our streets. And again, from what we're hearing is that cocaine is being used, it's being cut with other dirty drugs so to speak, and again, entering into our streets. In terms of the safe consumption site, what processes would be engaged to help people, you know, be guarded from these dirty drugs as well as, you know, potential opportunities to help wean them off drugs all together?

Michael Payne: Maybe Shohan, I'll start us and then hand it to you, because you'll better answer that piece. One thing that is really important for people to understand is, is there is not one way of delivering safe consumption services. And part of why this motion is important is there is a wide range of the way that people are implementing this across the country and across North America. So, it's important not to be assuming or envisioning a standalone, one fixed site that is managing all of this. There is a number of ways to do this. And part of what we want to figure out is, what are the best ways to implement these services in the City of Winnipeg that will make the most sense primarily to people who use drugs and also then to the service providers and communities that are impacted by what is happening right now. So, I just want to make sure that we're clear about that. Shohan, I'll hand it over to you.

Shohan Illsley: Great. So, your question, Councillor Chambers, was what kinds of things will be available at a safe consumption service to address some of that. And one of the things we…like Mike said, it will be a process to figure out what needs to be there, but I do want to note that we hope to have drug testing there, so people can test their drugs before they actually use them, so they know exactly what they are using and they can make decisions accordingly. Also important to note is, at safe consumption sites there is access…direct access to health care services, and so folks will immediately…in the event that they do overdose, they will be able to respond immediately. And to just note some of the evidence around that, when the safe injection site in Vancouver opened up in the very first year, there was a decrease of 30% for overdose numbers in the immediate area surrounding the site. So, it had an immediate impact on preventing death. And then, I think the other thing I will just add is that the hopes of this review and being able to see what other sites have done will allow us to look at what other services need to be available at a safe consumption site. So many sites have supports around substance use, so addiction services and recovery services as well as direct linkage into detox and into treatment programs. And so, this review will help us inform what that could look like here in Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Mr. Mayor. Yes.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I just want to thank both of you and your teams for the work that you're doing on behalf of our community. I know it's not easy work and it's incredibly important. I'll be supporting the motion later today and I'll articulate my reasons for supporting it at that time. I do have a couple of questions. Firstly, this is an area that is primarily provincial jurisdiction when you're talking about health, mental health, addictions, many of the related issues which we know are complex and interrelated for individuals on a case by case basis. I'm just wondering if you can share with us if you've been afforded the opportunity to speak directly to the Premier or the Health Minister about these matters and, if so, what feedback you could share with us for our information.

Shohan Illsley: Who wants to start? Mike, do you want to start?

Michael Payne: I can start by saying, I have not been afforded that opportunity to speak to them. So, I hand it over to you.

Shohan Illsley: I also have not been afforded that opportunity. But what I will say is, in 2018, we did a bit of a needs assessment here in the city. We did a report on safe consumption services and kind of an early assessment of what that could look like. That was provided to the Premier and the Premier, to the best of my recollection, put that paper on the floor and said it was not done by the experts. And so, it didn't actually go anywhere there. What I will also say, is that I just had an invite and a meeting with Minister Gordon who is the new Minister of Mental Health, Wellness and Recovery. And we did not get a chance to speak about safe consumption. It was a very early meeting, but our hope is that her requesting a meeting with us shows some support for harm reduction initiatives. What that looks like, I can't speak to.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Sure. I'll just have one other question. Mr. Payne, you referenced businesses leaning in a little bit more, I'm just wondering if you could expand on that, please?

Michael Payne: Yeah, particularly here in West Broadway, I'll say that, you know, early in particularly the emerging of crystal meth, there was a lot of conflict that started to emerge in the West Broadway community amongst Nine Circles, the high school that is right next to us, some of the local businesses. Not really directed at each other, but just really great concern about what was happening and a nervousness about how to properly respond to it. And we had the opportunity to work with the West Broadway Alliance and other partners to have a number of forums where we came together and talked…spoke about what we were all experiencing and have really been able to come to a common ground where local businesses and local residents, the high school next door, are all really wonderfully understanding that this is a wellness issue. This is a social equity issue. And while there is a sense of nervousness around safety, the strategy to that is to lean in and support the human beings that are struggling right now. So local businesses and community agencies will contact each other to do check-ins when there is someone present around their space and they're not sure what to do. Before we phone the Winnipeg Police, we talk to each other and try to bring…

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

Michael Payne: And you'll know…you may know, there was recently a study released now that the crystal meth study for West Broadway where businesses and residents and local agencies have a common strategy of how they want to start to work together more meaningfully to properly support the folks in this community who need it most. And again, this motion opens up some doorways for us to explore a whole range of what those interventions may look like.

Shohan Illsley: Madam Speaker, if I can also just add to that. The West Broadway BIZ also is a stakeholder in the Winnipeg Harm Reduction Network. And I'd just like to note that the businesses in West Broadway are absolutely looking to come up with some really great solutions. And we will…actually, they requested harm reduction training for the businesses, which we will be providing on Monday. So, their hope is to figure out a balance between social responsibility in the neighbourhood and conducting their businesses.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you very much for your presentation today. I just wanted to ask you a little bit if you know at all about managed alcohol programs and how that can help individuals and improve the outcomes here for many Winnipeggers?

Shohan Illsley: Yeah. I can start that. Managed alcohol is, of course, along the continuum of safer consumption services. And there has been a lot of research in other places in Canada around managed alcohol. We don't have local data here. We're just working…through COVID, there has been two managed alcohol programs implemented through the Indigenous Response. And we are working with folks running that program as well as the Province to start to look at what kind of data we want to collect locally. Anecdotally, we are getting quick information back from the folks…

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

Shohan Illsley: Folks who are conducting those programs or are overseeing those programs, that they're getting great uptake and support from community. And they're seeing some really quick outcomes like people returning to work who haven't worked in a long time due to their engagement in the managed alcohol program. But our hope is that moving forward, we're just in a process to start to evaluate those.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. And for my second question, I just want to talk…I want you to kind of talk about why isn't important for the City to take this step? I know you're probably going to hear lots of councillor colleagues saying this is not the responsibility of the City. I know that you mentioned it before. Why is it important that the City start to get this conversation going?

Michael Payne: I'll start just honestly by saying because the community agencies that are trying to do good work in your communities throughout the city are struggling and they need help. Because this is an issue at the end of the day that lands on my doorstep and your doorstep in terms of folks who live in this…in our communities, wanting to see a different kind of response. As I mentioned before, there is a range of community agencies and networks who are happy to lead that response, but we just don't have a political environment where we're able to explore all of the options that we need to explore. And as I mentioned before, I'm confident that there's actually resources, financial resources, still on the table that we can't access as a result of that. We recognize that at the moment, although that is hopefully shifting, the Provincial Government is not there yet. But the Federal Government is there and there are other sectors in the private sector, in the charitable sector, that can get there with us. We just need, partially because of the fact that the report Shohan spoke to, was dismissed because it lacked experts' involvement, we need that expertise to partner with us so that we can make sure that the next report that comes forward is heard more clearly and really taken more seriously and we believe the City can help us to do that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer moves further extension. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Okay. Councillor Gilroy, nothing further? Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Listening to the response from Nine Circles, I do have a question going back to them specifically about financial resources and charitable giving. I believe they're a registered charity if I understand the Federal Government correctly. And I do understand that between the years of…taxable years of 2015 to 2019, they went from $4.2 million to nearly $4.9 million in government investment, $700,000 increase in that. Could they explain which level of government increased their funding and what the breakdown is?

Michael Payne: Yes. So, the majority of Nine Circles core funding, our primary care services, our direct clientele services come from the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority. So, that's provincial money that flows through the region to us. And then we also get…are very lucky to often receive grant funding, the majority of that comes through the Federal Government, either through Health Canada calls or Public Health Agency of Canada calls. And those increases and decreases that you'll see, that generally refers to term, time-limited federal grants that we've received. And that was certainly reflective in that increase as well. Specifically, that increased funding was to pilot efforts to bring a more robust safer sex and safer drug use supply program into Nine Circles to do dissemination, distribution of resources, education and intervention, one on one with people who were accessing those to explore our ability to not only get supplies out to people who need them, but work to integrate a relationship so that people will eventually use STBBI testing services and

primary care services where that population wasn't consistently reaching out before. It was really successful. And successful enough that the region has supported us to integrate that program into our permanent (inaudible) programming going forward. So, there is lots of examples of where we've had short term opportunities to prove what works…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Payne. We'll just have to pause. Our clock has run out. Councillor Rollins moves a further extension of two minutes. We do have some other questions for you as well, Mr. Payne. If you'd like to continue with your answer or I think you've provided it.

Michael Payne: That's my answer, yes.

Madam Speaker: Yes, thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you for that response. I appreciate that. So, just to understand that the Province and Federal Government are at the table. When I heard earlier in the delegation about increased naloxone use, is that…is the rapid increase because of the type of drugs that are being used resulting in more applications being used per incident?

Michael Payne: Shohan, that sounds like yours.

Shohan Illsley: Yeah, so, the question was, is the increase a result of an increase in substance use?

Councillor Nason: Specific to the types of drugs being used and the ineffectiveness or lack of effectiveness of naloxone.

Shohan Illsley: So, no, naloxone is quite effective. What we're seeing is that, at one point in time…so, a little bit of background. So, folks used to access primarily oxycodone in order to meet their needs when it came to opiates and then oxycodone was taken off the market. And at that time, which coincides with the increase in overdose…in the overdose crisis, fentanyl showed up. And fentanyl was around before as a prescribed substance, but once oxycodone got taken off the market, fentanyl became street produced. And a street produced substance, of course, is not regulated in the same way as a prescribed fentanyl. And so, of course, folks just like when we walk into a liquor mart, we know exactly if we're getting a 5% alcohol or a 40% alcohol. When it comes to fentanyl right now or street produced opiates, we don't know. Folks do not know what they're getting. And so, really, it's…we talk a lot about substances being altered…or we talked a little bit about substances being altered with other things, but primarily, people are hoping to use an opiate and thinking they're using an opiate, but the potency of that opiate is quite high. That has been resulted…resulting in overdoses or drug poisoning. So, the increase is actually incidents. So, more people aren't necessarily using drugs, there's no evidence to suggest that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins moves further extension. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Shohan Illsley: The bit of evidence we have suggests that the actual opiates that are available are unknown. So, too strong for folks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Just a last kind of clarification. So, I guess a street term might be called down for the latest concoction that is out there. And so, is it accurate that NARCAN is not working on that?

Shohan Illsley: Not necessarily accurate. It's people are needing two, three, four doses sometimes. But the problem isn't so much that NARCAN is not working, the problem is that people who need it don't actually have NARCAN. And safety or availability to call 911 is unavailable. So, one of the public health measures in response to the pandemic is for people to isolate and stay alone, so more people are using substances alone than we would usually see. Often people will be using with other folks who would then call 911 if they were overdosing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I want to thank Nine Circles and Harm Reduction Manitoba for coming. Madam Speaker, my questions have been asked by other speakers that came before me, so, in particular the leaning in that businesses are doing and the economic impact. So, I'd like to thank them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a few questions for our delegates this morning. And first, through you, I want to thank them for their efforts in our city. And I want to thank them for their hard work advocating to make even

more improvements in the community. But, you know, when we started this discussion and I saw this motion come out, I started doing some research of my own. Move for extension?

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

Councillor Klein: Started moving…started doing the…some research on this and I came across a report that was released not that long ago, several months ago by Alberta Health. As we know, there is a number of safe injection sites in Alberta. They conducted a survey with first responders, with business owners and with residents in select areas and a very thorough report, I might add, with…in conjunction with the two universities; University of Alberta and University of Calgary. And I'm wondering if our delegate was aware that businesses in Calgary, Red Deer, Edmonton, overwhelmingly stated they felt a negative impact after safe consumption sites were opened. First responders to the tune of over 200% in Calgary said, after safe consumption sites opened, their daily roles were negatively impacted. My brother is a paramedic in Calgary, talks about that an awful lot. First responders reported and crime stats confirmed that in Calgary, in one year, there was 115% increase in crime in a 250-metre radius of safe consumption sites. So, location, location, location. And noted was there was no plan or discussion about meth because meth is unpredictable. Meth has, as we know, triggers different reaction in every person. And at times, can become fairly violent. And they felt that that was creating harms. There's many other reports in there. And I guess what I'm suggesting is, are we considering all the data with this motion? And are we reaching out to the right experts?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Back to the delegates to answer.

Michael Payne: I guess the first thing I would say, is the purpose of this motion is to, in fact, gather the information and do the analysis so that we can learn from all of that. Certainly, how you implement these types of services, I mentioned before, there is many different models. If you look in Ottawa and Toronto, they've had some interesting ways of integrating safe consumption into existing spaces where people are already going and people are already using. Look, here at Nine Circles, it is not uncommon, as I noted, people are using in my bathroom. They're using out in the parking lot. They're using over at their (inaudible) behind the cars and my staff are going out to try and engage them. This is already happening. It's about finding the proper places for people to connect and working with the community to help identify those appropriate places. And so, it sounds like there's parts in Alberta where that may not have been implemented as effectively as they hoped. Part of the purpose of this motion is for us to learn from that and to think about where the right places are. And at the end of the day, we want to reduce death. That's the goal. And we'll need to work with emergency services and all of those other players to find a way to do that in a fashion that supports community safety and doesn't exacerbate it. So, I understand that there is a negative tilt to that support…that particular report, and there is also lots of reports that bring out very positive outcomes. The goal here is to put all of that together, compare that to the Winnipeg landscape and then figure out what is the right next step for us. I'm not sure what else to say.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Payne, second question by Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Excellent, thank you very much for that, through you Madam Speaker, to Mr. Payne. I guess my final question then is, based on everything that he said, which I agree with, is the Public Service of Winnipeg the right group to be doing the research? Should we be reaching out to a different authority?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Payne, if you can answer that and we'll wrap up.

Michael Payne: Shohan, do you want to answer that?

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

Shohan Illsley: As far as, should we be asking somebody else to do the review or should that be the Public Service responsibility? I think what I will share is that the City of Winnipeg is a stakeholder in this. Just like where every other location that there has been safe consumption services, the cities, they're primarily all urban. And the cities have always been a stakeholder. So, we would hope that there would be commitment from Public Service to participate in this or potentially move this motion to lead reviewing this, but we know that there will be a lot of folks who will be engaged in that. So, although folks will…you folks will hopefully motion it to move it forward, there is a lot of us in the community that would like to participate in that as well.

Michael Payne: And as mentioned before, Shohan and I and other partner entities can support the City, not just wait for them, but actively support in making sure that this is an effective process and lead it together as much as you need us to do that.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Any further questions from Council?

Councillor Klein: No ma'am, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Seeing none, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Chambers did ask about issues like dirty drugs. In my case, I'm concerned about, as we've mentioned already today, the issue of fentanyl and its potency and its incredible relative potency which unto itself is creating death through overdose. And I want to know, when it comes to things like dirty drugs or the…just the strength in this era of drugs like fentanyl, if there is…we're in a zone of discomfort, let's face it. But while they're there at a safe consumption site, is there an opportunity for, as uncomfortable as this is, education from preferring one drug to another? So, getting people off the drug most likely to kill them through an overdose and less controllable like fentanyl?

Shohan Illsley: Yeah, I could speak to that.

Madam Speaker: The clock is…excuse me. Just one moment. We're going to pause. That really…our time is out. Councillor Schreyer, that was his first opportunity to ask a question. I just want to advise Council of that. There has been many speakers. Councillor Klein moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Shohan Illsley: Yeah, so during our opening, we, both Mike and I identified that harm reduction, of course, is along the continuum and has a really vast amount of opportunities and initiatives which absolutely includes education about risk when it comes to certain substances that folks are using. And sometimes it includes conversations about when and where and how to use your substances to be as safe as possible. I also mentioned drug testing which we would hope to have in those sites. And to also add, sometimes it's not necessarily about getting people to stop or reduce their use, but change their route of transmission. So, we know that injecting drugs is, of course, more potent and can lead to an overdose much quicker. And so, one of the things we've done, for example, with methamphetamines is we've started a pilot project with meth pipes so that people smoke their meth instead of injecting meth which, of course, is safer and reduces overconsumption of the substance.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Shohan Illsley: But that is just a few examples of the many pieces. And if you look at any safe consumption service, there is always discussion around substances that people are using and how to use them as safe as possible to prevent all the harms, including death.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And that brings our questions to a close, I believe. On behalf of Council, thank you for your presentation today.

Michael Payne: Thank you.

Shohan Illsley: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: We'll now move into reports. Mr. Mayor, on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 17th, 2021.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE DATED FEBRUARY 17, 2021

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of the consent agenda Items 1 through 11, Madam Speaker. And I would like to pull reports 4 and 9. I expect there will be others pulled.

Madam Speaker: So, just to reiterate, we've pulled 3 and 4, 8, 9, 10 and 11. So, I'll call the question. I'll call the question on Item 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7. There's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That passes unanimously. Madam Clerk, Item 3.

Item 3 – Winnipeg Committee for Safety – Contract Renewal for Committee Coordinator

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, to introduce the item.

Mayor Bowman: You know what, I'll wait to hear from my council colleagues, but I do want to just thank my council colleague, Councillor Santos and others on the Winnipeg Committee for Safety for their ongoing leadership.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any speakers on Item 3?

Councillor Klein: Speaker, so I will…just give me two seconds while the documents come up on my computer.

Madam Speaker: Any other speakers following that? Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: No, I'll go after you.

Madam Speaker: Yeah, I'm just making my list. Want to keep everything moving. Got a big day ahead. That's fine. Any further speakers? And Councillor Klein, we can proceed with Councillor Gilroy or if your ready? Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I want to thank…I would like to thank Crystal Van Den Bussche for her many years of service on the Winnipeg Committee for Safety. You know, it is unfortunate that we don't change the payroll structure. The slight increase will be very, very helpful as she works on two committees, one she doesn't actually get paid for, it's the Winnipeg Safe Cities Committee. So, she's actually doing a lot of free work for the City. This is also within existing budget, so this isn't going over any budgets. It's just within the existing Winnipeg for Safety Committee budget. And it has been done before on other occasions. I know Councillor Eadie was very supportive of the Access Coordinator at the time making sure that they bump up the salary a little bit because the salary is quite low. So, I just want to say that I'm in support of that item. And I want to thank the committee and Crystal Van Den Bussche and our new Chair, Councillor Santos, for all the work that they're doing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you, I apologize to my colleagues, I'm having a technical error, so I've gone to a different computer. You know, it's a challenging motion to support. And, again, it's one of the fundamental issues that I think we have within this chamber, is some information that is missing and some questions that are not really addressed when we prepare these motions. First and foremost, I believe this level of government has drastically reduced services to residents, but not staffing levels over the last several years. And I struggle to understand why this work could not be reallocated to a different staff member. I also don't believe any other level of government provides a 10% salary increase like we're suggesting here. This would be a 10% salary increase during a time when businesses, community centres and other not-for-profits are asking for support. Last year, this government also provided a 5% increase for this role. So, in two years, that's 15%. And the fundamental issue I have with that is that this government is inconsistent with the decisions we make. Most salary increases are negotiated and on average they're between 2 and 2.5%. Residents want a government that carefully spends their money. And I have an issue with that type of an increase and I have an issue that we hadn't reviewed such a position to see if we had available staff internally that we could reallocate to that resource.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The coordinators, Madam Speaker, that we employ, for example, we have an employee who are…actually, I don't even…it's a contractual agreement. The Human Rights Committee, we have a coordinator and I believe that coordinator got a commensurate raise with the extra level of work that would be required by combining a couple of advisory committees, Madam Speaker, into one portfolio, which was a good idea, Mayor. But ultimately, with the Safe City Committee, I had a motion and I think it's proceeding, we'll see some stuff I guess in the future as Councillor Gilroy pointed out, that the mandate, Madam Speaker, of this particular committee in which this 10%

raise is being given, the responsibilities from when…actually, I was involved on another advisory committee at the time that this Safe City one was created. And at the time, the scope of the work, the terms of reference for these committees have changed over the years, Madam Speaker. And so, I believe that this 10% raise…and quite often with these advisory committee contractors that we hire, they don't see a raise for a long time. And so, ultimately, a 10% increase, I believe, is commensurate with the amount of workload and responsibility that this person has. And ultimately, you know, I haven't done the research, Madam Speaker, but to find out where, at what point that contract was raised in terms of remuneration, I don't know. Anyway, Madam Speaker, I'll be supporting this report. I don't think it should be held in context to COVID and all the struggles. As a matter of fact, the work of this committee probably has gotten much more…much more to do in terms of trying to assist that committee to provide the advice that the city needs to move forward in regards to its terms of reference. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? Or Councillor Rollins, yes.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, thank you. I couldn't have said it better than Councillor Eadie. What is being characterized, Madam Speaker, as a 10% raise, I think is really an accounting of increased hours due to UN Safe City Work and the committee work of…that Councillor Santos now chairs, and which was found in the Winnipeg Committee for Safety report…annual report, that really has expanded. So, I think it's an improper clarification that it is coined a raise when it really is as Councillor Eadie describes, Madam Speaker, you know, a broader…a broader coordination effort for this coordinator.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Councillor Klein's concerns are legit. This is the way we have to look at it. In this case, I'm hoping to respond to Councillor Klein's question in greater context of what has already been said by Councillor Eadie and Councillor Rollins. That is my understanding as well is that it hasn't been a 10% increase every year. So, this is sort of making up for increased workload as well as it…just given the nature of the contract and how it started, and it's sort of a new position, relatively new position, therefore, there is still concerned consideration in terms of what the salary should be, what the contract should be. And, therefore, in terms of a single year, yeah, it does look high. And Councillor Klein definitely, you know, is deserving of that response. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'll be supporting this and would encourage my council colleagues to support it as well. I would also just, as I mentioned earlier, I want to support the efforts of the Winnipeg Committee for Safety. What I appreciate is the engagement with the community, engagement with volunteers in helping address also the root causes of crime. I would argue if Councillor Klein is looking for consistency, I appreciate the approach of as there are salary increases looking for savings within. I would encourage him to take that approach with respect to police salary increases when we turn our attention later this year to the police budget funding formula. This is something I know he didn't support in terms of the budget recommendation. I think that there are going to be some ways in which this council can turn its attention to how we manage the increasing police budget. I'm certainly not arguing for that position, but if we want to be consistent, let's be consistent when we're also talking about the Winnipeg Police Service, Madam Speaker.

Councillor Klein: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I don't recall saying or seeing anything in the police budget that the Mayor is referring to.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, it's not in order at this time. Thank you. Thank you. No speakers. That was the close. And I would like to call the question on Item 3. 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, Lukes, Mayes, Nason, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillor Klein

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 3 passes.

Item 4 – Amendment to the Council Policy on Citizen Appointments to Boards and Commissions

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is…I think this is a really progressive move and I'm really proud that we're voting on this. I think this is a historic and a progressive step forward to trying to really include more Winnipeggers in our appointments to boards and commissions. As members of Council will know, Madam Speaker, historically, the City of Winnipeg has required individuals be Canadian citizens before they are allowed to serve as citizen appointees to City boards and commissions. This is a way in which we can really open the doors to individuals who aren't Canadian citizens to participate in local democracy. I want to recognize and I want to thank the work of so many community stakeholders, including those members of the…of Council's Human Rights Committee of Council. I want to thank my council colleague, Councillor Chambers, has supported this and has advocated for it at the Human Rights Committee of Council. This is one of several positive actions to come out of that Human Rights Committee of Council for this council's consideration. And I would encourage my council colleagues to support this.

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

Councillor Nason: It's a good thing we're at Council and everybody is sitting down because I'm going to say that I do support this. I heard the term "progressive" being used. I know from the time of going to, you know, 12, 13,000 doors during my campaign, knocking on many doors of new residents to our community, they are permanent residents in our community. On visitor visas or not visitor visas, but lots of people with visa status that own real property in our community that aren't able to participate in a lot of the things that affect them directly. Can't vote for school board. Can't vote for Council. Can't be on boards and commissions. It's something that, you know, talking to some of those, that as the Mayor has many times chastised me for in the conservative circles, that might be counter to some of that dialogue. But from an inclusion perspective, I see this as a right thing, because to have them to have a voice in some of the things that affect them greatly, I think it is a good step forward and one that I will support. And I don't think we're going quite far enough. And perhaps we can do some additional work together to get those voices more so when we come around time for election. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And this one will, I hope, I think it's going to be unanimous. I really appreciate this in that giving a voice on our various boards and commissions, Madam Speaker, I think is very essential. And my colleague mentioned his first city campaign, Madam Speaker, but since 1998, I knocked on almost every door north of…well, actually…anyway, I won't get into it, 100…over 100,000 doors I've knocked on. And Madam Speaker, I quite often run into permanent residents who, you know, are putting in their time, they're going to apply, they're going to become citizens. They actually have the right to buy a home. They can buy a home, but they can't vote? So, I hope that our decision here will also send a message that maybe there needs to be a change to the Municipal Elections Act that states that permanent residents would get to vote. Because, Madam Speaker, ultimately, as I always explain to the people, and they're always shocked because I guess I don't know if some people have a different attitude but I always say, you know, like maybe you want to ask me questions because I'm going to be serving your area and serving you if I get elected. And if you have any questions, I think it's important that you express any concerns you have at the City level, for example, our…I've run provincially and I've run federally. So, in speaking to them. So, Madam Speaker, I really appreciate that we, as Council, are doing this. And, yeah, it's great to give people a voice and maybe the letter will…maybe we could…maybe the Mayor could brag about Winnipeg to the Province so that they look at giving a vote to permanent residents. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Just looking at the hour, shall we recess? We need to unless there is a motion. Or we can continue, just finish this item first? Shall we do that? Okay. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to echo the Mayor's comments, Councillor Eadie's comments and even Councillor Nason's comments, thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Just pause for a moment. Councillor Eadie, do you move the motion that we continue with this item and then recess following?

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I do.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you. And I also want to take the time to acknowledge the efforts of my co-colleague, I guess, on the Human Rights Committee of Council, Aly Raposo who has done some great work in this regard in getting this motion forward. She was so excited and had, you know, put it out on her social media about what this represents. And about diversifying our boards and the commitment of the City of Winnipeg to do that through strengthening its efforts by allowing individuals who are not Canadian citizens, but permanent residents of Canada to sit on boards in this municipality. Over the last couple of weeks, months now, I've been consulted by various stakeholder groups, whether the arts community or different social agencies, about how they can diversify their boards and get more information from individuals that are racialized and their lived experience that can have an impact on the governance and engagement that board representation provides. It's more a process, Madam Speaker, of making sure that there is some rigour around selection of an individual, and not just opening up a board seat to identify that you have diversity. Or as we call, tokenism. It is about meritocracy that you're looking at the merits of that individual and the fact that they have that lived experience that can provide that information on that board that helps to improve the services that are being delivered through the citizens of Winnipeg, a very multicultural and diverse population here locally. So, I'm really glad with what this motion represents. I'm glad for Aly who has worked hard on this and her…the other members of that subcommittee as they brought it through the Human Rights Committee of Council, as we've approved it, as it's gone to EPC and now here in front of us. I'm really excited at what this represents and I think it's great leadership for our city to consider this and I'm hoping that municipalities around this province and across this nation will also consider this as a pioneering type of motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. And with that, Mr. Mayor to close or I can call the question. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 4 passes. We'll now have a recess and reconvene at 1:15 sharp. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 25, 2021, at 1:21 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of February 25th, 2021. We're on Item 8 of the Executive Policy Committee report. Madam Clerk, Item 8.

Item 8 – Contribution Agreement between the Government of Manitoba (Manitoba Justice) and The City of Winnipeg for the Construction of Cells within the Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters

Madam Speaker: And noting we have an amending Motion 7 that goes with this item. Mr. Mayor, to introduce the main item and then over to Councillor Rollins.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you Madam Speaker, and welcome back, everyone. I'm going to be brief in my opening comments and may have more to add afterwards. I want to just say…I want to voice a concern in which…the manner in which the Provincial Government made this decision which has impacted the operations and the finances of the Winnipeg Police Service. I will be supporting this. Obviously, $3.5 million from the Province for the construction of new holding cells and modification of existing holding cells is warranted given their decision, but I do share the concerns that the Chief of Police has raised concerning the protection of human rights for prisoners. I think there will be obviously more dialogue on this between officials and certainly here today, and I look forward to hearing from my council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Rollins, to speak to amending Motion 7 and the main item.

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

WHEREAS Winnipeg Police Service has presented a report to council of seeking authorization to enter into a $3.25Million dollar contribution agreement for the capital costs of the Service's Central Processing Unit (CPU) at Police Headquarters and indicating that no further funding will be provided by Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) must fulfill its responsibilities as an arresting agency in a manner that ensures the safety of all persons who come into conflict with the law, including the provision of appropriate medical care;

AND WHEREAS the budget impacts of the termination of direct lock-ups to the WPS or the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service (WFPS) have not yet been identified, analyzed, or forecast for future fiscal years;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 8 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 17, 2021 be amended by deleting Recommendation 5 and replacing with the following:

"5. That the Chief Financial Officer be directed to consult with the Winnipeg Police Service and report back on the budget impacts of the termination of direct lock-ups and establishment of the Central Processing Unit at Police Headquarters, including budgetary impacts on related departments such as Municipal Accommodations and the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service, and to report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance in 60 days."

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, want to express my report for Item 8 – the Contribution Agreement between the Government of Manitoba, Manitoba Justice and the City of Winnipeg for the Construction of Cells within the Police Service Headquarters. I do have an amending motion. That is to Recommendation No. 5, that the Chief Financial Officer be directed to consult with the Winnipeg Police Service and report back on the budget impacts of determination of direct lockups, and establishment of the Central Processing Unit at police headquarters including budgetary impacts on related departments such as Municipal Accommodations and the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service, and to report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance in 60 days. This has been a discussion from Finance to Executive Policy Committee and now here today, Madam Speaker, that the Winnipeg Police Service presented us with a report to Council seeking authorization to enter into the $3.25 million contribution agreement for capital costs and the service's Central Processing Unit at police headquarters and indicating that no further funding will be provided by Manitoba is a fact that they lay out in their report in terms of page 5 of this report. And Madam Speaker, that the Winnipeg Police Service must fulfill its responsibilities as an arresting agency in a manner that ensures the safety of all persons is a fact, including as Mayor states it, upholding human rights with respect to detainees. And you know, that's why we need to pass this today, Madam Speaker. The budget impacts of the termination of direct lockups, that practise called direct lockups to the Winnipeg Police Service or the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service have not yet been identified, analyzed or forecasted for future fiscal years. That, too, can be found in this report and this amending motion covers that off. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today in…to speak to the amending motion that was provided by my council colleague, Councillor Rollins with respect to the updates…or upgrading of the Central Processing Unit at police headquarters. Of course, the COVID pandemic has resulted in changes to operations at the CPU, but more specifically, it is a practice now that is consistent across other jurisdictions where detainees are held for longer periods of time before they are…go in front of a justice to have their matter heard. This $3.2 million…$3.5 million that is being provided by the Provincial Government is only for the capital costs of renovating the Central Processing Unit, addition of cells, bathrooms, private rooms, so that detainees can have video conferencing with their lawyers and representatives. It does provide for a medical room that will…you know, for individuals that come in either injured or feeling ill. It will be staffed by a paramedic. And again, this is practice that is consistent across other jurisdictions and I believe also in Brandon. So, in terms of the operating costs, there will be no additional operating costs for Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. The paramedic that will be brought over to facilitate this service will be absorbed by the Winnipeg Police Service within the Winnipeg Police Service budget. The additional costs such as hygiene products, toothbrushes, changes of clothes, things like that, are all part of what would be going forward in the Winnipeg Police Service budget. They already have the staffing there for…in terms of the Central Processing Unit to accommodate the length of stay individuals will be now required before they see a justice. I believe that is all, you know, in terms of, again, it now being a consistent practice with other jurisdictions. So, I'm supportive of the original motion. I don't know what the amending motion seeks to do. These all will be taken care of within the Winnipeg Police Service budget as it is a practice that, as I said, is consistent with other jurisdictions across the country.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers, thank you. Councillor Klein, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I'm going to echo a number of comments that my colleague Councillor Chambers has just made and add a few if I can. This is the practice across Canada. This is the practice in Brandon and has been for many, many years. That aside, I'm supportive of the first motion, but the amending motion, I have a particular concern with because we're driving into a different lane here yet again because when it comes to budgetary matters and questions of the budget, that is under the authority and jurisdiction of the Winnipeg Police Board and is not under the direction of the Chief Financial Officer of the City of Winnipeg. So, I would suggest that had this been written in a sense that you would have the Winnipeg Police Board report back, that would be certainly something that was acceptable, but directing it and, you know, going over the Winnipeg Police Board and ignoring their powers and authorities is just not allowed. And we're simply doing that on this motion. So, I would be supportive of the first one, but not the second one. And I'll note, over a year ago, police and the city were informed that this was coming because it is a change that matches all other jurisdictions in the country.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker. And I rise in support of, actually, both reports. I just, Madam Speaker, want to speak at, you know, this whole level of concern around the Central Processing Unit is interesting in that early on in the operations and identifying how to design this in the police headquarters, I'm not going to get into detail on it, but one of the important things was the way it was designed wasn't to operate like other places where there was long waits and all kinds of problems which were costing the Police Service money, Madam Speaker. So, when the new police headquarters was designed and devised, it was built in a certain fashion to deal with, you know, expected loads and demands for what I would call crime intake is basically what it's about. And Madam Speaker, it sounds like COVID has made this worse, but I think one of the problems is how many people we have to work with and, you know, the idea was to move people through the system quicker. You know, to respect actually their rights. And so, it seems to me now that there is a loss from that innovation and we're having to move to a setup like many other places across the country in order to deal with it respectfully because you're not guilty until found guilty in the court of law. So, anyway, Madam Speaker, I support though…ultimately the savings that the Police Service was realizing as a result of the new way of utilizing a Central Processing Unit. You know, it was based on allocation through the Police Board, which is the responsibility of the Police Board with the Police Services, how do we allocate the overall budget of the city? But I really…don't really have a problem with the CFO going through and working with the Winnipeg Police Services Controller to figure out what these additional operating costs mean. And ultimately, it's part of the whole justice system in order to proceed. So, like, I don't have a…I personally, I believe in the Police Board and I think they should have a much bigger role, but ultimately, they're going to try to examine all the costs and this is going to have an effect on how budgets get allocated in '22 I would imagine because I'm not quite sure how long it will take for them to get the capital dollars spent and everything done properly. But anyway, Madam Speaker, a serious issue that we need to deal with, and it is an essential component of the whole justice system and moving things along properly. I don't know how many…you know, in the news I've heard of people in custody having medical things and dying. And you know, Madam Speaker, we don't want that. We don't want that. So, we're going to have to figure out a way. And I think the way is figured out, we just have to associate all the costs to figure out where the money is coming from. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to rise to indicate I'll certainly be supporting this report and the amending motion. I want to thank Councillor Rollins for the amending motion. Just to be clear, the amending motion in no way slows down the establishment of this capital project, allowing this capital project to go ahead. In no way does it kind of slow down 1, 2, 3 or 4 within the recommendations. And further, it's not outside the scope of Council to request budget impact information. That's not solely in the purview of the Winnipeg Police Board. This doesn't…the Winnipeg Police Board is the one that allocates the Police Service's budget, it's Council that sets it. So, to get information back to Council so that we can understand as the decision-making body what the budgetary impacts may be on the Winnipeg Police Service is completely within our purview and not solely within the purview of the Winnipeg Police Board. On a regular basis, on a quarterly basis, the Winnipeg Police Service reports to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and they present, you know, kind of their update on their budget and how their budget is being allocated and the amounts that are being allocated. So, there is a regular reporting mechanism that's put in place through the Police Board, but then ultimately to Standing Policy Committee on Finance. So, this is more like an extension of that. It's simply asking for the budgetary impacts of this…of this new…new arrangement. There will be ongoing operational impacts. We want to get an understanding of what those may be. Again, it's not allocating the budget, it's simply getting the information to understand what the budgetary impacts will be.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I heard two of my council colleagues raise questions, well, one raised the question about appropriateness of directing this to the Winnipeg Police Service versus the Winnipeg Police Board and a counterpoint saying it is within order. I would like to hear from the Chief Administrative Officer on this.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, do you have a time sensitive question?

Councillor Nason: Well, it's one of two things; lay the matter over or get the questions.

Madam Speaker: So, you're seeking clarification?

Councillor Nason: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Clerk, is there…do you have any comment on that? We certainly have called Mr. Ruta up and given him the opportunity. But again, you're seeking clarification on this time sensitive matter. Mr. Ruta, if you could please come forward?

Councillor Rollins: Councillor Nason is asking a question that is more appropriately answered by Madam Speaker and the Chair and the Clerks. If the amending motion and the motion is in order, Madam Speaker…

Madam Speaker: Can you restate your question, Councillor Nason? Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Nason: Well, I may have subsequent questions, but my first one is, is it appropriate for the Chief Financial Officer to be consulting with the Winnipeg Police Service versus the Winnipeg Police Board?

Councillor Chambers: Point of order, Madam Clerk. I'm wondering if this amending motion could be further amended so that it goes through the Winnipeg Police Board to ask these questions through that process.

Madam Speaker: Certainly, you can, but we need to circulate it. It needs to be in writing.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, just…that is not a friendly amendment. I will note that within the administrative report before us, there is municipal accommodations costs as well as costs to the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service, that's why the motion points to the Chief Financial Officer.

Madam Speaker: Okay, yeah. We're just going to take a pause.

Councillor Klein: Point of order. Just a point of order before we do, Madam Speaker. Reading from the Manitoba Police Services Act, which we are bound by, a…it states quite clearly here, Police Board, the purpose of the Police Board is to provide civilian government…governance which we're all aware of and such. The administration…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein,

Councillor Klein: But this is important.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, we are aware of the document.

Councillor Klein: No, we're not because we heard earlier that this is within the jurisdiction of the City Council.

Madam Speaker: You can finish and then I'm going to seek my own clarification with the Clerk. Please wrap it up. Thank you. Okay. Thank you for that pause. The motion is in order. It's up to Council to decide the appropriateness of when you vote on the motion. But Councillor Nason, I will allow one question to seek clarification from the CAO. If we can…you can please come down, Mr. Ruta. If you wish to proceed with that, Councillor Nason. Okay.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, is there a reason why (inaudible)

Madam Speaker: The motion is in order as I've said. And to know if it's appropriate or not, I mean, that's your vote when you cast it. So, you're seeking clarification from the CAO, so ask your long-winded question, how's that? Okay. Councillor Chambers, are we expecting an amendment possibly? Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Ruta, good afternoon.

Mike Ruta: Madam Speaker.

Councillor Nason: If I may proceed, Madam Speaker? Sorry for the long walk, Mr. Ruta, but the motion before us today has that the Chief Financial Officers be directed to consult with the Winnipeg Police Service and report back. In your, you know, history, you've also been the former Chief Financial Officer, is that the authorized approach based on the, I believe it's the Manitoba Police Act? Police Services Act, thank you.

Michael Ruta: Madam Speaker and councillor, thank you for your question. Unfortunately, I wouldn't be able to comment on the Police Act and would have to refer back to it, but generally, as a comment, the CFO of the City of Winnipeg has overreaching or overarching responsibility for the financial results of the City of Winnipeg. We do have a very strong working relationship with the Winnipeg Police Service and in doing so understanding that they have direct responsibility to report to the board. We still have that working relationship with the controller, with the chief, and many people in that organization. So, this type of information in terms of how it's built into the budget is…we would be dealing on a cooperative basis and trying to obtain information from the Police Board…or not, sorry, the Police Association, the Winnipeg Police Service. And also, because there's other departments that are part of this motion, which includes the municipal accommodations of the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service, the request is, as well, for the CFO to accumulate information from those entities as well, or departments or divisions, so that we can have a collective understanding of what the costs are. So personally, on just a strictly a working relationship basis, I'm quite happy with the motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Ruta. Appreciate your time. Follow-up question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I was wondering if the interim CAO knew that in that Police Services Act and regulations following it says that the Winnipeg Police Board and the Winnipeg Police Service need to follow the City of Winnipeg's administrative processes. Was the interim CAO aware of that?

Mike Ruta: Yes, I am, Councillor Eadie, of course. And I understand that is in fact the case. But also understand and respect the relationship and the reporting relationship to the Police Board. So, at some point it's possible that the chief and also the CFO might participate in that kind of discussion with the Police Board as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Ruta. Thank you for your time. Moving on, Councillor Nason, do you wish to continue with speaking time or we can move on and come back?

Councillor Nason: I'll defer at the moment.

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

Councillor Klein: Just have a motion that will become an amending motion.

Madam Speaker: Yeah. Okay, any other speakers? We're going to circulate an amending motion right away…momentarily. And then, of course, that opens up the floor for anyone to speak once again. Yes. Mr. Clerk…Madam Clerk, could someone read the motion and the number into the record, please? Take your time. I'm sure you're trying to print it here and so on. Thank you.

Clerk: Therefore be it resolved that Item 8 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 17th, 2021 be amended by deleting Recommendation 5 and replacing with the following: that the Winnipeg Police Board be requested to consult with the Winnipeg Police Service and report back on the budget impacts of the determination of direct lockups and establishment of the Central Processing Unit at the police headquarters including budgetary impacts on related departments such as Municipal Accommodations and the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance in 60 days.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And the mover and the seconder are?

Clerk: Apologies. Mover is Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Klein.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers, your opportunity to speak to the motion if you'd like.

Councillor Chambers: Yes. I just want to echo what both Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein had mentioned with respect to the role of the Winnipeg Police Board in…

Madam Speaker: Just…could I just take a pause. Mr. Clerk, is the motion being circulated? Copied? Okay. Okay, I'm going to take a short recess. We want that to come back up. I think they're at the copier on the lower level. Just if we could give…about five minutes, okay? Just to get that motion up here for everyone's benefit. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 25, 2021, at 1:53 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Reconvening our Council meeting of February 25th, 2021, just after a short recess. Councillor Chambers, we've circulated amending Motion 10 on Item 8 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee. And it's your opportunity to introduce the amending Motion 10 moved by yourself and seconded by Councillor Klein.

Motion No. 10
Moved by Councillor Chambers,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

WHEREAS Winnipeg Police Service has presented a report to council of seeking authorization to enter into a $3.25Million dollar contribution agreement for the capital costs of the Service's Central Processing Unit (CPU) at Police Headquarters and indicating that no further funding will be provided by Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) must fulfill its responsibilities as an arresting agency in a manner that ensures the safety of all persons who come into conflict with the law, including the provision of appropriate medical care;

AND WHEREAS the budget impacts of the termination of direct lock-ups to the WPS or the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service (WFPS) have not yet been identified, analyzed, or forecast for future fiscal years;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 8 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 17, 2021 be amended by deleting Recommendation 5 and replacing with the following:

"5. That the Winnipeg Police Board be requested to consult with the Winnipeg Police Service and report back on the budget impacts of the termination of direct lock-ups and establishment of the Central Processing Unit at Police Headquarters, including budgetary impacts on related departments such as Municipal Accommodations and the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service, and to report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance in 60 days."

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I've just…as I've indicated, added the Winnipeg Police Board that the…this process go through the Winnipeg Police Board as opposed to the Chief Financial Officer. I'm fully supportive of collaboration and communication back and forth, but I believe in terms of the Winnipeg…or sorry, the provincial…the Police Services Act, that this is the process that was established for this purpose.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? On any of the amending motions or the main item? Seeing none, Councillor Chambers, do you wish to close or I can move on?

Councillor Chambers: Yes, I'm just asking my council colleagues to respect the process that has been established through the Police Services Act so that the board can do its job in asking those questions and providing that information back to Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to close on the amending Motion 7.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, the Chief Financial Officer has a role and so does finance. And this is all this is. There is…the reality is is we have…we have a contribution agreement for capital costs before us and the budget impacts of the termination of direct lockups with respect to the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service has not yet been identified, analyzed or forecasted for future fiscal years. And the Chief Financial Officer in consultation with the Winnipeg Police Service, in consultation with Municipal Accommodations, in consultation with the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service is in a unique position to do that. This is…this is the kind of report that financees, as Councillor Gillingham, the coauthor of this amendment pointed out earlier, and as the report points out. And so, I think that, you know, this is the level of cooperation that the senior management team sees with chiefs, whether Chief Lane or Chief Smyth or whether department heads like John Kiernan, Cindy Fernandes. So, this is for the Chief Financial Officer simply to consult with the Winnipeg Police Service and other departments about the direct lockup establishing at the Central Processing Unit, and you know, the Finance Committee is the place to do that. And I think it's really important to have this kind of financial information. And to support the motion in addition to supporting the motion today because time is of the essence because we already have this business.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close on the item?

Mayor Bowman: I'll do my best, Madam Speaker. So, yeah, I know members of Council, myself included are reading these in real time and are doing our best. And I want to thank members of Council for their comments. The one thing I will acknowledge is the Police Services' efforts to-date as well as the Police Board who are represented by Councillor Mayes, Councillor Chambers, of course, as the Chair is doing outstanding work on behalf of Winnipeg as Chair of the Winnipeg Police Board. I would expect regardless of the vote today for increased dialogue and scrutiny as we've seen at the Police Board regarding this matter, and I want to thank my council colleague for that. I am…in absence of additional time for dialogue on this with my council colleagues, I'm going to defer to the commentary from our Clerks and our CAO and our Finance Chair and support motion…the original motion, Motion 7. But hope that there can be some dialogue and collaboration between councillors as well as, of course, the work I know will continue at the Police Board. And we'll be mindful going forward if the way in which I'm voting is carried out by Council, to see how we can work to ensure that the jurisdictional boundaries of the Police Board, as well as the various committees, notably Finance, can be respected.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And with that, we will be voting on the amending motions in reverse order. Thank you. We are first voting on Councillor Chambers' amending motion, Motion 10. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Amending Motion 10 passes. We'll now move on to amending Motion 7 that was moved by Councillor Rollins. All in favour? There is no recorded vote that was called. So, okay, all in favour, please rise. Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, do we move on from that vote? It's difficult to vote on both.

City Clerk: Both motions before Council are amending motions. Motion 10 did not amend Motion 7.

Madam Speaker: That's right.

City Clerk: But rather, amended the original one, so Council should vote on both amending motions.

Madam Speaker: And then as amended for the final.

City Clerk: Correct, yes, ma'am.

Madam Speaker: So, just to…yes, Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: I'm trying to follow this. So, if Motion 7 passes, then you've got two amending motions that kind of are at loggerheads, correct?

Madam Speaker: That's right. That's right. So, keep that in mind as we move this along. Okay, because 7 and 10 were very similar except for some words that were changed that the Clerk did read out. Does anyone need clarification on that? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: So, if 7 passes, does it then become that both are considered?

Madam Speaker: Acceptable? Which doesn't make sense really in our decision-making process, right? So, 7…10 just passed okay, 7 is similar. So, we're going to have the vote and keep in mind the end result for the as amended. Okay? I think we can do…we can count to eight. All in the chamber, we can count to eight today. So, let's…all in favour…any other questions? No. All in favour of Motion 7, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 8.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Motion 7 is defeated. And now on to the main item; Item 8 as amended. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Item 8 has passed as amended. Item 9.

Item 9 – Appointment of Chief Financial Officer

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce Item 9.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to be brief because I know we'll hear from the Chair of the CFO Recruitment Committee in a few moments, but I do want to thank…I want to thank the members of Council as well as our interim CAO for serving on this committee. They brought forward, I think, an outstanding candidate whom I'll be supporting once again today to serve as what I understand is our first female full-time CFO in the history of the City of Winnipeg. And so, I'm very pleased to support the appointment of Catherine Kloepfer and want to thank Councillor Gillingham, Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Chambers as well as Mike Ruta for their diligence. I know they spent a lot of time on this. I want to thank all of the other candidates who brought forward their names for consideration. And I also want to thank Paul Olafson for his willingness to serve in an interim capacity over the last little while. It's not been an easy time in the public service in the middle of a pandemic to serve on the financial front. So, I want to do…do want to thank him and look forward to voting in favour of this motion today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you Madam Speaker, and certainly, yes, I rise to support this motion. I, too, want to thank my colleagues who served on the committee with me, Councillors Gilroy and Chambers as well as Mr. Ruta for his work…for all of their work. And I'm really pleased to support the selection of Catherine Kloepfer to the position of Chief Financial Officer for the City of Winnipeg. She has served 14 years with the Winnipeg Airport Authority as the Senior Vice President of Corporate Services and the Chief Financial Officer, 22 years with KPMG before that as an associate partner. She has an excellent history of work on many local and national boards including serving as the Chair of the Canadian Airports Risk Management Group. Also, was a member of the airport's Council on International World Economic Standing Committee. For a time, she was the Chair of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and also the Chair of the Winnipeg Arts Advisory Council, so she has a very diverse background. And her diverse background also includes her professional experience and accomplishments, including negotiating a 34-year public-private partnership with the government of Nunavut to design, to finance and to construct and to operate the Iqaluit International Airport. A proven executive leader, Ms. Kloepfer has an extensive professional background in the private sector and her work with various boards will be an asset to the residents of our city. Over her career, she has regularly engaged with all three levels of governments. She has a good understanding of how government works and so this will make her transition to the role of Winnipeg's Chief Financial Officer a natural fit. And so, I certainly look forward to my councillor colleagues voting on this and I trust it will be a very favorable result. I also, like the Mayor, wanted to take a moment to just echo my appreciation to our interim CFO, Mr. Paul Olafson who has done an outstanding job in this last year plus that he has served as our interim CFO. He has effectively managed the City's finance and the City's Corporate Finance team in the face of a pandemic. Also, in preparing the City's first ever update to our multi-year balanced budget and has just been outstanding to work with. And, of course, in my role I have the privilege of working with Paul on a regular basis, pretty much daily basis, and so, I certainly have

appreciated and continue to appreciate his professional excellence and all that he has contributed to our city. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Chambers, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm really excited to support this motion to bring Catherine Kloepfer on board as our Chief Financial Officer. In the process that we undertook for the CFO search, she presented so confidently and was so knowledgeable about our city and our city's processes, just demonstrating the background searching that she did on our city, about our finances, and was able to present confidently. And I know that going forward that that's how she'll present herself to all of us as councillors as she supports us in the roles that we have here and that we support her as well and her team supports her as well. She's a very team-oriented individual and I think, you know, just based on how she was able to present the information that she did through this process, having a team supporting her, her decisions, her recommendations will be much more thoroughly provided based on the supports that she will get from her team. And as I said, she's a very team-oriented player and I look forward to working with her in the future, especially as we look towards economic recovery and building our city strong as we move forward past this pandemic. So, and again, I do want to thank Paul Olafson for his efforts over this past year. When coming into Council, being newly elected, I did have the opportunity to sit with Paul Olafson who was able to walk me through baby steps, you know, very complicated language, number crunching. So, he was able to take time with me and walk me through the budget process. Walk me through the books that we get during the budget process. And I really appreciate that from him. And still look forward to working with him as he returns to his role as the Chief Comptroller. So, thank you…or Comptroller. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Chambers. Councillor Schreyer, followed by Councillor Klein.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do want to welcome Catherine Kloepfer to City Hall. She is certainly not new to working with the different levels of government here in Winnipeg or elsewhere in Canada. I want to thank Mr. Olafson for his interim work and commitment to the City of Winnipeg and wish him well as well on his future endeavors. We're in a very challenging time. In every year, at any moment, I guess one can say we're at a crossroads. And I guess one can argue that is always the case because we make decisions that have influences. I've been saying since I've been elected over the last six years that there is a very specific issue, fundamental to our budget, that is fundamental to every aspect of what we do here at City Hall, whether you consider yourself a progressive or conservative, it doesn't matter. Your political values are not really relevant until we all agree on what the facts are. Mike Ruta, while he was the Chief Financial Officer, we all have to admit that our current…our future Chief Financial Officer has some big shoes to fill. Mike Ruta made a statement that is so important that there is no room…no longer room for political pushback. There is no room for spinning the issue. There is no room for putting your opinions into it ahead of the facts, and we need to deal with the common facts that we all can accept as facts, statistics. Not a statistic coming from any individual, but something that the Chief Financial Officer said in 2017 when he said that a bridge that would cost $12 million in 1988 would cost 200 million today. And I do not know…this is my perception. I'm going to add my perception at this point. Anything that has affected our budget over the last generation than the cost of government construction contracts, it has affected every aspect of our budget including…look, I mean, I'm not here to attack, I'm just saying, the Mayor's primary vision from when he was elected, and that's a fact because we really didn't have…we didn't really take into consideration at the time the fact that we would have to deal with…we would have to deal with a sewage treatment plant that would cost $2 billion. Why $2 billion? Because that is the rate of increase of construction contracts that is so high that 10 years or 20 years previously, we wouldn't have considered it to the same extent in terms of how it eats away at our budget and how it affects our ability to do anything, including create affordable housing or housing for homeless, and that's a fact. Our ability to evolve out of combined sewers for the health and safety and environmental standards expected of us in this country. That we're only putting $30 million a year into evolving out of combined sewer systems. That's all we have. But how many tens of millions a year are we spending on dealing with one bus corridor? So, the fact that we don't know if we can…it's not my statement. We don't know as a Council, according to Matthew Allard, we do not know if we can in the foreseeable future, according to plans based on engineer reports, not in the past few years, over the past several years two councillors before I was elected in terms of the Louise Bridge if we have the budget to replace these 200-year-old bridges. That's where we're at as a city. Now, I'm not here to blame any individual. This is happening throughout the country. This is happening throughout the continent. But we're a city that has shown that we can show leadership. Now, what I'm dealing with here are statistics and facts. And if you ever think that I'm putting my opinion into it too much, let me know one way or the other because I'm not here to deal merely with my opinions. If we can't agree on what the facts are, we're in trouble. But I know that we're dealing with facts the way we've never seen them before. Because when I brought out the statistics, not mine, not my statistics, consistent with our former Chief Financial Officer, when construction contracts have gone up 10 to 20 times higher than the wages of the construction workers, when government construction contracts have gone up…sir, this is a…

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, point of order. This is about the CFO hiring.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes. Yes, it is ma'am. Absolutely. This is about the CFO handling…hiring and the challenges that we have. And I'm saying this is the biggest challenge that she's going to have.

Madam Speaker: Let's stay on the topic of her appointment, Councillor Schreyer. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Absolutely, Madam Speaker. I'm going to base it on…when it came to the budget and the chief…CFO cannot ignore the budget, and we cannot ignore the CFO, told me when I was dealing with the budget, told me the quote I just said on bridges. That was a quote from the Chief Financial Officer Mike Ruta. And I'm going to stick on that because what he said was so important. And for the extent that we might be concerned to whether we're sticking on point, I salute Mike Ruta, the current Chief Administrative Officer for saying it. The fact that we're not sure of whether this is what we're really talking about. Mike Ruta is right. This is what we're really talking about. We can't afford to go the way we are. Something's got to give. And in fact, many things are.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: What I'm saying, Madam Speaker, is our new Chief Financial Officer has some big shoes to fill based on what our previous Chief Financial Officer has said. I accept that challenge and I accept…I invite Council and our new Chief Financial Officer to deal with these realities as spoken by Mike Ruta. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to, you know, talk a little bit about this. I was wondering why, you know, we as a Council would be deciding on this. And I know that Section 96 of the Winnipeg Charter states that Council must appoint the following statutory officers: the CAO, the City Clerk, the Chief Financial Officer and the City Auditor. And after reading that, I took a step back and thought, well, based on what? You know, I've been very fortunate to have had the responsibility for hiring many senior executives over the years, including chief financial officers. And when I saw this one I thought, okay, well, I need to look at this objectively because I'm being asked to give my stamp of approval on something that I really don't understand anything about the person, but I'm being asked to support that decision today. So, I look at it and I ask myself, well, what is the most important issues that we face as a city? And we hear from residents that they're concerned because they're customers. They're customers of ours. They're concerned with the services we deliver. There is no incentive for government at any level to be efficient because there is no profit or accountability that they have to worry about. This government, for example, has a monopoly on the services we provide. And that results in having no fear of losing customers, really, when we're budgeting. So, do residents come in to the…are they factored when discussing this? Well, I congratulate her on the appointment. During my time in the private sector, we worked an awful lot with the executive team of the WAA and have always found them very good to work with, lots of integrity and very strong forward-thinking group. But we have some fundamental issues we have to deal with. City budgets have been, for the most part, an exercise in denial. You know, completed for the most part behind closed doors. These are issues that we have to deal with. And I know it's concerning because being in politics for just two years, it's very hard because you always want to make…everyone is always saying, you want to be careful what you say, because you want to be positive, you want to leave stuff out of the public realm, but that's not me. I think we have to talk about the things that have to be spoken about. We're being asked to make a decision on an appointment that I take seriously. I don't know this person personally. I wasn't part of the process and the interview. I don't know any of that. I don't know if we've talked about the fact that we have fundamental challenges as the City of Winnipeg in our processes, in finance. Did we talk about whether or not the candidate is ready to face those challenges? Do they have experience in change management? Are they committed to introducing a new way internally? Knowing that there is going to be a lot of pushback. Nobody wants change. I don't know that. I'm sure she is an excellent human being. She went through the committee. I have no personal connection whatsoever. I'm thinking of it as an individual who is being asked to say, yep, this is the right person for the job. I honestly don't know. None of that information was shared with me.

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

Councillor Mayes: Very briefly, I'll be supporting this and more good news, I think Councillor Schreyer has finally beaten down my resistance. I'll be asking Mike Ruta and hopefully Tyler Markowsky to come to the next Water Committee meeting so we can talk…I've heard that analogy of the bridge that was $12 million goes to $200 million over 32 years enough times now. I want someone to back that up if that is factual. I unfortunately have not memorized or have forgotten the formula for figuring out the rate of interest over a standard period of time. Perhaps Councillor Gillingham will refresh my memory later. If I had $12 million in 1988 and I have $200 million now, what rate of interest? It projects, actually, looks like 50%, but then there's…which would be wildly high, but that there is compoundings. So, we'll get this explained if you would, please, Mr. Ruta and Mr. Markowsky, will probably enjoy that challenge of coming out and explaining because I find it hard to believe that there has been 50% annual rate of inflation in just about anything in this land. But again, there is compounding there. So, we'll get that sorted out. Councillor Schreyer makes larger, broader point that construction inflation

has been outpacing the Consumer Price Index, wage increases for some time, probably decades, but I would be interested in seeing what the actual rate of construction inflation is. And so, we'll pick that up at the next water et cetera, and environment committee meeting. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I rise, of course, in support of the committee selection. And sorry, I'll remember her name. Anyway, from what I heard, she was introduced to us from the committee at a seminar and the Mayor. I fully respect their decision, Madam Speaker, and will be definitely supporting it. And I just felt I was going to rise…so, I don't think, Madam Speaker, that Councillor Schreyer was really out of order because when you interview somebody for a job, and Councillor Schreyer wasn't on the hiring committee, we have a whole bunch of financial challenges as you know, Madam Speaker. And whoever is the CFO is going to have to help Council and the City's corporation through difficult and sometimes opportunist times, the change maker. And I think that she has the qualifications having been the CFO for what used to be a Canadian public entity called…at that time it was called the Winnipeg Airport. Now we have a different name. But ultimately, the Federal Government privatized all of those public services. But still, they are a public entity that is to further the cause and the best interests in air flight. And so, I have a good feeling that she has an understanding of the public good, the public interest in the operations and whatever we, as a City of Winnipeg do. I don't think that experience in the private sector, private for-profit companies is always a good experience, Madam Speaker, but I'm sure that she understands that this is a public entity and it has to uphold and follow rules that are quite different than private sector corporations follow, Madam Speaker. The air industry is a highly regulated one, so that's interesting. But anyway, I'm fully supportive and I'm glad and happy that Councillor Schreyer was able to express a real serious financial issue that we have because it's not…it's related to our roads, too. The inflation is going faster. We're getting less done for more money that we're putting into our roads. I mean, it goes up and down, but ultimately, we're getting a lot less done than we did for the same dollar back in 2013 when we moved our first road budget. So, Madam Speaker, and I just wanted to publicly thank our interim CFO, Paul. What a wonderful job. Very qualified to do it himself, and I'm very appreciative in his ability and I hope there is a way for him to stay with the City of Winnipeg. I'm not sure if he's going to retire. He's not as old as me, so. We really appreciate the work that Mr. Olafson does for the City of Winnipeg. And that's it, thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A couple of comments. I appreciate the longstanding and lengthy discussions we hear regarding construction inflation. One suggestion to my council colleague might be to introduce a motion. I'm not sure if he has, but as a member of Council at any time, I would encourage him if there is additional work that he'd like to engage in with the new CFO or with council colleagues on any matter including construction inflation, that could always be something for consideration by way of a motion. I want to thank once again the committee for their deliberation. And also, just to put on the record there, there was a Council briefing for all members of Council. I'm not sure if everyone attended, but certainly appreciated the openness and accessibility of the committee members who undertook the work on behalf of Council and by extension EPC who is formally mandated with bringing forward these names for this position in particular. As well as members of the committee's openness to have dialogue with all members of Council regarding any questions that we may have had since Catherine's name was made public. And so, I have had discussion. I did raise questions with Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Gillingham and Chambers. And was really appreciative of their openness and willingness to engage, to answer any and all questions that I had. And I would encourage other members of Council to do so as well. And hopefully with the support of Council, we can welcome our new full time CFO to City Hall.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 9. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Klein

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item…

City Clerk: Yeas 14, Nay 1. Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Item 9 passes. Madam Clerk, Item 10.

Item 10 – Land Dedication Reserve – City of Winnipeg, Urban Forestry Branch – Tree Planting Program

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like to move referral of this motion to EPC for a report.

Madam Speaker: That's with no instructions. Councillor Eadie, you have a few minutes to tell us why.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, the actual need for the money within this motion is undeniable, it's a very good one. However, Madam Speaker, I have a problem with process here in that I call it EPC privilege that it actually got introduced right at EPC without coming through community committee or other committees. Usually something like this comes through community committee as in the Glenelm reforestation that happened in the past. And so, it seems to me we should at least get a report. I don't agree with the privilege, but we are as Council voting on something and I have no idea what the detail is. It just says $300,000 for reforest. I don't know anything about it and I'm being asked to vote. So, I think it requires a report.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Mr. Mayor, do you wish to rebut or we can go to the vote? Okay. Councillor Chambers, we're going to a vote for the referral. You had your hand up. Yeah. Okay, so all in favour of the referral to Executive Policy Committee for a report, please rise. Councillor Eadie called for a recorded vote. Yes.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 8.

Madam Speaker: Okay, nays 8. The referral is lost, correct? Okay. Moving on, referral is lost. Mr. Mayor, to…you introduced the item. Any other speakers? Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I'd like to thank Councillor Eadie. We did have a discussion on it and I…you know, I'm sorry, that was not the intention of this, really. The intention that came as if you were to listen to my City Centre Committee, it did try to go on to my City Centre committee. My councillor colleagues didn't know about it. I pulled it because I just was concerned about some of my wording in it. And then when I got…when my wording was fine, the intention was for it to go. And the reason why it's a challenge is this is my own Land Dedication Funds and usually I do support my other colleagues and where they spend their Land Dedication Funds. For me, I'm spending it on some trees because I've had a major loss. I have a large urban canopy, Madam Speaker, and it's a huge loss. And that's where people walk because I don't have a lot of parks. So, it is a major issue for my ward. As you know, we're dealing with Dutch elm disease and ash borer disease. And the reason why it's kind of a rush is that our Forestry Department will be handling some of this for us, so they're in the middle of trying to purchase trees, get the right staff in place in order to do this work. So, that's why there is a rush. And, Madam Speaker, I do support all my council colleagues and in terms of Land Dedication, I do understand if in normal…I would agree with you normally, you do…would want a report. But I think we can all agree that this…we all have done a Land Dedication and this just doesn't warrant it. I do have an e-mail from Helen Fabbri from our Projects and Community Initiatives and she has indicated that this is not what she sees fit.

Councillor Nason: (Inaudible) material, is that being entered as part of the…

Madam Speaker: No, Councillor Nason, I think she's just referring to it and reading from it for her remarks. Councillor Gilroy, you can continue.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. I don't normally do lots of motions like these, so this was not my intention to make somebody feel like I was abusing my power. And I hope that…because that was not the intention here. I just really want to get this project going. It's been a major issue in my community. And the Parks Department, we do have issues in terms of how many trees that there is in the city. There is a lack of trees, so I want to make sure that we…the City gets its fair share of trees compared to other places that are also trying to purchase it. As everyone is dealing with the aftermath of what we're seeing with the devastating impact of our reforestation aspects. So, I'm really hoping that I can get the support of my council colleagues as I have supported many of you. And I do…would agree with you. In normal cases, I would like to see a report in front of me, but I think you all can agree this…you know, there are times when we do rush things and this is one case where we all can agree, this would not warrant a land…wouldn't warrant being under the Land Dedication. So, this is…this is appropriate that I do ask for this. I wish I could have got it on City Centre which was my intent. It just didn't work out that way. But I will hear what my council colleagues have to say on that issue and I will be mindful of that in the future when I do make relevant motions. That is not my intent is to make sure that I'm abusing my power. But I also do believe that we're all on different committees and sometimes there are motions that come to those committees that I'm also not a part of, so, and I respect kind of the debate that is happening at those committees. So, this is within my own ward funds. And historically, we have all supported each other on what those funds are used for. And so, I'm asking you to support me on this. And I want to apologize if I hurt anyone's feelings about how my motion came about. Again, I want to reiterate, if you listen to the dialogue at City Centre, this motion was intended to go on there. I'm just really trying to get this project on the ground. As you can see, we're getting really close to spring and the Forestry Department needs to do its due diligence in order for this project to happen in the spring. So that's my pitch. I really hope you support it. It's trees, people, so it's really a good project. And I'm really asking all my colleagues to support this. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. And I do want to commend Councillor Gilroy with respect to her interest in getting trees planted in her ward. 2019, we had a devastating snow storm…ice storm that had a devastating effect on our tree canopy throughout the entire city. And, you know, we all mourned the loss of our trees, added to the fact that we are at risk in losing more trees to Dutch elm disease, emerald ash borer, the knotty pine fungus, all of those types of diseases that are decimating our tree canopy. Without a report provided by our Urban Forestry Department, I'm kind of concerned with respect to the trees that do get planted that do need ongoing maintenance. There doesn't seem to be anything that will address all of those trees that will be planted throughout this process, the $300,000 talks about a budget for tree planting, but doesn't talk about the maintenance that is required subsequent to that, the operating cost. The resources of our Urban Forestry Tree Division; if all of our resources are now pooled into one ward, what about the other areas of the city where we've had devastation to our tree canopy? You know, I'm concerned with that. So, while I do appreciate Councillor Gilroy's interest in reforestation and I think that this is something that we should all be committed to, there is a process that is in place in terms of getting the reports that we depend on from our Public Service that speaks to some of these issues that I've raised here today, that I think without that due diligence, you know, it's not as an efficient process as necessary to ensure the sustainability of the trees that are going to be planted through this budget.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know this quite well because I've seen trees coming down in Transcona. We are the park city. Not just from the plentiful parks that we have, but we have lots of older trees. And the trees we're losing, we're being told that boulevard trees are going to be, I believe, it's a five-year replacement. They take down three, you might get one back. I appreciate the want and desire of using Land Dedication Reserve. And just earlier today, we passed a report for a park for Land Dedication Reserve Funds that was counter to the report of the Public Service, but we passed it. We passed it unanimously. We had a report. Councillor Schreyer, I know quite well used some funds from his ward to replace trees in Elmwood that were very important to him. He took the time, he put a request at community committee that got a report and it came forward and it was passed. We've got lots of challenges with our urban canopies. We all admit that. You know, one member of EPC has reminded me multiple times, you can always move a motion, Councillor if you want something done. As a member of EPC, the motion was moved. It should have been to get a report. I'm challenged because we don't see that $300,000, what exactly it's being spent on. How many trees, what the diversity of the canopy is going to be, but we're getting trust. We need to trust that that is going to be the right thing, that we're going to get the right trees, but what I'm hearing is priority for this councillor's ward above all others. You know, the same ward councillor just had an issue with regards to combined sewer overflow. I'm sure there will be a motion coming forward with that to address that ward's priority to address the combined sewer overflow. I know it's a city-wide issue, but I suspect that will be coming shortly as well. I unfortunately won't support this. I do wish that she had got a report. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. As I tried to express, I think the cause…I wish, actually, the Mynarski Ward had enough money to do trees and update and fix the parks that I already have in my ward. But anyway, I digress, Madam Speaker. I actually don't think that this request for LDR money should even be at Council. The reason I'm saying this is, for example, the boulevard by the Battle of Seven Oaks Monument, the Seven Oaks Monument at Main and Rupertsland, Madam Speaker, provided money that went into there. It's Crown-owned land, owned by the Federal Government, that park. And then the boulevards around were actually related to the City owns. It is in all intents and purposes Crown-owned, publicly owned property. And money was applied to do things with the boulevard. And money directly from LDR went to pay for it. I don't agree, Madam Speaker. I don't know where this interpretation came from that somehow Council needs to vote on this type of LDR. They're planting the trees in greenspace in the City of Winnipeg, owned by the City of Winnipeg. I don't see anything in this report that says they're planting trees on private property, which would be definitely outside of what the rules are for Land Dedication Reserve money, Madam Speaker. And I would love, and I don't have the money to move a forestry program, to challenge our administration's advice that somehow this kind of thing needs to come to Council. It's great for everybody to vote to do trees because I know the public wants their trees. And I get calls all the time, Madam Speaker, demanding that the City plant trees on Inkster. It's bare. When I was young, I mean the…it was like a forest. It was beautiful. It was great. Now it's empty and open. And we know we have budget challenges in that regard. And we have all kinds of other austerity legacy that we have to deal with from previous budgets and council decisions, Madam Speaker. But when it comes to this one, I don't see in the report. I want to actually challenge because I think that Councillor Gilroy should have been able to move this LDR at community committee and it would have been evaluated and they would have processed it and went forward with it, without it coming to Council. So, I don't understand. I don't understand why it's there. And then there is no detail, but I know that Forestry, I sit on the standing committee who deals with Forestry, I know that when they plant a tree, they're going to make sure that there is enough money to maintain it. I can't remember how much it costs. And that would have been good to see in the report, Madam Speaker. I'm really…like, I want to vote for this thing, but I voted for…I voted for the Glenelm neighbourhood. And in my speech, Madam Speaker, go to the record, in my speech I said, I still don't understand why this is coming to Council. I think it should have been at the community committee's discretion to move forward if Councillor Schreyer wants to move that and that's what the residents of the area are demanding for that money, then that's good. That's good. But for it to come to Council, I still don't understand. It's greenspace owned by the City that these trees are being planted on. So, I…this time, I don't…I'm not going to…you know, Madam Speaker, I really want to vote for this, but I'm not going to. I can't because it also demonstrates the privilege that it's not following process. And if I was the mayor, the chair of EPC, I would be concerned about the openness, transparency and accountability about making a decision on this, actually, Madam Speaker. I hear this all the time from our leader of Council, and I'm not hearing that here so far. So, we'll see. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much. And I know that this is one of the topics that are going to be discussed for a while. I'm supportive of using LDR money for this type of work. I think It's important to use LDR money for this. I'm a little perplexed because right now we have a process in place because of COVID that says we can just send it to the Clerk's Office and with the proper wording from the Forestry Department, it can be approved by order of the Clerk's Office. So, I don't know why we need a motion for that and why it gets tied up in this. I do…I am concerned that there is no report because we talk an awful lot sometimes and other times we don't, that you have to follow the proper processes and you don't have to follow the proper processes. I did go through the process of having trees added in the ward of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood, which are beautiful, but going through the City of Winnipeg we learned an interesting…a lesson that the City of Winnipeg route we paid $1,500 per tree and that gave us service for two years, and priced it out with a supplier that is a frequent supplier of the City and the cost would have been $300 for the same tree. I mean, I think people are tired of paying $3 for something with the City when you could pay $1 as a private citizen. And then that's kind of my question, too. I mean, it's called volume discount. We should be taking advantage of that. I just think we haven't followed that process. I think it's easy enough to say to the Forestry Department, which is what I did, can you write it up, send it to the LDR representative. She wrote it up, it got sent in to the Clerk's Office and within one day it met requirements and was approved. And I would think that that is the proper process to go. But again, we're showing inconsistency in our decision making which is a fundamental issue that we have inside this chamber.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think a lot of my council colleagues have expressed similar feelings of mine. $300,000 is, I mean, it's over a quarter of a million dollars for trees. It's a tremendous amount. And it's so needed in Councillor Gilroy's ward and in many wards throughout the city as we heard from Councillor Eadie. But you know, I, too, have been…I, too, have been working on process issues and trying to adhere to process. And I think that…I think that we

do need to see a report on this. And I do think there is enough time to get it done and come back. And for those reasons, I won't be supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, I know you've been waiting patiently. We're going to go virtual to Councillor Orlikow and then back to you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Well, I guess first of all I want to thank my council colleagues. I've heard some beautiful words about our support of trees and that we all are on the same page. I do find it interesting that we're having these debates about privilege. We do walk-ons, they happen. Time sensitivity is one of the reasons why. All this motion is doing is asking for the money to be forwarded to our own internal department so they can start planning on how to use it. It doesn't say the $300,000 is going to be used this year, immediately. They'll figure out how to do it. You know, it doesn't say that it's going to replace other people's trees in other wards. Of course, it doesn't. It's on top of the existing complement that we've already budgeted. Thank those who agreed to the extra $3 million in the budget this year and voted for the budget. So, again, we hear a lot of times in this council chamber as well, you know, we need to move faster, we need to be more nimble. Well, again, in this case, it's not one blanket fits all, absolutely. I look at this one here and I say, okay, there is some time sensitivity with the purchasing and I've talked with the Forestry Department. It's not going to be all 300,000 trees we'll be able to purchase. And then the second phase…the second part of it is, it's been done before. And the third is, it's an internal department. So, I know there are some other issues that people commentated on today, but I'll be supporting it. And I'm really thankful to Councillor Gilroy for making this huge investment. We've all done our part and I hope we all do more for our trees going forward. But this is a significant commitment by Councillor Gilroy to address our continuing problem of our trees being decimated through either climate change or bugs. And again, I agree, lack of investment. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Already? Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. That was very well said by Councillor Orlikow. And I agree with almost everything Councillor Eadie said right up until the end that there got off about privilege or something. But most of what he said made sense, which is, this is not at the expense of other wards. This is what Councillor Gilroy has in her ward allocation. Great cause, I'm in favour of it. If it was resurfacing the track at Sargent Park, I'd vote for that, too because she's saying…I'd vote for almost anything. It's her ward. She has a better sense of what is going on there. Where is the $300,000 from? I have no idea. She saved it up in her ward allocation, so she gets to spend it. I've spent some on tennis courts. Marc has helped me out on some of that. He has spent some on other things. You've spent some, Madam Speaker, on Garden City track. I'm sure a City report would have said, oh, you shouldn't spend it, Mayes, on the Victor Mager School running track or Garden City. I don't care. I mean, I think this is…the program is not the prep program where it's all on City parks. This is much broader. We do grants all over the place. But Ross is right, I have no idea why this is here, frankly. I think Councillor Gilroy should be allowed to spend…I gave $12,000 to the Kingston Crescent Residents' Association to spend it on trees and nothing but praise, you know. Nothing but positive feedback. So, I'm not really sure why this had to come here. I feel badly for Councillor Gilroy. I agree, spend it on what you want, it's a good cause. It's money well spent. I don't want reports coming back here because I don't want to have to fight off some City administrator who at the time would have said, no, don't spend it on a track. And then we have Ken McKim who's this great guy who works doing Community Services for us said to me, you know, you were right on that track thing. That's great. There are all sorts of people there from all across your ward. I know, I thought it was right at the start, too. So sometimes, believe it or not, elected people have a pretty good idea and know how to spend money in their own wards. We do have to have some control so we don't have a repeat of Councillor Rollins, very unfortunately, inherited a deficit, which certainly wasn't fair to her, I don't blame her predecessor, but somebody needs to be keeping counts here. And not everything comes here to be approved. So, yeah, I'm voting yes. I agree with most of what Councillor Eadie said, this shouldn't be in front of us at all, I don't think. And Councillor Orlikow is right, it's a ward fund. Why does Councillor Gilroy have 300? Because she saved it up somehow. I don't know. I mean, if you ever get the ward by ward totals, they're all over the place. And people…I've chosen to spend some of mine on projects I opted to do. I think I've gotten pretty good value for money. I've got like…I don't know, I've got like $30,000 right now, so I can't do this, but good on Councillor Gilroy for trying it push this forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The only question that will endure after today is, did we use the tools of office, Madam Speaker, like walk-ons, like this one that are in order today for good? Are Council using the rules of procedure today to prioritize issues of concern in the city, like trees? Well, I certainly hope so and I'm supporting this motion. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Back to you, Mr. Mayor, if you'd like to close. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This isn't about Councillor Gilroy. This isn't about trees to the extent that I've heard people's concern. It's about process. Councillor Gilroy mentioned that, you know, hoping she didn't want to hurt anybody's feelings. I don't think it's about hurting people's feelings. I think it's about process and concerns. Councillor Rollins says the only thing that will matter in the future will be the trees, but the thing is that the concerns are when we create precedence. So maybe the only thing that might the biggest thing that might happen here is that there might be a change in precedent in terms of function and governance at City Hall. So that is the concern. What does this create? What happens down the road? Councillor Gilroy says she'll only do this once, she didn't mean to abuse any power and that's fine. I'm sure that's the case. Let's face it. This could have gone through community committee and it would have passed, I'm pretty sure. Let's face it. We all know that. So, the thing is, why didn't it go that way? The issue is timing. Okay, we'll just…let me say a few things. One, I did after this a few…after the last election. I had a bunch of money saved up after the last election. So, after the last election, then I spent $300,000 that I think in a day. $200,000 because the City wasn't doing any riverside stabilization at a City-owned lot where a seniors' co-op had a lease with the City. So, once it actually started falling in and a chasm was created, every year it doubles. One foot, two feet, four feet, the thing is five feet wide now. We just started. I had to put in $200,000 from the LDR money to do that in the same day. $80,000 to deal with the corner of Johnson and Henderson to deal with some beautification and dealing with the fact that we have this empty lot sitting there as an eyesore as everyone goes down Henderson Highway and for those that live in the neighbourhood. The same day I spent $50,000, which at that time was the largest allocation of funds from a councillor's ward budget for trees to guarantee, in this case, 100% reforestation of a neighbourhood, which at the time was the largest one, until then, I knew about Councillor Orlikow, that had been brought to my attention, Councillor Orlikow did River Heights for $5,000 and I was, you know, approached before the election, why aren't you doing something? And I said, well, you know, I'll let the community organization come to me and we'll see what we can do. After the election, that's what we did. It went through community committee. Shawn Nason, newly elected be witness to this as well as Councillor Browaty. It didn't hurt my feelings that it went through community committee or anything like that. I think that was proper process. We thought it was unusual that it had to go through Council because the administration was saying, well, it followed criteria except that it's unprecedented. And it had never been done before, they had never seen this application before. And therefore, even though they didn't say it didn't follow criteria so much as the criteria had never been applied that way. Now, that's unusual, isn't it, but that's what happened. And on that basis, it came through City Council. It didn't hurt my feelings that it had to go through Council. That was the way the administration perceived it, it had to come through Council despite the fact that they didn't say it didn't follow all the criteria, it's just that it was unprecedented and they had no convention for it. So, there you go. Now, we're talking about conventions and that's the concern here. Why are we doing it this way? I (inaudible) at the exact same time…exactly three years ago. I think I did it in February of 2019. Just a few months after the election. And I didn't hear any member of EPC giving me kudos or whatever for doing it at the time. It didn't hurt my feelings, just an indication of functionality at City Council. So, (inaudible) you know, Councillor Eadie made his remarks and Councillor Mayes did come around in days afterwards in recognizing what was being done here on the council floor. So, I'm going to vote for this, but the concerns raised in terms of process are legitimate. Process and a change in process leads to conventions in precedence. And it can change…it can evolve into a dynamic and a form of governance that is not the intent. And even though it was not the intent of Councillor Gilroy to (inaudible) search words, to abuse her position or hurt anybody's feelings, I understand that. That's not the…it's not about her personal intent, it's about how it evolves over time. And so, I'm just going to say that. I'm not here to make hay. It's real. But nonetheless, let this be a lesson to us. This doesn't have to happen again just cause it's a good cause. But nonetheless, apparently, formal process is being applied. I didn't ask someone to do this on my behalf through EPC. I guess I could have. See, it would have sounded really strange if I asked Councillor Gilroy, hey, you're on EPC, Councillor Gilroy, can you move my motion for me? Well, that would have been weird because there is already a process for this. It's called community committee. And that's why this is strange because it would have been weird for me to have done that. So, based on that fact, don't take it lightly, the fact that this is a change in terms of process, in terms of potential evolution of governance. Not the intent we say in this motion. So, it's been said, let that be the record. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: You know what is strange is trying to understand sometimes community committees. That is something I still struggle with, to understand what is appropriate and what is not appropriate. It seems like anything can go at community committees, but that's a topic for another discussion and that's for our governance review discussions. There are…firstly, I want to thank all of my council colleagues, all of whom have raised various points of interest to themselves and, of course, to our citizens. There are number of discretionary funds that are within the purview of members of Council. Land Dedication Reserve is one of them. Most recent balance, I think, was around $9 million. Of course, Community Incentive Grants, the Parks and Recreation Enhancement Program, thankfully, more recently the Wellness Program. And so, I know for various accounts the ground rules for how those discretionary funds are exercised can differ. I, for one, as a general rule try to defer to the local councillors in areas like this. And so, what I've been pleased to hear today is the deference for helping support our tree canopy. That's something really good to hear from, I think, every member of Council. I can appreciate some members would have preferred this matter originate at community committee. Some may choose to vote against this for that reason. Some…and I don't think this is the case, some could just vote on it on the merits of the

matter. And that is proper process. Ultimately, Council does get the opportunity through this process and through this body to vote on waiving the criteria as proposed. And members of Council obviously ultimately have that discretion. I'm pleased that the local councillor is taking some of her Land Dedication Reserve, putting it to something I'm passionate about as well. I had the pleasure last year of visiting every ward with each of my council colleagues to plant a tree in support of the Million-Tree Challenge. Saw some spectacular places in our city. We need a lot more trees. And so, I'm going to be supporting it and appreciate the councillor's leadership as others have demonstrated, just to use the resources they have, bring it through the proper forums. This is, of course, one of them on the floor of council and for that reason, I'll be supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I will call the question on Item 10. All in favour? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 10 passes. Madam Clerk, Item 11.

Item 11 – Community Incentive Grant – Downtown Winnipeg Business Improvement Zone

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce Item 11.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is another one of those discretionary funds where we have three local councillors stepping up to prioritize for, in this case, improvements to the downtown plan. As I've indicated previously, I'll be supporting this. I know, again, this is one of those matters that requires Council to waive the criteria and I think the best speakers for this are, of course, our three downtown councillors who I know we'll hear from, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Time is of the essence in supporting the downtown. Downtown is critical to our economic and social development and Manitoba's post-pandemic recovery. We need recovery in the downtown. And I couldn't have said it better, Madam Speaker, than Kate Fenske, the Executive Director of the Downtown BIZ, in terms of her reference to the 70,000 people we're missing in the downtown. The customer base that businesses in the downtown are missing. And the economic success benefits of all Winnipeggers and, indeed, the province. Downtown Winnipeg is home to many of my residents, Madam Speaker. And the businesses that they love and the streets in which they walk and the parks in which they walk their dogs. OurWinnipeg and Complete Community policies acknowledge the downtown plan is needed for Winnipeg. And with the effects of the global pandemic, time is of the essence and funding to assist the development of a downtown plan would help the economic and social recovery of downtown Winnipeg. Other cities are doing more on this topic. Other cities like Calgary's announcement today of multimillions are really doing more. The three downtown councillors have been leading a discussion on safer city by design. And I'm so proud of the discussion we've been leading because we know that downtown, women don't feel safe. So, we want a plan that roots our downtown in deep social equity, makes sure that we're not exacerbating spatial inequities in the downtown, that we do not privilege just the 9 to 5 folks that we need back, but indeed, the residents of all of downtown. So that our residential development, our public spaces, our social and economic investments in the future and you heard Kate Fenske say that we need those catalyst projects, we need market analysis and we need real engagement. So, that's why I, along with Councillor Santos and Councillor Gilroy, really put money where our mouth is with respect to our downtown and our residents that live downtown, to build more residence. We want more residents to come and live downtown and experience the SHED District that we share. We want more residents to be in public spaces and enjoy the amenities that we have. And we want more residents to experience social and economic results of what should be a resounding yes today because walk-ons like this one that are in order, this isn't a walk-on, are issues of concern to the City. Like economic recovery in the downtown. That needs to be prioritized. At the end of the day, this is really about three people collaborating. Three councillors doing what I think folks expect of city councillors, to use their office to collaborate, to be really transparent about their priorities,

downtown social and economic development. There is an expectation that we are standing shoulder to shoulder with our residents always. Standing shoulder to shoulder with businesses in this city. And including businesses that we share in the downtown business economic development zones like the Downtown BIZ and the Exchange District BIZ and the West End BIZ. The three of us are contiguous colleagues along Portage all the way up to the beautiful intersection that is Portage and Main. We want to save our city by design. We want the research engagement and market analysis to do it. This is that and I hope there is a strong resounding majority vote today in Council in defence of the downtown and social and economic development. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Councillor Eadie is the next speaker.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, I'd like to…I'm not speaking. I'd like to move referral for a report to the proper committee of Protection, Committee Services and Parks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Do you wish to speak further on that?

Councillor Eadie: I just want to mention, I'm not going to say anything about privilege, but the walk-on for this particular report should have been at the Standing Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. We have a report before us and we did hear from a speaker about it, but we know nothing about what the money is spent on and we're being asked to actually vote on this at Council because normally, again, we wouldn't have to vote on it at Council unless it was breaking some policy or rules around the money. And so, just to be clear, I think a proper report should come, so it should go to Protection, Community Services and Parks for a report. I don't think it would take that long for it to come back.

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

Mayor Bowman: Sure. Sure, Madam Speaker. I mean, look, we've got leadership of our three downtown councillors. These are dollars that are typically within their discretion. The one thing I will say having heard from Kate Fenske earlier today from the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ, she did stress the urgency of some of the planning work that's going on right now to support not just the downtown businesses, but just the overall downtown. And so, I suggest we vote on this, but of course, members of Council will decide in a few moments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, we'll vote on the referral as Councillor Eadie proposed to the appropriate committee which was Protection and Community Services for a report. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The referral is defeated. Okay. Yes. Councillor Eadie, your opportunity to speak to the item.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'm rising, you know, I'm not opposed to providing money to businesses to come up with strategies and plans to get us…get businesses in those areas out of the COVID situation, the social turmoil, which you know, every business improvement zone, Madam Speaker, across the city has its own unique difficulties that it has to deal with because of this COVID situation. And I would point out…and it is at the discretion of each councillor. I'm saddened that the Mayor doesn't actually understand what is at the discretion of councillors because whenever the budget comes down, things that were at the discretion of councillors get cut. Cut. Cut, cut, cut. I would love to be able to use CIGP money to provide a plan for the North End BIZ and the Selkirk Avenue BIZ, but I have a big demand from not-for-profit organizations who are trying to deal with the social ills in the North End, but I digress. That is sour grapes. I wish I did have more money at my disposal. And the Mayor has money at his disposal and has provided money to the Downtown BIZ for them for their planning and doing different things. His pot of funds in his office are uniquely at his own discretion. I don't think we've ever had…well, I guess we have had some come to Council. I shouldn't say that. But we as…our ward allowances, we have to follow our policies. We can give grants, Madam Speaker, as you know. But in regard to this report,

like…there is no doubt, like I, you know, I participate at the Winnipeg BIZ alliance meetings and you know, I have a lot of respect for the West End BIZ, the Exchange BIZ and the Downtown BIZ. They work hard at trying to keep their neighbourhoods, business neighbourhoods, viable, working for the people, feeling safe. You know, women don't feel safe walking at night anywhere in this city as far as I know. I wouldn't recommend walking late at night down Scotia by yourself. Who knows out there? There's…anyway, I don't want to…I'm digressing again. So but again, I know there is an urgency, but to come back with a report, there is no detail. We had somebody present the idea. We have…we're being asked to vote on something that is usually at the discretion of the councillor, except that this violates some rules. And I'm not quite sure of all the rules that it's violating. I don't know, maybe is this a plan to do capital projects? I don't know. Like, there's not…I don't…like, it sounds great. It sounds great, and each of the councillors I respect that they put their money in there. You know, but the thing is, I really think it needs a report. The proper walk-on committee, again, the Standing Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Usually it comes through community committee. If it is violating a rule, Ms. Kowal will let us know. Then we know that we have to move it along and it would come to Protection, Community Services and Parks and then it would go to EPC and then it would go to Council. So I just…like…and I think…actually, I thank Councillor Schreyer for expressing my real concern here. We're changing the way things are governed. I'm wondering if the Chair of EPC will allow walk-ons and order his standing committee chairs to walk-on Councillor Nason's motions, Councillor Klein's motions, Councillor Lukes' motions, Councillor Chambers' motions, Councillor Gillingham's motions. Well, Councillor Gillingham's on EPC, he can walk it on. But, you know, the people who are not on EPC can't walk-on to EPC and that's my problem…only problem with this. And I will point out, Madam Speaker, I didn't have time to prepare. There are so many things going on, Madam Speaker, I wanted to move a motion. I heard at Finance Committee that we collected a half a million extra dollars in business taxes we didn't budget for. We should be using that $500,000 to provide to all the business improvement zones who are all struggling. We are not able to raise our levies. We don't want to hurt our business members and gouge them with levies. Here we are, there is a pot of money. I don't know that we need it. I will move a motion because, you know what, the Selkirk Avenue BIZ, the North End BIZ, the Corydon Avenue BIZ, the Academy Avenue BIZ, the St. Norbert BIZ, on and on I could go. Transcona BIZ, we could all use extra dollars to get us out of this hole that COVID has caused. So, it's not that I'm opposed to these three councillors exercising their will. But again, you're setting up a totally new process here. Like, it's crazy. I don't think EPC is prepared to handle all the community committee stuff. And I invite the Mayor, you know, he's on his way out, he's not going to be around. The community committee is a very important entity within the city and has a real long history, but more and more powers. It used be that community committees actually had residents who had some kind of pull that would sit on these things back before Unicity and I think slightly for a little while after Unicity. And Councillor Browaty's ward, actually, I believe there are still a number of people who they attend EKT. It was a very important to the residents. So, don't dismiss that, okay? I think community committees are important. And again, if it doesn't violate any of the policy rules that are set out, it doesn't go any further. The decision is made at community committee. Done. Just like that. LDR money I invested on the boulevard by the Seven Oaks monument at Main and Rupertsland. Why? I don't know. But this one definitely is violating the policies. I don't think the LDR one was, really. It's just how it was proposed. But anyway, I'm going to end, I'm only voting against this because the proper committee to walk it on was PCSP and the person who's moving this motion actually Chairs that committee and did some walk-ons that we are going to be voting on later on, and those walk-ons actually call for a report. This one is calling on us to make a decision to do an action. There is no report. Thank you.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to share a few brief words of support for this motion. I believe great things happen when we collaborate and come together to work toward a common goal. I'd like to thank the incredible leadership of our downtown area BIZs such as the Exchange District BIZ, the Downtown BIZ and the West End BIZ for your partnership and commitment to work together. I also would like to thank CentreVenture as well as my fellow downtown councillors, Councillor Rollins and Gilroy for your dedication and hard work. Collaboration is key. It's critical among all our partners to develop a new innovative plan for our downtown. The proposed process strategically reflects the social and economic needs of our downtown community and solidifies the vision for the future of our beloved downtown. Especially now with the pandemic, we have an incredible opportunity to take a step back to innovate how we work together to create a city that supports the growth and development of our greater downtown community for the long term both economically and socially. As we know, the Exchange District is currently in the process of creating a local area plan which we should be seeing very soon, so this plan will provide the vision, policy statements and strategy to realize the potential and the future of the Exchange. Together, in partnership with this economic development plan for the whole of downtown, we can cohesively put together these pieces and work together towards our shared priorities while enhancing and preserving unique parts of our community that make them distinct. This downtown plan will be an essential tool to provide a much needed framework. It will drive effective data driven decision making processes, providing rational backed up by cohesive plan to support the evolution and growth of the downtown in intentional strategic directions. As a councillor of Point Douglas, I'm committed to the future prosperity and vibrancy of the Exchange District. A national historic site in the heart of our downtown needs to be advocated and supported. I will continue to fight for its success. It is a true gem of a neighbourhood in the heart of Winnipeg, the arts, the cultural hub of our city, with many socioeconomic challenges. The prospect of supporting an economic and social recovery plan for the Exchange District and the broader downtown is a

must have for our future successes of this city. It's my hope that the rest of my council colleagues can support this motion before us today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today in terms of this motion that is before us for money from the…to consider waiving the criteria of the Community Incentive Grant for the purposes of providing it to the Winnipeg Downtown BIZ. I'm very supportive of the efforts of the Winnipeg Downtown BIZ and Kate Fenske, and recognize the concerns that she has raised with respect to the countless number of Winnipeggers that are no longer in the downtown area as a result of working from home. Somebody on my social media had pointed out that there are cities across North America that are looking at closing down some of their offices for their staff and having their staff work at home, city governments, and why doesn't the City of Winnipeg do that? And I replied, you know, it's all part of the circular economy in the sense that we depend on those people coming downtown in terms of their lunch time and patronizing restaurants and other shops and stores that are in the downtown area, being on buses and creating revenue by paying bus fare and surface parking lots. And all of those things that we need to create revenue and generate revenue to keep our economy going. So, I'm very supportive of the need to have people in the downtown area. In terms of the plans that are being presented by Ms. Fenske and the support that she's receiving from councillor…Councillor Rollins and those other councillors, Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Santos who has taken the charge of the downtown area and really want to see it revitalized. And I'm committed to those goals as well in terms of safety, and I recognize the fact that now the Downtown Community Safety Partnership is alive and running. We received an e-mail today that their website is now up and running. We can get more information about the services that they're providing. But this plan, Madam Speaker, deserves so much more robust discussion and attention. Last year…earlier this year, we decided on our budget which talked about, I think it's upward of $400,000 plus that is going to set up an economic advisory office. Well, where is that office and why aren't they providing input on a plan that looks at economic recovery post-pandemic? Our community centres are struggling. And when we talk about mental health and well-being, we need our community centres there to provide recreation activity to our kids and to our families, so that, again, we can get out and deal with the effects of COVID. I would suggest that if we don't have an economic advisory office set up, why don't we take the $400,000 and spread that out to the BIZ groups so that, you know, they can address the needs in terms of doing robust studies as opposed to utilizing money from Community Incentive Grant that can go back into the community for other activities? If our advisory committee…and I did ask this question at our last Council meeting, Madam Speaker, what is…has the advisory committee, economic advisory committee been set up yet? When is that going to get off the ground? When are they going to be providing input with respect to economic recovery now that the vaccine program has rolled out and we're charging our way towards herd immunity? The Province today talked about looking at more restrictions, even though we want to keep Manitobans protected, but looking at further relaxation of some of the restrictions that are in place. So clearly, we're on a path towards economic recovery or looking at the things that we need to do to get our lives back to normal. As I said, if the economic recovery or economic advisory office is not open yet, let's utilize those the resources dedicated to that towards other initiatives such as the Downtown BIZ, such as the St. Norbert BIZ and all the other BIZs that need money to have studies done to look at how they can recover post pandemically. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise today to in the strongest possible way support the motion before us here today. Winnipeg as a city will not be successful without a strong downtown Winnipeg. The success of St. James, of Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood, of St. Vital, of North Kildonan, heck, the entire province depends on downtown Winnipeg being successful. And prior to COVID-19, we were on the right track thanks to the initiatives of the private sector, but also the leadership of City Hall. We were on the right track. Look at all the success along Waterfront Drive. New residential buildings on Assiniboine, 300 Main Street going up, one of the tallest buildings in Winnipeg, the health of the Exchange District, True North Square and the surrounding area, the expansion of the RBC Convention Centre, announcements across the way here on the Market Lands, our arts district, Innovation Alley. We're on the right path but it's not a guarantee that that success is going to be maintained. It's on the brink. There are problems in our downtown. There are challenges downtown. It's a huge area with all sorts of socioeconomic challenges and economic development problems. We read today about the Bay Building boarded up. It makes me sad. It really does. Downtown has changed. I remember going as a kid, you know, Eaton's and the Bay, the Paddlewheel, Portage Place. Going to movies downtown. Downtown is changing and it needs a little help sometimes. That's why I very much strongly support this $36,000. It's timely. It needs to happen now. And on behalf of all Winnipeggers, I'd like to thank the three members of the three community committees for putting up the CIGP money and I think it's a smart investment and timely. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm glad I follow Councillor Browaty because when we talk about challenges in the economy, you know, we're bailing out the RBC Convention Centre as I understand. We're covering their

losses. You know, members around this table, many of them are members of the Budget Working Group. This wasn't a priority of the budget only two months ago. Did we not know that we were going to have to do an economic recovery? That our BIZ zones were challenged? Was that not a discussion at the closed-door meetings of EPC plus whatever Budget Working Group? Same group of individuals pretty much. You know, we're here today, and you know, on my way to Council today, I stopped because there is an encampment in one of the bus shelters that I've been getting lots of calls about. So, you know, we've got a motion here today as well a little bit later to look at Main Street Project's ask. Right? They want $600,000. But you know, we've got other challenges. We've got governance where we're wanting to try to figure out, you know, the Mayor's budget. You know, if you take 15 councillors times what we have in our ward, it's around $1.3 million. But yet, the Mayor's budget is I think $1.8 million? Well, you could cover off the bus or the requirement for Main Street Project just there in that surplus. But that's not the debate today. There seems to be a rule for me and not for thee in these matters that are before us today. As Council members, we have to put forward a motion at community committee. Yes, our community committee is the one different from the other four. We have a residents' advisory group. So, we have motions we put forward that before the Public Service even chimes in on them, our communities chiming in on them, the representatives. It was there before I got elected. And I said, why do we have this? What purpose does it serve? Well, it's membership that has been there for every day. Probably has been around longer than Councillor Browaty has been on Council, probably the same members. But we have homelessness challenges in our city. You cannot escape it. You can walk out this door. You see it at the bus stops in front of City Hall. You go up to Higgins and Main. You see it there. You see it in front of Portage Place. Where better could this money be spent but dealing with the homelessness? If it…if this money was so critical, why wasn't it part of your budget plan? That you members that are bringing it forward today, why wasn't it there? Sorry, I'm looking over this way, I should be directing my comments towards you, Madam Speaker, but I'm pulled that way. So, you know, if we followed the process, the process that's laid out for all 15 of us, albeit for the Chair of EPC who brought this forward today, if we followed the process on these matters that have no report, we could have probably saved two hours today. What better things could we be debating today? Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I certainly appreciate the great work Kate Fenske has been doing at the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ. She was an excellent executive for CN and she was doing a great job for downtown Winnipeg. And I do support that we need to build a solid foundation for rebuilding our local economy downtown. But we have more areas of the city than just downtown as well. We have to consider all areas of the city,, and I commend my council colleagues for their passion and commitment to downtown. I think that that's admirable. But as Councillor Nason eluded to, we had a budget. We have talked about this numerous times. We have brought up the fact that we have to plan for the economic tsunami that's coming and it was ignored and ignored and ignored. There's no details in how this…how these funds would be sent…spent. I think it's critical that we have those details because I heard this money was going to be used for research. Let's find out what the plan…what we have to get started, let's find out what we need to do. However, when you read the motion, it seems to be more of a grandiose headline grabbing narrative talking about everything. That it's going to cover it all. It's going to be the problem solver, but it's just going to scratch the surface. The mayor of Winnipeg has a $1.8 million budget, an expense account. The second highest in Canada. Second highest. The Mayor gave…the Mayor's Office gave $100,000 to the Exchange District. Fantastic, a wonderful use of those monies. This could easily be funded, in fairness, through that funding or do we pick and choose what areas of the city or what groups get the attention? Inconsistent decision making, again I'll say it, is a fundamental problem within this chamber. It breeds mistrust in the public. Everything we do, every time, has to be seen as precedent setting. That's how it is. It creates division in this chamber and we're hearing that. This government, Councillor Chambers eluded to it, has money set aside for a new economic development officer. We provide funding to Economic Development Winnipeg. We provide some funding to CentreVenture. We provide funding to our own internal Economic Development Department and we have several leading businesspeople in the downtown that without their help and leadership to-date, I don't know where we would be. When you look at the success we're having downtown, you really only have to point to a couple of businesses and their leadership. And I'm sure that they would be happy to sit down and talk about what needs to happen if we only asked. Surely, a billion-dollar organization with thousands and thousands of people employed by the Public Service, surely, we have individuals that we could allocate that have strengths and expertise and they could work with the Downtown BIZ, the business people downtown, and other stakeholders to develop a robust plan to steal Councillor Chambers' phrase. It's not that I'm opposed to what is being said, there's not enough detail and it bothers me that we're just throwing more money to hire a consultant. And I remember once being told by someone that held up the smiley face. You all know the yellow smiley face. He said, you know what this is? And I said, what? And he said, this is a Picasso painting after a consultant touches it.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you, Madam Speaker, this discussion that we're having right now is exactly why we need to put the money forward. And I'm going to try to address some of the comments. I'm kind of really shocked, actually, about what people are saying. This is coming out of, again, out of a grants that, you know,

I spent a lot of my time debating on what I'm going to put my money to and each one of us put our money through different grants, whether its CIG or Land Dedication and we decide on where that money is best for. And sometimes, we have to come through Council and get it okayed by everybody. Now, usually, we're all very supportive because we believe that the councillor of that…of those areas know best on where to put the money. In this case, this is our downtown. You have three downtown councillors and I think this is why we might need a community committee that looks at just the downtown. It's because I don't have the ability in the downtown. I don't have a community centre. I don't always have the community groups to connect with. I rely on a lot of the community groups that are downtown like the Downtown BIZ, like the West End BIZ. CentreVenture's going to be a part of this. They're applying for a bigger pot of money, so this is going to be trying to kind of pitch in for a bigger pot of money so they can do a plan so the City of Winnipeg doesn't have to do the work so they can do other planning that we're all on them to do instead of having a report to come back that we are all wanting reports back on. This is using councillors' money that looks at a plan that is going to take in all of the downtown like, all aspects because part of the problem that we have is our downtown is really big. It's been a challenge. We have the SHED, we have the Exchange, we have, you know, my little pocket of Central Park. We have all Portage and Main. We have these different corners, and we need to bridge those gaps and not work in silos, and this is what we're trying to hope to do. Another thing that I really respected is that some of this work and this stuff is they're going to be working with different social agencies. So, they're going to be working with people like the Social Planning Council and the different groups like Spence Neighbourhood that are within their plans, like West Broadway, like all the different groups I think in Councillor Santos' ward, they're going to connect those people. So, we actually have the people that live there that are going to be able to have a say in what they want and what they need to see. And is this going toward homeless? Absolutely because they are part of that community. So, right now, the community centres are in the bus shack. Right now, the community centres are in my parks downtown. That's where the people are, and they are the homeless and they are the people that are living right there. So, I'm asking you guys to support this because we don't have a committee where all three of us can bring a motion forward, right? So, and you talk about it being in Councillor Rollin's committee, I don't know. I kind of think that that's also a Property and Planning thing, right? You know, it could be Councillor Browaty's thing. It's a very complex one. So, I actually think it's fitting that it's at EPC that has all the different chairs from the different committees that this would have to filter through. So, I really…like, this is…these are our grants that we usually decide and I normally don't get involved in what other councillors are doing, I really believe that you know best on where to put the fundings are in your ward. And in this case, the councillors in these wards do not have the same level of community supports that you may have, and even in mine, I have them in Wolseley, I have them in the West End Community Centre and pockets of communities that I can connect with to give out grants, but I don't. So then what gets left is that the people that live right down there don't get any money. So, the people that I give them grants to are people like the West End BIZ and the Downtown BIZ. The West End BIZ does some clean-up for me. The…you know, social clean-up. Like, cleaning up garbage, right? The West End BIZ does some patrolling for me in areas where I need patrolling, and that's a social thing. So, sometimes it's those…they are my social groups at times. And I really think that this is an important plan. We all know what's going on down there. We all know that we have many challenges. We now…we have people working from home. We don't know if they're coming back and the businesses are hurting. And all we are doing is asking to use some of our own grant money because we see that there's a need there. And there could be some other dollars that they're leveraging, and we have the support of the business community. We have the support of CentreVenture. We have the support of our community groups to do this. All we need is the support of councillors around the table to really see that this…you know, beyond where this came from, these are really good projects. This is a good thing that actually isn't going to be using your planning dollars where we all are fighting for those planning dollars, this is taking it out of planning and letting us be able to do some of this stuff on our own and so that the…so that our planners can…they're very busy people. I have them working on housing, and where they should be working, where they should be working. So, I hope you support this. I'm sorry, I'm just a little frustrated at this point. But I mean, you're going to support…you're going to do what you're going to do, but I just…I think…you know, I mean, I have always supported all the councillors when you have projects that have come up through your wards. And so, I'm a little shocked at what's going on today. So, anyways, thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support this motion and thank my council colleagues Rollins and Santos and Gilroy for turning their attention towards economic recovery, which we certainly have to do as has been mentioned, not only in the downtown, but across the City of Winnipeg as well. I'm wondering…I was…you know, I know we talk about…a lot about…heard a lot about process today, which is important. Part of the process here at City Hall is we do have options, actually, even any councillor can bring a motion right to Council. So, this could have come directly to Council, but it came to EPC seven days ago. I'm wondering, in that time, Madam Speaker, how many councillors that have issue today with details have reached out to one of the three councillors who put this matter forward to get clarity from them in the last seven days or get any clarity at all. I think, Madam Speaker, I would encourage us though to look beyond this council chamber, even if I dare say, look beyond process, to consider this is about downtown and the businesses of downtown and the fact that as we are turning our attention to economic recovery, we're still in a pandemic. Businesses are hurting. Businesses are struggling. And so, today, to be quite frank, what we discuss, I know there's members of the Downtown BIZ including Kate Fenske who does a great job, and other business owners who are watching

and paying attention to the debate on the floor of Council. And I would encourage us to…in this matter, to support local business by supporting this motion. One of the councillors, Councillor…I believe it was councillor from Transcona asked, you know, why…was the…you know, not focus in the budget when it comes to economic recovery? With all due respect, the budget had much in it related to economic recovery. Think about what is in the budget as we turn our attention towards that. There was three specific initiatives in the budget to support businesses, including businesses in the downtown. We waived the business and property tax penalty for three months. The budget included an increase in the business tax threshold to support small businesses so that almost 1,000 more businesses, including businesses downtown, Madam Speaker, that we're talking about today, do not have to pay the business tax. We've also provided $1,500 grants in an economic recovery program for 2,000 businesses including businesses that we're talking about today in the downtown. I'm glad to have supported that budget. We also included in that budget an economic…the economic development office is being stood up once again. That's an investment in our economy. That's an investment in economic recovery post-pandemic. That's planning today for what we need in the future days. We also added some staff to the Planning Department through the budget to expedite, to do a better job of processing what is, ultimately, the permits related to economic development, including economic development in the downtown. So, I'm a little bit surprised at the question today as to whether or not there was anything in the budget for economic recovery. And at that time, Madam Speaker, in that budget vote, members of Council voted for the budget. And by doing so, they voted to support small businesses. Other members of Council, Madam Speaker, sat and made excuses and did not stand and did not support small business because they did not vote for that budget. The economic recovery that is needed in downtown Winnipeg, as Councillor Browaty rightly points out, the downtown is our core. If it's not strong, if it's not healthy, the rest of the city will not be healthy. We have to invest in the downtown. And so, I'm glad to support my councillor colleagues and their initiative today. It's their decision. They are asking for our support in them…each of them, using $12,000 of their respective Community Incentive Grant Program funds to invest in the downtown, to help our downtown, to help businesses in the downtown, to make it a safer downtown. So that the investments the private investors are making in our community can go a long way and we can expedite the recovery that is going to be needed in our community post-pandemic. And it's right. We have to serve beyond downtown as well. We have to look into the outer parts of the city to make sure that we are offering economic recovery supports for all of our community. We're going to need that. And so, I'll leave it there today, Madam Speaker, just to say I'm glad to support this motion.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. As a former downtown business owner for over 15 years on Sherbrook and McDermot Street, I'm acutely aware of the benefits of a healthy downtown. I have much sympathy for the challenges so many businesses are experiencing now because of the pandemic. And to Ms. Fenske's point, residents throughout the city come to downtown to work, for entertainment, for shopping, and a healthy downtown benefits our entire city. I want to commend the leadership of the three downtown councillors on this issue acknowledging that a downtown plan is needed for Winnipeg. Due to the fact that Winnipeg…the City of Winnipeg has one of the lowest level of office support for councillors in all of Canada, resulting in a limited capacity, I rely on the insight of a ward councillor's perspective or in this case, the three councillors from downtown, to know the needs of their wards best and to take a lead in bringing forward appropriate motions. But I also want to share with you, Madam Speaker, two years ago, during the first year of the four-year budget process, Ms. Fenske and many downtown business representatives came forward speaking about the dire need for a downtown plan. I'm not clear on why funding support for a downtown plan wasn't included in the first year of the four-year budget process because it seemed pretty, pretty important at that time. And I'm not sure in the second year of the four-year budget process in the midst of the pandemic why it wasn't included either. But perhaps this is coming forward now because people realize more so than even a few months ago that the global pandemic is negatively impacting every aspect of our cities. I'm not sure why right now this has become of great importance versus a few months ago or even in the first year of the four-year budget process. Regardless, I'm absolutely supportive of the development of a plan, but what I'm not supportive of though is the process used to bring this motion forward. Again, another walk-on motion, but that is EPC's privilege. And I'm not…and if it's not clear to my ouncil members today, I'll state it just to ensure it is, the current governance model that we operate under does not assist in creating a collaborative environment and leadership is very aware of that because that is why the deputy and acting deputy roles were separated from the chairs to gain majority. A model where so much information is shared to all…is shared to some, but not all is not a good model to create a collaborative environment. I am concerned, Madam Speaker, about the request to waive criteria, and when criteria is to be waived, I think in all fairness to Council that the report comes forward. I recognize time is of the essence, time is of the essence in a lot of areas like Councillor Chambers spoke about with community centres with the entire city. But I also recognize there's been a lot of motions coming forward recently with no reports, not just in this Council meeting, but in others and I think we need to adhere to process. I know none of my motions would be walked on at any of these committees. And I also look forward to support from the new Economic Development Office where I think even more value can be added to the downtown plan. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair…Madam Speaker. Well, I guess we're going to…I think Councillor Klein said really well at the last meeting, really stuck with me is, we have some major issues to deal with in Winnipeg and right now, I'm not sure how long we've spent to talk about 12, 24, $36,000 of a ward councillor's who want to put it towards a plan. I am, with Councillor Gilroy, quite amazed that this debate is going on like this where, you know, ulterior motives have been brought up and a whole bunch of other issues. Well, the motion is about the motion. And the motion is quite simple and I agree, quite needed. I am very glad that when those people that did support the Wellness Grant and all the incredibly great programs that people are doing right now with the Wellness Grant, I appreciate them all, that we didn't have to go through this process for each grant because you know what, area councillors are accountable. They understand what they need for their wards and the Wellness Grant was one of those examples that during COVID, having continuing reports and bogging things down could be a problem. We need to address issues now. So, we can point the fingers and blame each other for this or that, but the reality of this motion is quite simple. We have an incredible group, CentreVenture, we're going to have another incredible group, the Downtown BIZ, which I can say, in my history, I'm very, very proud to see happening. We used to have way back in the day it was called the downtown council model. Again, that fizzled out and there was some issues between different groups, but you can see now that those groups, and they've been working at it for a while, are coming together to be more collaborative. We need to support that. Again, I think we need to support that at the economic development level, which we will, but again, the three area councillors today are saying, you know what, it's COVID, we've got to have a little bit of faith. I know we don't like the word pivoting, but we have to do some pivoting. We have to get that money out the door so they can address these issues sooner than later. Now, we can say, why didn't we do this last year, three months ago? For sure, but here we are today. We've got a very good program. We've got some incredible collaboration going into the heart of the city, we should all support this.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I guess, you know, we've all got to say what we've all got to say and we kind of justify our positions with things with…we don't necessarily have to say aren't that relevant. (inaudible) is really relevant, construction inflation. I mean, I can't get around it. I mean, first of all, we talk about…how many times did we mention COVID during this…just in this round of discussion, how many times did we mention COVID as the problem? Didn't half of us mention COVID? Now, I'm going to say something, prove me wrong, COVID doesn't even compare to how our budget has been gouged and where we are economically as a society and as a government as construction inflation just over the past decade, let alone the past generation. Are you kidding me? How is COVID effected our economy greater than our necessity year after year, decade after decade, of 5%, 7%, on top of 7%, on top of 7%? The compound gouging and taking away from the people whose income…the people that pay for this budget, who pay for our economy, through taxes, pay for the government economy whose income hasn't even gone up by 10% of these costs. And we think that after a decade or two or three, there's no major effect, that we can just pretend it doesn't exist and say, oh, it's cause of COVID right now. It's after 30-years of ignoring something. Councillor…Mayor Bowman did mention the fact that we could bring in a motion to deal with construction inflation. I did do that a few years ago, it was not supported by Council and I didn't get a majority on the vote. I don't think I received a single vote from a…

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry to interrupt my colleague. I think my colleagues are genuinely confused if this relates to the Community Incentive Grant for the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ improvement zone.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, I think you're familiar with the report we're on. Please get to it, thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Fair enough, Madam Speaker. Fair enough, Madam Speaker. We know that our budgets are being cut. We have no choice because not every budget could be cut because we have to pay more and more for construction contracts. Therefore, our taxes have to go up and our services have to decrease and we have to increase further debt just to pay for our construction contracts. How does that relate, Madam Speaker? Due to construction inflation, we don't have as much money as we could or should in terms of proportion to our tax increases for our Community Incentive budgets and things like this. So, we've noticed in this one, Madam Speaker, that we are not sure where the councillors are going to get their money, whether it's going to come through Land Dedication or Community Incentive. Well, we know that this year we don't have as much for Community Incentive budgets as before, and therefore, we're going to take some money…asking criteria to be waived to come from Land Dedication to deal with this. Okay, fair enough. That's where we're at. That's where we're at as a Council…as a city hall. We're looking at taking the money from a different budget because we don't have it in one…I would say more applicable. I would say it's more applicable to come out of Community Incentive. My money from Community Incentive's already done for the year. I've got Land Dedication Reserve Fund this year. And it looks like at least one of the councillors are going to have to do it…is going to have to do it that way as well. Now, there's some concerns about waiving criteria for this. Well, look, I could do the same thing in my ward. Councillor Gillingham just said, it's not just about downtown, we need economic development city-wide. You know, different perceptions in terms of what is economic development. Is that economic repair? Is that helping people with the fact that people are…more people are getting poorer everyday? Pre-COVID. Independent of COVID, people are getting poorer. The middle class is shrinking, and more middle class is becoming poorer. That's a statistical fact. If you take umbrage with

that statement, let me know privately and publicly. Don't hold back. As I said, if we can't agree on the facts, we've got a problem. And that's our responsibility. That problem's ours. So, our Community Incentive funds are decreasing. Our ward allowances are not keeping up with construction inflation costs or proportionate to our tax increases. So, you know, we talk about economic development and we're not really dealing. I was asked this time…I was told because I didn't vote for the budgets in the past, I voted against downtown development. I voted against development because I voted against the budgets. My point since I've been elected, Madam Speaker, is that we're not dealing as a government…as a council. We're not dealing as a government trying to find out why we are regressing. And don't pretend we're not regressing. We just…I'll agree, when we vote for the budgets, I'm not blaming any individual, but the fact is when you vote for the budgets, you're voting for tax increases and reduction of services while making sure you pay no heed over the past six…five budgets at least to not knowing why. We all know I was the first to offer the statistics in terms of absolutely why more than any other factor. But we're told in this budget…last budget, there's going to be a review on the construction inflation by the administration. It was brought in, oddly, through the budget. It didn't have to come through the budget, but it was a reason to vote for the budget. Well, last time I brought forth a motion to have a review, an analysis of construction inflation. It was voted down and Councillor Gillingham says, we don't need one because the administration's going to give the report anyway. The report was two sentences long. It could fit in here. Okay, easily. And that was the report. So, I'm told to vote for the budget this time, but I don't know what the report is about. I haven't been told yet what the report is about. So, based on the conversation we've had here, I'm going to move at our next Finance Committee meeting that we get an interim report before the 100 days. That we get one, you know, three months…three months ahead of time so we get an idea of what the heck we're talking about.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, just, I appreciate the councillor referring to other motions. Perhaps, if I could just ask, as a point of order, this is about a Community Incentive Grant.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, every member has spoken a little bit about the budget. Not too much more leeway, let's get back to the item. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Yeah, if we're going to pass this, again, Madam Speaker, another point that's relevant and related, this is how I think. It's all related, it's all connected, Madam Speaker. Look, you know, my Community Incentive budget's not increasing, it's decreasing. My LDR sort of holds itself because it has to do with directly sort of construction costs. So, we sort of abet that. Based on this motion, if this motion passes, well, based on the individual reasons I've given, that I've heard here today, I expect those councillors to be supportive of the idea. Whether we like it or not, I know this is where we all diverge in…for different reasons. But that I can use a proportion of my Land Dedication Reserve Fund from my ward for other purposes other than its intention. Because I could…I have a lot of important things to do. There's a lot of people suffering in my ward. You know what the Chalmers Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation, the Elmwood Community Resource Centre, various public housing, coops could do with some extra funding? Quite a bit extra, Madam Speaker. And if this motion passes, I do intend to move a motion that everyone's allowed a certain percentage of their Land Dedication Reserve Fund to go to these other types of programs such as why we're encouraging adoption of this motion today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mayor Bowman: I'm going to be very brief because we have spent a lot of time on this matter. Sorry, I'll defer if Councillor Mayes would like to speak.

Councillor Mayes: Point of order. This requires two-thirds of members present, right? It's not the hard 11 that we had like on the Bruce Oak vote where it had to be 11 which is two-thirds Council. This is 15 of us present, requires 10.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. You're awake and we are counting to 10 on this.

Councillor Mayes: I'm on fire as always, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Always. Mr. Mayor, back to you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A lot of discussion about a lot of other topics. I'm going to try to just be very brief and to the point of the motion before us. We have three members of Council who have discretion regarding Community Incentive Grants. I know the grand total is approximately a million dollars this year for discretionary funds for councillors. Where criteria needs to be waived, as in this case, it does come to the floor of Council as we have before us. I want to support my council colleagues. I know Councillor Nason had referenced some of…initiatives important to him. I know there was a vote earlier today on waiving Land Dedication Reserve for an important project in his ward relating to the K9 Unit. I was very proud to support that as well out of deference to my council colleagues. And I will say, you know, Councillor Browaty and I have disagreed over the years on some aspects of downtown and he did reference Portage and

Main as being one of them, but our support for downtown Winnipeg has been unwavering and I know that that goes for so many members of Council as well. We are talking about an organization that the City of Winnipeg has worked with in the past. The community homeless…or the CHAT Program, now the Downtown Safety Partnership, the partnership is actually quite strong. They're probably one of the organizations that the City has probably one of the most positive and collaborative relationships with is the Downtown BIZ. Not to mention, CentreVenture. And for those that are at the Downtown BIZ including Ms. Kate Fenske, I want to say, thank you as we heard from her earlier today. I want to find a way to support the Downtown BIZ, support my council colleagues, and you know, this is one of those situations where the waiver of the criteria is required. And I'll be supporting it in an effort to not only support my council colleagues, but also to support the efforts…the important efforts of the Downtown BIZ and their members and the broader community. I think Councillor Gillingham said it quite well in referencing the need right now in our community. And so, I'll be supporting it, Madam Speaker, and would encourage my council colleagues to do so as well.

Madam Speaker: There's a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Excuse me. All in favour? Your question? No. Thank you. I'm sorry, you're looking to me, I was looking down.

Clerk: I'm sorry, Councillor. I'm just looking for the vote.

Madam Speaker: You can move on. Thank you. Those opposed, please rise.

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 7. So, the motion is lost not having achieved two-thirds. The item is lost.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Sorry, I have councillors e-mailing and texting me here about a process question. This item is lost. We'll now move on to Notice of Motion. This was a motion from last month appearing on today's agenda. Moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Klein, and it is regarding standing committee composition. Councillor Klein or Councillor Nason, pardon me, to introduce your motion.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Item 1 - Standing Policy Committee composition

Moved by Councillor Nason,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

WHEREAS the current composition of Standing Policy Committees has a membership of four members;

AND WHEREAS the current Standing Committees do not have a required representation of the five Winnipeg Community Committees;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Governance Committee of Council undertake a composition review to determine a Community Committee focus on Standing Committee composition being in the 2021 restructuring and implement the following:

1. *Provide change to governance to include that a representative on each Standing Committee from the five Community Committees be required.*

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief because as my council colleagues will note, there's no report. So, I suspect this one will get referred and hopefully we'll get a report and let the Public Service weigh in. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any speakers on this item? Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Klein.

Councillor Eadie: Yeah, oh, I thought I heard him…so, the motion is to refer I think, is that the recommendation of this motion? Anyway, Madam Speaker, I rise to…oh, this is…we're debating this right, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: We are, okay. So, I've gone through this motion and I appreciate the intention, Madam Speaker, of this request. I only slightly see…and, you know, this would actually help I think Madam Speaker, people understand why community committees are so important. Because technically we only represent individual wards and then we have community committees which brings three people together, Madam Speaker, to represent a bigger area. And I…you know, I'm saddened that because of the process I had to vote against one of my colleagues for part of the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee today, but anyway. That aside, the only problem I see with trying to implement this, and it would include more people and this actually should be one of the governance issues that many of us haven't had time to make more recommendations or provide our perspective to MNP on governance, Madam Speaker. But the only committee I think there would be…I think is somewhat of a problem is the Property, Development, Heritage and Downtown Development Standing Policy Committee because, Madam Speaker, it does really need to have a couple or maybe it should have all the three who represent the downtown area on the committee which…if you went to five, I think you could accomplish that as well, Madam Speaker. But to me, the other standing committees, there isn't as much complexity. Although, there would be some complexity with the Finance Committee in terms of how appointments are made. I believe the Deputy Mayor represents…or maybe I'm wrong. Anyway, that might have been changed, anyway…sorry. Anyway, but that demonstrates that the Finance Committee is somewhat different. And so, I really want to support this motion. And, you know what, I can't remember the details of the recommendation, but maybe somebody else will refer this to the governance review, which I think would be a more appropriate place so that we can figure out how to implement it. So, anyway, I support the concept, but I'm…at this point, I'm waiting to hear from others as to whether I should vote for it or not. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You have…I'm sure many of my colleagues discussed this morning at 8:30 during their EPC plus two private meeting, so I'm not going to get into too much detail other than to say, I want to just pose a scenario for you, and that scenario is pretty simple. How would you justify a fairly basic democratic approach to a resident at a door step? Residents are voicing more and more concerns with the governance structure at city hall. We're hearing it. They're talking about it more. We're hearing it more in the chamber on a daily basis. We're seeing how it happens. We're seeing it unfold before our eyes. How would you defend to vote opposed to having equal representation at least from the community committees at a table? How would we explain that four councillors on a property…or a planning decision voted opposed to a councillor that was there representing the desire of those that elected that councillor to represent them at City Hall just by saying, well, we know better? Or that councillor's not on that committee or there's nobody from that councillor's community committee on that committee. And how could we explain away the fact that we said no already to, I believe, the 50/50 split. We said no to other basic, simple requests of policy changes or governance changes. We're going through this governance review right now that I'm sure most of you saw my discussion with the professor from the University of Winnipeg. And not…go and look at it and see how he refers to what we're doing and his reading of the report that was made public and of the process. This is a fundamental issue that we have again. Because I don't…I believe this is the only level of government that does not follow a party system. In fact, it doesn't even allow parlay…party alliances. However, this specific level of government has a pseudo-party system; EPC plus two non-EPC councillors. This is a pretty simple motion. This is one that we could simply say to somebody, it doesn't cost the City a dime. Well, yeah, somebody might have to work a couple more hours. Sorry. So, that would get us up there, but I think this is a fair and reasonable request. I don't see how this would hurt anything unless you're looking to control the outcome of a vote. But that's already covered off when you get to the different levels of governance. So, I mean, this is a reasonable solution. It starts to provide equality within the chamber. And I struggle to find any reason, and I'm sure some of my colleagues will jump in, and I'm sure they'll have lots and I can't wait to hear them, why this is wrong.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This…my understanding, I did consult with the Clerks Office in advance of this motion being considered today. My understanding, and perhaps we can hear from our Clerks, was that these are matters that are germane to the governance review which I have supported and the majority of members of Council have supported. You know, in terms of the composition of the committees, the Charter is very clear in the Mayor's responsibility

to appoint chairs, but it is the members of Council absent, at least since I've been mayor, there is a private meeting amongst members of Council which is staffed by the Clerks where the composition of the committees are populated. I respect that process. I obviously fulfill my responsibilities to appoint the chairs of the standing policy committees as well as the chair of the Police Board. And so, I am…for me, I want to see the work of the governance review continue and support that effort. And certainly this…I know that this is certainly something being considered there. I would perhaps just in close ask if the Clerks have anything they can add to the discussion today on the topic of the governance review and this motion.

Madam Speaker: The motion, Mr. Clerk, is in order?

City Clerk: The motion is in order, Madam Speaker, yes.

Councillor Nason: Point of order, on the online survey that the City of Winnipeg is doing for the governance review, in fact, does not address the number of councillors or the composition of a standing policy committee.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. And Council will have their opportunity to weigh-in on that report, I'm sure, in the coming weeks and months. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thanks. I'll just say a few things. I have an open mind to this. Always did. I had an open mind to changing the structure at City Hall when I was first elected in that first campaign. A lot of hope in terms of a change of structure, a change in the system, a change in decision making because we have to change our decisions. And what's a better way of going about that than changing the structure? And so, I had some concerns when we found out upon getting elected that it wasn't going to happen. And we all have our own opinions about that in terms of some things that I felt could have been done right away to change the structure here, the decision making structure right here at City Council as soon as I was elected. And that was disconcerting, that combined with sort of what was going to be the budgetary priorities. I realized, you know, that process wasn't for me. I didn't want to be part of the Executive Policy Committee. Just my opinion. That was just my opinion. You know, the dynamic after that, that's another story. But not to say I haven't been a team player, Madam Speaker, in my mind and I don't see any regret or anyone proving me wrong. In terms of providing to the Executive Policy Committee what I think is the information I think they need, I did my part, Madam Speaker. I can't say that about everybody, but in terms of what I think was the most important stuff that I could contribute for the Executive Policy Committee to make the best decisions, I felt I did my best or at least I tried. I look back, I could have done a better job. But I'm saying that, you know, we all could have, Madam Speaker. But nonetheless, I believe the decisions we have to make are a function of the dynamic. And therefore, I would say the process, Madam Speaker. So, I kind of read it right from the beginning. And I don't know what else to say, I'll continue to be a team player. I know I've taken the hits over my years here. I have to say to everybody here, I don't know what I've done to you. Have I manipulated anybody? Have I misled anybody? Have I…if I've said anything that's misleading, like, I'll apologize right in this chamber. I'll apologize right here, but probably with some explanation because I've got nothing else to do here other than sort of say what it is. It's kind of a decent legacy, actually, to sort of prioritize the facts that are common to us all. Because that's the biggest challenge, eh? That will be our legacy; acknowledging what reality is and dealing with it. I'm not a very big photo op councillor. I sure could be. I'm not exactly against it, but sort of not my modus operandi these days. Things can change. And I guess I've sort of been watching in terms of how we make decisions, the decisions we make and how they're related. So again, I'm not blaming any individual, but I'm saying, sometimes you've got a group process and a group think that's unhealthy and not the best. And I'll say this, and I'm not going to say it behind anybody's back. I'll say it here. It's inadequate. We need to change it. But again, I have an open mind to this. I think we all can contribute something to this. The idea in this case of dealing with the idea that we have greater representation from the different…the different community committees from the different regions of the city, yeah, that's something to like at. I'm open to that because it creates a balance that I think would have a greater communication system here. The reason we have our government is to make the best decisions we can. So, if everyone asked themselves this question, you don't have to answer me, does the dynamic we have…does the process we have create the best decisions we can? That's all. And I know it's an ambiguous question. It's hard to answer, but that is the question and don't deny it. That's the question, don't deny it. And I'll say it again in case there's any doubt to whether it's, aw, this is not really the issue. Yes, it is. In terms of the process we have here, does the process we have allow for the best decisions we can make? And if that's not the issue, then what's governance about? So, it's on the agenda. It's a part of our daily lives here as councillors, members of City Council, here, governance. So, because…one thing I think we should look at because we're pretty archaic here at the City of Winnipeg in terms of process compared to other jurisdictions around the country, I would have…I would have…I would be…of course I would. I would be inclined to be part of a rotating EPC because that forces city councillors to be responsible to each other and accountable to each other in a way that creates a more consistency of communication regarding making the best decisions we can. And that's one thing that I see other jurisdictions do, they rotate their EPC. And guess what that creates? An obligation of all members of council to work together. There's no way around it. Now we've got to grow up. Now we're really accountable. Well, we're not there yet, but issues like…concepts like this that we're dealing with now in terms of changing representation per region, that's the way of ensuring a communication process…part of it. I'm open

minded. I'm not sure yet. But it's a way of opening up the process to see what is the way that forces city councillors to deal with each other the most maturely they can. Not for their benefit, but for the entire city in terms of the best decision making model for the people of Winnipeg. That's the challenge for governance. Is there another challenge for governance? No, I don't think so. I think that's it. I think that's all it's about. So, what can we do here today? Keep an open mind. Admit we could have a better process and see what we can do to improve it. And there's other cities that have done that. I think we can talk a lot about that, what other cities do for another day, at least on my behalf. Thank you very much.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I think for me, Madam Speaker, I'd like to wait till we have the actual review and see, you know, what's going to happen with EPC and how that's all going to unfold. For me, the challenge is when we are deciding on what committees we're going to sit on, some councillors have an interest in some areas and other councillors have interests in other areas, so kind of forcing someone to sit on a committee that they don't want to just because they're part of a committee or some people have other…you know, other things that are going on in their lives and they don't want to take on more committees. So, I just think that…I like the process that we have right now allows councillors to make those decisions. I think some of the concerns that I've heard throughout this process might be helped out when we have an overall review and we see how the governance structure is going to unfold. So, I think I'd like to wait till that. And we can always come back to that, but as far as doing it right now, sometimes we don't have councillors that want to take on more roles sitting on more committees. If we increase the amount of people sitting on those committees, we might struggle trying to fill those spots. So, that would be my concern. I'd rather wait to see what the review has.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was actually rooting for Councillor Schreyer to work in construction inflation into this argument here. You know, I'm looking at this motion and I'm seeing the request to have each committee…each community committee have a representive…representative on each standing policy committee. I just look at the time commitments that I currently have in doing case work in the ward and all the issues that we have as councillors with respect to our wards and the committee work that we already are involved with. Some of us as chairs of different standing policy committees and the other boards that we may sit on as well. And, you know, we're not resource rich right now in terms of supports that we have in our office as city councillors, so stretching us that much further, I don't know if we're particularly getting a bang for the buck if that makes sense. I mean, to have us on one additional standing policy committee when we're devoted to the case work in resolving resident issues, sitting on standing policy committees and sitting on other boards that we take on, it's really going to, you know, wear us thin. I'm not talking from a physical standpoint, potentially emotional standpoint or mental standpoint and as well as a resource standpoint where, again, our assistants are running our offices, responding to e-mails, phone calls, walk-ins when they were happening, and now to have us away further sitting at one more standing policy committee when we have something that's functioning right now. And I do understand Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein's motion here and I'm just concerned with, again, if we don't have the resource to match the needs of the demands of our office, something's going to wear…my mom always used to say, wherever it's slender, it's going to break.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting this motion today. You know, one of the things about the standing policy committee structure that we have is that right now, of course, we don't…none of us sits on each committee. We couldn't do that. That would be impossible. But when you…if there…for example, in St. James, if there's a St. James related matter, on a committee, a standing committee of which I'm not a part; Water and Waste, Public Works, I review each committee's agenda. And if there's a matter there, the first thing I'll do is probably go as I've done to…most of you here, is I'll go to my councillor colleagues who are on the committee and say, this pertains to St. James, this matter is important to me. And so, I will make my voice heard there through my colleagues. If not, I have the opportunity as each one of us do to appear in delegation which many, many of us have done. I've sat on committees that, you know, one of my colleagues is not on, but there you are appearing in delegation to make your case on behalf of the residents. So, the structure we have permits that already. We serve two roles, of course, and we know this. We are representing our respective wards, but also, we are all city builders. And I have enough trust in everyone around this chamber that if there's something completely detrimental, unfair to the people of St. James, one of you would stand up and say, let's not go this direction, on behalf of the residents of St. James. And so, I think…my view I've shared with many of you before and Madam Speaker, it's that, I supported the governance review, but with all due respect, the governance model is secondary to the people involved. You can have the best model on paper, the best model going, but if the people involved don't make the model work, it's not going to work. You can have arguably one of the worst models involved on paper, but if you have people that can make it work and work together, a poor governance structure can function well and provide effective governance. And so, I won't be supporting this motion. I am confident that the people of St. James are represented by me. It's coming up on me to represent the people of St. James whether I'm on a committee or not. And to…when a

colleague is not on a committee, if their members of their community would be hard done by by a decision about to be made, it's up to me as a colleague to stand up as a city builder and support my colleagues who may not be present on the standing committee.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Klein, Councillor Nason for bringing this motion forward if only for discussion. I think this is the most we've ever discussed governance in this council in…on the floor of council. You know, I think a governance model is important and I think that people, obviously, to Councillor Gillingham's point that people involved in the decision making process are important. But I do take issue with the fact that a weak governance model can still be good. I look at countries all around the world that have poor governance models and I see the turmoil and disruption they're in. And I look at today and I see some of the decisions that were made and the reasons they were made and the reasons behind why they were made. And I respectfully disagree with what Councillor Gillingham was saying. We are dealing with a governance model that is almost a quarter of a decade old that needs to be updated. And yes, I will thank Mayor Bowman for championing the governance model. Six years it took, but whatever. It's happening and that's good. I do not see at any point in the process where Council will have the opportunity to sit around and discuss it other than on the floor of council. I hope that we can work together to figure out a way that we can have detailed conversations because it's so multi-layered. But I do appreciate the motion coming forward to bring this concept forward to allow us to discuss governance and I do think this should be part of the bigger discussion. So, only for that reason, I won't be supporting it, but there's great merit in it and I look forward to future governance discussions with Council in hopes that we get a model that works with strong leadership and weak leadership. And I think, you know, I think we have a huge issue here at City Hall. Today was a perfect example so far, I'm sure it's going to continue, of why we need to look at our governance model and the way the model is set up to enable almost half of Council to receive more information than others. I explained this to my kids. You know, I have to talk about it in a classroom. Cut the classroom in half. You guys are going to get the information, you're not. Then we're all going to vote on a decision or you're going to write the exam. Makes no sense to me and I think it's a very poor model and creates a very divisive environment regardless of the people.

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

Councillor Nason: That was some good dialogue. And the one thing I'm glad about having it here today is I can go through Hansard and actually get the text as opposed to watching the video. Councillor Chambers, you are the marathon man of Council for committees. I've never seen anybody step forward to sit on committees more than you. So, you know, I'm worried about you. I think we talked about that at our first founding meeting. You know…

Madam Speaker: I told him.

Councillor Nason: Pace yourself. You know, and now you're the Chair of the Police Board, which I understand being that is probably one of those ones that you shouldn't be on anything else. But I digress. As far as governance goes, we have the Governance Committee of Council. Guess what? We have five members of that committee already today. And I believe it's one from every ward. The Speaker representing her ward plus the other four community committees, sorry, representing her community committee. You know, downtown development, I believe when it came to Property and Development Committee, the downtown historical, I think those were all add-ons. You know, could it be dealt with through subcommittee, special committees? Probably. If there is a will, there is a way. The Mayor's got ex officio on, I think, on every committee. So, when the four members of the standing committees have challenges with quorum, in comes the relief pitchers. That happened a couple of times in 2020. That the Acting Deputy Mayor and Deputy Mayor were called to make sure quorum was there and that matters got pushed through. There were times when decisions were deadlocked, 2-2 ties. Happens on Appeals all the time. Right? Or yeah, I think it was on Appeals or some of the standing committees. But with a 5-person committee, even if two members weren't there, you'd still have quorum. You'd still have a decision that could be made. You know, we talk about division, we talk about how we could work better, how, you know, this governance review might help us. I honestly thought that when I conceived of this and the talk of the governance review, because I tried to bring this forward at community committee and through dialogue and consensus building with the two other members of that committee. It was withdrawn. Then the governance document came out. And I looked, I didn't see this mentioned about composition. So, that's why I've reintroduced it. You know, we talk about, you know, reaching out to other members of Council when things are on the agenda. Well, I've got an issue in my area of Transcona with a particular road and at least four times I've reached out for a meeting with one member of this council. I have yet to get an acknowledgment of that meeting. It's a challenge. I know we're busy. I know it's a challenge. But when we're a council of colleagues, consensus building, you know, we talk about, you know, who voted for the budget, who didn't vote for it. It's one of those things, if we had consensus, if we had truly worked together on building the budget, where matters that affect all of our communities, like reinvesting in recreation, a $50 million spend, that the crumbs that fall off of the table, the $155,000 a year times three may have been discussed amongst all of us. Maybe we could have came together. We may

not agree on the budget, but at the end, there's part of consensus, we can live with the decisions if we truly work together. Now I know sometimes even myself, I'll find fault in myself for not talking with colleagues, but it's a challenge. Because I know automatically the division that is here. And it's been here for…since first part of November in 2018 when I was elected to this building. It comes out regularly in decision making. The very first budget. The public shaming that went along with not supporting the budget. So, we can go a long ways on this. I do hope that this can go to Governance and the five members from the five wards can work with their colleagues and come to decision. Maybe it's that we refer it then. I don't know. But we find interesting that, you know, we look at our org chart and Governance is above Council, but yet, everything flows through EPC. And we've got a motion later today that EPC didn't agree with Governance, so it's rejecting the decision of Governance. Again, consensus. You know, my colleagues on EKT, East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee. We've got Councillor Schreyer who I am confident to say is on the left side of the fence. I've got myself that some members of this council have painted me very heavy on the right side of the fence. And we've got the councillor from North Kildonan, I'll place him in the middle as a more progressive conservative, probably a little bit more on the conservative side than the left. But again, we're three members on that board. And you know, when this first came forward, we built consensus that it wasn't the right time, so I withdrew it. So, I leave it at that. And I do hope that this passes today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. I'll call the question on this notice of motion regarding committee composition. Councillor Rollins called for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Nason and Schreyer

Nays

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. This notice of motion is defeated.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 4, Nays 10.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Okay, we're moving on now to by-laws. Just one second. By-laws under this committee, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So soon in the day we get to the by-laws on the EPC agenda. I move the by-law…by-law be read a first time: By-law 8…

Madam Speaker: Excuse me, Mr. Mayor. I'm sorry. We have some motions still that I need to read out.

Mayor Bowman: I'm sorry. You're right. Yeah, of course.

Madam Speaker: It's been a long day. We have Motion 1 and that is moved by the Mayor and seconded by Councillor Rollins. It's regarding the Vote Information System. We have Motion 3 and that is a notice of motion, the one I just read out. So, it will appear on next month's Council agenda. Motion 3 is moved from Councillor Allard and seconded by Councillor Rollins. It's regarding Main Street Project. This is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee.

Councillor Nason: Madam Chair?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Nason: Motion 3 that I have is Councillor Rollins and Gilroy.

Madam Speaker: Yes, I'm sorry. That's correct. Councillor Rollins. Yes, moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. I think there was some changes this morning. So, that is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Next is Motion 2, which is moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Gillingham and it's regarding plebiscites. It's an automatic referral to Executive Policy Committee. And now, Mr. Mayor. Thank you. On to the by-laws.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS openness, transparency and accountability in government is essential to a local democracy;

AND WHEREAS the residents of Winnipeg expect their municipal elected officials to be publicly accountable for the decisions they make at City Hall;

AND WHEREAS electronically recorded voting systems are used for Council meetings in many Canadian cities such as Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, Toronto and St. Johns;

AND WHEREAS through the diligent work of the City Clerks department the Executive Policy Committee began using the recorded Vote Information System to record votes at its September 21, 2020 meeting;

AND WHEREAS the use of the recorded Vote Information System at Executive Policy Committee meetings has been effective at clarifying for committee members and the public the item that is being voted on and allows Council and the public to transparently see the outcome of each vote;

AND WHEREAS use of the recorded Vote Information System at Council meetings will eliminate the need for time consuming recorded votes, which will streamline Council meetings;

AND WHEREAS by visually displaying the outcome of each members of Council's vote, the recorded voting system is a more effective method of holding elected officials accountable than voting verbally or by standing for a recorded vote, when requested by a member of Council;

AND WHEREAS electronically recorded votes will transparently display how members of Council vote on each item in the City's Decision Making Information System and will better allow the public to hold each Council member accountable for their votes;

AND WHEREAS it is appropriate for Council to vote on the use of the recorded vote information system before implementing it at Council meetings;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the public service be directed to hold information sessions on the recorded Vote Information System for all members of Council;

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the public service report back on a plan for implementation of the recorded Vote Information System for use at City Council meetings in 30 days.

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

WHEREAS placing referendum and plebiscite questions on the ballot provide the public an opportunity to have a direct say on policy matters important to the community;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg does not have established policy to guide the use of referendum/plebiscite question(s);

AND WHEREAS Winnipeg City Council and the residents of Winnipeg could benefit from a policy surrounding the use of these democratic tools;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Winnipeg Public Service conduct a cross jurisdictional analysis and report back to Council within 180 days with recommendations on a policy to guide the use of referendums/plebiscites, and the report also include the following:

1. *Criteria for when a referendum/plebiscite should be triggered;*
2. *What types of matters should or can appear as a referendum/plebiscite;*

3. Rules related to advertising, promotion, messaging, and spending limits for respective positions;
4. Determination of the effective/correct wording of the referendum/plebiscite question to ensure a fair and accurate answer;
5. Whether the results are binding;
6. Whether 50 percent plus one is a sufficient score to deem the result the decisive will of the people.

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

WHEREAS Main Street Project (MSP) currently operates the only van patrol outreach program for unsheltered residents that operates 24 hours per day, 7 days a week, 365 days per year;

AND WHEREAS MSP's van patrol program is supporting unsheltered residents, and a principal partner in the City of Winnipeg's Voluntary Transport Protocol, Emergency Cold Weather Response System and non-emergency related transportation for those in need;

AND WHEREAS during the cold snap outreach teams receive hundreds of calls every night from concerned Winnipeggers; including calls from the City of Winnipeg's 311 unit; to which they respond by seeking out those in the community who appear to be at risk providing help such as a ride to their emergency shelter, or to provide warm clothing, water, coffee, food and harm reduction supplies;

AND WHEREAS MSP has written to all members of Council seeking funding support for ongoing operating costs for its van patrol outreach program;

AND WHEREAS MSP advises that it currently only has confirmed funding from Canada for the overnight portion of its van patrol beyond March 2021, leaving no funding for the van patrol outreach program during the evening or daytime;

AND WHEREAS all three levels of government have a role to play to ensure the safety and well being of unsheltered residents;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the Public Service review the request from Main Street Project for financial support for its van patrol outreach program beyond March 31st, 2021 and report back in 60 days on potential city funding support for this initiative, including specific sources of city funds and a requirement that any city funding be matched by the Province of Manitoba.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 18/2021, By-law 19/2021 and By-law 20/2021.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 18/2021, By-law No. 19/2021 and By-law No. 20/2021.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I move that the By-laws No. 18…sorry, 18/2021 to 20/2021, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 18/2021 to 20/2021, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 18/2021 to 20/2021, both inclusive, be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Question period for the Mayor. Any questions? Councillor Nason.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you, I'll ask my question. COVID-19 and life in general has changed dramatically over the last year. Frontline services been affected significantly, morale is low, personal attacks are frequent on many fronts. Mental and physical well-being is being challenged by those on the front line to near the breaking point or over. Today my thoughts are with Manitoba RCMP and Winnipeg Police members. These offers…officers have suffered loses among the ranks in recent weeks and with that, Madam Speaker, through you, my question to the Mayor, is he willing to use his powers as Mayor to order flags lowered to half-staff in the coming Monday?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: I'll thank my colleague for his support for the Winnipeg Police Service members as well as I think he also mentioned the RCMP. If…if he would like to forward me any information concerning the request, I'd be more than happy to review it, consider it, and have some dialogue with him if it's appropriate.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, again, through you for my second question. Could the Mayor use his ability to request a moment of silence to recognize the loss of frontline members in Manitoba this past while? I wanted to acknowledge this in my opening statement this morning, but was discouraged to do so.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Could you restate that question, Councillor Nason?

Councillor Nason: I'm wondering if he could request a moment of silence for fallen members of the RCMP in Manitoba and that of the Winnipeg Police Service.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, I'll just say the moment of silence is usually on condolence motions. So I don't believe that's an appropriate question at this time. But do understand the sensitivity and the nature of what you're bringing up. Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, and to you to, His Worship Mayor Brian Bowman, and I apologize, I didn't prepare you for this question, but I'm hoping you can respond. To provide accolades to citizens who have made major accomplishments in our city by provision of a Key to the City has been done in the past. But is there any process by which a Key to the City can be rescinded if once issued, an individual may have done something that would require us to rethink that…that honourary title? Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank my council colleague for the question. The Key to the City is…is an honour bestowed by the Mayor to non-residents of the city. Historically, it's been given to dignitaries that have visited the city. I've had the honour of providing it on rare occasion to, I think, some deserving individuals including Teemu Selänne, Evelyn Hart, formerly with the Royal Winnipeg Ballet; after he departed our City, Alexander Mickelthwate, former Conductor of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra; and David Foster, award-winning Grammy. There is one instance, recently, where I have indicated that depending or subject to a court matter, which has been widely covered by the media that…that, I…I may make the request for its return from an individual. But I do… I'm respecting the judicial process, and I suspect that perhaps is the basis for the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. Mr. Mayes…Councillor Mayes, on the report dated February 9th.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
DATED FEBRUARY 9, 2021**

Councillor Mayes: Very familiar. I'll move the items on the report, Items 1 and 3, pulling No. 2, noting No. 3 is merely a layover.

Madam Speaker: Okay, No. 2 is pulled?

Councillor Mayes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Yes, and No. 3 was the…yes, layover. All in favour of the 1 and 3? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And those items pass. Item 2, Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – New Capital Project for Interim Chemical Phosphorous Removal for the North End Sewage Treatment Plant

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I hate to break the general mood of acrimony around the chamber, but this is actually a pretty good example of councillors working together on an initiative. Perhaps we're not at that Eric Church song lyric about everybody's got their arms around everybody else's shoulders, but this is…this was a pretty good example of people…of an idea coming forward from outside EPC. Before I was chair, Councillor Gilroy really steered this forward and steered this through. Good work by our staff coming back with a report on the interim phosphorous removal. I think Councillor Nason and I think Councillor Klein got this site moving originally. So, you know, more expensive than we thought. More expensive than some people in the community thought. But later coming on than we thought. But you have to construct a whole building, it's going to take some time in the midst of a pandemic. So, we're doing something. We're doing something real. We're going to reduce, very slightly, the amount of phosphorous going into the lake. So, we are taking some real action here to the credit of everybody, I think, around the table. And I know I certainly don't take any of the credit. This was before my period as chair, but you know, it's a step forward in terms of what we're doing to help benefit the lake.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? No. And I'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. I'm sorry, Mr. Mayor. You were waving with no sound. I did not understand that. Thank you. Okay. We'll now move into question period under this committee. Any questions? Yes? Pardon me?

Councillor Schreyer: Is there not an item…

Madam Speaker: We did do that together because there was the consent recorded. Yeah. Okay. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Okay, seeing none, lets move on. Standing Policy Committee on Innovation and Economic Development.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 19, 2021**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of January 19th and move Items 1 through 4 as consent.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Two and four. Any other? Three has been pulled. Okay. Just Item 1. And that's the Animal Services Special Operating, Mr. Mayor. Call for a recorded vote. And I'd like to say, please call at the appropriate time because it's hard when there are so many items. All in favour of Item 1, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillor Klein

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

Madam Speaker: Item 1 passes. Madam Clerk, Item 2.

Item 2 – Winnipeg Fleet Management Agency – 2021 Business Plan

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll wait to hear from the comments from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just actually pulled this down so I could stay consistent with my vote from Innovation and Economic Development. I voted nay to the Fleet Management. I think it's flawed. Thank you

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I recognize the…oh, I'm sorry did you want to?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein, next speaker.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll just make a couple of brief comments. At a time when our financial concerns are stressed to the max, and when I see brand new king cab trucks that are obviously being leased on a yearly rate or even maybe less than a yearly rate, then I don't see our…truly any real work to address our fleet. I'm not going to support the business plan as it's presented today.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. I, too, have concerns about the level of short-term rentals. And they are doing full year rentals in the Fleet Management Agency. I do know in 2020 there were more than usual and part of that was some of the distancing required and the sizes of the crews that were travelling in those trucks due to COVID, but nonetheless, that is still an issue of concern to me personally.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we'll call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein recorded in opposition. Okay. Yeah, so Councillor Eadie and Klein and Nason and Schreyer. So, that will be a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Orlikow, Councillors Browaty, Chambers, Gillingham, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins, Santos and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Nason and Schreyer

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 2 passes and Mayor Bowman is absent. Item 3.

Clerk: Item 3 – The City of Winnipeg Golf Services…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer? I do not. We'll have…Mr. Clerk or Carlos, could you confer with Councillor Schreyer on what he's asking while we continue. Madam Clerk.

Item 3 – The City of Winnipeg – Golf Services – Special Operating Agency – 2021 Business Plan

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty, to introduce the item.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report and listen for comments from my colleagues. I will note that 2020 was a banner year for the Golf Special Operating Agency and all of the civic courses had record numbers of rounds, high sales in terms of concessions as well as merchandise in the pro shops, rentals of pull carts and gas carts.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any speakers? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Well, what a long way we've come from back in 2013 or 2012 when we first started talking about this, from my memory, of when we first started talking about this, because if you were here in 2013, there was the following logic presented to you; the City of Winnipeg courses are unionized. The City of Winnipeg courses lose a million dollars a year, therefore, it's the fault of the unions that the City of Winnipeg golf courses lose money. And I would get up and say, actually, Kildonan's unionized, it makes money. So, there's a problem. B) Harbourview, if you look at the numbers back in 2013, if everybody worked for free, they'd still have lost money because there was so much debt saddled onto it when it was first created. So, we have come a long way. Much praise to…or a word and praise, I think, of Ben Fey who is running our Golf Services now and his predecessor Al Shane, both of whom did a very good job turning things around. We got more honest accounting, frankly, so we weren't pretending we were losing a million dollars. We got more honest numbers about how things were going. And as Councillor Browaty just said, probably our best year in decades on the golf service. Some of them made money, some of them still didn't, but really a very positive year. We did listen to CUPE back in 2013 when Mike Davidson stood over there and said, you should add a surcharge onto each round, take the money and invest it back in capital expenditures. We do that. We put a surcharge on each round and we're investing it back in the courses. So, I think we've had quite a good run under this mayor with our Golf Services. We will have a debate. We will have a debate here. There will be a report about what to do with repurposing possibly or looking at some options for the golf courses, but nothing has been decided yet on that. But for today, it is worth noting, very successful year. I played my one round of the year at St. Boniface and the fellow who had me there said, look around you, and we were like the oldest people there. Most of the people were under about age 16. It was like the youth deluge at St. Boniface Golf Course because there was a pandemic on, it was something to do. So, we've had, I think, a very promising year. And for the future, I think our Golf Services is in very good hands with Ben Fey. So, it is worth noting, though, we have turned things around in a very real way at our Golf Services. I make my annual objection to the cost of each round and then you shoot it into 18 and the 9-hole courses, it costs more to maintain an 18-hole course because they're bigger than 9-hole courses. And then you should take…should divide it by rounds times the number of holes, I would suggest we do that for a year or two because otherwise you look at this and you think, man, it's great to run Harbourview, look at the costs here. Well, yeah, of course. It's much cheaper than running Kildonan because it's 9-holes versus 18, but I'll have that conversation with Mr. Fay again some time. So, good news story in short. And I look forward to further debate about the golf courses in the future.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Councillor Klein. Pardon me, Councillor Nason, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Nason: I don't have the hair, Madam Speaker. You know what, when I was on IED, I was very critical of golf and the challenges that it presents, specifically with regards to Crescent Drive and the arrangement that's there. You know, I remember dialogue where it was supposed to be such a great arrangement for the City with the external partner that was there. But I do see that, you know, it's about 50% less losses than previous years. I know we've got the least spaces that we're talking about what to do. Transcona Golf Course, they're wanting to move forward. Their lease is up in a couple of years. We have, again, you know, I mentioned earlier, we've got some challenges with regards to the space around it. Plessis Road, we need to look at that. We need to look at some of the challenges. If we go forward with that, there is going to be significant impacts on that course. I've made the president of the club aware that, you know, there is a potential of three to five holes being gone as a result of reconfiguration of the road. They just want clarity. Again, you know, recently we dealt with Tuxedo. Their lease was renewed. There was a two year out on it. You know, looking climate wise I see that there was something about electric golf cut or a mower that has been purchased for Kildonan, that maybe looked at expanding. I know they were venturing into electric golf carts for, I think they were leasing them as opposed to gas. There is a lot of chemicals that are applied. These are pretty good-looking greens. Kildonan's got a lot of trees on the property. I'm not sure if there is going to be an LDR request to replace those trees because there is a heck of a lot on. There's a lot on our golf courses. I don't know what our plan is to address the trees on these courses. There is a lot of them. Bloomberg is still out there. We haven't made a concrete decision on that. You know, we've tried a few kicks at the can, but you know there is challenges in the future. This plan, you know, we've got four courses that, you know, are they providing utmost service? Could that money be redirected somewhere else? I don't know. You know, I know residents want pickle ball. You know, we've…Transcona, this weekend, Sunday. So if you're not busy, you can come out to Transcona and hopefully there might be a little bit of snow left. Winnipeg Trails has put one of those grooming setups there as Councillor Orlikow is shaking his head, an improvement. You know, I wasn't able to give them the full amount that they asked for, but there is Wellness Funding that is going towards that. Yes, I didn't vote for the budget. I didn't vote for the budget. There was components in there that were okay. You know, but it wasn't…the full meal deal wasn't there to support it. This plan will go forward. I know the votes are there. We do have to look at being in the business of golf. You know, many municipalities are looking at it and they're getting out of that business. Is now the time? Maybe not, but I think it's worth a look to see if paring down some of these and finding some alternate ways where we preserve the green space, but yet meet the needs of our community. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: On Golf Services, thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, of course. And Golf Services, guess what we've been going through over years? Divesting ourselves of assets to get short-term funds. Madam Speaker, you asked for it. Madam Speaker, why do we do these and things in the short term, selling off our assets? I wasn't going to start my speech this way, by the way, but guess why? Because we need the money right away, because we're not really dealing with the fact that our capital costs have been going through the roof every single year. And we try to take it out. We try to sell our assets to try to deal with that. Not only that, Councillor Mayes mentions the point…and I want to thank Councillor Mayes. Over the years, when I'm losing hope in the process, including how EPC runs, there is Brian Mayes showing that…well, that's true. Showing that extra element of independent thinking, which is what we all rely on. We all rely on everyone thinking independently and dealing with what everyone is saying. Dealing with statistics. Dealing with opinions and perspectives, yes, but dealing with stats. Councillor Mayes would bring up the stats, just as he did, making the point, when they're trying to blame CUPE, if everyone worked for free, it would still…well, wait a minute. Why was there…why was there…why was there debt laden on it? It wasn't through operational costs. There was debt laid on it through capital costs. Madam Speaker, you asked, construction inflation. So, there you go, Madam Speaker. It all relates. And why does it always relate? Because everything relates to the budget. And when you relate things to the budget, guess what you're relating to? Our increase in debt. Our increase in taxes. Reduction of services primarily due to one thing. And I don't have to say why. I don't have to say what it is right now. And that's why it relates to everything, because the budget relates to everything. So, Madam Speaker, I am just rising right now to thank Brian Mayes over the years for making points that need to be said that no one else was saying in Council, let alone EPC, and just thank you for that independent thought on some objective perspective based on real information, real statistics, that we can use to make better decisions. Thank you.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. To Councillor Nason's comments about opportunities through reforestation, specifically at Kildonan Golf Course, I'm very happy to say that this year is actually the 100th anniversary of the Kildonan Park Golf Course. The golf course's first rounds were played on June 9th, 2021. And I'd like to invite all of you to mark in your calendars right now, Wednesday, July 28th, 2021. It will be the 100th anniversary of the political launch of that golf course and the golf course staff are planning to have all of us out for festivities on that day.

There is an opportunity though, we're also going to be going out to the community and saying, does your business, do you personally as a commemorative thing, because your family has a long history at the golf course, sponsor something at the golf course. There will be an opportunity to sponsor benches, to sponsor trees. So, if Councillor Nason wants to whip out his credit card right now, we'll get you in touch and we'll get you down for three trees and we'll…we appreciate your support. So yes, brush up on your game. Need to find a virtual screen. Today's health orders may permit them. I'm not 100% sure. Get out there and get your game on. And I look forward to a strong golf season again this year. Thank you, everyone.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. With that, call the question on Item 3. Call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. None opposed, that item passes. We'll now have question period. Just before we do that…yes, we'll go to Item 4. Just before we do that, there has been a request. We can have a break from 5:15 to about 5:45? If that's amenable. And we are going past 6:00 today.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I would move that motion just because I have some personal business. I have no choice.

Madam Speaker: Yes, there has been two requests, so…and yours included. So, is Council amenable to breaking for half an hour? And we will be continuing the meeting past 6:00 as well. Fifteen? Just need a little bit more time. There is a personal matter a member has to deal with, so. But let's come back at the 5:45 sharp. Okay? Back to you, Madam Clerk, for Item 4.

Item 4 – Winnipeg Parking Authority 2021 Business Plan

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'll wait to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I stepped this one down. Again, I believe the overall plan, there is a lot of good things in there, but there is a number of issues I'm not going to get into. I just believe it's flawed and I just wanted an ability to I guess have a recorded vote, so I can say nay.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, the one major thing that sticks out to me and it's caused me concern because I've heard with regards to aggressive ticketing through the Parking Authority, particularly in around the Portage Place area, that they're very aggressive with regards to assigning tickets to seniors and others that may be downtown for medical appointments. But I see in this report that there is…about expanding the use of automated licence plate recognition technology to improve enforcement of safety infractions in school zones and fire lanes. And other parking infractions across the city. I see this and I see a significant way to make up from parking revenue in the coming year or more. If this passes today. Just on that perspective alone, it causes me pause to support this matter. We've yet to hear back about some of the new approaches with regards to automated ticketing. Any complaints or issues of getting multiple tickets before people are aware. I remember recalling years ago being at Children's Hospital, taking care of my son in an emergency situation. Parking on the street and looking…I looked as I pulled up. It just happened that the block that I was on didn't have a snow route parking sign. There was one a block back and a block forward. I was worried about dealing with my child at the time. Only to come out luckily, I didn't get towed, but I did get a fine. Now that would happen a week or so after. We know that there's challenges in the province. At some point we'll get off their hiney and complete the review of photo enforcement in the city, but I see this as yet another…you know, I hate using the term, but cash grab, right. When we're doing the auto detection, auto enforcement, it can be very punitive very quickly if people aren't aware of the signage

that we're enforcing on. Right now, our snow route signs don't have the period of time that they're involved. So if somebody's coming from outside the perimeter, they're not aware of what our terms are. So, I won't be supporting this report today, Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Nason. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Browaty, back to you.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much. As you know, this council has been doing…taking initiatives to try and help our downtown in particular. The fact that we've previously voted that we are giving people one hour of complimentary parking downtown through June 30th is an important way to help support some of those downtown businesses that are trying to come back from COVID. Again, the point of charging for downtown on-street parking is about managing the supply. And right now, the demand is way down. There is a lot of supply capacity and even giving away the complimentary hour is not negatively affecting people's access to downtown businesses and services. In terms of, you know, adopting new technology to deliver tickets more efficiently, I mean, that's I think a positive initiative. On the other hand, if it is getting to the point where it's punitive, if you've received multiple tickets in the mail consecutively without getting one in the mail, that is a concern that I have previously expressed. And if we have examples of that, I would like to hear about it so that we can make sure that there are improvements made. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Browaty. With that, I'll call the question on Item 4. All in favour? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And that would be an automatic recorded vote as there was more than three in opposition. All opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein, Nason and Schreyer

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 11, Nays 4.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 4 passes. We'll now have a short recess. It's 5:15. We'll reconvene at…in half an hour, 30 minutes at 5:45. Thank you. Councillor Eadie, you made that motion. All in favour? Recorded vote? Contrary? Carried. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 25, 2021, at 5:50 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good evening. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of February 25th, 2021. We are on the Standing Policy Committee of Innovation and Economic Development. It is time for question period for our chair, Councillor Browaty. Any questions for the Chair? Councillor Schreyer.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you. I heard Councillor Nason say that we're looking again, we might be looking again at using electric carts at the City-owned golf courses. I just wanted to know if there is any comment from the Chair of the Committee on that one.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Schreyer. I am not aware of anything at the moment, but I can look into it and get back to him.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Gilroy, on Report 'A' dated September 17th, 2020.

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

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

Madam Speaker: No. 1 – List of Historical Resources – Nomination of the T. Eaton Building. All in favour? Okay. Madam Clerk.

Item 1 – List of Historical Resources – Nomination of T. Eaton Company Mail Order and Catalogue Building, 333 St. Mary Avenue

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an item that came before us. It's a little different whereas we are…the Heritage Committee has asked us to designate this building that is owned by MPI. And they are…is a Crown corporation. And in that, doesn't have to adhere to the heritage designation if they don't want to. There was quite a lot of discussion at the committee. And what we learned from that is that we do have the authority as the committee to declare this a heritage site. If this…heritage building. And if this building ever were to be sold in the future, then the next owner would have to adhere to making sure that is…adhere to the designation. So, we really felt that it was really, really important that we…that under our guidance as a city and our committee that does a lot of work in ensuring our heritage buildings, that we listen to them and that we do declare this a heritage building. Now, we do know that the Province, you know, the Crown corporation does not have to adhere to this designation, but I think that it's important that we highlight this and say, this is an important building. It will be up to them to make the decision if they want to proceed in following the guidance that we pass here today and no, we cannot force them. But I think this is a pretty clear moment in time when we are saying that these buildings are very important to us. As a government, we want to acknowledge that we have a role to play in ensuring the historical nature of these buildings and making sure that we pass on that if this building were to be sold. So, that was the…the committee felt really strongly that this still be cleared a historical building. And in the end, it will be up to the Province to decide on how they're going to go forward with that. And we will not be able to make them adhere to that, but we will be able to if they were to sell the building in the future. And of course, I know there was concerns about, you know, this being different because, you know, if they don't have to adhere to these things, how would people know? Well, we do a lot of these things all the time as we make decisions at Council, that we have to go back and take a look at how we voted, but those things are documented here now. And I think that that will be documented, you know, if there are issues that arise in the past. But what I think what's really critical is that if this building ever gets sold in the past, we are acknowledging that this is a critical building, we want to declare it a heritage site, but we're also sending a clear message that…to all others that we think everyone should be participating in this including our Provincial Government. So, I think this is a good motion that's in front of us here today, and I hope that my councillor colleagues support it.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I feel compelled to speak to this heritage…or, well, it's not a heritage designation. It's getting the lower designation, Madam Speaker. Now, you know, I'm not a practising lawyer or have I ever been a member of the bar. I have, Madam Speaker, had the opportunity to work under a minister responsible for the Crown corporation called MPI. And I can't remember all the legislations there, Madam Speaker, but what I want to say here is, it is a Crown corporation created to provide public auto insurance and that is a publicly provided one in which we don't have private insurance offerings for the vehicles that they insure. Now, of course, MPI is also responsible for the licencing and all that which happened a number of years ago. I don't want to go into the whole history of MPI, but ultimately, it was controversial. MPI leased, as Councillor Nason mentioned, leased a couple of floors at what is now called City Place. And they have a company that sells private insurance that really is not regulated by the act that created MPI. They are providing a competitive for-profit insurance to semi tractor trailers and other types of equipment that aren't covered under our public insurance. And they use those profits. I remember the controversy. You might have remembered it yourselves in the news. Gary Doer was under quite…pressure because people were saying, why are you spending our

public insurance dollars in buying a property that is meant for business? And da, da, da, da, on and on we could go. And the reason it was rationalized is, is they were using profits to buy that building that they made from their private enterprises. And as we heard from the representative speaking to this issue of heritage and MPI, they're representing the for-profit business that manages City Place that makes profits that MPI can use not under the Public Insurance Act or whatever the name of the act is. So, City Place is a private for-profit driven business that MPI decided to get into in the downtown. And I hear all this talk about the SHED district and somehow that having an effect on that. Well, the SHED district is about for-profit businesses, well, not the Convention Centre, but the point is, is they're generating economic growth and wealth. And MPI is involved in that private sector enterprise, outside of their Crown corporation, and they own a bunch of buildings around Winnipeg and they're all for their public insurance operations. I think they might even have the odd outlet where they have private insurance offerings. But ultimately, this building I don't believe should fit within their…it's Councillor Orlikow used the word duplicitous. You know, I think that we should be giving it the full designation. I'm probably the oldest person on Council here. I don't know if you remember, but I remember going with my mom to the catalogue centre. Going to that warehouse, and you know, it has great historic significance to Winnipeg. And I'm not sure of all the architectural aspects of it, Madam Speaker, but I have a hard time supporting this report. And I think that the committee and the City did their best. And you know, the discussion of lawsuits and so on and so forth. I don't know how you would argue that in court, but I personally can make a decision from my own perspective. And I believe that it should be getting the full heritage designation and, therefore, I can't vote for this because I don't personally believe. And it's never…this situation hasn't been decided in court. And, yeah, we can say, throw it onto the Province and they can decide whether they want to keep the heritage or not. You know, I don't know. Whatever. But we, as a city, have a responsibility. We have an official by-law on everything that deals with the heritage here. And I don't see any problem as to why MPI can't agree to accept the heritage status and just leave bygones alone. So, you know, really, are they actually…have intentions of violating the heritage value of that building? I don't know. But you know, they agreed to put it on a, you know, a special list, but they don't want full heritage status. So, you know what that tells me? That tells me they don't want to be held down by heritage and they really don't care about it, Madam Speaker. So, that's my position and that's all I could gather from what I heard, so I won't be voting for this report. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Okay, thank you very much. Let's just be very clear again today of what we're actually talking about, is the City of Winnipeg has gone through a process where it's evaluated the building and we're looking at the exterior elements to preserve. So, that's what we're talking about today. And if you believe in that, and you believe that these exterior elements that are the stone, the façades are very important for downtown Winnipeg, you really should be voting for that today. It is the reason why we're here today. Now, the nuance of this one is, will the corporation adhere to this when they're not obligated to under what we've been told is under a third party, which is Provincial Government. I believe they will. I actually do believe they will. But again, we don't know who will be the second party who will own this building in the future. So again, there is no harm, no foul, if you actually believe that this is an important exterior building to preserve. Now, if they do go to the Province and the Province takes that forward, it will save the problem that we as City Council believe in this, that we really need to preserve this building. I think that's very fair. So, that's what we're here for today. So, I believe Council, I believe we all agreed, we've been told, there is no development plan imminent not by this MPI or if they do sell it, by a third party. We didn't hear that today at all. So, we're just saying today, again, we, the City believe this building has an incredible attachment to Winnipeg's history and all we're asking for is the façade on the outside to be preserved. So, again, with all the other comments I've heard, I understand, but again, I just want to be very clear on what we're voting for today is that we, as a council, representing the Winnipeggers, believe this façade of this building is worth saying we want to preserve it. Regardless if the MPI will follow it or not. I hope they will. I believe they will. So, at that, I will be supporting it. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe that, again, we're driving in a lane that we don't need to right now. We heard a very thoughtful presentation. We know the rules that govern this, you simply have to google it. If you don't take the time to google what the rules are and who has jurisdiction over Crown properties and who does not. My other concern with this is that, if you drive down Portage Avenue now coming into the core, I'm seeing more and more boarded up buildings and one of them that sticks out is the Bay. And in this council not that long ago, every one of us received a letter when we were about to vote on whether or not the downtown Bay should receive historical status from the Bay's executive stating that if we would remove the interior portion, they felt that they could keep that building strong and they could make changes that would benefit the community. However, they would maintain the exterior. They asked us to do that. I spoke to it thinking that that was a reasonable compromise, that would be the true meaning of collaboration with a business. We voted opposed to that. And today, we drive by a landmark in Canadian history that is boarded up. Right? I'm going to go back to what Councillor Orlikow said and what I said I guess. We have more important things to deal with. This is not something that we have to do today. We can certainly send a letter to the Province. We don't seem

to have any problem calling the Province out every day. Surely, we could…you can send a letter and ask them to do the right thing on this motion.

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

Councillor Nason: Well, I was going to say much of the same thing, but now I've got to figure out a different way to say it, Madam Speaker. You know, hearing Councillor Eadie speak and I know we wear different political hats, but you know, you come into an election season and you know, MPI is going to be sold, Manitoba Hydro is going to be sold. Well, we've had a few years of a PC government down on Broadway and MPI is still going strong. They're actually giving money back, which I scratch my head over at times. But you know, on the heritage value, you know, we see the Bay. And I read the report, I think it was yesterday, where they talk about the boarded-up windows and the zero-dollar property values. It sounds like we're making an issue over something that is not there. That we're creating fear where fear shouldn't be. I can well imagine if there were destruction cranes suddenly rolling down in the area towards MPI building, that the crowds would be out in masses. You know, John Kiernan's cell phone would probably be going off the hook with, what is going on? You know, police would be called. Riots would be breaking out. I don't think that's going to happen in this case. MPI is a public agent. I can't see them doing that. And as Councillor Klein suggested, you know, working with the Province and actually putting true historical designation on it, because as I understand it, with a stroke of a pen they can say, yeah, nice try, City of Winnipeg, but you know, I think we're not in the right swim lane here. And we should get back to it. And get through the rest of the remaining items on our agenda.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Gilroy, back to you.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have a Heritage Committee for a reason. We have a beautiful downtown heritage area for a reason and that's because we've preserved it as a council. We made that a priority. Now we have people that come from all over just to see our historical buildings where other cities have torn them down and they didn't have these things in place to help save the very characteristics that we treasure. This committee, if this was not provincial building, this committee would say, yes, declare it. The only thing that makes this different is this is a provincial building. I agree with what was said here today. The Province has every right under the Charter not to have to listen to that. But we have every right as a council to listen to the committee that we have designated to look at the historical buildings that know and understand what should be listed and what shouldn't be listed. And just so you guys know, this is basically the exterior. We're not talking about the inside. They can go and do whatever they want to the inside. These are the elements of that exterior that we treasure. So, I think that that's our duty and that's our job to protect that. We're not the Provincial Government. They will make their decision. And I hope that, you know, I hope that they will listen, but if they don't, then at least if the building hasn't been touched too badly and the next owner comes in, they will have to follow the heritage designation rules. So, I think this is a really thing that we should cherish here in Winnipeg is this beautiful city that we preserved our heritage buildings, that other cities don't have because they didn't do the measures that we're doing. And you know, this is our role and this is our job. And if this wasn't a provincial building, we would probably be declaring this. So, that's why this is kind of in front of us here today. So, I hope you consider supporting it. I think we've done a lot of work in the city to preserve these old buildings and we just have to walk outside, we just have to look outside of I know my own offices and I enjoy seeing the beautiful façades that I can see right around us here. So, I hope that you consider that and you'll support this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. With that, the question. All in favour? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Klein and Nason

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 3.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 1 passes. Moving on to the report dated January 18th, 2021. Councillor Gilroy.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 18, 2021**

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move consent of agenda Item No. 9.

Madam Speaker: It's been stood down. Madam Clerk.

Item 9 – Jardins des sculptures

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Madam Chair.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know that we've heard lots and lots about the sculpture. I know my committee has done a lot of great work. Councillor Klein, Councillor Lukes and Councillor Santos, I think even Councillor Rollins when she sat on this, heard lots about the sculpture. I know lots of work I know that the motion that has come forward with Councillor Allard was also looked at through the public administration, so I know lots of collaboration has gone on. So, I hope that you support the motion that is in front of us here today.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to speak to this. I was looking for some guidance from Councillor Allard, Madam Speaker, but I guess he had something else he had to deal with today. But Madam Speaker, I will be supporting this motion that Councillor Allard has been trying to fix the mistakes from what, back in 2007, 2008, that we may or may not think occurred depending on your perspective on this. It is a…well, it is a heritage historical site. And for the people at St. Boniface, it's very important. And I respect that. The…we will be, I believe, declaring rescinding the surplus on the Sculpture Garden property proper. The whole issue of the other sculptor work on the rest of that lot, I don't know, but what I wanted to point out and I think should have been in this motion, although I did see that a subdivision is going to be required. I think would have to be accomplished by the prospective new owner of that property and I'll speak to that report when it comes. But Madam Speaker, I think that what is really important here is that…and I think it should have been part of this motion, but I was seeking the advice and Councillor Allard thought that, you know, there could be other motions moved later, but I really believe that we should be rescinding the surplus on that property. And in this report here, we should be demanding that subdivision application and rezoning happen for the garden Madam Speaker, to…it's not enough to just rescind the surplus decision, which I think doesn't require two-thirds vote, but I believe when the subdivision happens for these gardens, it should be zoned a P2 which is park community, which is what the property is about. This is about the French community of Winnipeg. And that sculpture garden represents that and any subdivision that goes ahead should make it park land, so that who knows way into the future what people may or may not decide in regard to what we do with park property. But it would take two-thirds of a vote to then declare that particular area surplus way into the future. At least currently the way our governance works, Madam Speaker. So, I just wanted to speak out on that part because I think that we do need to protect our heritage and I usually vote consistently with trying to keep heritage, although I guess…anyway, in these terms, I just wanted to mention that that subdivision needs to turn that into a P2 property so that Council won't have an easy time declaring that part if it becomes park space, a surplus ever again. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this motion today. This was a…this is a result of an oversight by the Public Service on a particular sculpture within the Sculpture Garden and it's a very prominent, very beautiful sculpture and I absolutely understand the francophone community's desire not to have to have that sculpture moved. I absolutely support that all costs associated with this be the responsibility of the City, and have been encouraging the francophone community to work with the new owner of the property that even then that maybe they can work out an arrangement in their offer to purchase and with the francophone community. So, this is a very similar scenario that Councillor Santos is familiar with when the heritage building was sold across the street. So, you know, and the Public Service admitted that it was a new…this is new to them and this was an oversight. So, I think this is a good motion that Councillor Allard brought forward. And I will be supporting it. It's a complicated project. It's a very passionate issue in the francophone community, and I'll be supporting this. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting the motion before us. I read the report from PP&D and administration with regards to not only the Sculpture Garden but the sale of 212 Dumoulin and 219 Provencher. Like many of my council colleagues here, I participated in meetings where the community articulated their concerns with

respect to the City's RFP for the St. Boniface…for the old St. Boniface City Hall. I also read and heard from the francophone community about their surprise and their disbelief that the City of Winnipeg would sell such a cultural asset and heritage site, specifically the old St. Boniface City Hall, to a third party without being consulted. I would have hoped and expected that through the ongoing negotiations with Manitoba Possible, that the administration would consult and involve the community, the francophone community representatives, and stakeholders to find solutions that may involve retaining ownership of 219 Provencher and so we would avoid having to pay for removing the garden at a substantial cost to taxpayers. Consultation is at the essence of any good negotiation. So, we need to question how it is conceivable that a building of this significance and value both from a monetary perspective as well as a cultural perspective, can simply be sold without consideration to the community it has served since 1907. This demonstrates, Madam Speaker, the urgent need to implement reviews under our current procedures for the future and to strive to amicable solutions for the immediate. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I will be supporting the motion. I mean, obviously, this isn't dead on the whole issue of the sale of the old city hall. This is a relatively narrow thing, but there is a larger issue at play here. I've been coming to work here the last three or four years and being told several dozen times, if not several hundred times, how sorry that the community in your ward is crystal clear in its opposition to some of these projects in the Glenwood area, but densification is number one for the environment, number one for our books. We're all going to be…we're going to have tax cuts in the future. Yes, we are. So, it's good to see us recognize, and I'll be voting for this, that it isn't always densification at the cost of everything else. We do take into account the environment. We do take into account heritage. We do take into account other factors. Councillor Allard at EPC said the community has been crystal clear in its position on this. And that's great. So, I'm pleased to see and I will join in supporting the community. And somewhere down the line we're going to be having some debates on Complete Communities and on info guidelines and I'll be coming back to this theme because certainly, there have been crystal clear positions from people in my community. And I have lost a ton of votes here over time on this, so I'm pleased to see that we're taking a stand here and we're recognizing that we don't have to densify absolutely everything. Density can make sense in certain areas, but also…but also there is a role for the community and listening to the community. So, when the community is, as Councillor Allard said, crystal clear in its position, yes, we should listen to the community and give that some weight rather than simply saying, well, I read in a textbook that it's always good and this is what's going to save the climate and this is what's going to give us tax cuts in the future. I'm not sure that's as simple as all that. I'm not sure it's as simple as all that. So, I'll be voting for this today and look forward to revisiting this issue sometime in the future when we come to talk in more general terms about where we want to go in terms of infill guidelines and lot splitting and some of the other concerns that have come up from certain other communities; Councillor Rollins, Councillor Orlikow, my community about lot splitting. I look forward to that future debate. For today, I'm certainly supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, it's interesting hearing the dialogue about across at the…across the road from here with the museum piece that is there. You know, the deal that was done with the land and the dispute after. And who knows, we'll end up probably buying that building back for three times the price that we received for. I see this as the same. You know, the Chair of Finance has tossed this out a few times with regards to motions that come before him or other committees like, how much is this costing? Where is the dollar value? What is it costing the taxpayers? That's missing from this report, is that we're going to absorb this cost. We had an RFP that went out. So, we've got a…Manitoba Possible that's brought back the plan for it, and there is terms and conditions probably. We're good at paying lawyers lots of money for these things. So, no different than collective bargaining I guess. You know, I look at this and I'm thinking, earlier this afternoon we passed a Land Dedication. This is going to be…this is kind of…I look at this as like a park, Madam Speaker. It's a park. It's a monument that's on a piece of land. But yet, I don't see any commitment from the ward councillor to commit Land Dedication money, right? We learned today you don't need a report for it. Just put it in. Spend the money. Because I know that this councillor for this ward took $50,000 for Waterside Estates that was paid into Land Dedication Reserve that he never delivered a playground for. That came out of Transcona funds. So, he's got $50,000, but he's not putting any skin in the game. That's a challenge with this report that is before us today. There is no dollar value attached to it. It's an incomplete report. There is lot of unknown. There's a lot of risk. Is there a possibility there could be a legal dispute? Possible. It's a not-for-profit, Manitoba Possible. I think they're a fair player. They want to be a good steward in the community, but yet they got to be careful with their funds, too. I don't think the City should be responsible for this. And I think if, you know, if the community wants it, you know, there should be some skin in the game from the ward councillor through LDR even if it's a token amount. There was none offered, you know, maybe you guys can correct it, whoever follows me, EPC discussion, and how maybe behind closed doors what was discussed with regards to the risk, the liability and how much the true dollars this is going to cost the taxpayers. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's rather fitting that this issue came up right after dealing with the report item on heritage itself. And kind of surprising how this came about. Nonetheless, I do consider this an issue of heritage. In fact, I'm going to be a little more specific on Councillor Allard's behalf, back in the first term, last term, I moved the motion on his behalf regarding trying to fit in part of St. Boniface or get extra funding for St. Boniface because it wasn't given the funding, it wasn't part of the downtown area, the downtown tourist area. And I thought it's fitting that at least part of St. Boniface should be considered part of that because I think it's part of the way we can promote our city, our history, our heritage and that being the French aspect, the French fact of Canada, of Manitoba as expressed in St. Boniface. And on that basis, I thought it…St. Boniface should be given some extra consideration. By virtue, one, of its undeniable aspect to…of heritage and our history, and we went through the danger of ignoring that for 100 years, up until, happened to be, the first government in history of Canada recognizing finally Louis Riel not as a traitor, but as a founder of this country as part of the federation of Manitoba. And built the statue at the legislature officially recognizing for the first time an official statue built, recognized by the government, recognizing Louis Riel. Now, that was a bit of a tortured statue and it got moved to my alma mater of St. Boniface College. And so, we're dealing with the issue here of a motion that is a little confusing to me because we still don't know what is going to go on. It says, "Therefore be it resolved that the City either relocate the statues or retain the land upon which the statue is located or that the…and that the the Council rescind the declaration of surplus regarding this land." So to me, it's still some ambiguity here, which we talked about this morning. We can talk about…I didn't really want to go there in my consultations with them earlier on in terms of the possibility because the motion says, possible relocation. Now we did so with some form of consensus and some form of consensus and agreeability moving the Louis Riel statue from the legislature to St. Boniface College. You know, looking at where you would move this stuff. I mean, I guess, my son's alma mater, St. Boniface High School, could…there by Champlain Community Centre, could it be moved there because there is some shared green space between Holy Cross, St. Boniface High and Champlain Community Centre? Would it go there? Would it go back to St. Boniface College? But I…we really don't want to go there. Nonetheless, that's part of this resolution here. Ideally, as I've expressed this morning, ideally once we pass this, I think that's what this looks like to me, we have to make sure that the better aspect of this motion is what is expressed later on starting next week or whatever…well, whatever the administration and Council does next. So, in a nutshell, preserve heritage, try to make sense of this to my opinion so that it stays where it is. Interesting, I never thought of the point of view of Councillor Mayes in terms of the issue of density, but in the rich matrix by which we have to make our judgment, yes, we have to take into account certain aspects of heritage, culture, esthetics, which is part of what makes our life enriching as well as opportunities for promoting our heritage and our tourism as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. No further speakers? Councillor Gilroy to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to clarify a few things. This isn't about the sale of the old city hall when it was declared a surplus. That was two decades ago. Most of us, I think there's some that might have been here, but I know I wasn't here at that time and neither was Councillor Allard. So, that isn't what's in front of us here today. It is about the statue. And we've had lots of discussion on the statue and, really, what this is, is trying to really make a situation work in whatever way possible. We know that this is a historical value to this community. We want to make it work. And so, that's what this motion is doing. And I know Councillor Allard is on this and if there is…if there is more motions that need to come, I'm…we've all seen him, he's a master of motions, so I'm sure we'll see them. But I think what we're seeing here is a collaboration between what the administration, the community groups and the councillor wants. So, we are trying to do what we can to mitigate the concerns that people have around these gardens and the historical nature and the importance to the community. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Call the question on Item 9. All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Nason recorded in opposition. Councillor Schreyer. Just Councillor Nason. Thank you. That passes. We'll now move on to the next report. Councillor Gilroy, Report 'A'.

REPORT 'A' OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 18, 2021

Councillor Gilroy: Move adoption of consent of agenda Item 1.

Madam Speaker: Report 'A' dated January 18th, 2021. And that's Item 1. There is no one standing it down? Okay. And all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Item 1 passes. Okay. Councillor Gilroy, on the final report.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED FEBRUARY 12, 2021

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move consent of agenda Item 1 through 11.

Madam Speaker: So, I hear 3, 5, 10. Okay, 3, 5 and 10 have been pulled. I'll call the question on 1, 2.

Councillor Eadie: Just to confirm, I can't remember which report number. I'd like to stand down the…I think the purchase…

Madam Speaker: Ferrier?

Councillor Eadie: Of 212 Duhamel…or 212 Provencher and 219. Is that on…oh, it isn't. Okay, all right.

Councillor Gilroy: (Inaudible) 379 Selkirk Avenue.

Councillor Eadie: I just asked that. That's report 3.

Councillor Gilroy: Oh, okay.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. So, we've got 3, 5 and 10 stood down. I'll call the question on 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Those items pass. Madam Clerk, Item 3.

Item 3 – Proposed Sale of Vacant City-Owned Land at 379 Selkirk Avenue

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, to open.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, I'll wait to hear from my council colleague on this. I know he's worked really hard on this and it's something I support. So, I'll wait to hear from him.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to rise and, of course, I'm voting for it. We moved it at community committee. It's gone through a proper process I would point out. And actually, this isn't really…I heard Mr. Simms speak highly of me, but you know, this is Council, this is all of us. 379 as well as the sale of the lot to the Manitoba Indigenous Culture and Education Centre which, you'll note there is two other motions I moved at Council regarding their

operation, Madam Speaker, that all of these lots is our ability as Council, all of us, every…all 16 of us, Madam Speaker, this is our ability to contribute to the other reconciliation work that's going on in the City of Winnipeg. And I really appreciate and they appreciate the work and Council's support for this. Our City administration has vetted it quite clearly. These are dollar lots. I would point out that for the Manitoba Indigenous Culture Education Centre, the other two I introduced, they would be sold at the appropriate market value, but in this case, what's going to happen with 379 is, not only will there be development on this property, and believe me, there are so many vacant lots on Selkirk Avenue. And you know, you know, when this kind of thing was happening downtown…downtown, everybody was freaking out. And I know that everybody does have their concern for Selkirk Avenue, but we really need to try to motivate others and there is some motivation on Selkirk Avenue. As soon as this hit the media that we were selling the lot, my office received a number of calls, people looking at developing other properties. Some that are private vacant…privately-owned lots and asking me, well, do you know who owns it, maybe we're going to look at building. This is great. So, that's what we hope will happen. So, not only are we contributing as a council, all of us, to the healing and reconciliation, but we're also…also promoting the idea that new development is good on Selkirk Avenue and that people should start investing their dollars and improving the community because you know what, the North End, it does have some social ills, but you know what, the potential is to do better and with the efforts of this educational support, the people who live in the North End, those young ones, they will have hope. They will have the ability to move into better things in their future. And how can we not support that, right? So, I'm going to say, this is Council, it goes beyond what we signed on to in the accord, but you know what, it's really important. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor. Councillor Gilroy, back to you for the close.

Councillor Gilroy: You can call the question. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 3 passes. Item 5, Madam Clerk.

Item 5 – Insurance Responsibility of Non-Profit Organizations Operating on City-Owned Land

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, this came forward because there was a…we looked at West Broadway Community Centre and we have…we just have a couple of them that are in the city and we had a really good discussion at our…at community…not community committee, PP&D on this to really kind of understand it because there was a lack of understanding behind this. So, West Broadway and we have another one in Spence, they have community centres that are run by groups and that's because they don't have the community volunteer capacity like we do at some of my other community centres. So, they are covered. They cover their insurance for their building just like anybody else that, you know, that is in one of our buildings with the city. However, I don't think it's fair that they have to cover the insurance costs for the park space because that's not what the…you know, they're not using the park space. And this is similar to what we have with our community centres. Our community centres pay for the insurance and stuff within the building, but they don't pay it on the park space. So, this is very…this is the same thing. It's just that because it was a lease agreement, it just fell differently. So, we're just kind of correcting it. There is no cost to the City. It's covered under the City's insurance because we covered all the other park space, like this is. As you can see, it's a BMX park and there's lots of…it's a park space. So, there is no difference. And it actually saves the City money because in the cases where community organizations, we don't have the capacity, the City ends up running these community centres and so we ended up…we end up staffing it and then paying the insurance in these community centres and all the other stuff that goes along with it. So, there is no cost to the City for them taking over the park. I think they should be paying for the park anyways, it's a City park. And it's actually kind of a decrease in the cost because we're not…in this area, we would have to end up running the building and having staff staff the building. So, I think what happened was we really wanted clarity on that, so there was a report back to kind of look at, you know, where are we paying insurance and you know, what are these different organizations, because I think there was a lack of clarity from other councillors. So, I'm hoping that this report kind of clears it up, that this is actually a park

space and the insurance in the building is being covered through the group. And I'm hopefully…it kind of puts it in line with the other community centres that we already have, that each of us have in our own wards. So, I hope that that kind of clears it up for everybody. It's a good report. And thanks…and thanks to my committee, they did a really good job of asking questions and the dialogue that came from there.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And this was stood down? Councillor Nason, followed by Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Nason: You know, hearing…you know, reading the report, the report said there was 101 locations with one exception. One exception. Now we're hearing there's two exceptions. I look at the list and there are very specific items I was looking for in this list. I was looking to see the location where Canterbury Daycare…Canterbury Park Daycare and Transcona Nationals co exist. Huge footprint of a football field as part of that, Madam Speaker. They're not on the list. I was looking for the Transcona Retired Citizens Centre. They have the building and they have a parking lot. They're not on the list. It's curious because now I'm hearing that, you know, maybe this isn't a complete report. We have a flawed report that's been presented to Council. We don't have hours and hours and hours to comb over the videos and listen for the succinct details from the Public Service. We see a report, we read the report, we expect accuracy in the report. This report is not accurate. We still haven't heard, and we…well, we heard it's covered under our blanket coverage, but there hasn't been a dollar value attached to what that blanket coverage costs. And I guess onesie, twosie, you know, it's kind of like, you know, throwing money from a CGIP to programs. In the grand scale of a billion-dollar enterprise, you know, it's not a lot, but when we get reports from the Public Service, I would hope that they have an accurate inventory of the buildings that we own, right? I know it says land leases, but as I look through it, I believe some of these are strictly buildings. You know, we've got a wellness centre that's on City land. What else do we have? A housing development, right? So, to me, we've got a report that is not complete, but yet we've got it to be received as information. So, it went through the lens of the standing committee. It went through the lens of Executive Policy Committee and now it's before Council. It sounds like the budget from 2020 had a multimillion-dollar error. We accept failure or less than complete. You know, maybe I'm using too harsh of language, but you know, I heard after we passed the motion for Broadway that my constituents were like, oh, can we get a break on our insurance, too, because we're strapped for cash, we don't have a lot of money, we run shoestring. So, you know, what's in it for them? Where is their break on taxes? Can we cover them under it? Do we have the dollar value that it would cost to add some of these other great not-for-profits in other parts of the city or community organizations in other parts of the city? Like the Winnipeg Soccer Federation? My daughter plays soccer, so I know some of the funds that…the fees that I pay to the Winnipeg Soccer Federation to participate in the great sport of football. I'll use the term football. But I think there is an opportunity to do better with this report than what we have before us today. I don't know if we have to have another supplemental. I'm not in the mood and I'm sure none of our colleagues are. I'm getting a little tired of standing up for recorded votes to set a tone or a message. You know, I was thinking about doing a, you know, a recommendation by recommendation, but a lot of these don't have a lot for recommendations. Again, this one is to be received as information. But you know, as a city, we should be demanding better. I know I've got residents reaching out to me saying, why aren't people being held to account for failing to get a contract date for negotiation with the fire union? What can I tell them? You know, we just move on to the next issue. So, I think we can do better with this one. I'm going to vote against it even though it's received for information. Hopefully, maybe we can bring something better back next time.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, I just…I just want to really highlight a couple of things because I don't think it's still not clear. This is a community centre with parkland attached. They lease out the community centre. They don't do anything with the land. This is not a soccer club that is running soccer on that land. The area uses it as a park because in the inner-city we don't have much park space. So, this is a BMX park like a skate park that you might have in your own ward. So, I just want to be clear that, you know, this is park space. This is park land. And the City should be paying for it. And so, I just want to kind of clear, this is no different than any other community centre that is out there that has space attached to it. The City does the insurance for that. The liability for that. So, I just want that clear. And I hope you support it. This group does amazing work. And you know, they do…and it does save us money because we would be in there. Just a little while ago they were in Spence having to run programming and now, you know, Spence does a lot of the programming in the building. So, you know, it does save us money in some ways. And in these areas, these are the people that know how to serve the community best just like in our own community centres. We have a lot of great volunteer groups that are in our community centres and they know how to serve their communities best. So, this should be treated similar and I hope that you support that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We'll call the question. All in favour? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Madam Speaker: Those opposed, please rise. Any opposed?

Councillor Nason: Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker: Yes?

Councillor Nason: Councillor Chambers wasn't at his desk.

Madam Speaker: Yes, he was. Yeah, he was. He's just resting his hip. Any opposed, please rise.

Nays

Councillor Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That has passed. That is the end of that section. Item 10.

Item 10 – Rezoning – 2402 Ferrier Street – DAZ 209/2020

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie. Okay, Councillor Mayes. I'm sorry.

Councillor Mayes: Councillor Gilroy so enjoyed my oration at EPC that she insisted that I repeat it here today. Actually, she did none of the kind. I'll try and be relatively brief given the hour. This is more that the absence of something than the presence of something. I will be voting for this. It is fine. It is not my ward. I'm okay with the rezoning. What is the absence? The absence is what you've seen recently in other reports. Notably, a report in January, January of this year, January in my ward. Why should the community not be listened to? The Planning Department says, why should the density be approved? It provides more people to patronize local schools. That's the report, January of this year, at 75 Guay. So, I asked at EPC, well, where is that in here? Where is the provision about schools? We're being consistent. What do you mean? We only put that provision in in the mature communities and this isn't in the mature communities. Doesn't seem consistent to me if you're only putting in for one group of applications, but that's the position. Okay, so, school enrolment is apparently an issue we talk about in planning in mature communities, not somewhere like this. Councillor Lukes, god bless her, one of her finest hours, made school enrolment an issue down there in Waverley West saying, I'm not approving anything else until you guys guarantee a school from the Province. Well played by Councillor Lukes, there are schools there, but man, Councillor Lukes was vilified at the time because school enrolment wasn't a valid planning issue. So, where are we then? I hear at Sage Creek, the school is full. Planning Department keeps giving the green light to more building, more density, why? Why do we mention the school? Because we don't, because we're being consistent, because we only mention it in the mature communities. Why do we mention it in the mature communities? I, frankly, I don't think that being consistent. If it's a valid planning tool then we should be talking about it throughout the city, not just arbitrarily in mature communities. I've made the point. Councillor Rollins, to her credit, has agreed to me. We don't have any control here over school catchment areas. We don't have any control here over schools opening and closing, so why are we putting it into planning documents if we don't have any control over those decisions? Well, Councillor Mayes, and go back and listen to the tape, well, the declining population in the mature communities means we've got to just use that to get those schools back. And now we come to the main point here which is, the population in the mature communities is not declining. We have people getting up here and saying, how do we arrest the development? Good news, that decline was arrested in 2001. Now, when I made this talk and used the numbers provided by the Planning Department, it's right here in Complete Communities, I was later called and said, no we're going to give you new information, there is new data. New data for the 1971 census? This seems odd to me. And every other census here or since then, apparently, we have new data. First time I've been faulted for using the data the planners provided that they have relied on publicly that is in the Complete Communities document. That's what I relied on. So, the documents I rely on say the Complete Communities,

yes, yes, the mature communities have fewer people than they did in 1971. Yes, they do. However, that slide was arrested by 2001. Between 2006 and 2011, the mature communities grew almost as quickly as the rest of the city. Did the math myself, thanks to my grade 8 math teacher, Mr. Fuith, I am able to do some of these calculations myself. The mature communities grew by 3.1% in population, and the rest of the city 4.8. The mature communities have been growing since 2001. Yes, there are fewer people than 1971, but why you would sit there and say we need to be concerned about school enrolment, because school…because the area of population declined in the 1970s and '80s, I find that baffling to be honest. I find the whole use of this idea that there are 82,000, that was the figure in Complete Communities, 82,000 people fewer in the mature communities than there were now. Well, yes, there are, but let's give the full picture, let's give the full picture which is the decline was stopped decades ago and we've been increasing in our population in the mature communities since then. So, if school population is worth talking about in the mature communities, surely it should be talked about on items like this or items like Councillor Lukes' ward or even Sage Creek, for example. So, the point here is the decline has stopped in the mature communities. To be given then new data from the Planning Department that says, no, no, the decline actually stopped later and here's all new data which doesn't actually agree with what is published in Complete Communities, I have to call that into question and say, well, that doesn't seem to be consistent. But what is really interesting about the new data is, well, the Planning Department is saying, well, we're bringing in some of the bordering areas, the areas around the mature communities and deeming some of that population to be in. Well, and then therefore, the loss is greater than we thought. Well, wait a minute, then. Then it's the areas just outside the mature communities that have had a bigger loss. Perhaps the Windsor Parks, perhaps some of my ward. I rattled off various schools that have closed in the last 20 years, none of them in the mature communities. So, the point here is, if there has been a decline and there is new data being issued by the Planning Department, it would seem to suggest, actually, that the bigger decline is outside of the mature communities, just outside of them. So, lets be honest about that. So, in summary, let's, A) stop pretending school enrolment is a planning decision. Either it is or it isn't, but to say we're being consistent and only applying it in certain neighbourhoods because we're worried about school enrolment, even though the population has increased and the decrease was back in the '70s and '80s, that is not being consistent. Secondly, if we're saying the population has declined, lets be open, let's be honest and transparent. Yes, there are fewer people than there were in 1971, but the decline stopped in 2001. The growth has been almost as much as the rest of the city in some of the periods since then. We have stopped the decline. So, if our decision making matrix is for the mature communities, how do we stop that decline? That question was actually posed at one of our meetings, how do we arrest the decline? The decline stopped in 2001. Let's start being honest about that. So, this item is fine. My point in pulling it, and I may do this again is to say, we really should use one set of data rather than suddenly reconstituting the 1971 census. But perhaps…perhaps then I'm the beneficiary because I'm the one who said, I think the mature communities boundary needs to be adjusted a bit. When I'm presented with a new definition, when I'm presented with new figures saying, well, we've applied a 5% variation in our census. So, what we have here is, there was 393,000 people in 1971, I'm suddenly given something saying there's 400,000 people in 1971. Well, if there is that sort of variation, I'm sure there won't be problems making some minor variations to the boundaries when we come to that decision. So, my point is, look, let's be honest with people. Let's not say there is a decline because there is fewer people than there were in 1971. Yeah, that bottomed out and we've been coming back for decades. Let's be honest and say that and let's not pretend these schools are about to close because people moved out in 1971. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'll try to be short. We…this, of course, comes from the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee. And the whole…this is actually a great project as you know, Madam Speaker. We had to make sure that the proper things were there. And you know, many of the properties in this particular neighbourhood which would be the Templeton Sinclair neighbourhood was what they call it. But Ferrier is a street in which well, it's been there for a very, very long time. There is still lots of development to occur along Ferrier north of Templeton up to Murray. And this project just made sense, it's building density. The issue of schools, though, like, it is kind of interesting in that I don't know what I think…I think that Councillor Mayes makes a good point about school planning in mature neighbourhoods. And again, I don't know what Templeton Sinclair is designated, but on the fringes of it, it still has some development to go. But oddly enough, Ferrier, they're looking at building a private school across the street and up a bit. So, we'll see what happens there, but ultimately I really…and in planning, schools are very important. And we do zoning applications and so on for school divisions. But I, too…I don't understand the planning part about schools. The neighbourhood not that far away called Jefferson Neighbourhood which is a mature community in West Kildonan, and oddly enough, you know, West Kildonan, Old Kildonan which is in there, Margaret Park. But it's interesting about the mature, as serving as a school board trustee, we were all worried, Madam Speaker, that there was a decline in kids to keep enrolment up in schools like Seven Oaks Middle School, Victory School, Margaret Park School, for that matter. And these places. And what we discovered and, you know, I don't…you know, we were looking at historical data, but what happened, Madam Speaker? And this is happening in the Templeton Sinclair area as well because families get older, the kids move out and then, you know, there is that whole school thing and school planning. But Madam Speaker, what happened in the Jefferson neighbourhood is there is a lot of people who started making a decent living and they could afford to buy a house. And they've been buying the houses at…like, the Seven Oaks School Division all over the place is

having a heck of a time trying to manage providing school room space and they bus a lot of kids all over from West Kildonan to Old Kildonan to the Maples to Amber Trails, all over the place because maybe, you know, it's hard to plan out school property, but I have to agree with Councillor Mayes when…about mature communities and there are various ways to supposedly evaluate, but you have to look at renewal. Margaret Park, there is a fair number of older people, but you know what, they're starting to sell their houses Madam Speaker, and kids are going to come. People are doing better. People who…families who have more kids than my family, only two, but Madam Speaker, I just wanted to make sure that this project, the woman who owns this property, she's lived and owned that property for a very long time when it was actually zoned agriculture, Madam Speaker, in that area. And I have to say that when we pass this, the property owner will be very happy that development can finally move ahead and build these multi-family properties. Thanks.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief. Just fascinating to listen to my fellow councillors as they talk the specifics about a neighbourhood plus the demographics of it. I've lived very close to the areas that Councillor Eadie is talking about. And in terms of Councillor Mayes, as a member of this committee in terms of being on the Appeals Committee, how many times have we dealt with appeals regarding variances for density in St. Vital? And so, I certainly sympathize with Councillor Mayes as he is trying to make sense of this in a way that's consistent and fair. And so, it's fascinating. In terms of looking at 1971 data…of our census data, I don't know what to say, but congratulations for both our councillors for doing their homework on this. I can say, I just want to mention two things; three guiding points that I have to think about. Two long term sort of macro demographic trends, one micro (inaudible) macro as well. But one, families are getting smaller, but admit that the population of the city is growing and that communities go in waves. And then a community might age. They'll have children and then it gets older, less people living there, but then they sell, families move in and I guess we can see that regarding…I find it fascinating in the Valley Gardens area, what areas over time end up being where the parents come from to run the executive for the community club. And you can watch over time in terms of at one point they come from this area, then later on they come from the new development and then it's going to switch back, you know, less than a generation later. So, all these things are fascinating in figuring out the demographics ebbs and flows as well as the solid sort of consistent trends as well. I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Councillor Gilroy, back to you.

Councillor Gilroy: You can call the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, that's Item 10. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That item passes. Moving on to motions. Thank you. We've circulated Motion 4. It's moved by Councillor Nason, seconded by Councillor Klein. It's regarding the St. Boniface Industrial Park. This is an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Next is Motion 5, moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It's regarding the sale of City-owned property at 136 Argyle Street North. It's an automatic referral to the Property and Development and Heritage and Downtown Development Committee. Motion 6, moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Schreyer regarding the sale of City-owned property at 129 Sutherland Avenue. This is an automatic referral also to the Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development Committee. We'll now move into by-laws, Councillor Gilroy.

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

WHEREAS on May 12, 1975, City Council adopted the subdivision and rezoning of a portion of land which eventually led to the creation of what is known today as the St. Boniface Industrial Park;

AND WHEREAS prior to September 2018 the St. Boniface Industrial Park was part of the St. Boniface Ward;

AND WHEREAS following the completion of a review of ward boundaries in 2017, the Winnipeg Wards Boundaries Commission changed the boundaries of the Transcona Ward to include the land in which the St. Boniface Industrial Park is located;

AND WHEREAS having an area of the City named after a Council Ward in which the area doesn't reside can be problematic for a number of reasons;

AND WHEREAS the commercial, manufacturing and industrial lands surrounding the current industrial park continue to be developed;

AND WHEREAS the recently adopted Welcoming Winnipeg Policy doesn't specifically define Industrial Parks as a place name for consideration by the Committee of Community Members;

AND WHEREAS prior to making a formal request, the Winnipeg Public Service could assist by providing the area Councillor with valuable information regarding the requirements, costs and other factors involved in changing the name of the St. Boniface Industrial Park;

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

1. *Report back to the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee within 60 days on the following:*

    A. *The implications of changing the name of the St. Boniface Industrial Park to the Winnipeg East Industrial Park, including but not limited to the requirements to change the name of an industrial park, the potential costs and the appropriate approval processes available.*

    B. *The potential expansion of the current footprint of the industrial park to include all industrial, manufacturing or commercial lands south of Dugald Road between the CN Symington Line to the south and west and Plessis Road to the east.*

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

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

WHEREAS the Manitoba Indigenous Culture and Education Centre (MICEC) has identified 138 Argyle Street North to expand their outdoor land-based education services in the North Point Douglas Neighbourhood;

AND WHEREAS MICEC provides the City of Winnipeg an ability to continue toward reconciliation with the contribution of land for said purposes;

AND WHEREAS 138 Argyle Street North has the following characteristics:

Roll # 14000836000
Assessed area/Square footage: 5,412
Approximate assessed value: $46,000
Zoned: R2, probable Manitoba Hydro easement required

AND WHEREAS this property was acquired through the 1976 Neighbourhood Improvement Program, has been determined as buildable, has been circulated to determine whether the property is needed for City purposes some time ago, and the City undertook a Phase II ESA with property and site impacts being under acceptable limits;

AND WHEREAS due to the property use not involving the construction of a building, the property should be sold for market value to provide some revenue to offset the past costs to the city;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That 138 Argyle Street North be declared surplus to the city's needs.*

2. *That the Offers to Purchase City-owned Property Policy, adopted by Council on December 6, 2006, be waived for the direct sale of 138 Argyle Street North to the Manitoba Indigenous Culture and Education Centre, located at 119 Sutherland Avenue, for appropriate fair market value.*

3. *That if a signed purchase agreement for the sale of the vacant property has not been received by October 31, 2021, the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to market the property for sale to the general public.*

4. *That authority be delegated to the Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the Offer to Purchase, 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.*

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

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

WHEREAS the Manitoba Indigenous Culture and Education Centre (MICEC) has identified 129 Sutherland Avenue, adjacent to 138 Argyle Street North, to expand their outdoor land-based culture and education services in the North Point Douglas Neighbourhood;

AND WHEREAS MICEC provides the City of Winnipeg an ability to continue toward reconciliation with the contribution of land for said purposes;

AND WHEREAS 129 Sutherland Avenue has the following characteristics:

Roll # 14000838000
Assessed area/Square footage: 3,306
Approximate assessed value: $39,000
Zoned: R2, probable Manitoba Hydro easement required

AND WHEREAS this property was acquired through the Taking Title Without Compensation (TTWC) process, has been determined as buildable, has been circulated to determine whether the property is needed for City purposes some time ago, and the City undertook a Phase II ESA with property and site impacts being under acceptable limits;

AND WHEREAS due to the property use not involving the construction of a building, the property should be sold for market value to provide some revenue to offset the past costs to the city;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Offers to Purchase City-owned Property Policy, adopted by Council on December 6, 2006, be waived for the direct sale of 129 Sutherland Avenue to the Manitoba Indigenous Culture and Education Centre, located at 119 Sutherland Avenue, for appropriate fair market value.*

2. *That if a signed purchase agreement for the sale of the vacant property has not been received by October 31, 2021, the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to market the property for sale to the general public.*

3. *That authority be delegated to the Chief Administrative Officer to negotiate and approve the terms and conditions of the Offer to Purchase, in accordance with this report and such other terms and conditions deemed necessary by the City Solicitor/Director of Legal Services to protect the interests of the City.*

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

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, I'd like to move that the by-laws be read for the first time: By-law No. 21/2020 and By-law No. 83/2020.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 21/2021, By-law No. 83/2020.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read the first time: By-law No. 14/2021, By-law No. 15/2021, By-law No. 16/2021, By-law No. 17/2021, By-law No. 24/2021, By-law No. 25/2021, By-law No. 26/2021, By-law No. 27/2021.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 14/2021, By-law No. 15/2021, By-law No. 16/2021, By-law No. 17/2021, By-law No. 24/2021, By-law No. 25/2021, By-law No. 26/2021, By-law No. 27/2021.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that By-law No. 14/2021 to 17/2021, both inclusive, and 24/2021 to 27/2021, both inclusive, be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 14 to 17/2021, both inclusive, and 24/2021 to 27/2021, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 14/2021 to 17/2021, both inclusive, and 24/2021 to 27/2021, 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? That's carried. We'll now have question period. Any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Okay, seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Rollins, on the report dated February 10th, 2021.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED FEBRUARY 10, 2021**

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I haven't heard from my colleagues if they want to pull reports, so I'll move the consent agenda.

Madam Speaker: Okay. One has been pulled. Okay. I'll call the question on Item 3 which is Mount Carmel Sage House Program. All in favour? All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 3 passes. Madam Clerk, Item 1.

Item 1 – Establishment of a Consumption Site

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, moving a motion tonight on safe consumption doesn't get us bricks and mortar. It doesn't get us a safe injection site or a continuum of harm reduction services. Passing this motion means in 120 days, Madam Speaker, we will have a report on the merits and feasibility of establishing a low barrier supervised drug consumption site in the City of Winnipeg, including a review of applicable federal and provincial legislation governing the establishment and operation of supervised sites and managed alcohol programs. It means that in 120 days, there will have been a consultation with subject matter experts including, but not limited to, officials in Winnipeg Regional Health Authority, Manitoba Department of Families, Manitoba Department of Health, and relevant…relevant community-based organizations. In 100 and days…120 days, Madam Speaker, it means that all applicable funding programs at the federal and provincial levels available to support harm reduction initiatives and operation of low barrier supervised drug consumption sites and managed alcohol programs will be known and in a report for Council, that's what it means. A report in 120 days means only that this level of government, the City of Winnipeg understands the drug poisoning crisis and that we want to lean in and that we want to have a discussion of applicable governance around legislation in this country. And we want to hear and actively direct our public administration to consult on the subject of drug consumption sites with the department of Manitoba Health for instance. And really importantly, and I think this is really key, and with respect to the community-based organizations that came here earlier this morning like Nine Circles who told us today that they think money is missing in our province and our city. It means that in 120 days, we will have increased our own literacy and, Madam Speaker, I think that that is an act of solidarity. I think that that is what this city needs. Having our public administration produce a report to Council means, yes, being more literate of applicable funding programs. It means that harm reduction, it isn't one thing. It means that we know that it will be…that it's public education or safe supplies or managed alcohol programs or on-demand services like safe consumption sites. But as we learned today, it's a continuum of services and programs and ones that advocates feel and the evidence dictates save lives. They catch people just in time. They disrupt death. And they get more people the help they need, including sometimes the assistance to recovery. And Madam Speaker, I don't believe councillors need editorial work of city newspapers. I believe that you can turn to Google scholar, Canadian sources that all point to the facts of that harm reduction work, that point to the facts of the evidence and inclusion in drug policy and advocacy work…work, Madam Speaker. And I know this is of particular interest to you because you passed me in the hallway and asked. Work like peer reviewed studies of the potential cost savings of substance…safe consumption sites in other Canadian cities including Victoria, Saskatoon, Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa. Potential cost effectiveness of supervised injection facilities in Toronto and Ottawa. Cost benefit, cost effectiveness analysis of proposed supervision sites…injection facilities in Montreal. Examining potential roles of supervised injection facilities in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan to avert HIV among people who inject drugs. And finally, a report called, 'Is there a role for potential supervised injection facilities in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada?' And you know what, Madam Speaker, the answer to all of these studies and I could list more, but I will not; that yes, yes, there is a role. The basis of these reports, the evidentiary basis is the realistic path toward the health and well-being of our community, this city, this beautiful City of Winnipeg, to just save lives, prevent transmission of disease and disrupt needless drug poisoning in our city. Grassroots harm reduction advocates in my ward that came here this morning and your wards, argue human rights frameworks, so do I. Harm reduction advocates, families that love people who use drugs, families like my own and likely yours, too, Madam Speaker, and those in Council here, this is about more than simply making claims for the provision of particular services like needle exchanges or safe consumption sites or safe supply. I will suggest the context in this province is driven by ideology and have developed in ways that harm our residents, but to vote on this, to get a report in 120 days, you're just leaning in, you're just sustaining the conversation on harm reduction. I'll suggest that we have a problematic ideology that would reject just a report in 120 days, but you don't have to, to support this motion. I'll open that way, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, councillor…Madam Chair. And I want to thank Councillor Rollins for her work on bringing this awareness to Council and putting…getting it on the agenda. Having grown up in a very sheltered and religious house throughout my life, I haven't had a lot of exposure to some of these issues. But that is to say that there is not a family, I don't believe, that has not been affected by drugs or alcohol. And you know, I've come 180° with respect to the need for approaches like this because what we have now is just not working. And we can't blame COVID on, you know, some of the issues that we're seeing in terms of people in our bus shelters and on our streets and in the encampments. We have to blame the root cause of the addictions that is gripping people's lives and taking over. And what we heard this morning with respect to the amount of naloxone that is being administered because of the types of drugs that are being used and the overdoses that are currently happening, of course, fentanyl and carfentanil. The carfentanil is actually developed for…as a tranquilizer for elephants and something of that size, but people are using it in their drugs to get that high and overdosing because the receptor in their brain is not telling them to breathe. And so, the naloxone mitigates that and allows them to breathe again. So, we have to look at what mechanisms we can deploy as Councillor Rollins talked about that are low barrier, that help people address their addictions safely, and as other resources come into place, like the Bruce Oak Recovery Centre, where longer term treatment can be realized by individuals, hopefully we'll start to turn the corner and move the needle on the addictions problems that's gripping not only our community, but communities across Canada. We've heard and Councillor Klein talked about that there is some data out there where it hasn't been as successful as had hoped or intended, but we can't just say no. We can't just look at one set of data and not do the work ourselves, the due diligence that is required for our own community and certainly, working collaboratively with the Department of Health, with the Department of Families, with the Department of Justice, and looking at all of the collaboration that we can employ to work on this situation. We've had the Illicit Drug Task strategy that has come out of three levels of government between the municipal, provincial and federal governments, that talk about the need for strategies to occur. We talk about, you know, I referred to it earlier, the disruption that occurred yesterday with the Winnipeg Police Service that got $4.6 million in asset seizures and drugs off our streets and weapons off of our streets. That's what we need to target is those influences and those activities that are providing opportunities for people to take drugs and to spiral out of control here in our community. So, it's getting the treatment that they need, the mental health treatment, the addictions treatment and the safe treatments in terms of what a safe consumption site can offer just to keep them alive until they are in a position to get the treatment that they need. So, I will be supporting this today. And I want to thank Councillor Rollins again for her hard work. And this is a difficult conversation to have and I appreciate the fact that she's brought it forward. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I certainly understand and respect that there is an issue and people need help. And I know that yet again, there are certain things that we're told in the political world just agree with and…because you don't want to be saying something that people might use against you. I need to speak about the facts and the truth here. The reality is, I was just…searched it out, and a gentleman by the name of Aaron Gunn interviewed by the Winnipeg Sun speaking about the safe consumption sites in British Columbia and Vancouver, said this this week, "The safe injection, the safe consumption sites and strategy introduced in the early 2000s. At the time, there were 147 annual overdose deaths in BC. In 2020, BC recorded 1,716." It goes on to say that crime has skyrocketed around the safe consumption sites. We read or I shared with you facts that I provided to members of the media because they asked for them. I say that because nobody on Council asked, a report done by the Alberta Health, a research document. They have safe consumption sites that clearly show crime has increased 117% within a 250-metre radius of a safe consumption site. We're told by experts that unless, and this is a Winnipeg paramedic that was spoke at a conference or at a town hall that I attended, spoke about safe consumption sites. That unless you are able to get somebody treatment at that second when they want it, they're not helping. We can't provide that. That's not our jurisdiction. We're in the way. We're simply getting in the way. The realities of that report and what we read from this gentleman in the Winnipeg Sun, Aaron Gunn, is that it's not the right solution yet, especially for here. Lethbridge crime increases. Major crime increases. Calgary, major crime increases. Businesses, all reporting that it's had a negative impact on them. Vancouver businesses according to this gentleman, major impacts with these sites. I'm not saying that it's wrong and I'm not saying that we shouldn't help somebody, but let's just do it right. Let's not just do this for the sake of doing it. I mean, I was told earlier, look, it's just a report, it's not a big deal, don't worry about it. Well don't worry about it? Then why are we doing it then if it's just a report? Just for a headline? Or I don't think so. Or if we're going to do this, why don't we do a report on the fact that we had 87 murders in 24 months? Let's figure that out. Let's figure out why since 2014, violent crime in the city has increased consecutively every year. Property crimes are up. We're having some serious problems there. Nobody is asking for a report. I'm just struggling to understand why we are doing something that we should be sitting down just one on one and having a conversation with other levels of government. We continuously say we're collaborative. This level of government is very collaborative. By the way, I did learn through education that the secret to a good sales pitch marketing program is to continuously say the same thing over and over again even if it's not accurate because that's the best way to ensure people remember that as opposed to the real message. I mean, you don't really believe that if you leave home without it, something bad is going to

happen, right? Maybe I could be supportive of this if we took the time to call or send a note to the health minister, asking to establish a working group or even set aside a day and host a roundtable to discuss the issue, talk about the issue, lay the issue out on the table, bring in some experts because I noticed I don't see any of the local treatment centres here supporting this. I don't see a member of the law enforcement here supporting this. I don't see somebody from the health…you know, Shared Health here supporting this. I don't see a member from our own…from our illicit…from the Mayor's illicit drug group. I don't see them here in support of this. If we took a different approach, I'm just asking to take a different approach. Sit down in a calm manner, ask the other level of government whose jurisdiction you…we need and it is under and we need their support financially, to actually be able to help somebody, to actually be able to help somebody. If you google the report from Alberta Health, you'll notice that the number of needles found and collected after a safe consumption site was put there increased. So, we need to find the right solution and we need the levels of government to actually sit at the table and know that it only works if you're going to be able to help somebody at that moment, that very second because that is where the best success rate comes. If somebody comes to you and says, I really don't want to do this anymore. Great. Let's go. We can get you help. We're not suggesting that. We're just doing a report. If that doesn't work, if they won't sit down, I'll support this motion all the way. But I think we owe it to ourselves to try something different because the constant pointing of fingers is not working. We're not here to be the official opposition to somebody. Let's try to work collaboratively like we always say, but let's do it, like actually do it.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, want to thank Councillor Rollins for her leadership and advocacy to get some data. Madam Speaker, we have an illicit drug crisis in Winnipeg right now. It sadly has been a crisis for many years. Our Chair of our Police Board, I want to thank him for his comments and his leadership in the role as Chair of the Police Board, and also his insights into some of the illicit drugs that are plaguing our city and our community members right now, including, of course, meth as well as fentanyl and other illicit drugs. There is going to be, and you can see right now, Madam Speaker, for those watching these proceedings, very different views on the issues of supervised consumption sites. It is a polarizing topic. One issue that I expect to hear from some of my colleagues this afternoon, which I respect, I really respect, is the issue of the jurisdiction of health. Health is a provincial jurisdiction. It's a primary jurisdiction of the Provincial Government. And I do appreciate views that we will likely hear that highlight that. And I want to acknowledge that. The reason I'm going to be supporting this is there is right now a lack of leadership when looking at a true harm's reduction approach. And there is a role for us to play in the conversation as well as the signal that it sends to the broader community and those that are affected by addictions in our community. And we may be able to play a supporting role down the road. Those are my reasons for supporting this today. And let's keep in mind, this is a report that seeks information for Council's consideration. Information that I think is probably amongst the most valuable information we could be asking for in our broader community if we want to try to get information about how we can play a support role to those that may ultimately offer a supervised consumption site. I would prefer to get my facts from an administrative report by professional public servants than the Winnipeg Sun. There are many newspapers, many columnists that will have views about these issues. Some will be opinion. Some will report fact. I will do my best to review them, but I would like to see an administrative report with the input and guidance from professional public servants consulting with many stakeholders, including many of the stakeholders that were consulted this afternoon. What I don't want to see is, I don't want to see further stigmatization of individuals. And sadly, some of the language we've just heard does just that. If we look at this through a health lens, you know, we had a very heated debate on this floor during the previous term with respect to the request from the Provincial Government to transfer the Vimy site to the Province in support of the Bruce Oak Recovery Centre. And I was really proud of the vast majority of members of Council were very respectful and I thought were very pragmatic in making those decisions. Again, this is just a report for information. But we did hear, certainly from at least one MLA at the time, pretty inflammatory language that really stoked stigma in our community to so many that are affected by addictions. I, too, like Councillor Chambers and I'm sure probably everybody on this floor has learned a considerable amount, far too much than I wish I needed to in the role as mayor about what families are going through right now in our community. I've met with too many families, I've met with too many parents who have lost loved ones to addictions, and that compels me to try to take action. I appreciated the comments by Councillor Klein requesting collaboration with other levels of government and that's exactly what we've done with the creation of the Illicit Drug Strategy Task Force. That was in fact an effort to try to bring governments together to try to find ways in which we can work more collaboratively together to combat illicit drugs in our community. And I do want to acknowledge, there have been some positive steps from all of levels of government in furtherance of the task force recommendations. And I want to thank everybody that participated in that task force. Among other recommendations, the task force report reads, "Supervised consumption sites can be part of a long-term approach to addressing harms as one component of a harm reduction strategy." It goes on to talk about the timing. It goes on to talk about other measures that can be implemented right now, but this was from a report that was ultimately drafted and approved by provincial, federal and obviously municipal representatives. And so, for that reason, I think it would be wise to get some additional information to help inform us. Again, I would just stress that what's been impressed upon me time and time and time again when I've met with families directly affected, and, of course, these are families in every ward, in every corner of our city, is the fact that it's a health issue. You know, if you are…if any level of government, you know, in our case, Provincial Government is responsible for health, built a new hospital, I'll say elected

folks would be tripping over themselves to cut the ribbon and to try to help. You know, when somebody sadly injures themselves and has a cast, my son unfortunately had an accident a few years ago and he had the cast, and I remember everybody wanting to sign the cast with pride. Addictions is…it's a health issue and sadly, the stigma is very real. And I did want to speak to that because, you know, folks in our community, they're listening to the words that we're saying. They make a difference in how they look at themselves and how they look at their families affected by addictions. And so, I hope that the debate can be one free of stigma. I again, do respect the views on the fact that health is primarily provincial, I think is a legitimate argument. I wish that this debate was freely happening at the legislature where it should happen. I know there are members of all political parties at the legislature who care passionately about the health of our residents. It's unfortunate that this conversation in this format is happening here first and not in a meaningful way at the provincial legislature. And I'm hopeful that even today's discussion, regardless of how the vote goes to get information will spur further discussion at the Province of Manitoba. For those reasons, I would ask for support of this motion, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: I rise in support of this motion. I want to thank Councillor Rollins for all her work on this. I just want to talk about, I think it does start with getting a report back and a conversation. I mean, wherever we are on this, we need the facts, right? There are some struggles in some city with…in terms of safe consumption sites, but there's some really good things that are happening, too. So, I think we should make sure that we get, you know, that balanced approach so we know kind of the pros and cons to everything. I think that's important before we make a decision and probably before we even sit down with the Province. So, I think that is a key factor before we have those harder conversations. I just want to also say, we already have unmanaged consumption sites, unmanaged. They're in our bus shelters, they're in our libraries, they're on our streets and they're in our parks. And I just met with a coordinated group of daycares around Central Park that are coming to me, what are we doing? Like, we have needles all over the place. So, they are, but they're unmanaged. And so, I think that looking to see where we can make sure that we have safe consumption sites, where they should be located and I'd like to see the data. Is it not now that we're seeing them in the parks? Are we seeing that the chronic homelessness, the people that are very hard to house because they have major addictions, that they're using…they're sniffing instead of alcohol, do these other programs shift them into other forms of from sniffing to managed alcohol programs, does that help them get them more stable and into a housing that has supports that allows them to be housed and not on our streets? So, we see some of the devastating impacts that we have in the past week. So, I think that this is an important discussion to have. I don't think we're all going to come to some consensus. And yes, there is going to be some really great programs out there that work. And there is going to be some that, you know, we might want to question, but we should look and see what cities are doing because they are doing it and they're doing it as safety measures. So, the cities are in the game of looking at this and we should be there. We're not the only city that this is happening to, but we're always the last one to look at these preventative things to help us move forward. We're all dealing and you know what, it's huge in the inner-city, but I've heard all of you starting to talk about it, the impacts in your own areas. So, I know that it's growing. And right now, it's in our bus shelters and in the summer time it's going to be in our parks and it's going to be the tent cities. And so, we have to look at this. And we have to say, what are we going to do as a city? What is something that is manageable by us? What can we accept as a group? Like those are going to be hard discussions. But I think that it starts with having the information that is in front of us so we can have those debates. And we'll be able to see what is working in other cities, what isn't working with other cities and we should be able to have that debate, but we can't have it until the facts are in front of us. So, are we in the game? Yes, we're in the game. We're in the game whether you wanted to be or not because it's going to happen in our bus shelters, in our libraries or in our parks or anywhere else, so we may as well look at be proactive here. It's kind of not proactive, but look at what we can do to manage this now. And if you look at other cities, this is a growing problem and I think it's going to get worse. We have seen our homeless…our homeless situation grow. We've seen the addiction grow. And we need to be able to look at how we're going to move forward as a city. And until we have these hard discussions, we're not going to be able to deal with it properly. So, I guess for the people that are questioning, you know, should the City be in the business, we already are. And you know what, they're not coming to the Province's door, they're knocking on the councillors saying, I've got needles in my park, I've got people in our bus shacks, it's us. So, I think that this allows us to get the right facts that we need as a city looking at city data from other cities and then how we're going to move forward will be connecting out to the different levels of government. But this needs to be a place where we start as that is just purely collecting the data and then I think we should have the debate on moving forward when that happens. And I don't think…I don't think we should pause just because this isn't our level of government. Because you know what, we are the level of government right now and we're all fielding those calls. So, I encourage you to support this. I am. I think this is a very, very important step for the City of Winnipeg. It does not mean we're going to be doing it, and I'm looking forward to the debate and finding out the information. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a difficult matter. It's a complex matter. First and foremost, as others have said, our response to this needs to be one of compassion and understanding. These are real people in our community that struggle with…they're bound by addiction and they are sons and they're daughters and they're brothers and sisters and so many of our families have been directly impacted by addiction, mine as well like so many other around this table. And writing about the opioid crisis, author and law professor Benjamin Perrin said, "A response to this epidemic must begin with care and compassion for those who, for many reasons, have come to self medicate the physical, psychological and emotional pain and trauma in their lives using illicit opioids and other drugs." The analysis, I think, when we look across Canada, certainly would indicate that supervised consumption sites have merit. I specifically use the word supervised consumption site, and I would encourage us to…I mean, people can do what they want, but to stay away from safe consumption sites. Any time someone is injecting a drug or taking a drug or using a drug, there is not 100% safety. They're supervised consumption sites. The City has a role to play. And I think part, certainly, what this…you know, what would need to be done in the process is to see what is happening in other jurisdictions. I know one councillor has cited the Alberta report, it's 188 pages, socioeconomic review of supervised consumption sites in Alberta and the report was released last March. I've gone through part of it. Just from the executive summary, it indicates that numerous concerns of residents living near the respective sites, predominantly negative feedback, that's a lot of what the report is. Interestingly enough though, last month, a peer review came out kind of completely panning and criticizing the Alberta report saying it was unfounded, unscientific, deeply flawed, blatantly biased. Including, it says, "That the merit of supervised consumption sites was deemed out of scope of the whole Albert report's analysis." I'm not pitting one against the other, my point today, Madam Speaker, is that the difference between these two reports and the Alberta experience leans to the…leads to the main reason I won't be supporting this motion today and it's because it's complex and it's a health care matter. It is primarily the responsibility of the Province of Manitoba. The City cannot take on provincial responsibility. The analysis that needs to be done and I know that many are…you know, that this motion calls for our Public Service to do this analysis. With all due respect, this is not a city's public service's job to do. This is the job of those that are in health care, health care policymakers, provincial health care workers or officials that will look and analyze this because addiction services are health services. And my concern is that certainly I'm concerned for those that are struggling with addiction in our city, but I believe we also have a responsibility to the whole of the City of Winnipeg, the entire population that we represent and part of our responsibility is to make the difficult decisions to say, there are some things that we do at the City of Winnipeg because they are services, our core services, we are required by provincial legislation to do those things. And there are other things that the Province of Manitoba is required to do. And if we as a city keep reaching across the table and pulling off of the Province's plate and putting into…onto our plate, that which is the Province's responsibility, we will be swamped because whatever is on our plate, we have to fund and we have to provide the resources, and so that is a great concern as well. That's why I say it's a complex issue. I haven't heard one person here today that is anything but empathetic, I believe, to a person around this council chamber. No matter how we vote on this issue, there was empathy and compassion at the heart of every one of our councillors for this issue. But a great concern I have is that the City of Winnipeg cannot afford to do the Province's work. And we've talked a lot lately about policy issues that are very important, but they really, first and foremost, are the primary responsibility of another level of government. So, it's a challenge because I think that we really need to look at that which is ours and that which is the Province's. I would welcome what others have said. I would welcome the Province of Manitoba to take a serious look at the establishment of consumption sites and the merit of them, but take a holistic look. What is the health analysis and data? What does the science say about their merit? What are the…what are the impacts on a community? That work should be done by the Department of Health and the Province of Manitoba first and foremost. So, while there may be merit, there may be certainly value to the establishment of supervised consumption sites, we really need to understand I think as a council that there are things that we…that are beyond our jurisdictional I think responsibility and even capacity. So, it's a difficult decision today, adifficult choice, but I'm coming down today on the side of this is a matter of health and the Province of Manitoba needs to lead this matter.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is a difficult subject and one that, you know, I did have the opportunity to speak to some individuals this morning to see if they were being cared for. I received an update late this afternoon from Street Links giving me the update of, you know, that they are being checked in on. You know, they're being given food. They're trying to be connected to services, but many of them do not want to be taken from where they are at. It is a challenge. It's a complex situation from health, housing, healing. As Councillor Gillingham just said, we're really not equipped at the City level for many of these matters. We don't have a housing authority. The Federal Government gave us money to pick who we thought should be supported, providing supportive housing, but we're not a housing authority. We're not Toronto. We're not Ottawa with their health authority that they have. Cities and provinces organize themselves differently. You know, looking at this, you know, listening to some of the chatter that's going on with the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service, the pain, the crisis that they're in as an organization. We've got it from the top to the bottom. They're just...I worry for them and their ability to manage day-to-day, let alone, you know, you're taking somebody to...from that organization or multiple people, to fan out, to consult on...on this because those would be the people, the experts from the city, not our well-written public servants that put the reports together that go up to the executive Policy Committee, to the Mayor, to be massaged or whatever comes out before the public sees them. You know, from a data perspective, I hear

about data, right. We can see firsthand data. Main Street Project, you know, they're…they have data. Siloam Mission, they have data. Salvation Army, they have data. The Shared Health will have data from calls. 911 will have data from either police or emergency services. They have data. If this is a data-driven analysis, we should be pulling the data, going to the Province say, here, here's all of our data. Take one of your policy analysts and start going through the data, start analysing the data. Help, you know, identify, you know, where we can get some progress on this...on this crisis. You know, we've got the motion that's being referred with regards to Main Street Project, their half million-dollar ad. Again, you know, our frontline service organizations are struggling. We're not in this business. And, you know, we talk about things that we've seen. You know, as a political assistant to a minister working at the Province, reading death reports, right, crisis in the CFS system. A lot of this is attached to that, right? Generation after generation of harm, right. You know...and this is a call out. I'll need a moment to compose myself. You know, Councillor Klein, you know, some people criticize him, but he finished the U of A Indigenous Canada course and recommended it and my assistant and I undertook it and did it as well, just looking at that. But you know when we talk about, you know, who came to speak today in delegation, right, to lead the charge, to call on the Province, you know, the Mayor has been good at calling out the Province for not being at the table, you know, the Federal Government is there for us. We need to hear from our Indigenous leadership. Like, I don't know...I really...you know, Grand Chief Daniels, great man, great leader, I enjoyed my conversations with him. Grand Chief Arlen Dumas, again, another leader. MKO, our Inuit, our Dene leadership that are here in the city, why are they not here speaking to this matter today? Because we've heard time and time again that the stats are out there, right? It's our Indigenous community that are suffering. President Chartrand, you know, like, you know, reach out to me, educate me. Help me understand how we can all work together because I want to help, but if we're going down, again, swimming in lanes that aren't attached to us, we are doomed for failure if we're not all pulling the rope the same way, that lifeline the same way. We need to work together, people. This report will do none of that. Get on the phone. Get over to Broadway, Mr. Mayor. I think that as mayor you can walk in that building and say, I'm here, talk to me. Please, pull cabinet together. Appear before cabinet. I know they do that. They have special guests come in and talk to cabinet. Reach out, please. Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First, I just wanted to thank the chairperson of the committee for walking on this motion. I think it's an important…and just listening to the debate, I think it's a warning call for our…it's calling for professionals to give us some information. But you know Madam Speaker, you know, actually, I thought that it was ironic that I support the Bruce Oak Centre. What I didn't support was the whole concept that you took away a prevention mechanism in a hockey arena, and if you have good coaching and you have that kind of grounds, that's prevention. That helps young people avoid…avoid addictions because it's hard out there when you're young. I don't know if you all will remember, but I grew up in the North End and it was very hard to avoid substance abuse, all kinds of substance, very hard for young people to do that. But many of the kids who were involved in various recreation (inaudible). That is the City's responsibility, absolutely. We're debating whose responsibility...it's health care, it's these various things, Madam…Madam Speaker. First of all, every individual is different. There are different ways of dealing with this illicit drug use. The…there's the harm reduction. That's for the people who, really, they're at the point where they're…they've reached bottom and they're ready to change. And that's ultimately what it takes for an individual is whatever their bottom is that's going to help them change. And for some, they never hit that bottom without, you know, dying and that's the reality. So, I look at the…City's involvement is quite clear. We have a whole bunch of unsafe, Councillor Gilroy knows this, actually, I think we all know this, I don't think I have to be a professional to understand the information. You got to just spend some time out on the street and…to understand how individuals work and having discussions. But there's all kinds, and we do have to provide all kinds of different ways for people to deal with addictions in a safe manner. But if you look at...well, I'll just talk about my ward, what the hell. I grew up in the North End and I seen the addictions and the crimes grow. And I've actually seen it from the 2000s to the 2020s, Councillor Klein mentioned about, you know, now there's 1,700 and something deaths. Well, I don't know what was happening in BC, but I'd bet you they were starting to reduce their investments in recreation. They weren't investing in trying to help the Indigenous people reconcile and heal. I can tell you, you know what, there is a correlation between what the City does and the Province and the Feds. Okay? We can say that it's somebody's jurisdiction or not, but I can tell you what's in the City's jurisdiction right now in the North End. There are a whole bunch of houses where there is a lot of unsafe addiction things happening, lots of them, all over. And the City has to deal with it. It's by-law enforcement, it's the Winnipeg Police Service. It's the paramedic service, the fire service. It's happening all over the place that's because there's unsafe illicit drug stuff going on. And, you know, I don't want to...you know, every individual is different. I'm not judgmental. Stigmatization comes when you become very judgmental. You know, I don't...I try not to judge people because everybody has a different life experience. So, when we want to talk about providing...because there's lots of these unsafe illicit drug use places. Now, if you only create one, you're inviting all those people to come and congregate in one area. And what ends up happening? I'll tell you what ends up happening. People who are really struggling in life to get past their addictions, they'll show up and there won't be enough room for them. So, they'll be around that area because they know there's a potential for safety. But they're not going to stop consuming. There's a project that we, the City, are trying to...we've got zoning. The Village; Councillor Santos and many others are championing the 22 units that will be built over by Thunderbird House. That's for the people who don't fit into the data stream for Siloam Mission, for the Salvation Army, even for the Main Street Project, Madam Speaker. Although the Main

Street Project will encounter many of these individuals because they need a place to be safe because they're so intoxicated, so drugged up, what are you going to do? Or if they're in a hospital, you've got to take them there, Madam Speaker. But clearly there needs to be…and the City needs to take the lead. And I appreciate that the Mayor is supporting this. And I don't, you know, I'm not putting it on him. The Province didn't take a proper look at this when the Illicit Drug Task Force was there, Madam Speaker. I think they needed to take...but it's not about creating a safe consumption site because, again, you're bringing all those people who aren't ready to the same area. And then what kind of crime are you measuring? It's still illegal to take illicit drugs. The law hasn't changed yet and we as a city support the concept of decriminalizing the use of illicit drugs. I think that's good. Like, we're going to ask for a report. We all have the ability to input, Madam Speaker, into this issue. I think we do need to create them, but I think...I don't like the concept of a, because the Winnipeg Health Authority runs Street Connections, they're dropping off needles to these unsafe places. And if you only create one, you're going to create a lot of crime. I guess my last conclusion is, you know the Province and the City, we provide zoning, and the Province who provides liquor licenses, you know, actually the Bell MTS Centre, that's a safe consumption site. Licensed, right? There's security there. There's safety, everybody is making sure nobody gets too drunk, they get cut off, so on and so forth. All of these bars, all these lounges, they're all safe consumption sites people. But there's no safe consumption site for somebody to shoot up drugs because they're addicted. So, you know what, when we do this, we need to look at more than a site. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I really appreciate, Madam Speaker, all the perspectives that my colleagues are bringing forward. It's a very difficult…it's a very difficult topic. I know working with…when the Oak Foundation was establishing in St. James, it was very enlightening for many of us and a very, very difficult topic as is this one. So, I'll be short. I'm not going to debate the benefits or challenges of safe consumption sites, just as I'm not going to debate the benefits or challenges of cancer or dialysis sites or other aspects of health care because health care is a provincial jurisdiction. I also have concerns about the Public Service's ability to really do justice to research and prepare this report. And I'm saying that in the context that this is a very complex layered issue. And I look at countless consultants that are hired to study roads, recreation, forestry, and these are areas of the City's expertise and of our staff's expertise but the Public Service isn't trained in public health. And I just...you know, I don't even know what type of report would come forward. I think…I truly believe this issue falls under public health, and I will echo Councillor Gillingham in that this is a responsibility of the Province.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate, too, the care and concern that councillors showed in debating the motion. I want to reflect on Councillor Chambers' comments, the his…on his own exposure, but in his speech reflecting that he's come 180 degrees in the need of approaches like harm reduction and safe consumption. I agree that we just can't say no to quote him. Mayor has met with too many people, including moms from my ward, who are fighting the good fight like Arlene Cove. If you're listening, Arlene, I want to respect with these words all of the moms that you represent. I want to talk, Madam Speaker, about Councillor Gilroy who mentioned other cities and how they're responding in this exact way in part. And you know who agreed with her, Madam Speaker, the Mayor of Lethbridge who I will never forget it at Federation of Canadian Municipalities bounded on to the stage and yelling from the background as he started the panel on illicit drugs with Mike Jack, our Deputy CAO sitting there. He couldn't get to the stage fast enough and emphatically was declaring for the whole audience that he just needed to get and build more, and build more safe consumption sites, supervised consumption sites. We can do it though, Madam Speaker, in the Winnipeg way. In terms of support for continued work, let's consider the great people who were on the Illicit Drug Task Force like Sel Burrows and Réal Cloutier and Eric Costen and Dr. Rob Grierson and Kelly Holmes from RaY, and Dr. Michael Isaac and Damon Johnston and Rob Lasson and Rick Lees, then Executive Director of Main Street Project, and Randy Lewis and Trevor Myshrall from the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and Kim Nicholson from the Winnipeg Police Service and Ian Rabb from Two and Two Recovery in Aurora, and Max Waddell from the Winnipeg Police Service. The report on the Illicit Drug Task Force and supervised consumption was that they can be part of a long term approach, but there was no consensus because that's what policy actors like us are for. Our chief of fire and Chair of Illicit Drug Strategy, Mike Jack did come forward and, you know what they said enthusiastically? We want to get this done. They want to do the report. And they wanted to get to the work of the report. And they were enthusiastic and I believe that that is why Protection, Community Services and Parks that day had a unanimous vote on this motion. Perhaps folks just need to listen to leadership. My fellow councillor, Shawn Nason, Madam Speaker, wants to know where Grand Chief Arlen Dumas and other Indigenous leaders are and guess what? Chief Arlen Dumas, and Madam Speaker, I'm excited because I'm going to turn his vote tonight with this quote. Arlen Dumas on the subject of safe injection sites says, "At the very least, both the City and the Province should consider adopting safe injection sites or increase the amount of homeless shelters in the city", end quote. A direct quote from Grand Chief Arlen Dumas. Pay attention to Indigenous leaders, Madam Speaker. They will...they're busy leading nations, too busy to come to Council, but they are speaking to this matter. One study, Madam Speaker, does not in evidentiary basis make in Alberta prior to the United Conservative Party controversial report that I believe shouldn't be held up as the report. Health and social agencies in Alberta, the city and police did work together on prevention

treatment, harm reduction and enforcement related to opioids. Public health doctor and…and they were policy positive. Public health Dr. Sikora said, and I quote, “I can't really guess how bad it would have been without the approaches of the work that we've done”, he said. “I think without the good work we would have many, many, many more deaths than we have right now”, end quote. What struck me, Madam Speaker, following our own chief's life-taking data, he said a few months ago, life-taking data. What struck me was that the media didn't point to the west or the east and what the provinces were doing. There was silence. I think the only question in minds tonight should be what constitutes valid methodical, rigorous, evidence and can we report. And this isn't public health at this stage. No, it's just public policy. And our professional Public Service is equal to the task. I think that that's the basis for action on your vote. Don’t exclude and further marginalize those affected from your policymaking. Instead, Madam Speaker, centre the discussion on people with lived experience and what they need. Be that council, Madam Speaker, that leans in to challenges, centre the discussion with our City staff. Consider our frontline Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and our chiefs who work really hard, and we should too in Council. Consider the people, Madam Speaker, and the words of our chief when he cited those life-taking stats. Those were his words; life taking. Consider the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service who deserve your vote on this. Businesses in our wards, in our respective wards, do want us to lean in. Let us not be the government that is silent. People have lost loved ones due to drug poisoning. Centre your vote on them. Let us sustain the conversation. Let us not leave to fate businesses in our community, in our wards. Let us sustain the conversation on harm reduction and safe injection and supervised injection sites and the continuum of harm reduction services. And let's do this by passing the motion unanimously tonight, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. With that, I will call the question on Item 1. Yes. There was a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Item 1 passes. On to Item 2, Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Fire Protection Services Agreement with Husky Energy Limited as owner of Pounder Emulsions

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is...this is a proactive agreement that I believe is the most protection for the good people of Transcona and I will open the debate that way.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I would like to move this for referral to East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee.

Madam Speaker: Did you want to speak further to that?

Councillor Nason: If I may. I’d like to have the opportunity to have…

Madam Speaker: Three minutes on the clock, please.

Councillor Nason: Sorry. I won't need that long. Belabour it this evening. I suspect the votes are there that won't support this. But from a community committee perspective, I would like to have the opportunity to have that face-to-face question period on this matter. I would like to have the opportunity for the community to come and to speak, the good people of the Transcona, to come to speak to this because, you know, I look at this as nothing more than an insurance policy for the company that is in the RM of Springfield, additional inspections. Well, okay. There is the RM of Springfield Fire Department. I’m thinking they could do inspections, since they are City of Winnipeg firefighters that are off-duty for the most part, but I

would like to have that opportunity. And I think it's something that, respectfully, as the most affected community by this agreement, I would like that because I have a series of questions should this fail, that I will be directing to the Chair that if she can't answer it, it raises some really serious challenges.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Yes, referral was moved, excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Councillor Rollins, would you like to rebut?

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I would, Madam Speaker. You know, there was an opportunity, Madam Speaker, at Protection, Community Services and Parks. And great care was taken, Madam Speaker, I want to add, following Councillor Nason's submissions to the Protection, Community Services and Parks. Great care was taken by each and every councillor to make sure at each and every question was on the record at that committee, and was asked and answered by Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service of which the whole complement of staff including the authors of the report, Mark Reshaur and Chief Lane, were there in addition to Deputy CAO who answered some of the questions. And that's now a matter of public record. This is in the Rural Municipality of Springfield, Madam Speaker. And this is to really provide fire protection services to Husky Energy Limited. And at the end of the day, Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service is doing and intends to do some proactive inspections to provide, you know, that...you know, as part of this agreement. And this is simply to execute and deliver a service agreement with Husky Energy Limited as the owner of Pounder Emulsions. And I believe that it is the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service who has the expertise to provide that. So, I think…

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, can I make a point of order? She needs to speak to why it shouldn't be referred now, not speak to the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins, I think you have stated your point if you want to wrap up.

Councillor Rollins: So, in my opinion there has been, number one, a really good discussion at PCSP of which questions were asked and answered and that was an important opportunity. There has been no further questions of the department or myself in the intervening period. Two, it's an agreement and it needs to get done, Madam Speaker, so I am not a proponent of referral at this time. I think that it's ready to get passed tonight for the RM of Springfield.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we will vote on the referral. All in favour...all in favour of referring it back to committee as motioned by Councillor Nason. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillor Nason and Councillor Schreyer

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item…the referral motion is lost. Councillor Nason, do you wish to speak to the item?

Councillor Nason: Absolutely. March, 2000…I will say it again, March, 2000. That was the last time Council entered into this type of agreement. We've got one with Border Chemical. Council moved that we weren't going into enter into these anymore. Twenty one years later, here we are. You know, I don't know who was manning the stations back in March of 2000. I know who they are now. In fact, some of them I coached their kids in football. You know, or taught them to...well, I won't talk about how my skating abilities fare since I just recently broke my wrist, but hockey as well. You know, when we talk about protection, protection for the community, the fire that occurred in 2018, and I'm putting it on Hansard so it's nice and easily found, there was risk...huge risk to the community of Transcona. We were minutes from being evacuated. Water bombers were trying to be organized to see if they might be able to deal with this. The Province called the City in to support the fire. The Province, emergency services called the City in. And I'm talking this way very purposefully and I apologize if it sounds like I'm talking down, but I'm trying to get my point that the Province called the City in. So, we were already doing the work. But now we're going to get a retainer of $25,000 or 27, sorry. Almost 28...whatever, it goes up for the next couple years. So of course, you know, oh, it's found money. Heaven knows, we could probably find some money along the carpet here too that probably would probably be helpful. But you know, since that time...and this is where I indicated that if my motion failed, I am expecting answers from the chair that confirmation that there's some significant

changes happening in Transcona as far as medical services or fire services because as my understanding, you know, maybe it's water cooler talk, but if she can confirm some of the changes, that the hazmat unit that was over in Munroe...I think it was Munroe. Or was that Marion? I'm confused, so hopefully you can clarify that. Is coming to the Regent Avenue station. I'm hoping that the chair can confirm that the ladder truck located at the Regent Avenue station is leaving Transcona. If she could tell us if that's true, and maybe where it's going. And I guess that the largest one since, you know...this could have been a very, very serious medical disaster. I'm wondering if she can confirm if the Regent Avenue station is losing their advanced care paramedics that are there. Yeah, if you're wanting me to be assured that it's safety...that's safety, that the residents of Transcona are going to be better protected from a plant, a chemical plant or sorry, this is a petroleum plant beside the chemical plant in the RM of Springfield that we just passed first reading of a new residential subdivision in Precinct I today for first reading, that will go to hearing. That residents in that area will be better protected with the sealing of this deal more than they were since March of 2000. I'm wondering if the $27,000 that we're getting is...is going to protect us that much more. And I know the inspections...the inspections are...but again as I said, I suspect that the Province does inspections from an environmental perspective. I don't know about safety. If there's concerns about safety, workplace health and safety, they might do inspections. I'm just wondering if the RM of Springfield...and I know there's no one from the RM of Springfield here to answer on this, but if there's anyone from the RM of Springfield that do fire inspections or safety inspections from the fire department perspective because, again, the RM of Springfield responded to this fire at this location first, and then the Province called us in. So, I'm hoping that the chair will be able to assure me because, you know, I know that it's only a few dollars that will add to the…to support the services, these inspections, you know, to put a few more hours on the engines when they go out to inspect them. I'm just wondering what engines or equipment it might be because it seems that we're changing some stuff around. So, I'm hoping that the chair can help on that. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I shouldn't speak on behalf of the chairperson, but Madam Speaker, Councillor Nason has put some very important issues on the table in dialoguing about this. But Madam Speaker, if you look back to the decision of Council back in 2000, I think it was my neither political nor blood relative Jae Eadie, the thing is, at that point in time in the history of this city the...well, it's now called the metro...Winnipeg metro area or whatever, Madam Speaker, which its predecessor was founded by Mayor Thompson and others right near the end of the '90s, and where there was really bad relations between all of the municipalities and the City of Winnipeg. Well, I shouldn't say really bad, but you know there was...depending on the municipality. But Madam Speaker, today it's different. I can't wait until this...the reason I agree with there being metro Winnipeg land use and whatever plan is we do need to worry about what gets built where and, obviously, this Husky plant which I believe produces asphalt, I don't know who is buying the asphalt, but maybe some of the companies that are do the asphalting in our city, maybe that's where it's coming from, I don't know. But this contract, Madam Speaker, it's a short-term one. Right now, the City of Winnipeg is the department that has the expertise to supply the services that are under this contract. It's not an insurance contract. This is a contract for services. They have...and we did get the answer from Chief Lane, the reeve or mayor of Springfield. I guess he's still a reeve, I don't know. But yeah, okay, has talked to Chief Lane. They need the City of Winnipeg's…and this Husky plant needs to have the proper people inspect it so that they can make the workplace safer for not only the workers there, but to make it safe for all of Transcona as that fire there was a threat, a poisonous threat to Transcona and even south of there, very traumatic. Anyway, the...we also asked the question. We were concerned about, you know, the stations and the ability to respond to that industrial fire. We heard that if the Marion closes, and they combine the…in Windsor Park, they will have quicker access to Lagimodiere and they can get out to Springfield much faster once they're on Lag. Currently where they are, there could be a train going by when the emergency hits. So, anyway, and because right now the RM of Springfield doesn't have the ability to respond to those kind of fires, we need to be there. That's why the Province called them in. And I just want to conclude that...and this is a short-term contract. Once all these municipalities are planning...you know, there's a whole industrial area that Springfield is building along Plessis Road as we have heard from Councillor Nason. Right on the other side of Plessis. So, we have to be concerned now about that. So, under this plan, the metro Winnipeg land-use plan and stuff, you know what, the RM of Springfield is going to have to make sure that they have the ability to fight fires like that if they're going to build such a thing. Or if you are worried about the cost and making sure it's there, then somebody's going to have to help the City pay the bill. And I don't know if they're...and the bill is if we have to expand our capability, then that should be covered off by the municipalities that we're serving. That's the kind of thing that comes under that...whatever plan is coming out of there. That's what I want to hear when that plan comes up how they're going to deal with this economic growth all around the capital region. So, anyway, I'll leave it at that. I don't know that we need to debate a lot. We had all those…all the serious questions that Councillor Nason had were asked and answered and I'm comfortable with this contract and it's short-term. What happens in the future is subject to future growth. But this is not a similar situation as to what was happening in...back at the turn of the century. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Any further speakers? Councillor Rollins, back to you.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I really appreciate Councillor Nason wanting insurances and I appreciate his questions. He has concerns, and they're based because there was an incident. And he wants to be preventative, I believe. Ultimately why Councillor Eadie…and Councillor Eadie moved the motion from what I recall at Protection, Community Services and Parks is because we did clarify as Councillor Eadie was reviewing, Madam Speaker, with his laser-like memory, the impacts of the consolidations and how they would relate to Transcona specifically. And chief did say on the record exactly what Councillor Eadie reviewed, that that rail cut off direct from Cottonwood to Lag, and the station and the hazmat response to the entire city would be faster because the response time to the hazmat resources is really as chief explained, less important, but more focused on safety and the approaches of safety and measures and once you get on the road you keep going. So, we had an excellent conversation and in part Councillor Nason deserves a debt of thanks for that conversation, including are we enabling urban sprawl through these kinds of agreements? You know, are we providing the service to the facility? And many councillors, including at EPC, I believe Councillor Browaty pointed out, we want to have these manufacturers outside the city limits. And it's good to have them outside and not placed beside residences. But you know, it is important...and we did talk, Madam Speaker, about other agreements, you know, that we had or we didn't have, and we talked about them as framework agreements. And we talked about, you know, some of the hazmat heavy vehicle rescue...trench rescue responses and more. Mark Reshaur gave us some details with respect to inspections and more. We talked...we got deep into rates and the responses as we lay out in our Fees and Services By-law and how we update them every year to provide me comfort because I...I want to mind our budget in this way, and that they include fuel consumption. But it is important to clarify that Springfield requested back-up. And it is...it is important to consider that Husky Energy approached us with respect to the fire prevention...protection agreement. And the bottom line, Madam Speaker, is this; the whole aspect of Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service is being aware and proactive. Hazards that have potential to impact the city...well, the duty of Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and indeed, I believe our duty, and certainly that's why there was a unanimous vote at Protection, Community Services and Parks, is to mitigate...prevent on the one hand, and increase our knowledge so that if something were to occur we can better respond. Border Chemical is one such example. The committee of protection agreed because it's far better to lend expertise in agreements like this, and ensure that they're doing everything appropriately to mitigate problems and hazards, and that's why tonight you should support the agreement. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. With that, I'll call the question on Item 2. Okay, all in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Nason and Schreyer

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item 2 passes. We'll now move into motions under this committee. We have Motion No. 9, moved by Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Lukes. It's regarding an economic recovery plan for the city's community centres. It will be an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. By-laws under this committee, no by-laws. But we will have question period at this time. Any questions for Councillor Rollins? Councillor Nason.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Chambers,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

WHEREAS Winnipeg's community centers are critical to the health and wellbeing of the residents of the City;

AND WHEREAS section 1-5 RECREATION of the OurWinnipeg Plan states that "The City of Winnipeg is a leader in delivering recreation services that build healthy communities."

AND WHEREAS section 07 PARKS, PLACES AND OPEN SPACES of the Complete Communities Direction Strategy states that "Winnipeg's Parks, Places and Open Spaces contribute to all its citizens' enjoyment and quality of life. These public spaces are valued as essential to the urban fabric, encouraging and promoting healthy lifestyles, cleaner environments, connectivity, recreation, community pride and urban beautification".

AND WHEREAS although most of Winnipeg's community centers are owned by the City they are run by volunteers and supported by General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC);

AND WHEREAS with the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, time is of the essence and there is a need to develop an economic recovery plan of for Winnipeg's community centers to be able to provide health and well being services for the residents of Winnipeg;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service be directed to work with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) to develop an economic recovery plan for the City's community centers.

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

Councillor Nason: Through you, Madam Speaker. Can the Chair confirm that the Regent Avenue Station will be receiving a hazmat-equipped unit?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I'd like the opportunity to talk to the department about that, and as it's sort of late in the day, I…I will absolutely respond to Council by email on that question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further questions? Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Can the Chair confirm that the Regent Avenue Fire Station will be losing the Ladder Truck Unit?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll…same answer that I gave before. I'll confirm it in an email to all of Council once I have discussed this with the Fire Department.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Third and final question.

Councillor Nason: I'll through a bit of a curve ball on this one, Madam Speaker. Can the Chair confirm that Regent Avenue Fire Station or any other fire stations in this city will be losing their Advanced Care Paramedic Units that services their communities?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: No, I don't know of any loss of Advanced Care Paramedics, Madam Speaker. But I will confirm with the department and get back to all of Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, the next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. There's no report, no motions today. Councillor Browaty, will you do the motions?

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

Councillor Browaty: Sure. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 6/2021 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 6/2021.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the By-law No. 6/2021 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 6/2021.

Councillor Browaty: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 6/2021 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. Councillor Browaty will take any questions and promise the world. Any questions? No? Seeing none, thank you, Councillor Browaty. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. We have no reports, no motions, no by-laws. Any questions for our chair, for Councillor Gillingham? Okay, seeing none, final committee is the Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Eadie, I shall give you the Chair.

REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED JANUARY 22, 2021

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I accept the Chair and I will give you a moment to prepare yourself. And I believe there's an amending motion for report No. 1 from Governance so, therefore, Councillor Sharma will be introducing the report and then Councillor Lukes will be introducing the amending motion. Pardon me? What is that, Councillor Nason?

Councillor Nason: It was Councillor Nason that moved it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You're the main mover? Sorry.

Councillor Nason: Of the amendment, yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, sorry. Pardon me. Councillor Nason will introduce the amending motion. Sorry. It's Motion 8, I believe.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The amending motion is a motion…

Clerk: Yes, number eight.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It's amending one of the recommendations in the report. All right, Councillor Sharma, would you please introduce the report?

Councillor Sharma: I will just in a moment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, sorry, you're not read. Pardon me.

Item 1 – Mayor's Office Expenditure Policy

Councillor Sharma: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There is an amending motion to go with this item. And so, I'll wait and hear...wait to hear comments from colleagues on this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the amendment? Okay, all right, thank you. Councillor Nason, please introduce your amending motion.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Nason,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

BE IT RESOLVED Item 1 of the Report of the Governance Committee of Council dated January 22, 2021 be amended by deleting Recommendation 1. and replacing it with the following:

1. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to work with the Mayor's Office to develop a policy for the expenditures of funds from the Mayor's Office budget, to be submitted to Council for approval within 60 days.

Councillor Nason: All right, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You know, we talk about openness, transparency, consensus, you know, working together, all being on the same page, one team. I don't know. I was listening to too much CJOB, they were talking about all of these, you know, synergy and all these acronyms being thrown around these days. The committee of five...the only committee outside of...I don't know, EPC has more...this is a committee that has representation from each community committee. And we voted 3 to 2 on the recommendation that went forward. It went forward to EPC. And, again, I mentioned this earlier today when we were talking about governance. Governance in our organizational chart is above EPC, but yet our rules of by-laws, it goes through the EPC wringing machine and comes out with a different recommendation. The recommendation from the Mayor's committee is that he doesn't want any part of this. Now, you know, Mr. Mayor, I'm sure you'll speak to it and hopefully you'll speak eloquently with regards to the reason that, you know, the openness and transparency and alignment with policies that the majority of Council have as well...actually, more than a majority. You know, there's all of the councillors have a policy, and why one should be different. Though we just had that, you know, with regards to insurance. One was different. Two was different. I think...I think the public deserves to know that we're all on the same page and that this will be a stepping stone towards that. You know, when we talk about what's available to support our residents, there was a motion that went forward, went into the wringing machine of EPC and got kiboshed. EPC kiboshed it with regards to changing the way that we remunerate our staff, that there's a set fee, then we have our operating funds. We don't have a $1.8 million budget. We don't have the ability...the staff that are assigned from the City that work with the Mayor's Office almost exclusively. We don't have a media room that we understand is apparently off-limits to members of Council based on the spokesperson for the Mayor's Office. That was communication that was provided. That, you know, at a moment's notice, the Mayor needs to have it, we can't use it. Councillor Lukes I think that could probably speak better to it than I can if she chooses. But anyways, I digress. I think that this is a good amending motion and I hope Council will support it. It's, you know, it's...well, it's to work with the Mayor's Office to develop a policy for expenditures of the funds from the Mayor's Office budget. And the one thing we need to remember, you know, when we say taxpayer funds, right, our budget that we passed just about two months ago...maybe a little over two months ago was only balanced because of taxpayers...well, was it balanced? I know we added more debt. But it was taxpayer funds that came from the Federal Government and from the Provincial Government. But in the end of the day, it was taxpayers. So, to have us all on the same page, again, all pulling the same way. You know, we've got declarations. We…you know, we're open and transparent that way. Our policies go through the wringer. I know our Clerk that works with us as councillors, you know, they look really close at what we put through as expenses. We don't have the ability to change the policy on the fly. Heaven knows that I won't be going to any Jets games, not that anything has happened that way in the past. But we...you know, we don't have the ability as Council to change that policy, right? I went to the...I went to the...geez, it's been so long since I have watched them play, but our soccer team here in Winnipeg. I am sorry, I am blanking right now. The Valour. Thank you. I went to see the game. I got tickets from the Winnipeg Blue Bombers. It's on my declaration. I put a declared value of that item because it's required. It was part of policy. I don't think we should expect anything less of all of the policies that apply to Council to apply to the Mayor. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Clerk...or is it Ms. Clerk or Mr. Clerk?

Clerk: First speaker will be Mayor Bowman.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mayor Bowman. Mayor Bowman to speak to both the amendment and the report please. Thank you.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. So, I know it's been a long day. I'm going to try to keep my comments brief just out of respect to my council colleagues, some whom I know are PVRing the Jets game and so, I will not speak about what the score may or may not be. The Mayor's Office expenditure policy is one that...maybe go back and just advise through our Deputy Speaker, didn't exist before I was elected. I want to acknowledge, of course, the advocacy of our Deputy Speaker who I know had noted the deficiency of a policy. That policy was modeled after the councillor ward allowance policy at the time to try to have as many similarities as possible with some exceptions. The current policy is...is online. It is audited annually by external auditor. And that's something that my vote on the recent changes to the councillors' audits is a matter of public record. But you know, I felt strongly that for the Mayor's Office, it should be audited annually. And the data from the spending is also on the open data portal. It's something that any member of the public can view and can see. I've tried to lead by example on a number of fronts. Openness and transparency is one of them, unrelated even something as simple as my meeting calendar. Not directly related to this, but you know I'd like to see more members of Council adopt that policy as well. I know when we've had heated debates on certain issues, questions arise about who folks have met with and that's one measure in which I have tried to...tried to lead by example. The councillors do have significant discretionary funds. Something I know we've debated earlier today. Combined when you look at approximately $9 million in Land Dedication Reserve, Community Incentive Grants of about a million dollars, Parks and Recreation Enhance of 1.8 million, now the Winnipeg Wellness Support Grant Program, one I'm really very proud of and, of course, at the discretion of the councillors, all councillors on top of the councillor ward allowance and the councillor salaries is well over $15 million on average, and it is an average, and it fluctuates in a given year. Mostly the Land Dedication Reserve. And it varies according to, of course, various wards. On average, you are looking at about a million dollars in discretionary. Most of that is within different confines of the Public Service. It is audited through those various capacities. Of course, the councillor ward allowance policy is unique. The reason I mention all of those discretionary funds, which I, as a general rule, defer to members of Council and I've tried to demonstrate that today in deference to Councillor Nason as well as our downtown councillors on various matters is, it is very difficult for members of the public to...to go and to see how it breaks down. If somebody wanted to go right now and see, for example, Councillor Lukes or Councillor Nason, where they currently at with the Land Dedication Reserve, Community Incentive Grant, Parks and Recreation, their ward policy...like, all of these matters which by and large are discretionary, you can't find it in a single place. It is difficult. And not all of it, most of it through the Public Service is audited. That might be a good place for...I know Councillor Lukes has really championed this along with a few other councillors. That might be a good place to start is to lead by example. And I could certainly assist with that perhaps in the future. In the meantime, I have listened to my council colleagues, certainly, at the Governance Committee. I know there was a fulsome discussion and debate. And I had the opportunity to watch some of those proceedings, and noted some of the commentary, which I'm sure we'll hear from more…more so from some of my colleagues shortly, the ability of the Mayor to make changes to the policy. Well, firstly, I'm glad we have a policy because that didn't exist before. I'm glad it's audited. And the changes...even though it was modeled after the councillor policy, there are...there are some aspects that...that are unique and I'm very proud of because I think they raise the threshold and raise the bar in terms of the ability for folks to go to one place and to be able to look at the Mayor's spending in a way that is through that open data portal in furtherance of this policy. It is more challenging to kind of get that assessment from members of Council. That's not the purpose of this. I'm just using that to illustrate the point that it may be a topic for another day. I want to thank the collaboration of a couple of my council colleagues. I had conversations with Councillor Orlikow, our Deputy Mayor as well as Councillor Chambers who impressed upon me some of the discussion that occurred at the Governance Committee with respect to the ability of the Mayor to make changes to the policy and the need for those changes to be able to be better tracked just in the interest of openness and transparency. I have heard others…I know our Speaker has spoken about this at Governance as well and appreciate and thank for…for that input. I have made…there's a new section just to make it easier for members of the public and Council to see the document change history and I want to thank Council Chambers for his advocacy on that. I worked collaboratively with him to try to see what would address the concerns that were raised with respect to that. And so, if you go to...I think it's the second page of the document, it's online right now, you can see the document change history, which will be used going forward to identify document changes, including additions or deletions of content, just to make it easier to be even more open and transparent. Dialogue I had with our Deputy Mayor related to the Audit Committee function, specifically the reality that at present the audit is conducted by external financial auditor. That has been clarified and as a way to just illustrate how tracked changes would be made going forward. That's the change for clarity. Just to clarify that it is external. So, I want to thank our Deputy Mayor for that discussion and input. I…yeah, and I'll wait to hear from my colleagues. I will not be supporting the amendment. I will be supporting the initial disposition from Executive Policy Committee, which was to receive it as information. I remain open to working collaboratively with my colleagues not just on the policy itself, but also how Council can be more open and transparent in its spending. Thank you, Madam Speaker...sorry, Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That's okay, thank you, Mr. Mayor. Do I have another councillor that wants to speak to this?

Clerk: We do. Councillor Mayes is the next speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Mayes, okay. Councillor Mayes, to the amendment and the report.

Councillor Mayes: Thanks. A) I will be voting against the amendment. B) I will be voting for what was passed at EPC. C) I can think of few issues that concern me less, given the current state of the city and the budget and the enormity. D) I just can't sit here and be told I have a million dollars a year to spend. Perhaps it was a million when my salary is included in that. I deserve better than that. I have spent the money. The budget of the City of Winnipeg is over $1 billion a year. We have 15 duly elected people around the table, I think we can handle having between us less than a 10th of a percent of the budget. I think we have the sufficient acumen and experience to know if the park needs a new play structure or not. I don't really need the staff controlling 100% of the budget in this city. I think I can handle having the little bit of ward discretionary funding that I have. So, I don't give a damn, frankly, about this. I mean, the Mayor's expenditures have not been unreasonable or controversial. I will certainly back him on this. But I'm not going to be told I spent a million dollars a year. A) it's not entirely discretionary as Councillor Gilroy, to her unfortunate experience, discovered here today, right? There's a vote on CIG. There's a vote on LDR. Yeah, we can handle the $10,000 a year in per capita and I give $250 for scholarships to Dakota and Glenlawn. Yeah, I can handle that. I'm…you know, vote me out if that's a problem. But even that stuff gets voted on at community committee. Yes, I earn a salary. I don't think I earn an excessive salary. It's not discretionary. We did lower the EPC top-up by $10,000 per person in 2014. So, we have made that discretionary move. The LDR; I sat there in budget talks and was told a few years ago how there's all of this excess money and we just needed the staff to come in and take it. They're so much better at allocating these expenditures. Good god, there's 10 million. And I asked the next day, any commitments on that? Anything that's already been passed? Oh yeah, about $7 million. About $7 million. So, there isn't this…all this money sitting around. Then I said, oh, there's all of this money, tens of millions of dollars, and the landfill reserve for old landfills. Oh, you can't have any of that. I said, we're earning more in there than we're spending. The income exceeds the expenditures per year. We've got a lot of commitments. So, if the commitments count when we're calculating what is left in the landfill reserve, the commitments sure as hell count when we're looking at the Land Dedication amounts that each ward gets. So, I don't know how much others have left, I know exactly how much I have left. I don't particularly care how much Councillor Orlikow has left. I know, to his credit, he's saved and saved and saved to try and preserve some forest. So, kudos to him on doing that. But yeah, we can handle having that much discretionary budget. Yeah, we can. We are duly elected by 50,000-person wards, so I don't think there's anything particularly untoward about having some discretion over amounts of money. It will vary ward-to-ward because there's different levels of development in either...in wards. There is a socialization process where 20% of whatever comes in, in say, Councillor Chambers' ward, we split a chunk of that at Riel and a chunk goes out to each of the other community committees. It swirls around, sometimes it's surprising. I think the downtown...I think the City Centre Committee actually had a little more than I thought when I looked a few years ago. Councillor Sharma whose ward has had all sorts of development, has benefited somewhat from that. So, I do not apologize for spending Land Dedication money. It has made possible some of the best projects I have done such as all of the work at Dakota Collegiate. I think we're at around $2 million going into there. It's been the single best thing I probably did in my last term of office. So, yep, have some discretionary funds, so…but it is not a million dollars a year. Additionally, the prep money is going to Councillor Gillingham to nil in 2023, as is the Community Incentive Grants which have continued to ratchet down over the last few budgets. There's still some left in there, but if...if there aren't changes made, the councillors would have a gaudy $10,000 each to spend at their discretion in 20...I'm thinking per capita here, there's also a ward allowance which one can use to hire an assistant, for example, or to advertise or to do office supplies or have a phone, not particularly egregious. So, yes, if we continue on this path we'll be down to just covering the Per Capita Grants left in 2023. Don't know if I'll be here, but I'll certainly fight for others and myself to get the prep money which is parks and the CIG money which is Community Incentive Grant. We do good things with it. See earlier vote today on the money for the Downtown BIZ. So, yeah, I fully support...I'll not vote for the amendment. I will not vote for...I will vote for the motion that was passed at EPC, but I don't have a million dollars a year in discretionary funding. I fight like hell in the budget to get what I can for my ward. I face an administration that tells me I don't have the acumen to know whether I should have a park structure in park a or park b. I think I have the brain power to do that, frankly, after this many years here. I did the day I walked in the door too. So, wish I had a million dollars that I could spend at my discretion. I would make good use of it. I would do good things for my community. But in any event, I just wanted to lay that out on the record. I support the Mayor. I don't think that there's any problem with what he's been expending on. I hope this isn't taken in that light. But I don't know who did that calculation, but I'm going to make sure I correct that on the record.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Who is next, Ms. Clerk?

Clerk: I believe our final speaker is Councillor Klein.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Klein, okay.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Hands up for those of you who are surprised that I stood up. No. Let's briefly chat about this. First of all, I'm amazed at the wordsmithing that happens within the walls of this chamber. I mean, seriously, it's truly impressive. Truly impressive. There are careers to be had in television writing. It is unbelievable, the spin that can be spun but people do see through it. You know, the fact is that I'm sure that EPC will vote this through. I don't know how anyone will ever defend it because let's just look at the facts. And my colleague, Councillor Mayes has

always eloquently alluded to a few of the points. The public relations department for the City of Winnipeg basically works for the Mayor. That's not even included in the $1.8 million of the budget. Strategic initiatives, although a City department, basically reports to the Mayor because employees openly state to people they work for the Mayor. Everything we do for residents, residents have to pay for twice and they have to pay an administration fee on top of that. As Councillor Mayes said, if we want a telephone, we have to pay for that. If you want to use the photocopier, you have to pay for that. If you want paper, you have to pay for that. If you want to do pretty much anything for residents, that's got to come out of the ward funding, so that goes away from their ability to have it spent on them. But let's talk about how any of us would be able to justify a lack of spending accountability when we stand on this high mountain and say, no other level of government has the accountability we do. We do? Because we're sitting here saying no to some accountability that's not going to cost us anymore money. Like, let's remember it's $1.8 million. It's going to come up. If we think this is just something people are going to forget, trust me, they will be talking about this. It's an issue we have. We've heard countless times, there's no accountability at City Hall. That's on nobody else but us. Madam Speaker, I ask you, how would you defend to oppose a basic act of accountability? At no cost or Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I'd be hard pressed.

Councillor Klein: To cost a dime to taxpayers. How could we defend that it's fine that the expense account for the Mayor of Winnipeg is $1.8 million which is the second highest in the country. Let me be clear, it's not per capita. It's not for cities that start with W. It's not for cities, you know, west…or east of Brandon and west of Thunder Bay. It's in the country. That means Edmonton has a lower expense account. It might not seem that bad, right. But when I say it's higher than the Montreal expense account, you don't...you don't shake your head? When I say it's the…it's higher than Vancouver, you don't…you don't shake your head? You don't question why? What? We just follow everything? We just go along with it and then we turn around and say, we have all of this accountability. Where? Where? Show me. That's all I'm asking. Like, we have to start walking the walk if we're going to talk the talk. I don't know why anyone would be afraid or would speak against or try to turn it around on councillors and say you have all of this money, when it's really not factual. I mean, let's look at the realities. How many of you could call anybody in the...like, I saw a letter that was sent to me from a resident not that long ago who sent a complaint to the Mayor's Office, they got a response from the director who said the Mayor asked me to look into this for you. I can't do that. I can't even get an answer. I have to go through a 1-800 ask a question and hope that they have service that day. Please, consider the residents of Winnipeg. That's who we need to consider here. Consider the residents of Winnipeg. Are we prepared to stand in front of the residents and say, no, no, no, no, no, you've got to trust people. We have to trust them. Or do we say, look, everybody has to be accountable when it comes to tax dollars. I know which way I'm going to vote. I support the amendment and not accepting it as information.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Klein. I believe, Ms. Clerk, Councillor Chambers would like to speak next.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you. Yes, thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will be supporting the original motion of the Mayor's expenditure policy. I thought we were here debating the process by which, you know, of the expenditures and what not, recognizing that on a monthly basis the expenditures are posted online and annually it's audited. When I spoke about this with the Mayor and his staff, talked about a process to track changes, which is now identified, as well as an auditor who said that based on all of the different processes that the expenditures go through including that of Council, there are so many eyes that see it; it goes to the Clerk's Office, it goes to Finance, and then it's posted online. It's audited annually. We're now looking at another process down the road where it's randomly audited, increasing accountability. So sometimes there's overkill. And I think this is one of those situations where the Auditor himself has stated that he doesn't see the value in doing something that is so transparent. So, again, I will be supporting the original motion and not the amending motion. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Ms. Clerk, do we have any other councillors who want to speak? No? Okay.

Clerk: Councillor Schreyer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Deputy Speaker Eadie.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Speak to the amendment and the report.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, thank you. Or in general, I guess, as they're both interrelated. A few issues: one) His Worship mentioned that the councillors have this discretionary fund…or funding through land dedication and other ward allowances or other ward funds. But bear in mind, I think it's been mentioned, they're reducing. They are reducing. And are we going to see a subsequent...since he mentioned, some sort of expression of councillors proportionate or parallel type of

discretionary funding, would there be a corresponding decrease in the Mayor's budget over these years that we'll be seeing decreases in the Community Incentive and/or the Land Dedication Reserve? Also, issues of hosting…posting calendar...and congratulations that the Mayor posts his calendar. The difference is, councillor's jobs are different. We deal with case work. And it's very difficult for me to explain. In fact, I'm not allowed to discuss case work in a sense. You can't...I can't discuss that on Facebook. I can't discuss people's cases unless I get some sort of statement from them that I can. So, how do I talk about the case work that I do? I'm, in a sense, not allowed to kind of thing. And that's the job of my assistant, essentially, my prime assistant is to do case work and a few other things. But how do I explain that in a calendar when I'm doing case work? Other things that I suppose can be in the calendar, but it's sort of not the same proportion of my calendar. What the Mayor has, now more than ever, is resources for staff. So, the question is proportionate to those other aspects of the councillors' time, meeting time and his staff's meeting time, is essentially one executive assistant for the most part...meeting time. It would be...it would be proportionate to the Mayor's staff and the publishing of the Mayor's staff's calendars but that's not happening. I've never asked for the Mayor's staff to post their calendars. But I think that would be the same type of thing as the councillors and their staff, once you're getting out of the process of the time-staking commitment of case work. Which is sort of ambiguous and hard to say, well, I'm going to phone that person at this time kind of thing. That's not how it works. I have been doing case work for over a decade before I got elected. And that's not how case work works. That's not how my job works. And I'll just leave it at that. But bear in mind something, the budgets are changing at City Hall. Councillor Mayes made the point that the concern is who understands things better, administration or...or councillors...or Council in general. And I guess that's the give-and-take of this, we're the board of directors of this billion-dollar a year corporation. Yeah, we're incorporated. It's a corporation. And so, there's the give-and-take and the communication. We stand in judgment of what the administration does. Hopefully we do it in a way that's most functional. That we do it in a way that's in a sense cooperative, not cooperative to the extent that we have a you scratch my back, I scratch yours horse trading, but to the extent that it is most communicative, open and accountable. There's enough of that that happens in politics, and not just at the council chamber, not just in this room, let's face it. So, our job to stand in judgment of others at City Hall in terms of the decision-making process is extremely important. And, therefore, also bear in mind that the discretionary funds, they're not discretionary. The funds allocated through the wards is actually a highly accountable process. And there are very few processes of financial allocation at the City of Winnipeg that go through the same vigorousness of accountability because there's very little bit…very little of the funding to which I've got actually discretionary prerogative. And the rest has to be vetted through a process of administration, rules and other councillors, and bear that in mind. And yet, those are the award funding…ward funds that are going to be decreasing in the years to come. It's already started. We have seen it happen already this year with Community Incentive. So, I'm not talking about a hypothetical. It's already happening. I didn't bring this up, the Mayor brought it up in his speech. And so, the question is, is there going to be a proportional reduction in the Mayor's budget? And I was elected…I elect...I ran in an era of new hope that we'd have a greater level of accountability and scrutiny. I voted with the Mayor and the Finance Chair to maintain the same level of scrutiny on councillors...on councillors' expenditures from the ward allowance. Just the three of us, we lost, but why wouldn't I? I understand why councillors were saying, well, why do this? We're just so highly good at what we're doing, we're kind of functional...highly functional with their ward allowance expenditures. But, nonetheless, I don't mind if the Finance Chair and the Mayor want that level of scrutiny, I'm willing to vote for it. I just want that same high level of scrutiny done for the Mayor's budget. That's fair. Doesn't have anything to do with any particular mayor, it's just why I ran in the first place because people want that. They deserve it. And I don't believe we have that. I think we're in a position to attain that, if not now, then soon. But bear in mind, when we make a decision like I think we're going to do today and not pass the amendment, we've got to live with that and bear that in mind. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Ms. Clerk, do we have anybody else who wants to speak?

Clerk: I don't believe there are any other speakers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would ask Councillor Sharma, if you could just to take the Chair for a moment so I could speak to the issue. For a moment. Yeah. I think that is an order.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie, I will recognize you to make comments on this item.

Councillor Eadie: All right. Thank you. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak. I'm going to be supporting the amendment, but you know, I have to say…I want to start off by just saying, I have a lot of respect for Mayor Bowman who did bring forth a policy and it got framed around similar to the councillors' policy. And I think that's great. And we definitely know that Mayor Bowman is definitely open, transparent and accountable when it comes to comparing to, say, past mayors. And I think that's really essential in that we finally do have a public policy for the Mayor's Office that is very clear. But I think essentially what we're missing here is with the councillors' ward allowance, which is our office allowance, it's limited in scope as compared to the Mayor's and that's where there are some differences, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, a motion...I can't just change my council ward allowance policy. I don't have that ability, Madam Speaker. I can't just say, oh, well, I'm going to change my policy and...well, I'll make it more accountable and I'll give...when the change has happened to my policy or for that matter. So, the discretion in that policy is totally dependent right now on our current trustworthy mayor. The reality

is though, when we're considering this amendment and considering this is, we really need it to be not the mayor's policy, but the Council's policy because the ward allowance is the Council's policy. And, therefore, no individual member can change it. It requires changes to be made not by request, but by a motion and introduction. So, I just want to make sure that's clear. Now, in terms of the amount of money, you know, the Mayor has a very big job. A big responsibility that goes far beyond the ward office. The Mayor's Office is also the chief officer. The chief officer under that responsibility, there's a whole bunch of...like, you have to be able to stay on top of things and you need to have an office that can deal with that. I'm not really worried about how much the budget is, but I just want to...you know, it's just...it should be a Council policy and it should be subject to when it is to be changed it's a Council vote. I think that's important. I'm not...like, anyway, we have a very trustworthy mayor. That's not what this issue is about. It's about the future, who knows what is in the future. But I want to point out a couple things about discretionary money for the councillors...ward councillors. Okay, so Community Incentive Grant. That is actually a Council policy. It has four or five different criteria that needs to be met when you indicate the money. If you want to violate that criteria, it requires a vote of Council. Actually, it requires a report and a vote of Council. So, the Land Dedication Reserve, well, that's in the Charter. And different...actually, different community committees allocate it differently. I don't know that the Mayor knows that, either. But in Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, were all new councillors as to when it was first established, the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee. And the councillors that represented that area decided a long time ago…and we maintain it, is that we share whatever comes to Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee from no matter what ward, we share it one-third, one-third, one-third. So, it ends up we get 25% whether that development happened in Councillor Sharma's ward or Councillor Santos' ward or Councillor Eadie's ward, not a lot of big LDR money coming in from the Mynarski Ward though. Anyway, but so, anyway, so there's different things. So that really is not...like, it's not, like...it's money that has a policy as well. I don't necessarily agree with the administration, for example, the way they tried to apply it to...well, Councillor Schreyer's was different, I don't know about Councillor Gilroy, but the LDR money, it sounds like the department itself was getting the money so I don't understand why we had to vote for it. Like, really, really, I think it's a good initiative under LDR. But CIGP, so there is policy and at community committee we vote…we introduce it. And actually, any member on community committee if they want to question it, they can. We actually discuss it and maybe we share in the cost those kind of things for an initiative that is going to benefit the three wards. That's fine, but it has to meet criteria. In terms of the community centre grants, I think that there's a misnomer I heard, Madam Speaker. Somehow did I...you know, we as councillors don't have discretion on deciding the community centre grants. The Land Operating Reserve which is subject to the budget and all of Council, the Mayor has great influence though because the former mayor actually decided to use Land Operating Reserve money to provide two community centres for grants and there's a whole process that's set up and GCWCC handles that. So, I don't see how that is at the discretion of the city councillor. The prep program, well, you know, when it was first...you know, made really solid through, I think that was a 2012, 2013 budget move I believe or maybe it was a 2014, you know, we had a little more control then. You know, I know that the City administration likes to have a lot of control, but they do consult us, that's true. But the vote on how to spend that money doesn't happen at community committee. We work with the City administration to help say, well, we think this is important to spend the money here and it's been reduced, and that's fine. But that's not part of the councillors' ward allowance. There's a difference between the Mayor's policy and our policy. All of the money is within his. So, I just want to point that out. So, I don't really understand the problem of making any changes responsible to Council for changes to the Mayor's policy. Thanks, Madam Speaker, and I'll take the Chair.

Madam Speaker: Yes, thank you, Councillor Eadie. And I will turn the Chair back to you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Okay, Councillor Nason, would you close on the amending motion, please?

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It was interesting listening to my colleagues speaking. When the Mayor talked about openness and transparency and talking about his calendar and hoping that we too put ours up. If what's online is an example, Mr. Mayor, you need to talk to your staff because I know myself, I have been trying to get a meeting with you four times. I'm speaking...he raised it...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Councillor Nason, you should be directing it...

Councillor Nason: I'm closing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yeah, but you should direct it…

Councillor Nason: Oh sorry, I directed it…sorry, I directed my comments…

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You should direct it to the Deputy Speaker.

Councillor Nason: My apologies, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am out of order on that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: And you're speaking directly to the motion too, right? So, all right.

Councillor Nason: I listened to all the dialogue here. There was dialogue about openness and transparency.

Deputy Speaker: Okay, go ahead.

Councillor Nason: I just need to clarify the record that I did try to have a meeting with the Mayor in January. His schedule is so busy he has zero items listed on that…the calendar that is on his webpage. Go back to December, zero items listed there. November, zero items. For the entire year of 2020, he had 21 meetings. Mayor of a city that is growing to a million had 21 meetings listed in this website calendar that he's hoping that we aspire to. If that's openness and transparency, sign me up. I can easily do that. You know, we have our registry as well. There's only two active people registered as lobbyists on that registry. The others have expired. And I know it's voluntary. Again, you know, I heard from my colleagues, I heard a lot of concern over moneys that we have access to, don't have access to. We don't have a CWA of $1.8ish million. We don't have that. We have our $86,000, $87,000, whatever the dollar amount is. My assistant is very diligent with that, making sure that we can help where we help. Last year I spent a fair bit of mine honouring veterans. I spent a lot honouring veterans last year for my CWA. Living veterans of World War II. And we owe a lot to them for that. When it comes to aligning practices, I don't know why we've belabored this. It seems like a simple thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But it sounds like the votes have been lined up to align with the Mayor to defeat this. But we'll see in the final count what openness and transparency really means to the members of this council. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Sharma to close, please.

Councillor Sharma: I want to thank my colleagues for the discussion and debate on this matter. There was some mention of LDR funds and Community Incentive Grant funds. Councillor Mayes noted, there's policies and processes around those funds, which I do like, and even for the Per Capita Funds we do have an application process and that does come to a public body which is our community committee system. Policies such as the councillors' ward allowance and the Mayor's Office expense policy exists in my view to provide guidance and set rules for all of us on Council on how to expend the taxpayer funds with which we have been entrusted. I am a strong believer in these types of policies, both as they help and protect elected officials, but also because they provide assurance to our citizens that these funds are safeguarded and will only be spent in accordance with the policy. I supported the motion to have the Mayor's Office expense policy be approved by Council at the Governance Committee because it is the right thing to do. I have no concerns with the Mayor's policy. We do see it on the website as posted. He's mentioned that he's now going to be tracking changes. Those are good things. We did hear from the Public Service at Governance that the policy is a strong one, similar to the Council adopted CWA policy. However, I do feel we need to go a step further. We know that the Mayor's expenses are publicly posted on the website, as ours are, and they are audited with no concerns in past audits. This tells me that the Mayor is doing these steps correctly. However, the fact remains that the Mayor can change the policy at his or her discretion. There's no guarantee that future mayors will not choose to amend the policy in ways that may create...may cause concern or even without public knowledge. So, the concerns are, you know, for current but also for the future. I don't see anything wrong with having a Council approved policy. And Councillor Eadie, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you did mention the councillor...the Mayor has a different responsibility and obligations in his role and I think we would certainly be thoughtful of that if the policy did come to Council. So today, to be consistent, at the last Governance Committee meeting but also going back several years, this is going back into the last term and the term before, there's been a lot of conversations ongoing for many, many years. And that started even before this policy that we have with our current mayor. So, it's important. Maybe one day that next step will be taken. Hopefully it will be taken today. I will be supporting the amending Motion 8. And again, just to be consistent with the points that were raised at the Governance Committee and my view there. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Sharma. So, I'm going to now call the question. All those in favour of the amending Motion No. 8…recorded vote. Okay. All those in favour of the amending Motion 8, please stand if you can.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

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

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

Deputy Speaker: Motion is defeated. All right. Now I'll call the question. Does anybody want it recorded vote? I'll call the question on the main report. Recorded vote. Okay, all those in favour, please stand if you can. I know that I'd be having a hard time after this long meeting.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Klein, Lukes, Nason, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Eadie

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is passed, that report. And I would like to...would the…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, I will take the Chair back if you don't mind.

Councillor Eadie: You'll take the Chair, okay. Councillor Sharma.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And I just wanted to before we close, thank our Clerks. Mr. Clerk, Mr. Lemoine, your team here, it's been quite a long day and we…I know we all appreciate your efforts. And I also want to bid a good night to our Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Mike Ruta. Thank you for partaking in the meeting today and being here till the end. We appreciate your service. Councillor Gillingham, will you move adjournment? All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Roll call, Madam Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 9:33 p.m.