COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, February 24, 2022

The Council met at 9:40 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 Browaty.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: I'll move in to morning announcements. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's with a heavy heart that I begin my opening statements this morning standing with the citizens of Ukraine. President Putin's ongoing invasion of Ukraine represents a gross violation of international law, Madam Speaker. There are many residents here in the city of Winnipeg with deep connections to Ukraine and are understandably very concerned about the Russian invasion. I want those residents to know that we stand with our Ukrainian community and all those that are horrified of what we are witnessing in the last 24 hours with respect to the Russian invasion. Winnipeg's connection is deep. We have had a sister city relationship with Lviv since 1973. I support Ukraine's sovereignty, territorial integrity, I'm sure I speak for all members of this city council and our residents in standing with the people of Ukraine. And I want to thank all those that are working at provincial and federal levels for also issuing similar statements to support the residents and the citizens of Ukraine. Madam Speaker, since our last Council meeting we have sadly lost 88 more residents to COVID. 1,038 to-date in the city of Winnipeg as of February 23rd. We have fortunately seen less of our residents in hospital since our last Council meeting; 182 less people in hospital. There are currently 312 currently hospitalized. We have eight less ICU cases since the last Council meeting; there are currently 18 in our ICUs. And I'll just take this opportunity to thank all of those that are taking steps and measures, including this council and our Public Service for all that they are doing to mitigate the ongoing impacts of the pandemic. Madam Speaker, I understand the unlawful occupation on our public streets has finally concluded. No one will be happier than the residents and local businesses in the area of the Manitoba Legislature. Thank you to the Winnipeg Police Service for their recent efforts to bring an end to the unlawful occupation. I want to thank our Provincial Government for dialogue during the occupation. I especially want to thank our Federal Government partners for taking action that recognized the seriousness of the situation by providing additional tools to law enforcement agencies that has helped to deliver swift resolutions to numerous unlawful occupations and blockades across Canada. It is clear that the threat of additional enforcement measures made available by the Federal Government helped to clear a number of occupations across the country. This unlawful occupation has raised many questions and set a troubling precedent going forward. I want to acknowledge that at our special meeting of Council on February 10th, City Council requested, unanimously, that the Winnipeg Police Board and the City's Chief Administrative Officer to review public communications during times of protests and/or other large events. And I'm looking forward, along with my council colleagues, to seeing the results of these reviews in due course. I want to offer congratulations, Madam Speaker, to all Winnipeg and Manitoba athletes that participated in the Olympics. Whether you…a medal or not, we are very proud of you. I'd like to wish all athletes and staff all the very best at the Paralympics which commences on March 4th. And last but not least, I want to just wish everybody all of the very best with the Festival du Voyageur. I was able to attend the opening press conference with Councillor Allard. If you have a chance, check out the sculptures that are around Winnipeg, including one of the Million Tree Challenge at The Forks. And I would just encourage all those Winnipeggers that are able to participate in Festival du Voyageur. I think right now, a little more joy in our community is something that we could all use. And Festival offers that, both in person and virtual at the hybrid events that's taking place as we speak. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Merci and megwich.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Mayes, your morning announcements.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. And not to take away from the gravity of the situation in Ukraine, and obviously that's the main issue of the day, but we do have other business we conduct and I had booked time for an announcement before the events of last night. The melancholy task I have is to thank the Dr. Ernest Cholakis for his eight years as serving as chair of the board of the WAG. Dr. Cholakis said he will wrap up his term on February 28th. We do not directly run the WAG,

but we have a seat on the board. I've been privileged to have that for several years. In the wake of my denouncing the Qaumajuq project. Before it even had a name, I referred to it as a vanity project. And Ernest and Stephen Borys called me up and said, we don't think you quite understand this, come on down for a visit. And they were right. So, I certainly changed my position. It's been a great experience being on the board of the WAG, partly because Dr. Cholakis has been a very effective chair, very devoted. He's both skilled in getting compromise and moving things forward and a good sense of humor. The hardest I've laughed in this pandemic was his series of Hollywood Squares jokes when he had a Zoom call up with the nine different people on the call above him. So, a pretty good skill at moving things forward and leaving people satisfied. So, I want to thank Ernest for all the work he's put in over the years. He has managed to see this project from conception through to completion. He is being replaced by Nick Logan who is a familiar face around here. And so, we'll be in good hands with Nick as chair. But I do want to take a moment just to thank…to thank Ernest for all he has done to get Qaumajuq in place. I didn't always agree with him at the board, that is not our job. But he was very fair, he was very effective and the proof is in the building. Previous chairs of the WAG Board, of course, have gone on to political careers such as a certain Brian Bowman. So, I don't know if that's in Ernest's future or what his plans are, but I do think we should thank him for the work he's put in on behalf of the WAG. And every time you go by there, you can see that building is a landmark and he's…as he said, we've done something about nation building here. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Councillor Rollins, your morning announcement.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, stand with Ukraine and all Ukrainians, including those in Winnipeg's community, impacted by Putin's war. But I stand, Madam Speaker, to thank the ward residents of the downtown and ward residents across this city. Residents of Winnipeg that have reached out through me to the residents of downtown for experiencing the convoys that they have these last four weeks, Madam Speaker. And I want to just stand and recognize the resiliency of all Winnipeggers, and in doing so, hopefully, honour the downtown ward residents that I represent.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Santos.

MINUTES

Councillor Allard moves that the Minutes of the meetings held on January 27th, 2022 and February 10th, 2022, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We'll now move into delegations. First up, we have Dr. Andrew Lodge. He's with Klinic Community Health Centre. He's in support of the Executive Policy Committee notice of motion regarding a request for an exemption under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. The delegation is attending via Zoom, I see you here. We have 10 minutes on the clock. You may begin.

DELEGATIONS

Andrew Lodge: Well, thank you very much for having me and allowing me to present my views on this topic. I think it is a topic that is on the forefront of a lot of our minds who live in this city. As you said, my name is Andrew Lodge. I work at Klinic with a 'K'. I am sure most of you are familiar with it. I also work in northern Manitoba quite regularly, about a week a month. I also want to say, at the outset, this is quite an emotive issue. And I think that everybody here listening approaches it with compassion and I think that collaboration is our best step forward. The things I want to talk about are shaped by evidence and research that emerges out of the public health field. I think that a public health lens is the best way to view this issue. When you take that lens; criminalizing substance use and, particularly, simple possession, becomes very, very problematic because you end up punishing people as opposed to allowing other processes to happen. So, I think, to be very clear, this should be a public health issue, not a law and order issue. But I think there needs to be collaboration with the folks in the law and order community. And I don't think this is like a particularly radical idea. We see this in all sorts of jurisdictions around Canada and, indeed, around the world. And furthermore, I think we also see that this is supported by law enforcement bodies in various jurisdictions in our own country. Police on the frontlines, I think, have lots of work to do, and I don't know that simple possession, sorry is something that really is important for them to occupy their time with. Driving underground is not effective, it's not helpful to the problem. So, coming back to the healthcare point of view, criminalization causes stigmatization. Stigmatization creates barriers to individuals receiving healthcare. That is a well-established fact, a piece of evidence that is replicated over and over again. Addressing problematic substance use, and I should be very clear here; problematic substance use is different than substance use. But addressing problematic substance is something that requires a multi-pronged approach and it requires a number of different agencies to do it. Decriminalization is an evidence-based component of this approach rooted in the scientific

literature. I think it's something that, once we arrive at that conclusion, we can move forward and start making…you know, meaningful change in our city. I think greater focus should also be placed on partnerships between various levels of government. Something I am sure all of you work very hard on everyday as well as grassroots, community organizations, law enforcement and the healthcare sector. These are difficult partnerships to build, but I think without that we…you know, we won't see good success. And whatever's…you know, whatever's the moral view that a particular individual, any one of you takes on this. And, you know, on various issues in our city around substance use, I think we can agree that the current approach isn't working. And I think using evidence-based approaches that come out of the scientific literature would be very helpful to go forward. I think decriminalization is one of these. You know, instead of using huge amounts of resources to punish and criminalize and stigmatize people, those kind of resources could be used to identify…you know, to address root causes of a lot of the problems that we see in our community. I think at the end of the day, I think all of you want to see a healthier community. I think decriminalization really can advance this. I just don't see any harm in it. And I would be happy to talk to any of you, and I would welcome you all to reach out to chat further about this subject. With that, thank you. And if there is any questions, I am happy to talk further.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for our delegation? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Long day ahead, so I will just be brief. Are you using…and admittedly, you haven't drafted the motion, but in your terminology, are you using decriminalization in the same sense as legalization? We decriminalize…if I get a speeding ticket going through a school zone too fast; that is not criminal, but it is not legal. We have had people here presenting on different matters. In their minds, it's very clear what they're saying sometimes, but are you saying…and you didn't draft the motion, but are you using decriminalized as synonym for legalize or some…is it…would it still be a regulatory offense?

Andrew Lodge: Yeah, oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Madam Speaker: Go ahead, Dr. Lodge.

Andrew Lodge: Yeah, so absolutely not. Those are two very different issues. I am not going to speak to my views regarding legalization in this forum because I think the issue is, we are discussing decriminalization. Basically, I think…I believe the motion is that we're decriminalization…the idea to decriminalize possession. Legalization is a very different issue. I think that probably rises above municipal politics. So yeah, the…those are not synonymous. And I don't use them synonymously.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next question, Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Chair. I was happy to co-sponsor this motion with Councillor Rollins, with respect to decriminalization. Were you aware, sir, that the Canadian Associations of the Chiefs of Police also concur in this recommendation that we move down the pathway of decriminalizing small amounts of illicit drugs and focus this as a health outcome as opposed to a criminal justice outcome?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Dr. Lodge.

Andrew Lodge: Yes. So, yes, I was aware of that. And as I mentioned briefly or referred to briefly, I think whether…so, certainly, the chiefs of police are in support of decriminalization. And I think members of the police force on the ground on a daily basis all know that they don't want to be arresting people for, you know, holding onto a point of meth. I mean, it is a waste of their time. So, I think everybody is in agreement with this idea. This…it's kind of a no-brainer to me. So, yeah, absolutely, I agree. And I have heard of that. And I…it's hard not to find a counter...it's hard to find a counterargument.

Councillor Chambers: Are you also aware that in terms of a person being arrested for possession of illicit drugs, it's usually a situation where it is not just that charge, it is coupled with other charges. And possession happens to be one of the charges, but not the primary charge that they are charged with. And again, focusing on health outcomes and the fact that it is easier for an individual to get treatment while they are out of jail than when they are in jail.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Andrew Lodge: Yeah. Sorry, I am aware of that. Absolutely. Again, I think that criminalization at this point is simply a barrier to treatment. And again, it doesn't really provide…I don't think it makes our communities safer or healthier on any front.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation, Dr. Lodge. Next, we have Peter Martin in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development; the report dated January 17th, 2022, regarding Waiving of Costs for the Field of Honour Internments. Peter is joining us via Zoom. Welcome, sir.

Peter Martin: Thank you very much for this opportunity, Mr. Mayor, councillors and Madam Speaker. I just want to make it very clear, I am here to speak in opposition to the motion's recommendation. I love the motion to waive the cost…the fee at the Field of Honour for veterans, but the motion has no teeth in it in terms of recommendation; refer it to Council as information. And I should clarify, too, I was made aware yesterday by Councillor Nason that himself and Councillor Klein are putting forward a motion to amend that motion to actually remove the recommendation (inaudible) for information, but adding an opportunity for discussion at Council. And that's really why I am here. I really would love to see opportunity for Council to discuss that they can at least show, other than November 11th activities, show that they are at least thinking about how they can honour veterans that serve and continue to serve and will serve in the future as a symbolic act of appreciation. But first of all, let me just briefly give you a little bit of my background, so you know that I am very passionate about this. And I walk the talk throughout the year. I am a veteran, and over the past 10 years, I speak to schools and the students in Transcona and in Winnipeg about remembrance. I am also a registered speaker with the Memory Project out of Toronto. This is an organization that receives requests from schools, organizations, community groups for speakers during Remembrance Week. And I am on the list if they call for somebody to speak at Winnipeg or surrounding area, I am one of the (inaudible) speakers to go to the organizations available to speak to them. I am also an executive at the Transcona Legion in my role as a veterans' affairs liaison. And a couple years ago I was sent to France, before all the pandemic, on behalf of the legion. And I came back and felt that those veterans in Transcona, 123 fallen soldiers are recognized in our Field of Honour. (Inaudible) created plaques and stands, identifying the names of all those fallen soldiers and placed in the cemetery with the person (inaudible). I am mentioning that because we did that at no cost to the government. We got private funding from businesses to support that. Not wanting recognition, they just wanted to support something for the greater good here. I'm also…I am the Manitoba coordinator for this (inaudible). Most are lonely. We have students going to the Field of Honour, placing a poppy on all the graves. In 2021, we had 67,000 headstones honoured with 8,000 students across Canada. Manitoba didn't have as many this year because of COVID. But typically, we would have about 10% of that. It's about 850 Winnipeg students coming out of the classroom. Part of my role in that as coordinator is trying to set up a ceremony in Stonewall. You know, setting it up at the Stonewall Field of Honour. And looking at the Stonewall council, talking to them, I came across minutes and motion that was approved saying that all veterans were eligible to receive a plot at no cost. And that's what led me to speak to my Councillor Nason and say, that is a wonderful idea. How innovative. How creative. What a sense of…a show of appreciation to the veterans served. He loved the idea. He brought it forward on October 28th or 26th, I should say, to Council for discussion. And what surprised me is this motion, fairly simple, I was hoping this would be discussed on Council to see some sense of appreciation of my ideas and support for veterans. Remember, it turned out this simple motion went through six meetings so far in four months. When we met the day of October 28th, I thought great, this is going to be available in place for November 11th so we can make that big announcement for the City of Winnipeg acknowledging veterans service and offering something symbolic in a way that's special for those that want to be buried in the Field of Honour. (inaudible) A sixth meeting called to appear before Council including standing policy and two EPC meetings. And I spoke at a couple of those. The impact of this idea is less than $25,000 annually. So, to provide this for veterans based on…this is less than $25,000 annually. And I thought, for that amount of money, (inaudible) but it really, just getting to Council to discuss it. I am not saying that you have to vote for or against, but just having a show of support for those things to remember that aren't happening on Remembrance Day. So, this is not Remembrance Day, but it sure shows that we can talk about the appreciation of all those who serve and continue to serve, and especially those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice. Because as my father used to say, as a (inaudible) beach veteran, used to say, we have freedom in this country but we paid a high price for that freedom. And all those who served and all those who died, and all those (inaudible) persons suffered tremendously and those who suffer today, who served in recent conflicts are not the same person. We need to keep expressing our appreciation throughout the year. And so, I'm just surprised that this motion has been through so many troops to get the…I just want it on the floor to discuss at Council debate, great idea, but we can't afford it, it's an idea, but maybe there's other ideas, maybe we could strike a committee of some influential community persons and just come up with other ideas that we can show some support. The city does support veterans, of course. During remembrance week, they offer free parking for veterans. The City of Winnipeg employees who are reservists are 100% supported in terms of activity to take time off work. Absolutely. But I'm just looking for something tangible the City could say, you know what, plots for veterans in the Field of Honour is not very expensive, but it makes a statement, that, you know what, you deserve something. Even those who went didn't go through (inaudible) are not the same person. They went through training and everything. Health will have suffered. It is a statement. I am here today just to say, hopefully we can get this to Council for discussion. Because Council members not voting in favour of bringing it to Council, just submitting it as information. Say, oh, thanks a lot for the information. We are glad to know there are ways we can appreciate veterans and we'll just file it away and not even talk about it. That's what bothers me. We need to have a conversation. And if it approves…doesn't get approved, at least

a conversation where Council said, this (inaudible) and perhaps come up with other ways to recognize veterans. It's not about only Remembrance Day and that is the point. Remembrance week we can talk about remembrance all year around. It is not about one week in November. We need to continually express our appreciation of those who served, continue to serve and appreciate how great it is to be in this country from the backs of those who served. There is a monument in Burma that says, "When you go home, tell them of us and say, for your tomorrow we gave our today". That's what pride is. We have to do this for those that can't be speak and don't have a voice. I will continue to do that behind the scenes throughout the year to impress upon you the fact that myself and many others think much of the veterans and their service throughout the year in ways that we appreciate what they have done. Lest we forget. And I appreciate the time. Thank you for your consideration. Are there any questions? I think, Madam Chair, it's up to you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation. Any questions? Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Through you, Madam Speaker. First, I want to thank Mr. Martin and his father and many others that have served our nation. It is a challenging day with the affairs going on in Ukraine that we are debating this motion. I want to thank Councillor Gillingham, Madam Speaker. I do apologize for a bit of preamble. But Councillor Gillingham did second this motion to get on the floor as Veteran and Military Liaison for the City. This amount of money is small, but it is important. So Mr. Martin, you had indicated in your comments that for discussion, the amending motion that I brought forward today is to actually do action for this year to commit to spend $23,000 this year to be found from within and for future years to be part of consideration of the budget process. Is that something as a veteran yourself and as a member of the community advocating for that, is that something you can support?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Peter Martin: Absolutely. Sorry. Yeah, absolutely. And Councillor Nason, it's something…I suppose just getting it out there and the perception by the public when they see that it can't be anything but positive in terms of innovative, nice step. It's not going to cost a lot, but it's the least we can do to show our support. So, I totally support that, Councillor Nason. I appreciate that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, Mr. Martin, thank you for your presentation to Council today.

Peter Martin: Stay safe. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Next is David Dandenaeu, Vice President of Heritage Saint-Boniface in support of 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, 2022 regarding the List of historical Resources – the Nomination of the St. Boniface Police Station/Jail/County Courthouse at 227 Provencher Boulevard. Welcome.

David Dandenaeu: Thank you. Good morning Your Worship and councillors. Thank you for listening to my brief presentation. As a proud Métis citizen of St. Boniface

Translation of French Spoken:

David Dandenaeu: I wish everyone a good Festival du Voyageur.

David Dandenaeu: I think…take this opportunity to thank the City of Winnipeg and all those who have continued to support one of Canada's…western Canada's largest winter festival.

Translation of French Spoken:

David Dandenaeu: When I was President of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Boniface in 1995 and 1996, the Chamber proposed to Councillor Dan Vandal to ask that a part of the Old St. Boniface area be declared a national historic site. The community felt that there was a critical mass of historic buildings to justify this designation.

David Dandenaeu: When I was president of the St. Boniface Chamber of Commerce in 1995 and 1996, we had proposed to Councillor Dan Vandal request that part of the Old St. Boniface district be declared a national historic site. The Chamber felt that there was a critical mass of historical buildings to warrant this designation. For example, all within walking distance to St. Boniface city hall and its civic square, St. Boniface Cathedral, the burial site of Louis Riel, the cathedral cemetery, the St. Boniface post office, the Gabriel Roi House, the archbishop's palace, the St. Boniface Museum. The first normal school in western Canada to attend Masson, University of St. Boniface and many more. Councillor Vandal brought the idea to city hall and the councillors felt that the first site in Winnipeg to be designated should be the Exchange District, and

rightly so. We now can see the economic benefits of that decision. On September 27th, 1997, Federal Minister of Canadian Heritage, the Honourable Sheila Copps declared Winnipeg's Exchange District a national historic site. One of Canada's largest designated historic districts. Unfortunately, St. Boniface was set aside for future consideration. The recommendation of the EPC at its February 16th meeting by a vote of 7-0 in favour of adding 227 Provencher Boulevard to the list of historical resources is hope to the community of Old St. Boniface that maybe the time has come to revisit designation of a part of Old St. Boniface as national historic site. This would be good for tourism in Manitoba, would integrate well with the province's francophone tourism initiative spearheaded by Colin Ferguson of Travel Manitoba.

Translation of French Spoken:

David Dandenaeu: I thank you for your time and support. And I hope that you will be able to enjoy a bit of the joie de vie of the Festival du Voyageur.

David Dandenaeu: Thank you for your time, for your support. And I hope you will be able to enjoy a bit of the joie de vie of the Festival du Voyageur. Merci, thank you, megwich.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now take questions. Councillor Allard.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Allard: Yes, thank you David for the presentation. Are you aware that your presentation is appreciated at Council and that I am looking forward to speaking with you about your ideas. I will certainly support the recommendation from Executive Policy Committee and will ask the same of my Council colleagues. So, thank you for your presentation today.

Translation of French Spoken:

David Dandenaeu: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Monsieur, would you like to respond?

David Dandenaeu: I said thank you. Merci.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor…Councillor Schreyer.

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would also like to know if we also consider the idea if we have a historic designation in this area, if we can…we need to preserve this area like a good…a part of tourism like the downtown.

Translation of French Spoken:

David Dandenaeu: Well, like you said.

David Dandenaeu: Do I respond?

Madam Speaker: Yes, this is your opportunity to respond.

David Dandenaeu: Oh, okay.

Translation of French Spoken:

David Dandenaeu: So, if I understand your question, it's that you want to include it in the…I don't exactly understand how…

Translation of French Spoken:

Councillor Schreyer: Well, even…it's not formally, at least admit the fact that we can (inaudible) the idea of a historic area at the same…in the same sense to encourage tourism in the downtown. We can also use the historic designation to have tourism in Winnipeg as well.

Translation of French Spoken:

David Dandenaeu: I believe that Mr. Ferguson, Colin Ferguson, who had initiated the committee (inaudible) on francophone tourism, the idea is to use our (inaudible) since 1738, it's nearly 300-years, it's within walking distance to The Forks. And since this time, we spoke French in Winnipeg. So, it's still something that's incredible and I believe that this could attract people from all over to come to the city of Winnipeg and Manitoba just for tourism. So, it's an economic advantage. We have had occasions to meet with the World Trade Centre who can attract businesses to Winnipeg, partially, because we are bilingual.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions for our delegation? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation today. Next is Walter Kleinschmit, President of Heritage Saint-Boniface who is appearing before Council on two items: in support of Item 1 Report 'A' of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. The report dated January 17th, 2022 regarding the List of Historical Resources – the Nomination of St. Boniface Police Station/Jail/County Courthouse – 227 Provencher Boulevard. Also, in opposition to Item 4 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. The report dated February 7th, 2022, regarding the Waiver of Sponsorship Policy – the Lease Agreement for 50 Provencher Boulevard – Biomedical Commercialization Canada, otherwise known as the Manitoba Technology Accelerator. Welcome. We will put the clock on, please. 10 minutes. Thank you.

Walter Kleinschmit: Thank you, Your Worship and councillors for allowing me to address you today. I want to emphasize that I am speaking at this time as President of Heritage St. Boniface in favour of the designation, and I will speak to the other subject a bit later. David Dandeneau expressed very eloquently and very correctly the importance of the historical designation as an asset for the city of Winnipeg in the tourism sector…for the tourism sector, which is…does not need to be repeated. I would like to emphasize a couple of additional points for the benefits of councillor that I've not had the pleasure to meet at EPC or other meetings. Starting off with the importance of the carré civique, of which the police station constitutes one of four major elements. The Winnipeg act of 1971 changed the political structure and the administration mechanisms and the need of the city of Winnipeg, but it did not change the existence of the many communities which make up our city. Today's subject is central to the identity, the history and the continuing evolution and aspiration of St. Boniface community. The civic campus, which is composed of four major elements started in 1906 helped…integral to the collective memory, the patrimoine, and the continuing evolution and renewal of our cultural identity, our make up, the francophonie. So, it is a living mechanism, a living organ of the community which started in 1906 and continues to serve that purpose. And this is where the historical value on the memory side is so significant and important to us. The defining elements in the historical designation had been established not to be handicapped to the very important and renovations being anticipated by the current owner; Drs. Marc and Sharon Frechette. They bought the property in 2012 and at which time they recorded in the report of the city that they intended to preserve the building without modifying the historic architecture that is (inaudible) in the building and the benefit and appreciation…for the benefit and appreciation of area residents. They understand…they understood and they understand the historical importance and the significance of the building in St. Boniface. With the law which was passed in 2014, By-law 55/2014, the process is actually facilitated the ability of an owner to make necessary renovations to keep the building viable, and by being viable and sustainable, secure its future relevance and its future existence for the community. In 2012, Heritage St. Boniface supported the sale to Dr. Frechette and the use of it as a medical reach center. And today, we continue to do so. Therefore, in conclusion and to keep it short, I would like to strongly and without reservation recommend that the City agrees to the 227 Provencher Boulevard to be listed as historical resource. And also, at the same time, indicate our very strong support for the use of the building as a medical center as proposed by Dr. Marc and Sharon Frechette. And we offer them, as a community, our assistance to achieve this because that is part of a living organic historical resource, and that's what we need in St. Boniface, as in many other parts of the city. That is all I think I need to say on this building at this time. If there are any questions, I don't know, Madam Chairman, if you want me to speak on the other subject first or to take questions now.

Madam Speaker: You have six minutes left on the clock if you would like to address the next topic, this would be the time.

Walter Kleinschmit: Okay. I will do that. Thank you. On the matter of the sponsorship policy which was recently discussed at the standing policy committee, the matter…I was unhappy...I had appeared in front of the committee, but I was unhappy with the discussion that followed because the administration, and I am sure they will speak to that in due course, emphasized the frivolous, in some cases, and non-material nature of sponsorship activity. You know, a dinner, champagne for a reception, posters, those kinds of things. Elements for which I have absolutely no objection to and no reason to object. My objection to the waiver policy as proposed is that I consider it a significant variation of the RFP rules and regulations which led to the selection of and the agreement to a lease agreement which did not include that right. And the right I am concerned about is the ability to name the building. Naming rights, it's a very valuable asset. I am not saying that we should not name it, but I don't believe the naming of a City owned asset occupied on a short-term lease of five years with a five years renewal should be left to the exclusive discretion of the lessee. And therefore, I am concerned that after having negotiated the lease, having had made an offer, negotiated an agreement that was passed by the City, the

owner, the lessee has come back and says, I need that right before I can sign the lease, as I explained in the report. And I find that very, very concerning. Also, find that, you know, there is some silliness, if you…if I will use that word respectfully, that you don't want the Council or the Mayor to have to worry about small sponsorship events. Therefore, I would like…in conclusion, to make a practical compromise…suggest a compromise that the motion to approve the waive of the sponsorship be amended to read, "The waiver will not apply to naming rights to the lease premises or the sponsorship agreements that are for periods in excess of one year". I think this will preserve for the City the responsibility of approving those. Not stopping it, but of approving them and leave the business of MTU…MTA the ability to run the exhibition hall that they proposed to do there without undue paperwork or delays for nonmaterial decisions. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The opportunity for questions is now. Any questions for our delegation? Seeing none, thank you for your presentation today. Next, I would like to call forward David Pensato. He's the Executive Director for the Exchange District Business Improvement Zone. And Tom Janzen from Scatliff + Miller + Murray in support of Item 9 of the report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. It's the report dated February 7th, 2022 regarding the Exchange District Plan for 2022. Delegations are here with us via Zoom. Welcome.

David Pensato: Thank you, Council for this time. And I know the (inaudible) agenda, so I will keep my comments rather brief. The report in question and the recommendation from the civil service is well welcomed by the Exchange District BIZ. This is a project we have been working on for two years. The last time there was any sort of plan or vision for the Exchange District like this was, as I said at standing policy committee, is this one which was produced in 1996. And one (inaudible) we absorbed it as centre plan and to great effect. You know, one of the vision statement in that document is that the Exchange District should be a neighborhood in which there is a diverse mix of heritage, commercial, cultural, residential and recreational (inaudible). It should be known as a community for people and activities as well as the district of old and historical building. It should have a character which is unique in the city and distinct from the main commercial area of the downtown. And when someone thinks about cultural activities, about unique architecture, an interesting street, trendy bars and brew pubs, of public outdoor art, of (inaudible) apartment where an urban waterfront, which means instinctively think of the Exchange. So, it's, you know, sometimes these plans can seem long-term and people are concerned about what is happening right at this moment, but these kinds of documents, these kinds of cause and visions really do do good to tremendous change. I mean, that aspirational statement, I would say, has become a true statement today. And you know, as we have been looking at the area over the last number of years, it's really thinking about how do we guide the next stage of growth for the Exchange District? Everyone sees it transforming slowly into more of a residential neighbourhood, more of a mixed-use overhead. And so, we really drew inspiration from this Complete Communities document and really tried to shape what could we be concerned with, what should we be…what we should be looking at and how to guide the development in the Exchange District as it becomes a complete community. We did…we worked really hard to not be redundant and to not tread ground that's already been tread. To not reinvent the wheel. So, a lot of the…a lot of what's in this plan is actually, you know, absorbing various plans that the City already has in the books. Programs and strategies that are already there that are kind of scattered and no one really is looking at. So, we tried to compile all of that as well as literally guide where the neighborhood can and should go over the next 20 years or so. So, we agree with the civil service's recommendation that none of this can be looked at as part of the downtown secondary plan and that it be examined when work is being done and development being proposed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now take questions. Any questions for our delegations? Okay, seeing none, thank you for appearing today.

David Pensato: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is Tanya Palson, Director of Business Operations, Manitoba Building Trades, who will appear before Council in support of Item 1 of the report of Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment. The report dated February 2nd, 2022 regarding Bidding Requirements for Phase Two of the North End Water Pollution Control Centre. Tanya's joining us via Zoom. Welcome.

Tanya Palson: Thank you. All good, you can hear me? Good morning. Thank you again for allowing time for my delegation. I am here today speaking on behalf of Manitoba Building Trades, our 13 skilled trade unions and our 10,000 plus membership of our skilled trade construction workforce. Myself and our organization's CEO have spoken repeatedly in front of many communities over many years drawing attention to the importance of skilled labour supply in successful delivery and completion of projects. We've also presented in detail in favour of the motion before you today which we were glad to see successfully pass at Water and Waste and again at Executive Policy Committee. So, just here to represent our membership and simply want to reiterate our organization's support for the motion which is detailed, clear and I believe the intentions of the motion speak for itself. You know, City Council, as you know, has unanimously approved the creation of the social procurement framework, notwithstanding that important decision, there really won't be any meaningful changes to the City's procurement process until a framework is established and adopted. My current recollection on

timelines is that an action plan is expected by the fall with a three-year implementation timeline at that point. So, this is much past critical dates for any North End pollution control centre tendering. So, the motion today, in a very, very small way, deals with this long period of waiting. Even though the motion before you will not lead to the outcomes that the City and Winnipeggers are seeking through our bold social procurement framework, it is still a bold and important declaration of intent. The motion will send be a clear message to the marketplace that Council is engaged and committed to creating more opportunities for citizens. That the Council is accountable to its own Indigenous Accord and furthermore, accountable to calls to action within the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. You know, I've said before that we wish the motion before you established a clear framework for the North End Pollution Control Centre and, certainly, other city infrastructure. And that…I did that now, but in reality, it does not. But in the absence of an established process, this motion is simply an expression about Winnipeg and its citizens aspire to have in the future. This motion signals for the first time that there's an acknowledgment of the importance of the details of labour as an input especially into a project that is such a substantial investment of public money. Labour availability and supply have impacts on time and budget, which among many other causes, can translate to additional costs for the project owner. On labour, we also acknowledge that the City has made express commitments to their own equity, diversity and reconciliation. So, really, it's…this motion today is, it's due diligence on your part to make sure that any contractors and general contractors coming on to a project of this size, that they have the appropriate plans in place that align with the scale of the project and that you as the City, as project owner, have some transparency on what those are. So, again, not to reiterate what's been said a thousand times, but just again, we are glad to see that this motion is coming to you today. And we hope to see it move forward once again. Happy to take any questions if there still are any at this point. But other than that, thank you for your time.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thanks, Ms. Palson, for all your work on this. As you indicated, no one appeared in opposition at Water and Waste. No one appeared in opposition at EPC. No one is registered in opposition. We haven't received any materials in opposition, which is…which is a good sign. Some people said, well, we not just wait for the procurement framework? That has been said. Can you just repeat…you are more…you're more on top of that process than I am, certainly, but the timeframe that you mentioned, I think, is right, that the statement of intent, I can't remember the exact terminology is coming in the summer, but it's a multi-year implementation. And we don't want phase two of North End to be going to tender in three years. We want it to go as soon as humanly possible. So, hence the need for this motion. So, if you could just clarify something that you said that I think was quite important, just what the timeframe is on that larger social procurement framework. Thank you.

Tanya Palson: Yes, as far as myself and other people in the industry that I speak with, that the understanding is that the earliest will be early fall. So, September when kind of initial…the initial tendering actions start, which is around the same time. I think June would be the earliest that the City would see an actual proposed implementation plan from the social procurement group, which would be a three-year implementation plan which will identify kind of like high impact opportunities to kind of test out some of the methods that they are proposing in the framework. And so, even if by like the end of 2022, there were some type of social procurement high impact opportunities happening, it would be unlikely that…well, one, it just won't line up. The tenders will be way too in advance to actually test a framework on something this large. And it probably wouldn't…may or may not be identified as a high impact opportunity to do that kind of testing and piloting of a framework anyways. If that answers…that answers your question.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you.

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

Tanya Palson: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Next is David Grant in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Governance Committee of Council dated January 21st, 2021…2022, pardon me. Regarding an amendment to the Members of Council Code of Conduct By-law 19/2018. Welcome, Mr. Grant.

David Grant: Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to wish a very good morning to Your Worship, members of Council, staff and the people of Winnipeg. It has been said that as soon as a person is elected, the primary job is to prepare for re-election. Some take this very seriously. Virtue signaling and related photo ops are part of this strategy. Some simply try to do a good job knowing that this will lead to re-election. Those folks have no need for photo ops and, for the majority, virtue signalling. Winnipeg residents should be proud that such self-promotion is so rare at the civic level when compared with some senior levels of government. A person's elections prospects can be reduced when embarrassing news items are raised by the competition or by the media. This peril is…this peril is a natural and essential part of democracy. It is known to have its greatest effect in the months leading up to an election. It is often said that any effort to keep the public uninformed on election related issues is a strike against democracy. It is natural for any elected person to want to reduce

the effect of bad news on their next campaign. Some folks see the integrity changes proposed today as supporting the goal of breezing through a re-election campaign largely unchallenged. There are examples of this sort of threat to democracy outside of Winnipeg. In their first term, we watched the ruling party in Ottawa offer $600 million a year to media companies as long as they do not break the quotes, “trust”, that this party had in those companies. This trust was rewarded by those big media companies. In the months leading up to that party's next two general elections, media were silent on news items that would embarrass the party in power. In the months before the 2021 general election, federal, a special program was announced by the Federal Government. This program extended a one-time gift of money to small media companies across Canada. The $600 million had clear strings attached, strings attached to their local programs are not clear. While this is not what Council will be voting on today, both today's rule changes and other people buying friends in media have similar stifling effects on the dissemination of information relevant to electors. Council today is about to make changes in the ethics rules. These are called the code of conduct. It’s in your agenda for anybody else that’s watching. This code places limits on the behavior of each person, the ones that are voting today. In other circles, this is considered to be acting in self-interest. Your commissioner herself made reference to me of analogous rule changes made at higher level, provincial level, which only take effect after the next general election. With respect, I ask you to delay action on this item until words to that effect are added to make these changes take effect after the next election when theoretically, it affects a whole different group of people. Anyway, back to the code; among the monstrous loopholes in this code are ones that forbid complaints about unethical fundraising and some activities during elections. The elections rules are being made even more toothless with the changes before you today. The code allows members to act to benefit themselves if that act…if that action also benefits some friends, too. That’s another loophole, in my opinion. Honesty. Codes of contact…conduct have governed professional work for more than a century. My whole career was spent under very strict codes of conduct. Forty years ago, doctors and engineers would face severe consequences if they lied. Of course, their codes used big words to say the same thing because code writers like to avoid the words that common folks use. The rules for lawyers at that time allowed them to mislead, one of those nice words, anyone with the exception of clients and the courts, but even then, in only certain situations. Codes are being changed across Manitoba. All the wording to limit lying, misleading statements, was removed three years ago from the code of engineers. Their staff explained to their members at the time that lying had to be removed from their code to reduce the workload on their ethics enforcement team. That suggested that there were too many complaints about lying for the ethics team to handle. That’s a bit of a scary thought, but not (inaudible). The code rewrite before you today is much newer. It made no mention of all…at all of misleading statements. The new version still omits such wording. I would ask you to defer action on this item until you can have such wording added to the current code. It was Winnipeg City Council that initially approved the processes involving the integrity commission. They were not forced on you by act of a senior government. It is obviously within Council's power to restrict or even to cancel those processes. On the other hand, some suggest that you do not have the moral authority to quietly reduce the effectiveness of your integrity process. Some suggest that this move should have involved significant public consultation and a healthy debate on merits and harms which may result from these changes. There is some old cliché-type advice that says that just because you can do something doesn't mean you should. The ethical problem arises when one considers that any scandal discovered in the year or so before a civic election may never be known to the public once you make these changes. If the situation is actually investigated and eventually published, it might be long after the election. In any democracy, it is essential that voters be fully informed on the issues and the candidates. Even for an individual councillor who has no skeletons in their closet, and I’m sure that’s almost all of you, it is wrong to lay out a plan like this whose sole purpose is to hide facts from voters. It has been said, another cliché, it’s been said that in Canada, we have a set of multi-level dictatorships where democracy reigns but one day every four years. If these changes take effect, that one day may be tainted. Nearly every decision is made for us, the people, not by us. In other lands, major decisions are often made by vote of the people. In effect with these changes, we will go back toward the days before there was an internal city process for investigation of ethical matters. I suggest that you change in the direction that benefits transparency and honesty, which we all want, please eliminate the black out period on integrity-related information. Please do not make it longer. Thank you.

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

David Grant: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Moving on to reports; we have the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 16th, 2022. Noting we have amending motion on Item 8 and 9.

Councillor Gilroy: We never caught up with all the motions, because you had mentioned a little bit of a break before we get into it.

Madam Speaker: I got myself organized. Yeah, so I hope all of you did as well. Yeah. Shall we will move on?

Councillor Gilroy: Okay, as long as the Clerks are caught up because I’ve…I asked a question. I know that they’ve been busy, so I just wanted to make sure.

Madam Speaker: We are good. I just need a moment, though, to get something from my briefcase. One moment. Mr. Clerk, you are good to proceed? I had checked with you as well.

Clerk: We are good to proceed, Madam Clerk…Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Good, thank you. Mr. Mayor, on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 16th.

REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED FEBRUARY 16, 2022

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I trust my Council colleague, Councillor Gilroy, has the 10 motions or amending motions. That is the number that I have been given by Clerks. With that, I will introduce the report and move adoption of the concept agenda Items 1 through 9, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Okay, 8 and 9 have been pulled. There are amending motions. Councillor Gillingham? 6 – Airport Area West has been pulled. 7 – Tax Incremental Financing Policy has been pulled. Seeing no others, I will call the question. I'll wait till you get to your seat, thank you. Okay, Councillor Gilroy, I will recognize you…yeah, if you would like to rise and state your question. Which are you standing down?

Councillor Gilroy: I guess it's…I just want to stand down item…the police station one on St. Clair. If we can stand that down. Item 12 or report 9. Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Report 9 has been stood down. Thank you.

Councillor Gilroy: No, I don't think it was…this is EPC, right? Just making sure. Sorry. Okay.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, you are good? Okay. All right, we have stood down 6, 7, 8 and 9. I'm going to call the question on 1 through 5. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 – Airport Area West Fiscal and Economic Impact Analysis

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support this report and just wanted to take a moment to thank the members of our Public Service, specifically Mr. Matt Dryburgh and his team and others who have done the analysis and then the third-party review by Watson and Associates just to look at the City's own work to make sure that they are on track. I think we all have talked about and certainly I have been on the floor of Council before talking about the importance and the need for investing in servicing more industrial lands in the city of Winnipeg. It is going to be key to the future of the city, the economic future of the city. And the creation of jobs which is very, very important for us as a city. I've said it before, people move to communities where jobs are available, they move away from communities where jobs are not available. And so, for the sake of making sure we can attract future capital investors and provide good jobs, do our part as a city to provide the opportunity for good jobs in our community, there is a real need to have these lands serviced. I was very glad that the City of Winnipeg through our 2022 capital budget put $20 million…committed $20 million towards the servicing of CentrePort and CentrePort South, subject to provincial and federal matching dollars. And certainly, through conversations that I have had, my understanding is that those requests to the Federal and Provincial Governments for the matching $20 million, those requests have been made. It is clear in this report…in these reports that there is a return on the investment for the Federal Government, Provincial Government and City Government as well, to make this investment. And so, very glad to support this. And looking forward to the next steps of developing CentrePort South. There is a motion…or a notice…I shouldn't say a notice of motion, there's a motion that I have brought later on with Councillor Browaty. I want to thank him for seconding the motion. That will be an automatic referral, I believe, Madam Speaker, related to CentrePort. And finding ways to make sure that we are competitive in the southern part of CentrePort, which is Winnipeg CentrePort, by changing our development processes. So, making the investment in servicing the land; these reports show there is a return on the investment. If we can also then make sure that we…our development processes

align with those in CentrePort North, all of that will go a long way to making sure we are attracting investment in Winnipeg and creating…creating jobs in our local economy. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Long day ahead, so I'll try and be brief. Thanks to Councillor Gillingham for his work pushing this forward. Thanks to Matt Dryburgh from our staff and some of the economists we have on staff for coming up with the model here which was reviewed by an outside agency as well. Perhaps, perhaps this is a springboard, an opportunity to move forward and start looking at the idea of the impact fee. Again, it probably won't be done during the life of this council, but perhaps I'm being pessimistic. But this report does say, look, in certain circumstances you can make money, as Councillor Gillingham just said, the return on investment can be positive for a new area. It somewhat depends on the assumptions, though, and somewhat depends on how you do it. As one of my…one of the planners I get along with here in the city, Richard Mahé likes to say, it's you've got to build-up and out, but it's how you do it. So, we are continuing to build up, but we also have to continue to build out to an extent and in a way that's denser than what's being approved, say, in the 1980s or '90s. But we do have, I think, an opportunity to go with people like (inaudible) McGinnis, others in the development community and say, look, that first court case didn't succeed. I still believe in the idea of an impact fee. I think the Mayor, to his credit, tried to get that through. We are going to have to re-wire it, make it look more like an area charge so that areas like places I represent; Sage Creek, Bonavista, there should be a community centre there. We had the money ready if we had won the impact fee litigation. We're going to have to reload and start working through that again. But I think there is an opportunity there to say that some of the studies we had in the past rather breezily asserted that infill, greenfield, none of it ever paid for itself. Well, that was putting some pretty questionable assertions and assumptions into the model, I thought. So, here we have an example of an area that would be building out but can be done in an economically efficient way for the government. So, I would hope we take this as an example to get back, talk to the development community. We should have some form of impact fee. It should be more of an area charge as the courts said when we went through the impact fee litigation. Move forward, try to get that in place, the sooner the better. I will certainly commend the Mayor if he can get that done before the end of this term of office. And move forward so we can get some amenities built in some of the newer areas of town. But again, on this particular one, it's interesting to see; we did the analysis and we had outside verification on it. So, my thanks to Councillor Gillingham. And I will be moving…I will be voting in favour.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I will be...well, this is a report that, actually, is very exciting and really proves out, Madam Speaker, what many of us councillors have been hearing about why the industrial employment lands needs to be expanded as well as in this CentrePort South area, Madam Speaker. The benefits are huge. And Madam Speaker, in fact, having this development, CentrePort South, Airport Area West, it is the rationale, Madam Speaker, for the Chief Peguis Trail extension to go through as well. And so, as that industrial area proceeds, the councils of the future are going to have to figure out how to find the money to make the investment in the Chief Peguis Trail extension in order to facilitate the trade and commerce that is exciting the people who are wanting great economic development. And without continued economic development, the city overall benefits. It is very important. So, I also just…I found it kind of interesting, though, in that, now maybe CentrePort North, they didn't want to compete for housing with the City of Winnipeg, but they made a decision not to build neighborhoods. And I find it kind of specious, Madam Speaker, to hear the director that runs CentrePort North, the idea that, you know, St. James hasn't seen any housing expansion…housing development in a long time. Well, Madam Speaker, in the Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee area, it has been a very long time since the Mynarski and Point Douglas Wards have seen any housing, big development in that area. So, but anyway, I just…I thought it was kind of ironic to hear support for that. That sounds a little bit political from CentrePort North, which is more about the industrial improving our economy here in Winnipeg and Manitoba. I note that in the discussions and questions, the motion Councillor Gillingham refers to, Madam Speaker, that's a great motion, Madam Speaker, and it is good to improve the development process for industry and business, Madam Speaker, as we heard from Ms. Gray from CentrePort North. And I like the idea of the alignment. And Madam Speaker, as we have in your ward and in our community committee area, the employment lands north of Inkster, King Edward, west of King Edward. And in there, Madam Speaker, I would point out that, as developers, the requirement to provide land dedication was by some of the developers who have moved into that area. They didn't want to. And so, they paid the cash in lieu of land dedication. And…which is a requirement under the City of Winnipeg Charter. So, that's a private developer, the private developers. And in streamlining Winnipeg, our CentrePort South, west of the airport, I hope that, Madam Speaker, the Charter provisions will still be provided for in those developments and the future housing development area that happens adjacent to the CentrePort South. Anyway, I just…I totally encouraged and fired up by this evaluation report and how much we can make sure that Winnipeg is sustainable with sustainable economic growth. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this motion this morning recognizing the value that this area brings to the city of Winnipeg. Of course, the Airport Area West and surrounding area will represent a transportation corridor. And as we have seen over these last two years, the importance of the transportation corridors, not only here in our city, but the network that has been created in terms of trade from the south and trade east/west across…across Canada. You know, the trucking industry is something that, you know, has really been part of these last two years in terms of the continual flow of supply chain and goods and services, whether it's across the border or from the east coast to the west coast. I know of many companies, two in particular that jump to mind, that have made investments, millions of dollars of investments in this area, to start their businesses or expand their businesses utilizing this area of our city. And it only naturally assumes that there will be more investment in this area as well. I can see by the report that was provided that this land is anticipated to accommodate 16,000 full-time jobs, Madam Speaker. And generate, you know, hundreds of millions of dollars in economic revenue. So, this is a good investment for the City of Winnipeg. We're going to see a return on that investment annually. The City of Winnipeg is projected to receive approximately $80 million in taxes. This is a return on the investment, they say, within 27 years, we will break even in terms of what we provide as the City of Winnipeg to build this area up. You know, based on what we are seeing now and as our economy continues to improve and grow, that this will be expedited, Madam Speaker, as different jobs are being created that address how we get goods and services across our city and across our province, across our country and internationally into the United States. So, again, I do support…I rise in support of this motion and think it will be a great investment for the City of Winnipeg. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor or Councillor Schreyer and then Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to make a couple of points. You know, we were talking about return on investment. We used the word efficiencies. Look, I just want to say for the record, because it is important, I'm not going to deny it at this point, we are talking about a level of investment for the sake of infrastructure that is essentially unprecedented for these types of projects and that's because of the increasing costs of construction which has been going unaccounted for. We don't account…this Council's never figured out why it is happening. We don't…we've never been that precise. For all the work that goes into this thing, we're going to get a return on investment. We should use that kind of analysis to see what's specifically costing us and why these costs have been going up so much over the last generation and more. We talked about the point…someone mentioned the issue of efficiency. Just bear in mind, that the cost of building infrastructure, the cost of these taxpayer paid infrastructure and construction projects have gone up in the last 30 years 10 times more than the salaries and the wages of the people that pay for it. So, when it comes to efficiencies, ask yourself this: what has become more inefficient than these government supported construction and infrastructure projects? Now, I ask that question specifically. What has become more inefficient when they are 10 times…gone up 10 times…at a 10 times higher rate than people's wages and salaries that pay for them (inaudible) how else do you measure efficiency? It's…it's product for dollar. And so, when we talk about return on investment, return on your dollar, bear that in mind. I understand because we are competing with other…other centres across Canada and North America to be these transportation hubs. So, these costs are pervasive throughout the continent. But bear that in mind, we use the word efficiency just now. Bear that in mind. The inefficiency of the construction industry when it comes to these tax powered infrastructure projects have gone up by 10 times higher than the wages and salaries; how is that not an inefficiency? We talked about how there is a calculation that is a return on investment, we could use that type of ability to measure the efficiency of the construction industry over the last generation. Why not? Why shouldn't we? We are already talking about the calculations we've made. Let's do that. Let's be practical about it. I'm going to be supporting this, but I am not just going to be…pretend this is in the name of efficiency when the very thing we are talking about, the three levels of government, governments and taxpayers have never paid so much for infrastructure in proportion to their wages and salaries, not since World War II, not in the lifetime of anybody around here. Bear that in mind, because that's your real dollar. That's the taxpayer's dollar. If you care about the taxpayer's dollar, answer those questions. And if you've got any problem with what I am saying, say so publicly. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this report. I think it was a very good report. What I did want to mention is…I did want to mention, this came…this was motivated internally, which was good, that's good. And that the funding for the Watson and Associates…Associates report did come from the department. This provides very good information, obviously, for Council to make decisions. And it obviously provides great information for other levels of government to look at and review when considering to apply funding. I reflect back on the Starlight request for City support and you know, I think going forward, once we have a new regime, once this one leaves and we've got new leadership, I think that this type of economic and financial analysis on significant decisions is really important. If I were to look at Chief Peguis, you know, in my first term, I was very supportive of seeing that as a priority because what I believed, I did not have a financial and economic analysis impact, but what I believed was, it would create significant investment opportunities and revenue for the city. So, I really, you know…to the big picture of the Airport Area West,

absolutely I'm going to be supporting this. It is very good work. But in the bigger picture of going forward, I really think that…and to Councillor Mayes' point exactly, I do think that a financial and economic impact analysis should be done on larger projects that seem...well, on larger projects where we have to provide significant taxpayer funding. It provides me good data and information to make a decision. As you know, under the model, half of Council doesn't receive this type of information or a lot of information, but this, this is very good. And like I said, it does provide other levels of government good information. So, good work by the staff, by the economists and I will be supporting it going forward.

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

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, thanks Madam Speaker. I am very pleased that members of Council sound like they're supporting this. I think there is some great work that's been done and I hopeful that all members of Council can show their support in a few moments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I will call the question on Item 6 – Airport Area West Plan. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: The item passes unanimously. Next, Mr. Clerk.

Item 7 – Tax Increment Financing Policy

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. This has been something that has been called for for some time. I want to compliment my council colleague, our Finance Chair, Councillor Scott Gillingham, and other members of Council who have all recognized that there needed to be some additional work with respect to tax increment financing and policies that we are debating today. I'll be supporting this. Would encourage my council colleagues to do so as well.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I asked to allow this report to be debated. I haven't had a chance to speak to it, Madam Speaker. So, I thought it would be good to step it down. I will be, actually, supporting this new TIPP policy and…well, TIPP policies, Madam Speaker. I guess I first just want to start off, though, by saying, and I am glad that the actual by-law for the housing…affordable housing component is yet to come. And so…because Madam Speaker, what I get very concerned about and I voted against incremental financing, for example, for that huge tower that's never going to get built over on Graham and Smith, Madam Speaker. The reason I was against it is, Madam Speaker, their definition of affordable housing ain't affordable. I don't know…I think all of us know people who even the median market rate for, you know, a decent safe place to live realizes that that is a huge chunk of money as compared to their income, Madam Speaker. Huge. Over 50% for many, many people. Probably closer to 60, 70, even 80% of their annual income, Madam Speaker. So, what I am hoping comes back with on the by-law related to the policy for affordable housing, which is really important that it defines it as rent geared to income. Rent geared to income, Madam Speaker. That is very important because housing is not affordable unless it is geared to what your income is. And so, I am hoping that that is how we proceed because CMHC's definition of affordable, well, anyway, I find it quite lacking. And so do many people who live in this city find it lacking. So, what ends up happening is, you'll get that medium market rate but your family still having to go to Harvest or wherever to get the food because you don't have money to buy groceries because a huge chunk of your income is going to pay the rent and utilities, for that matter. So, I am encouraged that there will be some work by the Public Service in regard to that. And I was really excited to see that this incremental financing goes outside of downtown. Downtown is important, don't get me wrong, Madam Speaker. I totally agree; downtown…a vibrant, working downtown is essential to the whole city of Winnipeg. But so, then, are the rest of the areas, Madam Speaker, outside of downtown. Very important to the whole city. So, very encouraged. I think that is a good plan to only use up to 80% of the incremental amount of taxes so that at least 20% is still coming into a stream to pay for the services that we have to...the City has to provide everyday, Madam Speaker. The other...I think there is really only one other point that I would make. I understand they use a big project idea like a SHED area for a TIFF. I wish that would be a little more defined as ideas because while

the SHED is good for business downtown, it's a…you know, the sport, entertainment, hospitality. Great idea. And then maybe we're going to look at doing this for, let's say, the Exchange District, Madam Speaker, which has a whole secondary plan thing on the agenda and everything, which is…which is good, too. And the whole heritage component, as a matter of fact, too, Madam Speaker, in terms of the Exchange District. So, Madam Speaker, I am very encouraged and look forward to this policy moving ahead. But you know, I am not sure how the voting or incremental financing will go, but I won't be in support of the affordable housing TIFF if we don't have a specific definition, Madam Speaker, that affordable housing is rent geared to income. Thank you.

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

Councillor Rollins: I celebrate this, Madam Speaker, with all those who have been pushing for it. And I want to mention my colleague, the Chair of PP&D, Councillor Gilroy. I want to mention John Orlikow who…who together with myself formed the Housing Committee, but I also want to mention all those hardworking community-based organizations that want us to do this today and have been looking for us to make this move to make it really clear how we might go about investments in this city; small, medium and large. And how we might go about solving the housing crisis that is at our feet each and every day, Madam Speaker. So, I rise in support. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much. I will be also supporting this policy. It has taken years to get here, but I am very supportive and I am very supportive of the heritage aspect for heritage building restoration and rehabilitation; I think that that is very positive. And you know, it is great that it can be applied in other parts of the city, but I really, really want to stress, and I can only say this from experience, that downtown needs people. And this is going to help put people downtown. I see the hundreds, I think we are up to about 2,000 new units that have been improved along Pembina Highway now. And I see the anchoring of services, the businesses and the vitality and the life that Pembina Highway has. And it's…you know, I think downtown can throw all the parties and do all the things they want, but we have to get people downtown. And I am really, really pleased to see this finally, after years, come forward. Sometimes it takes a crisis like a pandemic to move bureaucracy and maybe not even bureaucracy but leadership. So, this is great. I am in full support.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Chair…Madam Speaker, sorry. Yeah, again, I don't like to get up to reiterate everybody's agreement to a motion, because we all do agree with it, I believe. But I do want to point out, this is two-fold. One, I hope it provides the development community and others out there with, you know, an idea of support so that we can provide at the City of Winnipeg transparently and openly. We've done a lot of TIFF motions in past where they come off in the side to support a specific project. But then I get calls from developers saying, well, I didn't even know that was an option that we had that possible pot of opportunity that everybody else got. So, this is much better. I believe if the Province like Starlight or some other programs come by, they also have equal footing to be able to apply for this. But again, this is the result, I believe, not only when we talk about in the past there was some difficulty about where the Province is going with this in the recent past. But and I was, actually, really pleasantly surprised to see the breadth of what this TIFF is. Again, as Councillor Lukes mentioned, some of the heritage issues that now we can do that, that's wonderful. The home…you know, dealing with affordable housing that we all support and we know we need in the city of Winnipeg. And also, the economic development part of it all. I like it downtown. I also like it outside of downtown. But again, these are the kind of initiatives that we have to keep putting our foot down on to keep moving forward as we get out of COVID. It is going to be difficult as Councillor Gillingham has pointed out to the Finance Committee numerous times, and rightfully so, that we have a way to go still. But this is a great first shot out, I think, of telling the development community and others that we understand what your needs are. We know that we need to support you in certain areas. We have given them a little direction of where we want that support to go. So, really, congratulations to the…our new Economic Development Officer who has been on the job for what, maybe a year, to be able to spearhead this through. And I do believe this should be a part of our COVID recovery plan in general and it is. And that is where it stemmed out of when we talked about the COVID recovery plan. So, I think on transparency level and providing people with kind of a road map of how we're going to move forward, I think this has many levels of positive in it. And yeah, we'll have to, as Councillor Eadie has talked about, going down…going down…going forward, we're going to have to maybe do a little adjustments. But today is a good sign forward. It is transparent for all. And it will provide at least some, and I don't think it's over, some supports to help us move Winnipeg forward. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, thank you so much to our staff for preparing this Tax Increment Financing Policy report. As a couple of councillors have already indicated, there are several of us, myself included, in my first term, in the last term, calling for a policy that could guide the City of Winnipeg decision-makers, could also

provide…pardon me, calling for a policy that could guide City of Winnipeg decision-makers, could guide our staff and as Councillor Orlikow just indicated, could give some sense of direction and understanding for developers who are looking to invest in…across the city and, certainly, in our downtown. I want to speak to the downtown component of this Tax Increment Financing Policy. Winnipeg's downtown is the heart of our city. Its health and success matter to residents in all corners of Winnipeg. We need the heart of our city to be full and pulsing with life and vitality. We need Winnipeg's downtown neighbourhoods to be vibrant communities teaming with residents, workers and tourists. Prior to the pandemic, parts of the downtown were experiencing some exciting resurgence. Investment was out pacing the level of developments that hadn't been seen for decades. Then the pandemic hit, and of course, that has had an impact all across the city, most notably, the pandemic has had a detrimental impact on the pace of development in the downtown. And certainly, over the years, workers have been brought downtown through investment. Tourists have been brought downtown through investment. But this Tax Increment Financing Policy will assist us with the key of getting people living downtown, to making the downtown their home community. And so, as Councillor Orlikow just indicated, this policy will also dovetail very importantly with the city's Economic Response and Recovery Policy as well. And together we take this Tax Increment Financing Policy, the Economic Response and Recovery Policy and very much focus on coming out of the pandemic and seeing our city, and specifically here now our downtown, grow and develop and thrive. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this today because it's a…it's actually something tangible here. The challenge I have and I have been having some discussions with landowners that were looking for TIFF and my understanding is they had some conversations with City of Winnipeg officials only to be told that we are up against a debt ceiling. And you know, it's self-imposed, but it's a debt ceiling nonetheless. And you know, we will probably eventually raise it because it's grown, I think doubled or more in the last seven years. The challenge that we have though is, you know, yes, focus downtown; downtown, downtown, but Transcona was its own place at one time before unicity days. There was an opportunity for investment there that seems to have gone away because we didn't want to invest in, as I understand, it was an underpass that was, you know, looked at in these discussions. We need to make sure that we're looking at these opportunities city-wide. And when City officials are having these conversations, that they're engaging all of Council so that we are aware of these opportunities. That we can speak to it. That we can look at, is there other lenses that can be applied to it? But when we are not aware, it makes it difficult until after the fact. I know our Chair of Economic Development will be eager beaver on trying to get out to spur more economic development in our city as we come out of COVID. Councillor Gillingham as our Chair of Finance will be counting those pennies to make sure that we are investing them wisely. To this point, you know, we are finding that perhaps we are not investing all of our funds wisely. I know everybody would like to have a TIFF. Why not? Money from the City at a lower interest rates makes it more affordable, more advantageous to establish. When we have development just outside of our borders and we see the growth in places like West St. Paul, the RM of Rosser, well, you know, when we see CentrePort under the RM of Rosser growing, a lot of that growth is at the expense of the city of Winnipeg. These are businesses that are moving and relocating from the city of Winnipeg in a lot of cases. Some are new to the city. Some may be from just outside the city. But you know, when we are investing in the infrastructure to support couple hundred million, I think it was $265 million that was being promoted from the RM of Rosser for CentrePort portion just outside of our border in permitting, you know, that is at the expense of ratepayers inside the city. So, we should be able to…we should be working to do what we can to grow inside our boundaries and not be a downtown versus the suburbs, but Winnipeg as a whole. I think we can grow a stronger city and one that, you know, I hope for my children that they want to stay around for a lot of years. Now, you know, I didn't start here in Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, but this is my home. I have lived here for over 25 years. I have established roots and didn't know anybody when I moved here. I know a few more people. But Madam Speaker, with regards to this infill…or infill, sorry Madam Speaker, TIFF approach, at least we got something to work with. It is like anything, I suspect that there will be times when policy is not quite adhered to and we will be seeking exemptions, but this at least gives us something to work with. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the TIFF policy and I'm very excited to see it's finally here. I've been looking forward to having a TIFF policy that we can actually make some real positive changes within Winnipeg and within our downtown. We know that our downtown has seen many different challenges. With COVID, we are knowing that there are possibilities that there are people that are going to be working more from home. We're seeing the effects within our downtown, within our businesses downtown, with people not staying here, playing here, working here. And it has created substantial effects to our downtown. This TIFF policy will make sure that we are reinvesting in our downtown. Making sure that we have people actually living here downtown to really support the businesses that are here and trying to flourish during this time. We know that some of the challenges that we have within our downtown is the fact that we do not have enough people living here. A TIFF policy; making sure that we are creating a place where people want to live through different economic development lenses or whether we're creating a new, different and improved spaces which makes it more desirable to live down here or whether we're actually building housing to get people to live down here. It is

critical to the health and safety of all of Winnipeggers. We know that in other cities that…cities that are more successful, are seeing higher rates of people living within their downtown. And we've got to make sure that we are moving in that direction while supporting the idea of…with COVID, this is a new reality. And what are these buildings going to look like? Are we going to have empty buildings? With this money, we are able to now reinvest some of the buildings that we're seeing. Aw have The Bay sitting empty. We had Portage Place that, you know, was going to have some development done. Now, you know, we don't know what that is going to look like. And that is challenging for the community that we live in. I am also happy to see that some of the money will go into affordable housing. I think that that is key. As somebody who has been very supportive of affordable…very supportive of affordable housing, I just wanted to talk a little bit about why this TIFF is critical, because it allows…and I understood what Councillor Eadie is saying; we all want to make sure that it's rent geared to income. But what this money will be able do is it will leverage other levels of funding that is available from other levels of government in order to make those projects actually succeed. And some of the people that will be applying for this will be suppliers of rent geared to income units. So, I think that this is really critical funding to make sure that those developments actually happen, Madam Speaker. So, I'm really supportive of this. I want to thank all the administration on the hard work and everybody around this table for really saying we need to look at our downtown. It is critical. And we need to look at affordable housing and how do we make that happen and what is the means that Winnipeg has to make it happen, and we're seeing that here today. I hope everyone supports it, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further…oh, Councillor Schreyer, go ahead.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is true, Councillor Orlikow was rarely redundant when he does speak. He is rather partisan for this…to the point during Council meetings. Is the liberations you see at other…at other…at other committees and…however, I don't think one will find what I'm going to say is redundant because I don't think we talk about this enough. Except to say, I will say, Councillor Eadie's concerns over, you know, affordable housing based on income. Well, you know, if you're going to look at the quality of life of a society and its economic sustainability, of course, everything. The entire economy has to be gaged to affordability and to people's income. In particular, housing. But bear in mind, because we are talking about income. We are talking about, now more than ever, disposable income. Because we know since Christmas time, a lot of costs have gone up. Besides, we've known…or we've talked about it for seven years here that, of course, people's rents, mortgages and of course, Councillor Eadie made the point, seven years ago very well, better than anybody else. And that is, people's property taxes, especially in the areas of lower income. I mean, that is an astounding…an astounding thing. So, bear in mind, now, since Christmas look at what the price…look at how prices have gone up, in particular for food. And they are not going down for rent and mortgages and property taxes. Our property taxes aren't decreasing. And now we see, after all of this time, because we have been warned. We can't continue at this rate of inflation for construction, what this does to people. And including, you know, less money for mortgages. And we can't have interest rates go up. And looks what's going to happen. So, look, all these things are related. Don't say they're not. We can't say what I'm saying is irrelevant, because we're talking about getting money…leveraging money. Councillor Gilroy just says, it is not just about what the city is going to do. But if the City puts in some taxpayers' money, we can leverage more taxpayer's money from other levels of government and other agencies. In other words, we've come to such a point in our society that we need all sorts of leveraging from all levels of society to create affordable housing. Except, how much? We are hardly doing anything. And don't…before anyone gives you the impression that that is in someway an exaggeration or vague, let's be very specific. We had a government in the 1970...in the 1970s. I've said this before, but we keep talking about how much we're doing for affordable housing in this city instead of talking about how we are not. How is it possible that in this province, a government from the 1970s, over a period of 8 years, created 14,000 affordable housing units in 8 years and maintained surplus budget. No one's ever said that is the greatest thing that government ever did in Manitoba. No. The many things it did in creating…in terms of creating infrastructure and maintaining a surplus budget; 14,000 affordable housing units. Doesn't every single councillor want to know? Doesn't our mayor want to know how that is possible? Doesn't our Chair of the Finance Committee want to know how that is possible? We're talking about taxpayers' money. How is that possible? So instead, what we are talking about, is geeze, how we can crunch in more taxpayers' money into a very…incredibly few, shockingly few affordable housing units. And so, we want to…we want to solve this. This doesn't solve anything. It's hardly a band-aid. It is something that we should be doing, we're supposed to be doing. We've got to do something. And this is kind of sad, isn't it? When you take a look at what our potential used to be. But you know, we are not trying to solve the problem. We are trying to put some money to it and make it look good. Do we want to solve this problem? We explain to each other in this council chamber. We explain to everybody. We explain through the media, using our free media stuff, explaining what is happening to people's lives, to their income, to their economy. Why…people could be doing the best they can, you know, with their income, which is smaller and smaller in proportion to their expenses, but their debts still go up. They keep paying…increasing their debt, their taxes, but their own government's debts keep going up on every single level. And do you think we're going to be solving our problem for affordable housing? I think not. I think…you know, this is a good thing in terms of a singular thing we can do to encourage people to live downtown. But you know, we don't exactly have transparency for explaining to people why it is that they are getting less and less and paying more and more. You know, Councillor Nason made the point about a debt ceiling and said that things have doubled in the last seven years. Well, what's doubled in the last 7 years? Have people's incomes, their salaries increased…doubled in the last 7 years? No. Certain costs have, but not

people's salaries and wages. Funny how though when it comes to these things that can double in seven years, it's okay for the government to deal with it, but not account to the taxpayers paying for it. Why it happened? So, you know, I wish I was being redundant. I wish. But unfortunately, these are things that…that we are not dealing with. So, let's ask the question. Let's all find out. What is making housing unaffordable more than ever before in our lifetime? What is it? Because the costs are going up. Yeah, yeah, what is driving the costs up? That is what we need to know. All of us. Just for being sort of average, sensible people that can talk to our neighbours explaining what's going on in our society, what's going on in our economy. We don't. So we end up doing extremely little for affordable housing. Don't take…it's not my opinion. You want to debate stats? Look at the stats. How come we are doing so little compared to what we used to? That is not my opinion. That is a statistic. So we all share it. These are all a shared statistic, not opinion. So, let's deal with that. I'm getting really…we are going to be doing this more and more as we continue to spend more and more taxpayers' money, increase people's taxes on this thing…in the name of affordable housing. Meanwhile, it's in the name of abetting an increasingly more and more inefficient construction industry. And that is a fact. And what am I supposed to do about it? Because everything…when something goes up for the same…you get the same good for something that doubles in price. That is called inefficiency, isn't it? Or am I making that definition up? Isn't that how we define efficiency? How much do you get for your dollar? So, when something has gone up 10 times more than your ability to pay for it, isn't that how we define inefficiency? Is it…tell me if I am wrong publicly, that the construction industry in this continent…on this continent has increased its inefficiency by 10 times in relation to people's income. Because that was…there is no other relevance. It's for people to pay for it, to buy these things or to support these construction through their taxes. And it has gone up 10 times higher than people's incomes. You tell me a different way to explain what inefficiency is. That is the problem I'm saying, now let's find out why. But we don't. Instead, we talk about, oh, isn't that great? Aw, we are putting some money in and helping subsidize an industry that is so inefficient we don't even know what to talk about. We don't talk about it. Obviously, it makes our heads spin because we can't speak about it. So, tell me this…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer do you require more time? The clock's gone.

Councillor Schreyer: A minute. Not even a minute, one sentence.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie moves extension for one minute. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Councillor Schreyer: So, well, if there is any ambiguity as to whether there's a relevance speech or not. How is it that an affordable housing unit today costs as much as my house? So, answer that question and we will have an idea of what the problem is so that we are forced into the situation of pretending we are part of the solution. When we don't answer the questions I just asked, we are part of the problem. Because our job and our job alone as elected representatives spending the taxpayers' money, working with the administration to answer these questions. Don't blame the construction industry, they are not public servants. We are and we are directly responsible for the taxpayer. They are not. We are. So, that is our job. We talked about a lot of things on this issue. We didn't answer these questions. We didn't talk about this. Why not? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. No further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Bowman: Madam Speaker, I agree with Councillor Schreyer. It is our job. And I would say we should do our job and vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I will call the question on this item, Item 7. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 8.

Item 8 – Delegation of Authority for the consideration of 'C' Conditional Use and Variance Applications

Madam Speaker: There is amending Motion 1 corresponding with this. Mr. Mayor to open, followed by Councillor Mayes to introduce your amending motion which is seconded by Councillor Orlikow.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting this. I'll be supporting the amending motion as well, and look forward to hearing from my Council colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,

BE IT RESOLVED that Recommendation 3 of Item 8 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee be deleted and replaced with the following:

3. That the Director of Planning, Property and Development be directed to notify the area Councillor when an application is received and when decision is made under the above noted delegation of authority, so that they are aware of the decision and the relevant appeal timelines.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This has taken an extraordinary amount of time for what, on its face, would be a fairly small matter, but could involve a great deal of time and confusion and inconsistency if we don't get this resolved. So, to back it up a bit, the…a motion was put forward and passed some months ago about changing a delegation of authority on class C variances. These are what we thought were very minor matters, I think. Speaking personally, I was unaware things like building lot size, some fairly big issues that come up a lot were part of class C variance. D variances are the ones we all are familiar with from hearing because they are attached to rezoning applications. So, that is a separate matter. A and B are very…are tolerances. In some cases, very small amendments to existing provisions. So, the concern a few months ago was, these matters used to be heard by the Board of Adjustment, not Board of Revision, which deals with property tax disputes, Board of Adjustment, which is unelected folks dealing with variances basically, conditional use applications. The traditional path was there would be a decision made and if people were unhappy, they could appeal from that decision up to the much unloved Appeals Committee of city hall which we've all sat on and is made up of four councillors in rotation hearing these matters. So, that was the model. Goes to Board of Adjustment, then comes up. What happened due to COVID? We stopped having meetings at Board of Adjustment. We delegated authority to the Director of Planning, to Mr. Kiernan. Decisions were made. There was still a right of appeal. Concerns, however, arose from some councillors that matters had been decided and they had no idea. They were getting calls from residents saying, this got approved, I had no idea this was even being considered. I'd have appealed if I'd only known about this. Or councillors were saying, I'd have appealed, I'd have raised concerns had I only known. Various councillors, yourself, Madam Speaker and others saying, look, I usually scan the agenda of Board of Adjustment, I see if there is something in my ward, I see if I want to get involved in it. I want to…I keep track of it. Fair point. So, I think, frankly, we engaged in some overkill there back in the fall by saying, well, instead of the Director hearing these, we're going to have community committee hear these. And as it turns out, this would add a lot of work to the community committee agendas. People said to me, so, you are afraid of work? No, no, actually. I'm afraid of spending hours and hours of time on extremely small matters. I have heard enough $18 appeals sitting on…in…when I had Councillor Gilroy's position as Chair of Planning. I actually think we should take a serious look at what does come before elected people for appeals. When we had one of the $18 matters at Planning, I adjourned it and said, I want you there, then Assistant Deputy CEO, Mike Jack or Mike Ruta, to come in and sit in on this hearing. And I was told very firmly by one of the assistants, they're busy writing the budget and you just…they don't have time to come to that hearing. So, the juxtaposition of that, we have four of us elected officials with all sorts of staff there for hours for a matter that worth $18 and wasn't precedent setting and it wasn't a human rights issue. It was an $18 window dispute. But these senior elected…senior unelected officials were busy doing the budget which is billions of dollars. So, I have to say, it's not that I am afraid of work. It's not that I'm afraid of making decisions. I am afraid of spending hours and hours and hours and having each community committee give its own gloss, its own twist, its own view of the new infill guidelines, for example, all of which would then be appealed up to a body of elected officials from a random collection of wards changing every two months. It's really not a good model. It's really not a good model when you are just starting in on the process of having new infill guidelines, which will hopefully reduce some of the disputes we've been having around these very variances. So, the compromise solution was to come forward and say, okay, we're going to undo that reference to community committee but we want a report out from the Director once the Director has made a decision they should heresy, should advise the area councillor. When I stopped in at Governance, and thanks to Madam Speaker for inviting me there, there were concerns expressed of, I want to know in advance of the Director making that decision. I, the area councillor, want some advance warning in case I have some thought or opinion to add in. Fair enough, again. Hence the amendment, which is…thanks to Councillor Orlikow for seconding, because I know he had some concerns originally about these variances. So, Councillor Orlikow is supportive. I appreciate that. I hope others can support. The idea is not to...the idea is not…it's un-transparent. All sorts of e-mails from the Planning Department about you can get access, you can do…things have been posted, there are things online. So, we should be able to know much better now what class C variances are coming forward to the Director and if you wish to share your thoughts you can do so. And if you hate the results, I remember Councillor Gerbasi being the appellant on a matter once. You can appeal. People from your ward can appeal. So, I think the compromise that's been worked out does make sense to say, look, we'll leave it with the Director, but we'll have a much better idea of what is going on in our wards. Additionally…additionally, as the COVID restrictions begin to lift, we run the risk here of saying, well, it's been the Director, we're going to take it to community committee for couple months, then we're going to undo that and it's going to go back to Board of Adjustment when they start meeting again. I think we need to discuss whether we need that board anymore. We haven't done that. But why we would give it to the Director, take it back, then give it to a third player, Board of Adjustment; to me, I just don't think that's good governance. So, the proposal here is to leave it with the Director till the end of the year. Once…hopefully by then we will be in a much more post-COVID state and we can…whoever is here at the time can make decisions on how they want to hear this. There is a bigger debate here, Councillor Klein has raised it, others have raised it, about how

we do all the land development approvals. This is a little separate from that. This is matters that aren't under swept under bill…under Bill 37, the provincial legislation, necessarily. This is still variances. So, I would encourage you to support it. The idea is not to be less transparent. The idea is, frankly, to get more information to you the councillor if you have concerns, please alert the people in your areas, they can appeal. You can appeal. It will still be heard very transparently by the Appeals Committee. What we won't have, though, is different community committees with vastly different workloads hearing and then producing vastly different results in terms how we're going to implement things like new infill guidelines. So, I hope you can support the amendment and the main motion.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I will be supporting the amendment which make…will then make the…make the report more at tenable for me, Madam Speaker, in that…in that we will get notification of the application even coming in, Madam Speaker. I think that is essential because just, you know, being informed while a decision was made then you got to scramble. It is good to know if the applications are coming in, Madam Speaker. So, in speaking to this, I just want to demonstrate that when we had the Board of Adjustment's hearing this stuff, these applications show up as a report on their agenda. And I have…having gone through experiences way before I was even a city councillor in regards to going to Board of Adjustments and different issues, always…once elected have always paid attention to the Board of Adjustment's agenda to look it over to see what is happening in the ward because the people who are putting in the applications, they don't necessarily want to talk to…they are trying to expediate and get done what they need done, Madam Speaker. So, just as an example of something that occurred. Now, I was made aware, Madam Speaker, I was part of and appeared at the Board of Adjustments in support of a third-party sign on Main Street out by Leila, Madam Speaker, getting close into your ward at the time. Now Councillor Browaty is on the way. Many of his residents will see that third-party sign at…between Newton and Leila on Main Street. And Madam Speaker, so I got this message that they got a variance. There was another third-party sign that was close within the distance. And if you read the by-law regarding third-party signs and where you could do it and so on and so forth, can't be this X distance from another third-party billboard sign. Now, so, my agreement was, well, I would support this conditional use and variance over further north of the old one, but there was an understanding, Madam Speaker, that the one…the old one, which was grandfathered, would have to go through a new application because its term was up. And so, I got an e-mail and at least they informed me that they wanted to keep that third-party sign further south, Madam Speaker. But I e-mailed them and reminded them that the agreement was you wouldn't be asking for that third-party sign that was grandfathered under the new by-laws. Well, they did. I think they applied, Madam Speaker. And so, what happened is, and this is why we need to be informed about the decision as well. Because what happened was, I never seen an appeal. So, that tells me that they got their conditional use, variance, whatever it was that they needed in order to keep the old third-party sign as far as I could tell, Madam Speaker. I wouldn't know because I wasn't informed. So, this amendment is very important because, you know, at the time…anyway, dealing with these things is very important for councillors to know what is happening because our residents expect us to try to stand up for them when there's situations that occur that they don't think are appropriate. Sometimes I support that, but sometimes I don't, Madam Speaker. The point is, is under the old system, Board of Adjustments, everything was there and you know, it is appealable. And Councillor Mayes did point out, Madam Speaker, that you are able to appeal those decisions which were made…people were…have been made aware of. So, I applaud the amendment. And I will be supporting the amended report as well. Thanks.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I will be supporting the amending motion. But I do have some comments I want to make because it speaks to process. This matter was at Governance…approved through Governance. Went EPC, was approved through EPC. Came to Council, was approved at Council. Now, it was supposed to take place January 1st. And it wasn't until the work actually started to come or was being proposed to come in March that suddenly this is a crisis, we've got to have a walk-on at EPC and we've got to have an amending motion. I understand that some areas are getting some repetitive work with regards to appeals. Some stressful situations. My main issue was, you know, work was being done through the office of director. If you didn't drive by the area, didn't see the yellow sign, didn't know. Or we would have a triple lot split. You know, a little sign on one piece of property. If you didn't go up to look at it, you didn't know. This…you know, the motion and now today's amending motion, okay, I can deal with it. The one thing I'll have to follow-up and you know, Councillor Mayes is the mover, maybe him and I can have a little side-bar after to discuss, but it's to know what we can talk about. Because if it's a hearing that's in the office of director, what are we allowed to talk about? What are we allowed to discuss? So, having the understanding of the rules a little bit more. You know, with this latest motion, we are not having the opportunity to discuss it at Governance. So, I'll have to get a better understanding. But I will be supporting it today, Madam Speaker. And thank Councillor Mayes and Councillor Orlikow for their amending motion. At least the fact we do know with the amendment that we know about it in advance of the decision of the Director. Thank you.

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

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thought I'd just quickly come up and first of all, it was…I am a little bit guilty here on this one. And again, Councillor Nason and I have talked about it. The concern when Governance was the ability always for the residents. As we all have our residents that want to be informed as well. And it was also concerns about some of the…you know, after the fact, we get to find out about what is going on, on the Director's side. And so, I…and I…and so, now I think we have clarified this. And I just want to really point out where I really think we should be going in our whole rezoning process. And it already is there, but we need to do a much better job of advertising this and making our citizen aware of the PP&D's public notice website. People can sign up to get notified of any development; either it's a class…class C conditional use or variance or class B, which is the Director, class C, Board of Adjustments or community committee, class D of the DASZs. They are all listed there. And people…I know we always get concerns from people that say, you know, I didn't know about this. I don't walk by that street. I didn't see the yellow sign or the yellow sign was down. This is an amazing tool, so that's what I'm getting up to talk about today. This is a tool that we should be promoting and we should be encouraging more. And I will be talking to Councillor Gilroy after this about how we can do that a bit better, because I get it and we've all got it where residents go, I was not notified. I didn't know about this. I'm not saying to get rid of the yellow signs. Can have the discussion about the newspaper another day. But this process of what the PP&D Department are doing is actually incredible for people to be…you know, what's happening in Transcona. I'm not sure if people on Dorchester are, you know, really that lit up to know about that, they may be. They can just sign up and they will get notified directly to their e-mail about applications from not just Board of Adjustments, not just a director, not just the community committee one, but the whole breadth of them all. So, again, that's an engagement tool to our residents who want to be informed to know what's going on in their neighbourhood. This tool is a…I've got to admit, I wasn't well versed with it, but I've played with it and looked at it since I've had this motion come through. And that is where my change of heart really came into. And that is where I think I was a little bit unaware, I will say. But this tool here is a fantastic tool. And I really hope we can expand this tool and advertise it more for residents so they can actually be more informed. Because we know a lot of times when we have these applications come forward, many residents are very upset because they found out so late in the process; the posting dates and all that. Well, this allows it as soon as the application is done and received, they know it, they can read it, they can get more informed. And you know, and again, Councillor Nason made a really good point today and we'll have to follow-up on that is, what role do we have as councillors? If I want to see this application go forward, and I…and again, this is the process we have now which is a little bit of…befuddled a bit, in my opinion. I can go there as a councillor and say, I don't approve…I don't like this application. Do I also get to go to appeals and say that as well? But again, now we will sort that out on how that governance and that works, but now, at least I am aware of these applications. My residents are aware of these applications. And I will be promoting as hard as I can to make people sign up and just have these come to their homes so they're better informed. So, yes, the process, I do agree with Councillor Nason, was a little bit awkward, but you know, sometimes good comes out of awkward. And I think this amending motion is part of that journey that we took on this motion. So, and I thank my Governance colleagues for helping me through this and supporting the way we went forward. So again, it is a great resource that we really should be advertising and marketing more for our residents.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Chambers moves that we work past 12 for a short bit just to finish this item. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Any other speakers on this item? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes to close on the amending motion.

Councillor Mayes: One is reminded of Nordman saying…former Councillor Nordman saying, I am the only thing standing between you and lunch. Thank you for the support. Councillor Orlikow is right in saying, I am somewhat guilty, I am too in terms of Councillor Nason has a point. This was approved. Should have caught it in the fall. Councillor Orlikow is right in that. I apologize as well. But we are catching it now before things get very confused, I think, and lurching back and forth. There is a larger debate here, which is, how do we handle all of land development? There is something very strange and different about the way we do that and the way we do the rest of our business. And people are saying, well, you don't want to lose democratic control. And people, I think, are saying, well, hundreds of us came out against such and such a proposal and we won at community committee and then it was just overturned at the next level up anyway. Or hundreds of us came out against a proposal and you guys ignored us anyway. So, I begin to think maybe the...and certainly, they've…and we've had people from the Planning Department say, well, we are experts, just do what we…you know, you should defer to us. Well, then why have all these large public hearings? Is it all just a sham? I really think we need to revisit this. Councillor Allard, to his credit, had a very good summary of this at one of our meetings where he said to somebody, look, I could vote with you and oppose this building, but it's just going to get overturned at the next level. And then all the stuff I'm going to put in wouldn't get through. So, I'm going to vote in favour of this, and you tell me what conditions you want, within reason, and we'll try and work something out. And it took 12 hours or something, but we worked it out. It was a good summary though of the problem, which is you can grandstand and say, I am with you, the residents, I'm going to vote against this. By the way, I've told my two colleagues to vote for it. You know, it…we see some of that. Is this the right way to run a land development process? I really have come to doubt this that the…is it…there is more work to be done in terms of democracy or let's just have a planning commission of some sort and then people don't have the view that they…hundreds of them will show up and that should influence, because people are…people are very frustrated. We have all experienced this. We will all lose votes because we have tried to do what we see is the right thing. So, it is a process

that I think needs to be revisited if we are to go forward with the new provincial legislation. But for today, pleased to get the support of Councillor Orlikow and others who originally expressed concerns. So, I'll certainly be supporting the amending motion and the main motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, Mr. Mayor, I can call the question? Or if you'd like to…

Mayor Bowman: Yeah, I'd just like to acknowledge, I think there's some great comments all around the council chamber. And I look forward to the vote. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on amending Motion 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. And the main item, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. And now, I will not stand before you and lunch. So, let's recess and reconvene at 1:15 p.m. sharp, please. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 24, 2022, at 1:17 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of February 24th, 2022. We are on the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 16th, 2022. Item 9, it has an amending motion. Mr. Clerk.

Item 9 – Proceeds of Sale – 260 Hartford Avenue

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to introduce the item, followed by Councillor Eadie has moved amending motion, seconded by Councillor Santos.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And this is amending motion…

Madam Speaker: To Item 9.

Mayor Bowman: To Item 9. I'm sorry, which motion is the amending motion? Just…8?

Madam Speaker: The Hartford Avenue…yes.

Mayor Bowman: Eight, okay. Thank you very much. My apologies. There's a few motions here. I will wait to hear from council colleagues. I will be supporting this motion. I will also be supporting Motion 8, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Motion No. 8
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Santos,

WHEREAS on February 16, 2022, the Executive Policy Committee submitted to Council a motion regarding the proceeds of the sale of Winnipeg Police Service Station #13;

AND WHEREAS Station #13 is physically located at 260 Hartford Avenue and not 266 Hartford Avenue as mentioned in the motion;

AND WHEREAS the 10% cash payment in lieu of land dedication required by the City of Winnipeg Charter for the development application DASZ 44/2021 has yet to be calculated;

AND WHEREAS the North End, which includes neighbourhoods in both the Mynarski Ward and Point Douglas Ward, is losing neighbourhood and regional park space to a new police station 13;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 9 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated February 16, 2022 be amended as follows:

- *Deleting all instances of "266 Hartford Avenue" and replacing with "260 Hartford Avenue"*

- *In Recommendation 2, add the words "and Point Douglas Ward" added after "Mynarski Ward";*

- *Delete Recommendation 3 and replace with the following:*

  "3. That should the proceeds of the sale of 260 Hartford Avenue be less than the calculated 10% cash payment in lieu of land dedication from DASZ 44/2021 for recreation projects, any balance be referred to the budget review process."

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I introduce the amendment and I will speak to the report as well. And so, Madam Speaker, I would just first like to begin to thank, actually, EPC for acknowledging two things. One is that the police station budget could have gone over based on some amendments from community committee. And the second thing is that I wanted to thank my EPC colleagues for finding a method of bringing some parks rec money back into the North End. As we all know, we're losing five acres and…of park space and a new police station will be there, Madam Speaker. In reading it, the amendment…so, this motion…this report, just so everybody is clear, when EPC decided to use the sale proceeds from the old station at 260 Hartford, what they did was they decided that we would ignore the Land Operating Reserve Policy because the net proceeds would technically go there. Acknowledging that we are losing park space. EPC wisely said, instead of sending it to the LOR reserve, we will send it to the...well, one to the Mynarski Ward Land Dedication Reserve, which is money that's there at the discretion upon consultation, Madam Speaker, with community about, you know, where to spend Land Dedication Reserve money because it's not each individual councillor's money. It's actually belongs to the areas in which the funds are derived and to be spent in our parks and recreation spaces, Madam Speaker. And technically, you can use it to buy land to create a park as well if there was enough, Madam Speaker. But I digress. So, very clearly, that is there. The amending motion also, Madam Speaker, refers to the 10% in lieu of land dedication…land dedication from a DASZ application, in this case, 44/2021. Now, the original report from the Public Service acknowledged that under the City of Winnipeg Charter, which technically we can't change without official motions and so on, there needs to be a 10% in lieu if no land is being given for park space, open space. So, Madam Speaker, that is a legal requirement. And there is a second motion that will come that just puts back and acknowledges that all DAZs, whether it's from a private developer or from a public sector developer or whatever, there is a…there is a…this provision in the Charter for good reason. And I think we all agree it is there for a good reason. So, Madam Speaker, this is just to clarify everything and to, actually, add in that point…the Point Douglas Ward…the North End; you know I have…everybody's got a different definition of the North End. But the North End that I grew up in, the Point Douglas Ward right now and the Mynarski Ward both have neighborhoods that belong to what people call the North End, which is north of the CP Rail main line. And I won't get into the northern boundary. But people who live in West Kildonan, something…they say they live in the North End, Madam Speaker, but most people understand that West Kildonan was a different city all together. And anyway, I digress. So, the proceeds of the sale, which again, this is helping the police service stay on budget so that they don't go over budget for their police station and it's also compensating the North End for loss of park space. Now, because I want to speak to the whole motion, I want to paraphrase Mr. Art Cable who lives on Selkirk Avenue since 1990. Just…this is history. The Public Service doesn't remember history that nobody seems to remember, but I look in our research. So, when the community consultations happened in 2017, there was a whole history that was missed. Sergeant Tommy Prince Memorial Veterans Park, I can't remember the full name, and its address is 100 Battery. And it…actually, which was…has a honorary name of Tommy Prince Way. The…Madam Speaker, the…how could I explain it? So, Mr. Cable pointed out that when they did the Flora Place development, all of the old housing that was there for veterans from the 1940s forward, it was all old and needed to be ripped down. And Flora Place right now has new multi-family housing which is just on the…will be on the north boundary of where the new district police station will be. And then, what happened was, because they wanted a complete community…this is going on way back to the 1990s, even into the '80s when they were building this and tearing things down, Madam Speaker, there was 1.5 million…they created a park, Tom…they created that Tommy Prince Memorial Veterans Park at 100 Battery. And that was a community…that was a neighborhood park…community park versus the old Ex grounds which is a…which is a regional PR3 which is regional park recreation facility that many Winnipeggers and Manitobans of my age will remember participating and doing all kinds of things there, Madam Speaker. So, but the point is, is that part of that neighborhood park, the Tommy Prince Park, it is losing some of its acreage as well. It's being all merged into one overall lot, separate from the police station. But there was $1.5 million that was promised to at the neighborhood committee who working on complete communities, there was supposed to be these pathways that never got built. There was all kinds of things of $1.5 million that never got done in that neighborhood as that development for Flora Place happened. So, Madam Speaker, Mr. Cable is quite upset, actually. And he doesn't agree with putting a police station there at all. He's saying this is a violation of historical commitments from the City of Winnipeg through various development agreements and so on and so forth, Madam Speaker. So, I just want to give it in context. This is the North End; it's not Ross Eadie, it's not…it's not Vivian Santos, it is Art Cable and it is a bunch of people. But in the 2017 consultation, the neighborhood residents committee that used to exist way back when, none of them were participating or on it. They weren't involved in any consultations. And so, what I am trying to do here is just to ensure that the North End will be able to have some money to invest in these neighborhoods like Burrows central neighbourhood, Shaughnessy Park neighborhood, the Dufferin neighborhood, the William Whyte neighbourhood. These neighbourhoods, right, they are losing some park space. And we need to provide better services in what's left because

we're not going to have enough money to buy and create a new park anywhere here, right? Or a thousand-acre commitment…well, it's down by five acres now. Anyway, Madam Speaker, so I hope that you will support the amendment. And I did consult with…just…just to make everything clear, but the…again, the Charter says that there will be a 10% cash payment in lieu. EPC and the Chair of Finance found a way to keep the budget online for what is a needed police station. It is very needed. I don't disagree that we need a new police station up in district 3. Remember, it's a whole district. It's not a…it's not necessarily a neighborhood community police station. It is serving the whole district which basically goes from the airport all the way to the Red River and south of the CP Rail tracks to the northern limits of our city on that side. So, it's a whole region of our city. So, anyway, I just point that out. I can't give all of Mr. Cable because there's no more representation, but on this report, I can talk about the representation. He…you know, he had big ideas, big investments when he moved in there. All these people had great ideas. And actually, what is happening now is, when this thing started to happen 2017 and so on, what's happened is, his dream of what was going to be an excellent place to live and community and, actually, to build a brand-new house, to renovate, to do a bunch of things. And I have to tell you, Mr. Cable is distraught. I told him that I had to support the new police station because we do need one.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Councillor Eadie: But I just want to conclude, that there are people in that neighborhood whose vision of a complete community has been destroyed. And I will be voting to put the police station there because we do need it. But I just think that we all need to understand that we have destroyed some people's dreams. They're very, very upset. And they weren't part of the 2017 consultations. There was some resident committee from William Whyte, but not…there was no, at that point, Dufferin Residents' Association. It fell apart. And over time, it fell apart because a lot of the things that the City promised were going to happen, never happened, Madam Speaker. So, I will leave it at that. Please support the amending motion and the full report once it's amended. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am in support of the amending motion. I'm supportive of the original new business item as well. But some background and how this interrelates with what we will see in a few hours at Item 12 under PP&D and amending Motion 9. Convoluted, but I think we can get it there across the line today. So, this is…the original concept here was…came out of EPC. Several of us were not supportive of the additional provision that was in Item 12 under PP&D around rezoning of the site which would have been a waiver of the usual Land Dedication Policy. The three area wards were going to get all land dedication money and this was going to cost quite a bit of money to the police budget that hadn't been budgeted. So, compromise arrived at by my colleagues while I was at home attending virtually. I think Councillor Gillingham, Councillor Rollins, Councillor Gilroy and some others came up with this. Okay, let's treat it more like Bruce Oak Recovery Centre. We'll do sale proceeds when the Hartford building is sold, that money will go into Mynarski Ward. Mynarski Ward is losing some park space; that is a fair point from Councillor Eadie. Councillor Eadie, rather generously, amending it here today to say, not just my ward, I'll split it with another ward. Hard to criticize him on that, that's for sure. So, all of this is fine. My concern and thanks to the Clerks and Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Eadie who are trying to work through this is, I will have what Councillor Gilroy suggested, slight amendment further down when we get to Motion 9, Item 12 on PP&D. Councillor Eadie is right, at EPC we took out any land dedication requirement. And he's saying, I think under the Charter that you have to have something in there. Plus, there is a calculation reference. If you take the whole thing out, how do you do the calculation? Okay, my concern, well, you don't get both, you don't get land dedication in the normal course and the sale proceeds. We are giving you the sale proceeds in recognition of the circumstances, but you don't get land dedication on top of that. So, Councillor Eadie I think has said, yeah, I get that. His point is, hey, the sale proceeds will pay the land dedication. That is how I'll get the money, is the sale proceeds will pay into land dedication and my ward will be made whole that way…and Point Douglas. So, a bit complicated, but I think salvageable. We don't need to touch anything here. I think, though, we need to clarify under…the item under PP&D that it's not a double payment. It's not you get both the sale proceeds and the land dedication, rather, you get the…these two wards will get money through land dedication. Is that going to come from the police budget? No, it will come from the sale proceeds of that building. At Police Board, we discussed this, the police service was fine with sale proceeds not resting with them. They felt it wasn't coming their way anyway. They did have concern, though, if we just dropped an LDR requirement on them and said, here's is a bill for a quarter million or $300,000. That was never part of the budget that we've approved for this project. Okay, so, salvageable, complicated, but do-able. Thanks to Councillor Gilroy for trying to work through this. I have no interest in getting any LDR money out of this. Normally on a cash payment in where there isn't land, the local community committee, of course, keeps four-fifths of it and the remainder is divided out into the other community committees and we each get a little bit. I don't want any. I think I speak for Gillingham and others, they don't want any. It's just making sure we are in compliance with the Charter, making sure we're not accidentally handing a large bill to the police service. Making sure Councillor Eadie and Councillor Santos' wards aren't short-changed here. So, I'll support this amending motion. I originally thought I might have to move deferral down there when we get that in 12 on PP&D because of the confusion, but I think due to some good work by staff and Councillor Gilroy, we have a couple of words to add in just to make sure…it's Councillor Eadie's vision, we just need to make sure it's clear on when we come to

that later item. He is going to get the money. The sale proceeds will pay into LDR and that is how the money is being delivered. You don't get the LDR that you would normally get and the sale proceeds. So, it's a good compromise, it's a good way of working this through without deviating from our normal land dedication policies. And Councillor Eadie is right, his ward, the North End, which we still have to work on renaming that sewage plant, we'll come back to that. The North End, as Councillor Eadie defines it, would include both his ward and another rather generous of him, actually, to say, no, I don't it all, it should be shared with Point Douglas Ward. So, I'm certainly supportive. Sorry for the long clarificatory note, but we do need to catch that some hours from now down at the PP&D agenda, but I'm certainly supportive.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Eadie, would you like to close on your amending motion?

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor? I will call the question. All in favour of amending Motion 8? Contrary? That is carried. All in favour of the main Item 9, as amended? Contrary? That is carried. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk: That is the end.

Madam Speaker: Okay, that's the end, yeah.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
NOTICE OF MOTION

Madam Speaker: Okay, we will now move on to notice of motion from our January Council meeting. It's coming forward now. The notice of motion moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by Councillor Chambers. Regarding the decriminalization of small amounts of drugs. There is an amending motion, Motion 10, to be rescinded by the mover and the seconder. Concurrence of the mover and the seconder. All in favour of rescinding Motion 10? Those opposed? That is carried. Councillor Rollins, over to you, to introduce the item.

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

BE IT RESOLVED that the Notice of Motion under the Executive Policy Committee, regarding a Request for an Exemption under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, be amended by deleting Recommendations 1 and 2 and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:

"1. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to Council in 90 days with strategies to place Nasal Narcan Spray in all civic-owned buildings and transit buses and a plan to provide online training videos that will teach people how to use nasal Narcan Spray to save a life.

2. That the Mayor be requested to send a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada identifying support from the City of Winnipeg for the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police and their work to properly address the decriminalization of drugs."

Item 1 - Request for an Exemption under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act

Moved by Councillor Rollins,
Seconded by Councillor Chambers,

WHEREAS criminalization makes it difficult for people who use drugs to access harm reduction services, increasing risks and subjecting them to even more health harms (such as injury, and disease), and/or social harms (such as joblessness, and homelessness);

AND WHEREAS many Canadian researchers have suggested racial bias within police investigations, and prosecutions of drug crimes resulting in Black and Indigenous people dramatically over-represented in drug possession arrests and convictions as a result;

AND WHEREAS people who use drugs, including peers and self-advocates who use drugs, Manitoba Harm Reduction Network, Mom's Stop the Harm, are encouraging Winnipeg to move away from a criminal justice and/or abstinence approaches towards a public heath approach with community-based organizations and the health and social services sector;

AND WHEREAS Vancouver, Montreal, Toronto and Edmonton are already calling on the federal government to decriminalize small amounts of illegal drugs to take on the drug poisoning crises and prevent further deaths;

AND WHEREAS The provincial government is responsible for funding and coordinating primary health care including mental health and addictions supports and services; and

AND WHEREAS All levels of government have a role to play in improving public health outcomes for residents including actively championing harm reduction methods, housing-first, safe consumption sites, safe supply, and other measures which can help save lives;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. *The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) request the Federal Government for an exemption for Winnipeg under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, to allow the possession of small amounts of illegal substances within the city's boundaries.*

2. *The CAO make all reasonable efforts with the federal government to set up a process as stated above to allow the possession of small amounts of illegal substances within the city's boundaries under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, and from the first formal confirmation from the federal government that they are committed to working with the City on a process toward the issuance of the aforementioned exemption, begin quarterly reporting to the appropriate Committee of Council with verbal updates on the continuous work and milestones until decriminalization is achieved within Winnipeg with the support of the Federal Government.*

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I appreciate the councillor's withdrawal. Madam Speaker, I stand support of the motion written by myself and Councillor Chambers, the current Chair of the Police Board. The motion requests the Federal Government for an exemption for Winnipeg under the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. The point of this motion is quite simple today, Madam Speaker; should we be doing all that a city can do to support people and prevent unnecessary deaths by moving from a criminalized sphere to the realm of community health sphere. The motion outlines several reasons why councillors should consider this and support it with their vote, Madam Speaker. The motion follows the logic that criminalization makes it difficult if not impossible for people who use drugs to access services, increasing risks and subjecting them to health harms; harms I've seen myself, Madam Speaker. The logic that Canadian research has suggested racial bias within police investigations and prosecutions of drug crimes in result of black…resulting in black, brown people, Indigenous people being over represented in drug possession arrests in our city and in Canada. It follows the logic that peers and self advocates and many of their allies in healthcare and academia need this city to move away from crime and justice and towards public health approaches. And Madam Speaker, I do believe today is that such opportunity. Finally, the motion's logic is that other cities like Vancouver, Montreal and Edmonton have already made this exact move. The implication is to be like them. Support residents like they have. And finally, it heads off with the past for those dismiss our charter obligations on wellness and for extra comfort that the Provincial Government holds responsibility for healthcare including harm reduction, mental health and addiction supports, but that all levels, Madam Speaker, can play a role. We have a toxic drug supply in Winnipeg and it's ravaging our city and people are hurt by it and dying. We need more work, Madam Speaker, not less. All governments have a role to play. Voting today is the least we can do to disrupt the current status quo. There are precedence in other cities who have done the same work. This is now a well trodden path. So, let us join today Vancouver, Edmonton, Montreal. Winnipeg shouldn't be laggers and doddlers on this one in terms of big cities tackling big issues we face and face by our residents, like the visible drug poisoning crisis that everyone on their way to work, hopefully in the downtown, can see. The Federal Governmental allows for this. There is a process they engage cities in and it's slow and it's methodical and members of our shelter and public health community like Dr. Lodge this morning want us to undertake this work and do our part. People are dying, Madam Speaker. A toxic drug supply is ravaging the city, Madam Speaker. And if you, like me, care about the downtown but don't want to delve into this work, please just follow Councillor Chambers and I with your support for this motion and your vote. If you are disturbed by people in shelters using drugs, your transit shelters, for instance, but don't know what to do and believe we can't arrest our way out of this crisis, then listen to the community-based organizations that have public statements or written to you and follow our lead on this vote. If you support the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service and are concerned with the number of calls they take as a result of the drug poisoning crisis, follow Councillor Chambers and I with your vote. If you think from time to time, how is Greg Burnett doing at the Downtown Community Safety Patrol, and you haven't just

had time to pick up the phone and you're worried about concerns that they are seeing, the patrols are seeing, on the drug poisoning crisis in primary healthcare, then just follow our lead with your vote, Madam Speaker. The City and members of Council, I would assert, should be doing all things in policy and prevention to protect this city and the very workers on that are the frontline each and every day protecting and preventing drug poisoning crisis losses. Winnipeg Council has the opportunity today to pass…not pass the buck, but to get in line behind other cities, perhaps with less drug poisoning crisis and hitting homelessness than us, and get in line with the bona fide work with the Federal Government as a willing partner to remove barriers to community wellness and harm reduction and move to the right side of the work; not criminalization but harm reduction and health sphere. This isn't about getting our roles confused and taking on health care. It is in Winnipeg, I believe, a city…critical city building basic. It is finding the priority file that we have before us whether we want to see it or not and moving it to the right path. The Federal Government's now well-trodden path, it's developed for cities that have asked for an exemption. All we have to do is ask. Many other mayors, councils and cities in Canada understand this and they are doing the work. RCMP, chiefs of police, chiefs of fire, they have been on the record in support for years including our very own chief of police and chief of fire. We don't have to think hard on this, we just have to vote today. Please consider the hardworking people who want to do…us to do just this. I mentioned other cities work, but here I want to take the time to reflect on those that voted. Those like Aboriginal Health and Wellness Centre, a wellness clinic. The clinic is Indigenous governed, community-based social service. It provides housing support for urban Indigenous community of the urban Indigenous community. It works on substance use, homelessness, housing insecurity and more. They do this in a traditional and a contemporary healing way. They recognize the city's current drug policy stance isn't working. The status quo is not working, it's a failed system. They see a city-wide exemption as a move in the right direction. They look at the toxic drug supply. They see its effects and they don't want their council to just offer trinkets of harm reduction. No, they want, in their words, a shift to remove barriers and address the crisis that has resulted in approximately 400 overdose deaths last year and counting, Madam Speaker. They support this motion. Don't disappoint them, Madam Speaker. West Central Women works to empower women, their community…their community…the women's community. They want…they work to be supportive and work on very responsive programming. They wrote to members of Council that we can do something. They know this move is overdue because people are dying and want…they want your support on this motion, Madam Speaker. Support them with your vote today. Dr. Lisa Lazareth, a researcher that is considered secure and non-exploitive housing in Canada's poorest postal codes, numerous publications she has authored on housing, health, street-based work in urban settings. She knows this move is overdue because people are dying and wants you to support this motion. Michael Payne, Executive Director of Nine Circles is a health centre, they want us to pursue an exemption for the city recognizing the adverse impacts on black, Indigenous, people of colour being over represented in possession charges, Madam Speaker. They want Council to turn…turn this city to evidence-based interventions that support relatives and have problematic…that have problematic substance use or substance dependence. They need our votes today. They looked up from their hardworking desks to this council. Wrote us and they need our positive support on this motion today. Dr. (inaudible) wrote Council. Her research includes intimate partner violence and other forms of trauma on physical and mental health, she wrote for our votes today a motion in line with evidence. Give her your thanks for her hard work with your vote today. Kyle Labelle, a counseling student wrote to Council wanting us to make the shift because toxic drug supply epidemic is ravaging our city. We shouldn't disappoint this counselling student. We should make the shift with our votes today. Nurses like Naomi Sirota from Main Street Project, Madam Speaker. Main Street Project and the shelter system does need our support to make a shift, for sure they do, Madam Speaker. Nurses like Naomi Sirota support the motion because mental health community program, well, that's her everyday. Everyday nurses like her move from criminalized field into the health…into the realm of community nurses like Naomi have their hands up, they want to take the next steps that this city should take. They need councillors to make this vote a success, though, or else they won't be able to follow suit, Madam Speaker. These are just some of the people on the frontline. They don't deserve trinkets today as a response to their compassion and profound community care work, they deserve a unanimous support of this motion. As councillors across the city face losses as I do, and the community-based organizations that support the everyday work, the everyday work that the drug poisoning loss, the homelessness and the wraparound supports that the community-based organizations don't just have at their disposal due to failures of government, they deserve nothing better than bona fide work and this is the path. Family members like Arlene Last-Kolb, Madam Speaker. And I might need a little more time to work this in. She is very familiar to councillors. She lost her son. And she is one of the many moms that I've talked to, that have reached out, likely, to you as councillors.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein…Councillor Gillingham moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Councillor Rollins: She lost her son. She's one of the many moms that I've talked to that have lost children to the drug poisoning crisis. This vote is for moms and dads, for sisters, for brothers, for friends. They desperately need our support. She writes to us, "I know now with so many dying, we have to do more. We all have to say, 'I can help'". And for these…those that live in the downtown, I really…that really need some faith in our city councillors, you could help them, she writes, "By saying you can help them and you can just help them by supporting motions". So, I will conclude with Arlene's statements just like I have concluded with community, they need our help. They looked up off of their very busy desks today to support this motion and write Council. Please today show them that you saw that with your vote. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm rising today to state my opposition to this motion. First of all, this is not a municipal file, not at all. How would you feel if the Province or Federal Government start debating and moving recommendations on City of Winnipeg's snow clearing? I suggest this is a…if this is a passion of my colleague, she could consider running for another level of government. But more importantly, what type of message are we sending to kids, to adults, that small amounts, simple possession are not criminal? It is not a problem. We are talking about addictive, life destroying illicit drugs. Hey kids, a small amount of heroin, sure, knock yourself out. Crystal meth, no problem. Never before have drugs been more dangerous even in small amounts. Where are they from? Microscopic amounts of lacing with things like fentanyl and carfentanil can be deadly even in very, very small amounts. This is a bad, bad idea. Just say no. Just vote no.

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

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, I would like to move referral to Protection, Community Services and Parks.

Madam Speaker: You have a few minutes to provide an explanation if you'd like. Three.

Councillor Nason: Doesn't require a lot, but you know, the…we have a motion here to ask for something that I think is a very serious topic. And I don't necessarily disagree that we need to have a different lens on these substances, but you know, I'm getting to Miriam Willis quite well and I appreciate her console that she provides to me on these matters. But it's one of those things, if we go this route without the support network behind it, and the support network that's behind it is needed from other levels of government. The support level we need behind it is supportive housing, treatment programs, programs that are longer than just a drop in the bucket. You know, great. We are going to wave this magic wand and suddenly…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason, speak to the referral, the reason for the referral. I think you made your point.

Councillor Nason: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Yes, Councillor Rollins, would you like to speak?

Councillor Rollins: Yes, I would, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much for the opportunity to do so. Madam Speaker, obviously, I believe that people are dying and time is of the essence. And that a positive vote today gets the lead out and demonstrates some concrete action and willingness to move forward and not leave people behind. Community-based organizations and that network of support, the only, frankly, network of support available for people who use drugs did write all of Council on what they wanted today, a positive vote. But it is the will of Council, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we are going to have a vote on referring it to the Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services. It's a majority vote. Call for a recorded vote, I heard that. All in favour, please rise to refer it to the community…to the standing policy committee.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Nason, Klein, Orlikow and Schreyer

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: That lost. Councillor Nason, do you wish to continue with your speaking time?

Councillor Nason: Yes, I will. Thank you for those that chose to stand on the referral. Anyways, since I wasn't able to talk to it before, but what I will say, and why I am not going to support today's motion, is I don't think we are ready. I don't think we are ready from a perspective of the supports that are behind it are not there. I know we are making moves through federal housing initiatives to find more stable housing. I know that the Province seems to be making announcements. They

can't make any announcements now because of the by-election. But they are making moves with regards to, you know, additional supports; mental health supports, et cetera. But we are not there. We are not there for the length of time it takes somebody to kick these addictions. And this is not the magic approach that suddenly in places like Councillor Allard's ward where people have taken up residence in a bus shelter on St. Mary. It is not going to help the situations in Transcona in front of Kildonan Place where people are consistently consuming intoxicants of all nature. It is not the magic end all and be all. People have to be willing to go in to the programs. And right now, those programs aren't there even if they are willing. There's wait lists that are far too long. And I don't think that going and trying to get some of those challenged individuals where criminalization may be the only way to get them into a program because they are standing there continuing day after day suffering. You know, they are suffering. And I have seen some of the successes. Like I said, I have been to the Morberg House. I did the tour through there and met some of the individuals, the participants in the program. Going on the streets, talking to some of the individuals there. When people are ready to get help, you know, they have asked for help and unfortunately, that call hasn't been answered. So, I'm not…I wanted to refer this matter. I'm just not ready to support it today. There is no report from the Public Service as part of this. It's a motion. So, unless there is a report, I am not supporting it. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, it seems like these days, spaces for civil debate about matters of public policy appear to be shrinking in the world. And I am pleased to be able to be part of this council where we have debates on issues like this that are incredibly important to our residents that we serve. And I respect the fact that members of Council will have very different views about the merit to the motion. And I think it is important for Winnipeggers to hear the full breadth of discussion and debate around this topic. Matters of health are certainly more germane to those levels of government that have health departments: Manitoba Health, notably, as well as the Federal Government. But I do recognize there is a role for us to play especially when the systems in place to protect our residents are not achieving the outcomes that we all want. As Winnipeggers, as members of Council, and with elected members at other levels of government. Right now, what is…what we are seeing in our community and communities across Canada should compel us to have these discussions and debates to see what we can do to help because the status quo should not be acceptable for anyone that has any lived experience or who has consulted with those who do or who provide treatment. So, I want to thank…I want to thank Councillor Rollins. I want to thank Councillor Chambers for bringing this matter forward. If you had asked me 20 years ago to consider this topic, admittedly, I would have recoiled in opposition. Since that time, I have tried hard to get better educated. And I have increasingly seen these matters through a health lens and a harms reduction lens. And I think many Winnipeggers are as well, including many members of Council. I am proud of the work that this council and previous council have done in topics such as this. The Illicit Drug Strategy was municipally led to bring together Federal and Provincial Governments to work collaboratively with us to see how we can achieve better outcomes. And that work continues. Councillor Rollins, in particular, has been a strong champion of supervised consumption sites; an incredibly important topic. And I know there have been many different views around this chamber and in our community about supervised consumption site. But quite frankly, we need to see more dialogue on these topics from levels of government who are responsible for health. And more positive actions to help our residents. I have taken the opportunity over the last month, I have not had…it's been a busy month for members of Council, myself included. I have taken the opportunity, not to exhaust it with consult with all that I could, but I did have opportunities in recent days to have dialogue with groups including Doctors Manitoba, Tamarac Centre, I spoke with the Provincial Justice Minister recently, with the Downtown Safety Partnership and physicians specializing in addictions medicine. Most…most, especially those in healthcare sector, were pleased to see dialogue that was moving in the harms reduction space. And encouraged me to continue to do just that. I also heard from many, though, of the need that if this were to be approved, there really does need to be an increasing amount of accessibility to long-term treatment. So, for now, I am not going to support this motion today. I do think it is a discussion that needs to continue primarily with other levels of government. But I also think the need for treatment needs to continue. And I think that this debate, should this not pass today, should continue. Part of the reason why I am not prepared to vote for it today is questions that I have about what we have seen in other communities that have applied in terms of any outcomes that we've seen; positive or negative. And I think, again, we can learn from other municipalities and other jurisdictions around the world. And I know that that data does exist. I just didn't, admittedly, have the time this month to research as much as I would like or have the Public Service do so. But questions I have relating to the capital region, for example; if we were to apply for this exemption and achieve it and it were not to be in place, as I suspect would be the case, and this may be unfair on my part to presume this of other municipal councils and jurisdictions in and around the capital region. But if Winnipeg were the only municipality, how would that practically operate? I do have…I do have questions about that. What we ultimately saw when cannabis was, no pun intended, rolled out, but when it was…when the new requirements were rolled out across Canada, what we saw in Manitoba, we ultimately saw some collaboration between Federal and Provincial Governments. That is something that I believe would need to happen in this case. I am not sure why the Federal Government just doesn't...if this is the direction they want to go, just change the rules at a national level or at least have some dialogue with provincial governments. I think we all know that there is almost certainly not alignment between our current Provincial Government and the Federal Government on this topic. And for that reason, I think debate is warranted. And the discussion that we're having today is something that we

need to have. Those are some, I have many other questions and concerns. Like I've said, I think we should be open to this. At this point in time, I am not prepared to support it today, Madam Speaker. And I want to thank my colleagues for bringing this forward.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Obviously, I rise in support of this motion today. And I want to thank Councillor Rollins for the work that she has done in, you know, developing a lot of this work and her passion around harm reduction strategy for vulnerable individuals here in our city. I do want to emphasize that this is about decriminalization, not about legalization. So, to Councillor Browaty's remarks about, you know, it is an open call for meth or cocaine or other illicit drugs, this isn't that. This is the decriminalization allowing alternatives to be considered as opposed to arrests and detaining individuals who have been utilizing or in possession of small amounts of these types of drugs. How many times have we heard the call that we want a better outcome or a better response or aligning the service need to the service call? That police are often involved in a lot of these incidents where individuals are intoxicated or are high on different drugs and that is not the call that should have taken place. That we want to have a mental health worker or a crisis worker, social worker or another health professional to respond to these calls and assist these individuals and help them get the assistance that they need. A lot of individuals that are taking drugs are using it to mask problems that they are dealing with on a daily basis. And so, it shouldn't be criminalized in that sense. We should be looking at alternative responses that allow them to seek the fuller and holistic services that they need in order to deal with the issues that they are dealing with. I want this to focus also, Madam Speaker, on the sellers of drugs. And that is where police operations and without…without directing police operations, but that is truly where police operations should be focused on in terms of looking at those that are selling drugs and preying on people in their time of need. And we have seen that routinely. And I am happy to hear that the Provincial Government is providing more dollars in recognition of guns and gangs that are on our street that around this illegal trade and activity. The medical outcomes should far exceed the criminal outcomes in this…in this matter in the sense that we are looking for individuals to get the treatment that they need and not a criminal record attached to that. It was mentioned that the support networks need to be in place. Of course, the Provincial Government has announced the rapid access centres that are in our clinics that in our community. There is also last year we officially recognized and opened the Bruce Oak Recovery Centre. And of course, there is also the Aurora House that is here in our province as well, up in Gimli. And as more of these type of long-term treatment facilities come on line, there will be a lot of, you know, of these resources available to meet the longer term needs of individuals that are impacted by self medicating and you know, trying to address their personal issues or those…those addictions issues that they are currently struggling with. So, again, Madam Speaker, I support this motion. I sat and chatted not only with Councillor Rollins, but with many healthcare professionals around this issue and have completed a lot of research around this issue. I want to thank Ken St. George who provided a comprehensive research paper on harm reduction strategies including decriminalization of illicit drugs and focusing on a health care outcome rather than criminal outcome. Thank you again, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will begin by saying that I will be, actually, voting to support this motion. Decriminalization of small amounts of possessions of these illicit hard drugs, if you want to call them, Madam Speaker. I grew up in an area where, you know, a lot of times you live in poverty, you end up getting addicted to various things. And I have seen it all over the city through my life. I will be 62 in May. And I have seen how people do get addicted to these hard, illicit drugs. Some people try it, but they don't get addicted. Others try it and they get addicted. Really, what we are talking about though is, decriminalizing for the future of individuals who become addicted to these illicit drugs. So, when we look at that we say, well, you know, nobody should have it. It is a criminal thing. It's none of the City's business. Well, it is the City's business, Madam Speaker. It is the City's business because I've got a bunch of people robbing stores, shops on Selkirk Avenue because they are trying to feed their drug habit, Madam Speaker. They're people with addictions. This is a City level thing. The police service are the ones who police the criminal act, the Province prosecutes. So Madam Speaker, it is a City issue and we need to deal with it. It is not a perfect solution, Madam Speaker, because every individual is different. Well, there's some different categories of how people will overcome addictions. But there's many people who will never overcome their addictions. And some of the ideas about the safe injection sites, whatever, places to try to ensure that people who have addictions don't harm themselves as much. They can die, of course, if they overdose on…and you have all these crazy drugs now that get mixed and people are dying, Madam Speaker. But I want you to think about when you are thinking about criminalization. So, you expect people to get help. And yes, there is a bunch of different centres that will help. But some can go…some people will end up doing it through cold turkey, some will try several 20, 30 times before they finally get a result. But I will tell you what will happen if you get a criminal record as a result of having a small possession to feed your addictions. You are not out there selling the product of people, which Councillor Chambers is absolutely right. That's the focus. You try to keep that off the street. But the thing is, people with addictions will find whatever they can to get high. So, you take all the meth off the street you want, they are going to go after something else because they are addicted. So, the purpose of this decriminalization of small amounts of possession is, let's say I got over my addiction, Madam Speaker, and I go back to school because I never actually finished school because I got addicted

to this crap. And now I got…but I got a criminal record. I got a criminal record. What am I…what kind of jobs…what is my future? What is my hope for my future? Once I beat and got that monkey off my back, what happens? What happens? This decriminalization is not about saying we condone these illicit drugs. This is an effort to try to ensure that people when they finally do beat their addictions or to prevent as much harm that they might otherwise do, this is about the decriminalization, but these other safe injection sites, different things like that, there are ways of doing it without causing what some people cited as problems in other cities. The municipalities around us, you know, a lot of the kids I grew up with, I know a number who grew up in West and East St. Paul. I used to hang with them. The odd one did get addicted. One is dead and others, whatever, trying to get their future together, Madam Speaker. So, I mean, the decriminalization, it is the Winnipeg Police Service. We serve the police within the city of Winnipeg. We can work with the RCMP or whoever the police service is in municipalities around us to nail the sellers who are helping to get people addicted in the first place, Madam Speaker. That is where the focus should be. So, I just want to say, I urge you all. You know what, it's time that we ask to be able to do, decriminalize it, at least for the Winnipeg Police Service so they can spend more time focused in on dealing with the real problem. And actually, you know, I will talk about personally…you want to talk about illicit drugs and how dangerous. You know, alcohol is a…Madam Speaker, it's an ugly, ugly, ugly addiction to have. We decriminalized that, Madam Speaker. When I got thrown in the drunk tank, I wasn't charged with a criminal crime. I was thrown in the drunk tank to make sure I didn't harm myself or others while intoxicated. We don't criminalize addiction to alcohol anymore unless you drive…drink and drive, there's certain things that will happen if you're doing that. But the sure…and look at what happened down over on Broadway recently. So, some people, you know, a little too drunk, way too drunk maybe, wanted to get into whatever action they want. The police took them home, took them to a friend's place. Got them away from a potential crime happening. So, like, I don't understand the backlash on decriminalizing small amounts of these illicit drugs. We did it for alcohol, why can't we do it for this? We're not talking about legalizing cannabis here, which is, frankly for some people, cannabis will lead them into other illicit drugs, Madam Speaker. So, you know, think about that. And please, this…it is time for Winnipeg to pass this motion. And I thank Councillors Rollins and Chambers for bringing it for debate. But let's have some sober thinking here. There are people out there who are working with people on the streets with addictions. I don't know that we need to consult with them to find out for sure because each service out there works for some people but not for others. So, there is no one answer from any one person. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this motion. And I really do want to thank Councillor Chambers and, of course, Councillor Rollins who's really has championed this right from the beginning and has done amazing job. You know, it is pushing the barriers of what we're used to. And I think that that's critical. I wanted to remind us, however, that we are not the first city to do this. There's other cities that have gone before us. And really, this isn't such a big…a big issue in the whole scheme of things. I know we are concerned about, you know, whose jurisdiction in terms of the capital region, but other cities have been able to manage that. And I have full faith that our city could, too. I think that it's critical that when we look at what we're seeing in and around our city right now, all of us recognize that this is a health and addiction crisis. And knowing the work that other community groups have done and hearing what they said about this issue, they're needing supports like this to make sure that they can provide the programs and supports needed to deal with people that have addictions and mental health issues. And how this does that, is that some people don't have the courage or they are too scared to go and get the help and support that they need from police or from different community groups because they are worried about being intoxicated and being under the influence and having small amounts of drugs on them. So, this makes sure that they get the support that they are truly, really needing. And that is one way we can deal with some of the crisis that we are seeing in the community is actually dealing with that crisis. And by them being able to get that support directly is critical. And I do want to also raise, I want to thank Councillor Eadie did a way better job using his own example, and I want to thank him for that. But I also want to remind everybody in this room that we have many, many women that are under the influence and are addicted. And they have very different realities than our male counterparts. And I want to recognize that because they don't seek the help because they are scared. They are scared of getting in trouble if they have…if they have a bit of drugs on them or getting the other person in trouble if they have some drugs on them but need to be able to deal with the issue that they are having whether it's with police, mental health and addiction councillors or community organizations. So, it is really critical. It is making sure that we provide the supports where they're needed. And arresting people isn't the solution to dealing with this problem. It really is about dealing with the addictions. And that frees up money for our police force to do other real critical things that we need to be doing other than arresting somebody from having just a little bit of possession of drugs. So, I do support this here today. I encourage my councillor colleagues to support this. And I really do want to thank my councillor colleagues, Councillors Chambers and of course, Councillor Rollins for their work on this. And I hope that we are building a new city and opening up this dialogue. And you know what, we are not the only city. And we can make this happen here in Winnipeg, too. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Some very good comments all the way around. I particularly want to say how much I agree with the Mayor's comments and how well spoken that was. I think I agree with almost all of what the Mayor said, in fact, including the bit about how I would have reacted 20 years as ago versus now. There is a very serious debate to be had about this. This is not having that debate, though. This…we have heard, well, if you vote against this, you are against parents and sisters and nurses and professionals. No. We've heard, if you vote against this, you are against concrete action. To be clear, this motion calls for the CAO to send a letter or an e-mail, let's say a letter, to the Federal Government requesting an exemption. So, all this is, is requesting an exemption. So, I personally do not think that is going to solve the problem. Councillor Gilroy is right, you can't arrest your way out of it. But does this solve the problem? What if it was my son? What if it was either of my sons, how would I react? I would acknowledge this isn't simply a problem for underprivileged. We've…the e-mails I've got were from people in some rather affluent parts of my ward. Fair enough. Those children, unfortunately, have children passed away. But I don't…but they'd write to me about safe supply. This is not about safe supply. This isn't about safe consumption. That is an important debate. The Mayor is right, that debate should happen. It should, however, happen with other levels of government involved. These are major health issues. And I agree with the Mayor again, this should be seen from a healthcare perspective. I voted in favour of the Bruce Oak Recovery Centre. I had long debates with Councillor Gillingham and we did not say, we'll operate it, we'll fund everything. We said, we will be part of this land transfer, but we have a role, but the Provincial Government certainly has a role. This is calling for an exemption simply for this jurisdiction. A) we've never discussed this at the Police Board. B) I would submit to you that if the police chiefs of Canada are in favour of this, they probably don't say, on a hodgepodge basis wherever an individual municipality has made that request. I don't think criminal law is something where you should have different enforcements in different jurisdictions. The Mayor is right again; how would you…how would this work? What if the RM of Stanley wants it and the…Emerson doesn't? What if…you know, if your child…if you feel this will help your child by decriminalizing small amounts, what if they drive to Gimli and they're caught there? And Gimli, the municipality, hasn't got an exemption. What if they go to University of Brandon U and then they're caught there. Brandon doesn't have an exemption. I think the criminal law, however it should be construed, should be construed across the country. The idea that police will save lots of money because we won't have to enforce this; to be honest, it's decriminalized, it's not legalized. The police would still have to do something if they found a person in possession of a small amount. Is it a fine? We don't know, this motion doesn't say. The fine, frankly, I sat through enough hearings at Brandon courthouse when I was lawyering with a machine gun like $50 fine for possession of marijuana. $50 fine, incredibly inefficient, but that was $50 for the…that offense. Would the fine be less than that? Would we be doing the fine? Who would collect the fine? Would the police be doing the fine? None of that is specified. So, the motion does not specify what drugs. The motion does not specify what small amounts are. The motion does say decriminalize, so it would still be illegal, but it doesn't say how we would deal with the ongoing illegality. If I drive over 30 kilometres an hour in a school speed zone, I'm not engaged in a criminal activity, but that behaviour should be stigmatized. I am speeding, there is a regulatory fine I pay. The faster I go, the higher the amount. Is that how this would work? How would poor people pay if we start charging them $500 for possession? A number of important issues. The Mayor is right here, that we need other levels of government to be involved in and to discuss. And if there was ever a national issue, I would think this is one. So, I don't want to denigrate, I don't want to downplay what people have written to me, but this has one mention here in one paragraph talks about all levels of government have a role to play in housing first, safe consumption, safe supply. What I've read about safe supply, the usual indication is, you need medical professionals there to do that. Are we funding that? Is that our role? What is our role then on safe supply? The motion does not call for a debate about safe consumption site or supply. And yet, most of the correspondence and people here are saying, well, if you vote against this, I guess you are saying we can arrest your way out of it. I guess you're saying you don't care about people. No. The Mayor is quite right in saying, there is a major debate to be had here. I agree that there is a healthcare focus, a treatment focus to be had here. What this motion is doing though is simply saying, let's make a request for an exemption from the criminal law within our jurisdiction. And I just don't think that is a comprehensive way to address this problem. If we want to have the debate, let's have that debate. Let's have a debate, though, with the Federal and Provincial Governments as well. So, I mean, we have heard about we need holistic services. I think that was Councillor Chambers. We need wraparound supports. We can't just have trinkets. Well, this motion doesn't call for wraparound supports or holistic services. So, voting against it is not saying, I'm in favour of criminal activity…criminalizing something. That the motion is well intentioned, but I really resist this idea that it is duality. If you are with the Mayor then you are against…you are in favour of criminalization, you're in favour of…you're against the interests of people, you're against...you're saying we can arrest your way out of it. No, no. What we're saying is, there is an important role here for the Federal Government and then Provincial Government to play. If we want to change our approach, then that should be done on a national basis. It surely shouldn't be done on a city by city basis. And what if…what if the next group in Council flips and now suddenly it is fully illegal. If the Federal Government agrees to your request, it's a hodgepodge approach, frankly, that I don't think is workable. So, I think Councillor Rollins has done a lot. Councillor Rollins is a very eloquent spokeswoman trying to put forward this. But the idea that if you vote no, then you're against all the aunties and the people who have children who've passed away. No, I would like to be part of this debate. I think it's a serious thing. I would be very concerned if one of my sons had an addiction, but this isn't solving that problem. How…we are saying, well, there are people who break into shops to get money to pay for their meth addiction. Would making it still illegal, but decriminalizing it, solve that problem? I don't see how that works. If we need more money for treatment, let's have that debate. If we want safe consumption houses, let's have that debate. If we want safe supply with medical

professionals, let's have that debate with other levels of government. But this has one 'whereas' that talks about safe consumption, safe supply and other measures. So, I think this council has come a long way. We've done Scott Oak or…I keep calling it Scott Oak, Bruce Oak Recovery site. We've had a lot of debates about harm reduction. But I don't think this is a concrete action that people are looking for. When they write to me saying, please vote for this because we should have safe supply, this…voting against this isn't saying I oppose that. That is a serious debate, the Mayor's right, it needs to happen. But I don't think this motion without a report, without any debate at the Police Board, without debate at committee is the way to do it. So, I would like to thank the councillors who put it forward, but I do think there is a much broader and more serious debate here than simply asking the CAO to make a request for an exemption for one part of Manitoba under the Controlled Substances Act. I think the Province needs to step up here on a healthcare basis and talk to us. I need a brief extension, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Councillor Mayes: All wards have people who have had addiction problems. All wards have people who have had to deal with this as siblings, as parents, as children. Some wards, certainly, much more problems I think in terms of the crime or of the repercussions. But I don't think this is going to solve some of those problems. And therefore, as the Mayor said, at this time, I am not voting in favour. And I look forward to a bigger, more comprehensive debate that involves the other levels of government.

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

Councillor Santos: Thank you. Can you hear me okay, Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we can.

Councillor Santos: Okay, just going to keep it really high level here and keep my comments pretty short. Decriminalizing the personal possession of drugs is, you know, part of a much larder…larger (inaudible) re-entry…re-entry…orientation, I'm going to say sorry, of policy towards health-led approach. Possessing drugs for personal use is instead treated as an administrative offense meaning, you know, it no longer is punishable by imprisonment and does not result in a criminal record and associated with the certain stigma that comes with it today. Drugs are, however, should still be confiscated and possession may result in administrative penalties such as fines or even, you know, community service within the city of Winnipeg. The decriminalization of personal possession is only part of a larger, broader health-centred drug policy reform that should involve an increased focus on harm reduction and treatment provisions. So, by accepting the reality of drug use rather than eternally hoping that it will just disappear as a result of a repressive legislation, a reform where we can allow drugs to be treated as a health issue rather than a criminal justice issue. So, when we move away from criminalizing and imprisoning people who are using drugs, has led to a dramatic change in the profile of prison population. I think one of the greatest examples that I can think of today is that we have seen this as actually true is Portugal. Their laws, they've removed the incarceration, but people caught possessing or using illicit drugs may be penalized by panels made up of social workers, medical professions and drug experts. And what they do with these panels, is they can refer people to drug treatment programs, they hand out fines or impose, like I said, community services. A lot of these benefits over the years from Portugal's policy shifts have come not from decriminalization, per se, but an expansion of substance use disorder treatments. And that is something that I am very supportive of. It is a very progressive policy. And I would…I wholeheartedly support us going and moving in that direction because I think it would be very, very tangible for…for all of us. So, I want to thank Councillor Rollins and Councillor Chambers for starting the conversation. And I'm supporting the motion today and look forward to learning more how we can support this policy. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Santos. Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Orlikow and then we'll come back to you, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Lots of…lots of really, really good perspectives and valuable information put on the record today. Lots of perspectives. I want to thank all the residents and organizations that have reached out to me on this very, very important issue. I want to thank Councillor Rollins and Councillor Chambers for your ongoing effort to push these critical issues to the forefront. Thank you, Councillor Rollins, you are, you know, really pushing the box and that is what we are here to do at city hall is to…is to stretch and push the box. In my opportunity to speak, I'm not going to debate the value of decriminalizing personal possession. I won't be supporting this motion today, primarily because it is a healthcare issue, public health issue. And this is not one of primary services that the City of Winnipeg delivers. Absolutely, for sure, the Province must take the lead on this. Without a doubt, the City can support and play a role. And we know…we all…I think we all know the status quo is not acceptable, but this is not a municipal issue that the City should be leading on. Like Bill 64, like the motion related to the supervised consumption sites, today's motion is an issue that the City, in my opinion, should not and…be the lead in. For those reasons, I won't be supporting the motion, but I really encourage residents and organizations to aggressively lobby the level of government and governments that do

lead on this issue. And you know, we need…we need to see change. We need to see some dramatic change. We are the front line. The City is the front line on a lot of issues that aren't necessarily City issues, but when we have the opportunity to make a decision, I am making the decision and won't be supporting today's motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you, Madam Speaker. There is one issue, I think, in the city of Winnipeg that is one of our biggest issues, and that is our drug epidemic. And to sit here today to not support this motion, I do support the idea of moving it to committee so we could have more of a robust conversation, and I know there's people who just don't support it at all. Councillor Browaty was very clear and I appreciate that. I do know, though, that the process that we are doing now is not working. I do know this is a healthcare issue. Yes, it is a healthcare issue. We don't have all of the supports around us. We don't have the money around to do all these centres. But what we do…can say to the Provincial Government, as we the City…and this is where we have a role to play. So, I don't necessarily agree with everybody who's saying, this is healthcare matter, we should be hands off because we, the City of Winnipeg, are asking. This is such an important issue for us, the City of Winnipeg. This issue, I say, is our number one issue that we need to be dealing with in the city of Winnipeg. It is driving people to be scared to walk down the streets. We're having human suffering going on that's…anybody whose driven around the city of Winnipeg and can actually hold their head up high and feel proud of our city, I know, you must have tinted windows on. The human despair that's happening on our streets is something that even I tear every time I see it. So, we can sit here today and say, we need to have a holistic plan all mapped out with costing and stuff like that. Sure, we can do that. That's called just kill it by slow design. We don't have time for slow death on this one. People are dying quickly and they are going to continue to die very quickly. So, what this motion is asking us to do is just ask the CAO to get the permission. That's what we're asking for. Yes, and I really do appreciate the fact, was hoping we had the referral, but that lost. That's fine. That we'll have to have more discussions on how it's going to be done with the Province and the Federal Government. But this motion today says to the Province if it is…whatever government is in power, that we as the City of Winnipeg are taking a position that we understand that this is one of our major issues that we have in the city. We need to find a different way to deal with this issue, and we need to work with you and the Federal Government on how we're going to do this. So, that's…what the motion today is asking for is to ask permission that we could. Doesn't say anything else other than that in that. We are going to have to carry on that conversation. But to sit here and say, well, I know…we need to have more discussion around every line on the pathway and exactly how it's being mapped out and all of the other services and we'll wait for all that to come to play, some of us have made…that is what you believe in, that's totally fine. I do not believe that. We have to move this forward. We have done a little bit. We talk about the Bruce Oak Foundation, that was nice. Again, we are way behind. We still need many, many more of those around the city in different formats. We need to be moving on many different planes and many levels because the issue is so dire in the city Winnipeg. It is actually holding back Winnipeg's growth. It's actually holding back family's growth. People are dying. It is not going got get any better. So, we can continue the same path that we've been doing so far, or we can recognize that the City of Winnipeg, we are willing…and that's what this motion is saying, we are willing to look at a different path, something that maybe we actually can get out of this downward spiral that we're in. So, again, I do believe…I think this motion really should have gone through a different format. Councillors have a right to do how they want to do. That's why I went for the referral so we could actually sit down as a group and talk about it and have the administration have their feedback. That would have been wonderful. But if my choice today is to say, we think that the path we are on is great or I will look at this when we have all the other pieces of the puzzle in together; well, that is not my position. My position is, we have to keep moving this file forward. it really is, to me, one of the biggest issues that we have in the city of Winnipeg right now. So, yes, I don't know all of the details about how this would be unfolding. I wish I did. But again, that can come at a later point. Right now, all we are asking is, the Federal Government, would you be willing to give us the exemption so we could at least explore this idea in more detail. That is what I see…that's what I read in here. Other people may want to counter that and say that, no, this is opening up the flood gates of doom and gloom. Sure, whatever you believe. What I believe, is this is asking for the exemption. Now we can go to the Province say, we, the City of Winnipeg, this is what we believe as a Council. This is how we see that we can get ourselves from out of this, add one piece of the puzzle only. There's still many, many more things that we have to do. But if we're going to say, well, this is a healthcare matter, we are not going to get…we're not going to touch it. Well, again people, as we know, we tried that route in the past. We know that it's just not working. We have the Bruce Oak Foundation, funded millions of dollars by the City of Winnipeg. We all voted for that, but that's a healthcare issue. We voted for many healthcare issues. And I am very proud of this council for doing that. Again, I know our budgets are stretched. But even in here, we are not saying how much we are going to be spending money. We are just asking for the permission to have the authority. And I think it's a strong message to the Province, whichever government is in play, that the City of Winnipeg is taking this matter super seriously. We need to find a new path, because the path we are working now is just killing people. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Schreyer, followed by Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, I am torn on this. Not on the intent of motion in terms of what we are trying to do with…you know, in terms of not passing the buck and taking on our obligations. I tend to see it in

terms of the way that Mayor Bowman, Shawn Nason, Brian Mayes do. There's no point trying to get away with this. Are we prepared to deal with this right now and how does this help? I am really torn on this, but I think what put me over on this one is Councillor Orlikow. He made the point that this does not do anything other than begin a greater conversation. I am not here to pass the buck on this issue, but I do have a few things to say, because this is incomplete. I have got a severe problem with taking the cheap and easy route on these big issues. If we got homelessness, build a few houses, a few, just a few. Measuring dozens and then put out a lot of press releases. That is cheap and easy in the sense that housing construction is so expensive right now. It is bizarre more it costs to build an…over a quarter million dollars to build affordable housing. But we don't do a lot of…put a lot of money into it. So, it's the cheap and easy…looks good. Safe injection sites. I voted for it. But having said that, I know that is completely incomplete. It is the cheap thing to do, so it's easy in that respect. Changing the laws here, I think would be part of the cheap and easy part of our real challenges that we have to deal with, but that doesn't mean it is wrong. But having said that, I really…what the conversation we've had in this council chamber today is the conversation. We're…and you can't ignore anybody's comments. Nobody's. But you know, there is a certain different comments I hear here; well, why don't we apply these? Councillor…the Mayor said something that was…if we do go along this, I don't want to…I can't exactly quote him, but I'm paraphrasing. If…he said if we do go along this route, we will need more long-term care units. Well, we need more long-term care units whether we do this or not. That's where it gets…that's where it's difficult because that costs money. That's real money. But you say…you know, Councillor Orlikow said, you know, our budgets are stretched. Well, yeah, they are. Except, magically…and you tell me why it is not magic. I know it is not magic. You tell me why it's not magic. Magically, our budgets are never stretched when it comes to the government paid construction contracts. They have put our budgets and our sustainability of our…of the next decade in such jeopardy, so out of whack, that when it comes to what we call the great…biggest…one of the greatest challenges of our society, what we're dealing with today, what we are willing to consider today, we didn't do 10, 20, 30 years ago. That is how big this issue is. We are willing to change our laws over something that we consider…now, no one of us take this…take this very easily, right? This is a serious issue. It is such a big issue, but we don't put any money into it. So, that is our society for you. That is our city of Winnipeg. You know, I know our budgets are stretched at the seam. I've been saying it since I'm elected, but we don't want to do anything about it. So, we always talk about, oh, we can't spend money. How about trying to save money where we spend the most? How about trying to see if we can save money where we've put the greatest increase to amounts people don't even realize, they wouldn't believe it. Well, every time I tell people, they can't believe it. They realize I'm not wrong. So, don't think I changed the subject here. The easy stuff is when you just pass the by-laws that don't count…that don't cost a lot of money. But if we are doing all this because it's such a big issue, why aren't we putting our money where our mouth is? Because it is already gone. Our tax increases over the last generation go…in particular, to one thing. It is not parks and rec, okay. It is not our parks. It is not even our streets because the inflation rate for street renewal is greater than our increases often, right? So, we are not really increasing our budget for…in terms of any greater value because the construction industry has become so inefficient. You can't say I am changing the subject unless you say Councillor Orlikow shouldn't have said our budgets are stretched. That is what I am talking about. And I'm going to say this, to do all this stuff without putting the same commensurate care and concern that we can as a government, as a society into what the Mayor's talked about; treatment including long-term treatment, we're…it is important we do this stuff for stigma, Councillor Eadie made the point. You know, you get through this. But now, you know, you have gone to jail for it or you have been convicted. Now what does that mean for your ability to take care of yourself for the future; to pay your taxes, to take care of your family? Right? And that's gigantic when it comes to the stigma, identity and it…believe me, we know, it changes people and their ability to do what they have got to do. Does that mean Councillor Browaty's argument is what; selfish? Superficial? No, not at all. It isn't. This thing is gigantic. And remember, we've never dealt with this before like we are now just at a time when our budgets are so stretched and we don't want to talk about why. It is amazing. I have heard a lot of good things today. But if we can apply them to actually having a sensible budget so we can do the things that we say are so important. We are willing to revolutionize drug law, but not do anything substantial and real for long-term treatment. And you can't really say you are dealing with one without really dealing with the other because it's the same issue. Now, of course, you can have one without the other, but if we're taking these issues seriously, why would you…why would you vote for one and not the other? And I sympathize for Councillor Browaty in the sense. Not just him. He represents a certain point of view. Well, why are we having both of these? You encourage this stuff and yeah, then you need, you know, more treatment spaces. I don't think it's as simple as that, but I…but having said that, you know, this is proof of a general sort of point of view. You might have your values, your social values, like we are talking about today, but if you don't back them up with an economic accounting of why you can't do what you say, you have got a problem in your society. That is exactly where we're at. We don't tell people why we don't have the budget. Our budgets are stretched. Councillor Orlikow just said so and he is running for mayor. And he had just said on this issue here, today, and he is voting for this. Our budgets are stretched. Why would he make such a comment? That's proof. I am not leaving this issue alone. Our budget, our economy? And yet, we don't want to talk about why. Let's talk about why. Let's talk about why. Our construction…our construction contracts paid by this government…paid by our government, have gone up 10 times higher than peoples wages and salaries that pay for those projects with their taxes, 10 times higher in just 30 years. More than that.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Rollins moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Councillor Schreyer: So, I don't get it. These issues are really important. Man, we've talked today about things today we've never discussed in this council chamber before. It's pretty big, isn't it? But what we are getting from our Deputy Mayor, is our budgets are stretched. He's right, it's true. Let's get on with it. Think we're going to solve our social problems just with social…just with…we think we're going to solve our social problems just with social by-laws? Who's kidding whom? You know, we have got challenges. Humanity always shows what challenges we can take on when we really want to and really need to, and we are not trying. And I do believe that there's got commensurate with these by-laws. There's got to be commensurate consideration for long-term treatment. And we…and I'm…I don't want to hear, oh look, we do this, well look. I know that. Look, we do this, we look, we do that. We don't do enough. And I am not saying it's…it's just one of many issues. I'm not pretending it's the one and only long-term treatment spaces, those space are precious and it is expensive. But believe me, the people and the specialists you pay to run these places and to care for people, those precious people that help people, the inflation rate for their wages and salaries in the last 30 years is nothing compared to what taxpayers have had to increase…had to go through in terms of tax increases to pay for construction contracts. Now, let's be specific; the people that will work in long-term care facilities, treatment facilities, their wages and salaries have gone up by one tenth of the construction contracts. So, when you want to look for efficiencies and where your money should go and your bang for your buck, bear that in mind. Because we, as elected representatives, we, as a City Council including administration, cannot make rational decisions without including that. Megwich.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a very important debate today. This issue…this item matters to Council and I think it has mattered to Council for a long time. And even though today we are on different…a few different sides of the debate, I think there's certainly agreement that this is very important. And I think Council has acted in the past and is acting presently as well through our budgets. Several councillors raised the fact that over the last few years…within the last few years, we have assisted in the establishment of the Bruce Oak Recovery Centre. We provide funding through our budget to Main Street Project, St. Boniface Street Links and other organizations that provide services to those that struggle with addiction in our community. Services that many Winnipeggers rely upon and access on a daily basis because they are caught in the chains of addiction. And so, this item really, really does matter to each one of us. You know, one of our councillor colleagues talked about the need to find a new path and I don't disagree with that. I think we do need to find a better path for our city because what we…the decisions we make today around this matter and other matters are going to shape our city for the future. My concern though and the reason I won't be supporting this report and this motion is that I am not convinced at this point that allowing possession of small amounts of illegal substances is a better path. I am not convinced that it is a better path for the people who right now are struggling with addiction. I am not convinced that it sets our city up for the kind of future that we envision. I think more needs to be understood. More needs to be studied by this council and more information needs to be provided to this council before we make a decision such as this. But I think, ultimately, I am in agreement with several…several councillor colleagues who have noted that, really, at the end of the day, this is primarily a matter of health. And the Province of Manitoba, the Health Ministry of Manitoba, really needs to be a leading voice and take a lead role in this file. There needs to be the supports in place where there's adequate number…sufficient number of detox places and then long-term treatment places and all the other supports that are required. Because all of the supports that are ultimately required to break the bonds of addiction, are beyond the capacity of the City of Winnipeg and the roles that we fulfill. And so, I believe we need to be partners with the provincial and federal governments and not-for-profit agencies that provide the services to those struggling with addiction. And I believe, in many ways, we are partners. Does more need to be done? Yes, I believe more needs to be done and stronger partnerships need to be forged specifically to the issue of addiction and assisting people in Winnipeg that struggle with addictions, assisting them to be set free from the chains of addiction. But I really believe that this is…as I said, this is a work that the provincial and somewhat federal governments need to play a key role in. And we…and we need to play our part, too. But I am not convinced at this point that the goal of this motion will get us to where we need to be as a city. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any further speakers? Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you to all my colleagues for your comments today. I think the one thing we have learned is that everyone does have varying opinions on this matter, but the opinions that we share are that we do have to find a way to address this. And it's no secret that we need a better way. And it is no secret that a harm reduction solution is already underway in the nation. Discussions are already happening. And harm reduction needs to have supports and beds to help residents. At the moment, they need it. At the moment, they are ready for it. I would invite some of my colleagues to research the simple…the number of simple possession charges that were laid in Winnipeg in 2021. I think you will find it is very low. It is relatively low considering the problems that we have in our city. But police officers are not interested in simple possession charges. They are trying to get to the dealers. They are trying to address those that put people in harms way. Those that would sell narcotics on our streets. Get them off the streets. That is what sometimes they will use simple possession for, gang members. To try and get to the bigger picture: the dealers. To try and stop it before it gets to this city. I will note that our one member of the Police Board mentioned they hadn't discussed it. We didn't hear that from the other member of the Police Board. But law enforcement should be a part of this discussion

given the fact that police chiefs across Canada are advocating for a better way. They are talking about a better way. But again, a better way, as we have all said in our own statements, requires support, real support. That is funding. That is services. Those are supports the City of Winnipeg cannot afford or is not under the jurisdiction of the municipal government. I will acknowledge it seems like it was days ago, but when the Mayor spoke about the Illicit Drug Taskforce and the work that is being done. That is exactly what we wanted to see; conversations with the Province, talking to those that are in a position to facilitate change, to enact support services throughout the province. I would ask my colleagues today to look at what we can do within our jurisdiction to help make a difference. We need to support the other levels of government that are doing their work and push them to have the supports in place before anything happens. You can't simply decriminalize drugs and not have supports in place. That is not my quote. That quote comes from a former police chief of the City of Winnipeg. It comes from police chiefs serving in other jurisdictions and two former crown attorneys who know we need to have support for our residents. This motion today has certainly touched a lot of us. It has brought out the fact of it is a political item. But it is one of those items that we have to not politicize. We have to do what is right for our residents. We can take actions today to help save lives that are within our jurisdiction. We can offer TIFF programs to centres so that we attract more of them to Winnipeg. We could sell land at a discounted rate to centres so more of them open in Winnipeg. We could work with the Provincial Government to see more centres on Winnipeg land not being used as long as they do their part and the Federal Government does their part. The Mayor has a strategy. They've talked about the Illicit Drug Strategy. The strategy, as I understand it, it's to talk to the other levels of government and ensure that we have the supports in place because to me, that is what's most important. It is not important to me what side of the fence you are on. It is about saving lives. And I will note, some of my colleagues didn't see the benefit of decriminalization of some drugs. Some say that there is. But the reality of what we know when you look at other jurisdictions, is we don't have the supports, you are not going to help anyone. And this motion does not help anyone. It is not offering any support to any member of our city. This level of government has a jurisdiction. We are in a position to help in other ways. We could have Narcan nasal spray. Very easy to use on city transit. We could have it in civic buildings. We could have videos online how to use it. That saves lives. That is what we should be doing. We should be the leaders pushing for a way to save lives to do what we can do within our jurisdiction. And then do…let the Mayor do what he is doing by pushing the Provincial Government and the Federal Government to take the appropriate action to put services in place. We can't do it for them. They need to do their job and we need to do ours. I can't support this motion today because it doesn't go far enough. It doesn't offer any supports to any individual that would be facing the most challenging and difficult time of their life. We need to be able to talk to that person and say, we are here to help. This motion doesn't say we are here to help you. This motion doesn't say we have support for you. This motion doesn't say we are going to care for you while you get through this. I can't support the motion today for those reasons. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Any further speakers? Seeing none, we will close first. Councillor Rollins to close.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you to all of my colleagues for this discussion. This is what I know to be true: the problem is that people who use drugs in marginalized communities are in the middle of the crosshairs of our politics and our governments, Madam Speaker. I absolutely agree with those, weary, that we need supports in place. And I want to state that for the record. I believe this is very critical, but I also believe in something called concurrent work. Work the Province needs to do, for sure, but work we need to do with the Federal Government. It's important sometimes to be a first mover in relationships with other levels of government because that's what people rely on us to do. In this case, I worry, Madam Speaker, no one is coming to help Winnipeg unless we stick our hand up. Municipal services, like police, fire, paramedic services are over burdened to due failures of government including, perhaps, our own. As Chair of Protection, I see the calls for service go up and up and up, 100% more, 100% more, 100% more due to the drug poisoning crisis. I want to back up my chiefs. That's my job as Chair of Protection, to back up the chiefs. Councillor Schreyer's analogy of construction inflation, well, this issue is just as big in terms of inflationary problems that we can tackle. But I'm not a politician, Madam Speaker, that needs some other government to be a first mover, especially if there's an absence of work by other levels of government. Sometimes you have to tell politicians how to treat you. And I don't wait for them to be perfect, like waiting for a prime minister who is on the record, by the way, of his support for supervised consumption sites and has chosen a path where he's respectful of municipalities and gets his Minister of Health to set forward a path that is, by the way, not a flick of a switch that's been described today on decriminalization. No, no, no. It's a methodical, slow moving process, and if your concern is more debate with other levels of government, this is that process. If it's genuinely an issue, Madam Speaker, and many of the speakers today have felt that there is a need for more deliberative stepping back with other levels of government. This is it. This is a deliberative examination with a federal government partner. Without putting your hand up first, though, without this vote today, that work with the Federal Government won't happen. And if it is continued work and more robust conceptions of the work we need, guess what? It can happen after the vote today. And many of the things, barring a few, many of the speakers wished for something more and better, and guess what? This gets us there. It gets us into a very deliberative design. What better than as a city to stick our hand up and say to the Federal Government, with, yes, acknowledged bigger pockets than us, to come together with us because we are in a drug poisoning crisis. We really need a robust debate, and it's only more from here. If you do want something more and different and better, change your path today, engage in this work. The consensus today is that it's everyone's heart desire. The path forward for Edmonton, slow. Vancouver's not done yet. Montreal, slow. If our vote is

here today, no, it's not a flick of a switch, it's actually more discussion, more people with community, and community has written you exactly about that; slowing down, that deliberative process with the Federal Government. They're supporting us to have it, and it's exactly what members of Council have said is missing, Madam Speaker. There will be other motions. We've already done a lot in terms of sharing data that is supporting people. I'm glad there was a withdrawal of the amending motion. Why? Many departments are purchasing naloxone. And Madam Speaker, I would have assumed that the former chair of Winnipeg Police Service because they…they are the department in the City of Winnipeg that have purchased nasal naloxone, that they would know that. But so, there are other things we are doing as a city, rest assured, to care. This motion does do that. It answers a call of those that care. It really answers the key call, and they've written to Council about it. Again, the problem is that people who use drugs in marginalized communities are in the middle of cross hairs of our politics and jurisdictional squabbles. This is the act, though, to be in conversation with the Federal Government, something the majority of people recognize is the basis of this motion, and that's why it deserves the support. And if I may, I'll yield my next few minutes to Councillor Chambers.

Madam Speaker: Rollins, I just want to check that with the chair. I haven't…I'm not sure about that. Is that in order? Yeah. Were we on an extension now? No. Okay, Councillor Chambers, the remaining time.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Councillor Rollins or Chair Rollins, for your comments. And again, you know, what I've been hearing around the council chambers is that it is health...health issues are a provincial jurisdiction, but they are having an impact on our municipal resources; our fire, paramedics, police. Those first responders are dealing with this. Our 911 call operators are dealing with this on a daily basis. It is having an impact on municipal resources. That's not the reason why we're doing this, it's part of the reason, but we need to have a better outcome for these individuals that are utilizing these illicit drugs as a coping mechanism for their daily ills. We need to have a better way of responding to this because quite frankly, the current status quo is not working. So, if we think outside the box, Madam Speaker, if we look at the direction that other cities have taken, other research has provided, other data has indicated, that we need to look at this from a medical health perspective as opposed to a criminal justice perspective. I'm certain it will provide better outcomes for individuals who do want to get off these drugs and turn their lives around. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, call the vote. There's call for a recorded vote. All in favour of the motion as presented, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Chambers, Eadie, Gilroy, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos and Schreyer

Nays

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

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

Madam Speaker: It's a tie vote. Motion is lost. Okay. Next is the notice of motion from our...also from our January Council meeting. And it's moved for…from Mayor Bowman and seconded by Councillor Rollins, regards to the mask requirements in this council chamber. Mr. Mayor.

Item 2 - Mandatory Mask Requirements in the Council Chamber and Committee Rooms

Moved by His Worship Mayor Bowman,
Seconded by Councillor Rollins,

WHEREAS Winnipeg continues to face a global COVID-19 Pandemic and its challenges, such as the increased transmissibility of the Omicron variant;

AND WHEREAS the Chief Administrative Officer has advised the Public Service to avoid in-person meetings, but that where in-person meetings must occur, much like Council and Committee meetings, they are to remain masked for the duration of the meetings aside from actively drinking or eating;

AND WHEREAS consistent with that direction, City Clerks and those appearing in delegation have been advised to follow this same process;

AND WHEREAS direction has been consistent from health officials that wearing a mask, watching distance, limiting your contacts and getting vaccinated are fundamentals in keeping ourselves and one another safe.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a mask requirement while participating in meetings in the Council Chamber and Committee Rooms for all employees and elected officials be observed.

Mayor Bowman: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a fairly straightforward motion. I want to thank Councillor Rollins for seconding this last month. It resolves that the mask requirement while participating in meetings of…in the council chamber and committee rooms for all employees and elected officials be observed. Madam Speaker, a couple of reasons for supporting this. One, as our CAO has advised members of Council as well as publicly communicated, when we expect the provincial public health orders to be amended, effective March 15th, and as we expect the provincial public health orders to be amended in a way that will not require the wearing of masks in indoor spaces, under at least the provincial public health orders, our Public Service is going to be requiring all members of the Public Service and all of our employees to continue wearing masks in the foreseeable future. And so, this is really to be consistent with that approach, to have us lead by example. It's…you know, unlike many of our employees who work, you know, long hours every single day, we're only in this council chamber for…at least the formal Council meeting, once a month. And so, it's not my favourite thing to have to wear is a mask, but if it's one way in which I can demonstrate respect to my colleagues' and just try to, you know, think about everybody's safety while I'm in this place, I think it's one small way in which we can mitigate some risk for now at least. I know that the mask requirement under the provincial public health orders is not extending to…and will not be extended to those entering spaces in provincial facilities and, by extension, is not anticipated to be extended to those visitors entering our spaces as well. And I do want to acknowledge that because I expect some of my council colleagues to raise that. The primary reason that we will, as a municipality, be expected to follow the provincial public health orders in that respect relate to enforcement. I don't envision enforcement issues with members of Council. We do get pretty rancorous sometimes, but I'm sure if we do vote to have this imposition on ourselves, I don't have similar concerns about the ability for us to respect those rules. The other thing I note is, given what the…what the Public Service is planning to do post March 15th, we can expect our Clerks who are here right now and observing wearing masks, to continue wearing masks. I think it would be a bit odd for our Clerks to be continuing to wear masks and for members of Council not to wear masks. So, I'm hopeful that members of Council can support this. I'm not expecting it to be unanimous, of course, but I'm hopeful that we can support this and...and move forward and then reassess going forward. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to let my colleagues know that I won't be actually supporting the motion. And I understand the CAO has responsibility for workplace safety and health and various responsibilities under the Charter, Madam Speaker, although it is overseen by the H…human resource committee, which happens to be the Executive Policy Committee, Madam Speaker. But I don't want to get controversial here, but you know...and I'm not going to, actually. My issue with masks is, I tried following the Mayor's lead by wearing my mask at all times, even while I sit in front of my computer, Madam Speaker. I don't really see the value in not being able to take off your masks except for when you're going to be taking a sip of a coffee, but you're still sitting there. And I, myself, with my sunglasses on and my headphones on and my mask on while I sit here, not exposing anybody to my breath, it just behooves me. And for the whole day, I'm the one sitting in front of this computer, nobody else, Madam Speaker. You will note, though, that today I have been practicing good social distancing. And I see…you know, the provincial orders are going to change, but I still see no reason not to practice some social distancing requirements, washing my hands constantly, so on and so forth. Even in flu season, I should respect...I don't want to pass on any sickness to my colleagues that isn't death threatening but still can be very uncomfortable. But Madam Speaker, I really don't see a need to actually put this in place. It's one thing for the CAO to talk about workplace, but I don't even think the Clerks in this chamber should have to sit there and wear their masks the whole time unless they're going to take a sip of water or whatever and then still speak with the mask on, Madam Speaker. And you'll note, I'm not speaking with my mask today, but you'll note…I always try to remember, I had people bringing me a piece of paper to sign, I'll put my mask on because somebody's getting close and I don't…if I have something, I don't want to spread it. So Madam Speaker, my problem is, is how you're saying we should use masks. I think that I am doing it in an appropriate fashion. I won't be supporting it. Things are lifting. And I just don't see the need right now to actually put this in place. But you know, I expect everybody to follow good practice, though, because COVID still hasn't gone away. It's still around. So, and I'm sure all of you, everybody in this chamber, we all want to lead by example, and so we do that. Actually, you know, in Japan, where you've got millions of people so close together, there's lots of people who wear masks. Part of it's because of pollution, Madam Speaker, but a lot of them understand that when you've got a lot of human beings in close all the time and stuff, sometimes it's good to wear a mask to prevent spread. So, I don't know why people have such a perspective of not wanting to wear masks, but...anyway, anti-masks. We're not debating that here today, though, we're debating what the practice should be in the chamber and in this committee rooms. And again, frankly, I don't want to be wearing a mask when I'm sitting in front of my computer in my space. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, we've got a bunch of motions here today. I believe some colleagues are planning to try to spin the rules to hear something that's already been passed at community committee. This could have been suspended last month and debated if it was an emergent situation. To put it on the record, to bring it this month, now that we know that these things are, you know, provincially are ending, putting us in a position where we're…we know better than the Province of Manitoba, we're going to set the example. We want people to come back downtown, go to our restaurants, go to our bars, go to our hockey games, but yet, here we are in this chamber. I'm in the back row. I've got a great colleague beside me. But you know, we're wearing masks. We've got...between colleagues in front of me, we've got probably 18 feet. It's been that way for a long while. I was probably the first member of Council to get vaccinated. I've now had it vaccinated two more times, so I'm three times vaccinated, probably will get a fourth. I hate wearing masks, but I do do it when I'm not able to separate. We know that that's been the profession, that it protects us, along with other measures, but I think I, like many people, are over it. I'm comfortable with the three vaccinations. You know, if it comes time that, you know, I do get COVID, I do hope that myself and my family don't suffer greatly from it. I know others that may be more afraid of it. If they are, you know, you can work remotely, but I think it's time that we show leadership and come together around this table at Council as one and not back row, front row, remote. I think that shows signs that we're moving forward through COVID-19, Madam Speaker. And I won't be supporting this today.
Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting, perhaps for different reasons than what others have said. I want to thank my friend, Zach Fleischer, for pointing out something to me yesterday, which was, decision was made by City staff, not by us, but delegated authority to City staff to unwind various provisions related to COVID-19, one of which was that we will no longer have a mask mandate on city transit. And I just can't support a motion that starts with, "That we continue to face a global pandemic and its challenges such as the increased transmissibility", so we've got to be very careful here in this council chamber. Although, it appears not for people coming in to speak, just these…you know, the staff and us. That if we're concerned about a global pandemic and its challenges, such as the increased transmissibility, that we also, at the same time, would authorize ending a mask mandate on transit, which has tens of thousands of people packed in, some lacking in means. I just find that discrepancy too great. I mean, this just starts to look, frankly, a bit like theatre if we're going to go ahead and not question our staff's decision on the transit. Councillor Nason also makes a good point, somewhat separate, but a good point, which is, I think we have throughout this followed the Province's guidance. When people have pressured us, we've said, look, we're following the health care professionals from the Province. So, I'm a little concerned that we would suddenly deviate from that at the end. But at least if we're going to ask for some sort of continued mask mandate in this room, why on earth would we take that off for everyone but our own staff on city transit. I just can't see the two being reconciled. So, I will oppose this today, and perhaps we'll come back in a month's time and debate where we're going on transit.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I would like to acknowledge the comments made by both Councillor Mayes and Councillor Nason. I understand the reasoning why the Mayor would put the motion forward, and I don't want to get into the politics of this item. I think for the last two years, we've seen division in our country, our province, and our city and among neighbours at a greater magnitude than we have ever seen in our country. There's people taking sides. There's been protests. There's…there has been many, many steps backwards when you look at Canada in that sense. And I am not going to support this motion because I don't want to see anymore division. I think we need to change our focus from the pandemic. Numbers are lowering every day in the hospital, they're lowering in the ICU. We have over 80% of the people in our province vaccinated. That's the herd number we were looking for. I think we need to focus on healing the division that has happened, and I think we need to focus on relaunching our economy, letting people know that we're through this now, we're on our way out, we're taking our time, we're doing it reasonably, we're doing it cautiously, but we're…we can see the light at the end of the tunnel. Let's get back to business. We need to relaunch or local economy. I don't want to be sending mixed messages about transit and what happens within the walls of city hall as well, as Councillor Mayes so correctly spoke to. So, I would ask today that we don't support this motion but we support our friends, colleagues, and residents that choose to wear a mask if they so choose. If that's what they choose, we support that. We don't bully people, we don't start making comments about it. We get rid of the division, and we celebrate the fact that they can make that choice. But here, I don't think mandating the use of masks when we're eliminating it all throughout the city and I can sit in a restaurant with my friends and have a conversation without a mask. Here, we are, as earlier eluded to, socially distanced. We are adhering to many of the rules, if not all of them, and in some cases, we go above and beyond. So, let's eliminate the negative that we have all had to live through of the pandemic and let's start focusing on the positives of getting back to our new normal of moving forward with our economy, getting people back out downtown, getting people on…back on our buses, and getting that revenue back in the city that we so desperately need. So, I don't begrudge the motion, I understand it, I just…I don't support it. I would rather we support a healing approach and moving business forward, and really, let's get going into the next chapter of our lives.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Really good points. I don't...at the time that this was written, we hadn't...you know, we hadn't heard about transit, and I'm concerned about transit, actually, but this was written before that news, and the news is still kind of still coming out and evolving. But in considering lessons learned of the only other global pandemic that I've lived through, Madam Speaker, which was SARS in Toronto, I've been reading the reports from that time to just really look at Justice Archie Campbell's report, for instance, on the SARS commission, to really comb it for lessons learned. Sounds a little nerdy. I haven't had, you know, so much time to do that lately, but really, I'm back at it. But in considering the lessons learned, one of the things that stood out for…to me from those reports was the precautionary principles, the deliberative action to reduce risks, and I believe that that's what this motion is. I'm worried about staff, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure I think it's the safest path for buses or, for instance, staff in library to be receiving residents back into the library that are not wearing masks, Madam Speaker. I do think we can't prejudge health issues that people have that makes omicron and any variant that comes later, you know, more difficult. We haven't played out the endemic. We've barely stepped into the endemic stage. So, I'm a cautionary person, I believe in those principles, but looking at the SARS lessons learned, you know, that breaking down a turf barriers is the lesson, the safety culture is a lesson, and the precautions. And I believe that's what this motion is and that's why I support it, Madam Speaker.
Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Again, I think this was a very well-intended motion. At the time, when it came forward at the height of omicron, it was particularly relevant. Again, if you look at the public health orders, you know, for all employees, there are exceptions like…subsections 1 and 2 basically requiring masks or asking people to wear their masks do not apply to employer or agent of the operator of the indoor public place while the employer or agent is A) in an area of a public place to which members of the public do not normally have access. I mean, people off the street can't walk right in front of us here on council chamber floor. We are physically distanced. I think the risks and that are quite low of being in this chamber without a mask on. So, again, I'm going to vote against this today. Nothing against the original intentions. You know, Councillor Lukes and I were privy yesterday to information, the…we're on…the City's reps on the RBC Convention Centre Board, for example. Their decision is, for the foreseeable future, their staff will be wearing masks just for that comfort level. I assume many residents…many restaurants and many services will make those decisions even if it's not legally required. So again, if I go out and see a member of the public, I'll wear a mask. If I'm going to go meet a constituent, you know, if we're going to meet for coffee or something, I'll say, is it okay if we sit each other, take my mask off. You have those blight discussions ahead of time. And that will continue, I think, for the foreseeable future So, again, well intended, I'm going to vote against it today. Thank you.

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

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. So, we followed…the City's followed (inaudible) work. We followed public health orders to the letters since the pandemic started. The Mayor has re-iterated time and time and time again, the City's following public health orders. I see no reason why we would change what we've been doing since the start of the pandemic. Whether it's the truckers or the premier or the rest of the world, there's a feeling that the pandemic has come to a point where, now, masks aren't going to be mandatory. You know, in the south end here, in south end of Winnipeg, people have been wearing masks for years. It's choice. I think it's reached the point where it's a choice. You want to wear a pink shirt or a blue shirt, you want to wear a mask or not. You know, I'm going to relate it back to public health orders, I won't be supporting this motion, but thanks for bringing it forward.

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

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I think, similar to what a couple of colleagues have said, including Councillor Browaty, I think the timing when this first motion…the motion first came forward, I think we were in a different…different place. I won't be supporting the motion today. I do think, you know, people certainly have the ongoing choice and option to wear a mask as long as they want. If that is something they want to do, and it's comforting to them, and I certainly support that. But I think any time...I think any time we as a City go beyond what the Province is mandating specific to this, because as Councillor Lukes just said, we have been consistently following provincial health orders; any time we step beyond that, I wonder if we don't open ourselves up for conflict and people to challenge that. I think we need to be aware of that. As others have…as several of us have talked about over the last several days, weeks even, through e-mails and correspondence and discussion, I think a lot of us are on the same page: we really want to see our economy open up again. We really want to see, in fact, the City lead in voicing our plan to have workers come back to the workplace and to make that public. We want to be able to stand up and encourage other companies who have business in the downtown and who have offices in the downtown, to bring their employees back to their offices downtown and to bring people back in to the workplace. And I think it's important that we as an employer, be able to lead that, have to show the way, explain how we're doing that to the public so that we can encourage others and fairly call upon other businesses that have companies, especially in the downtown, where they have offices in the downtown, we want to call upon them to bring

their workers back into the workplace. That will be key to our economy. Several of us have voiced that before, and I just think that as we come out of the pandemic, agree with my colleagues who have said, this is critical for us to do. So, let's lead the way. And if we are leading the way, let's make it public that we're bringing our workers back to the workplace and encouraging people to come back to the downtown. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Just looking at the speakers list, my apologies; Councillor Chambers, then Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, from the onset of this pandemic, I don't think there is one Canadian that signed up to say, I want to wear a mask, I want to not see my aging parents or grandparents. You know, I want to show ID just to get into a restaurant or a bar or whatever establishment that they were visiting, but we did what we had to do in order to do what we wanted to do. And that was wearing the masks, washing our hands, observing social distance protocols, and we're now at the point where omicron in our community and our province and our country has plateaued, and we're now seeing the downward trend of those numbers, having a lessening impact on our healthcare system, having a lessening effect on our economy as we start to reopen and make sure that there is that flow of goods, and services. And we have taken the Province's lead with respect to the public health orders and…that are now recommendations in terms of some of the safe practices that we must consider so that the numbers do not start to increase once again. And I recognize that this motion is done out of an abundance of caution, but we also need to start living with the understanding that the coronavirus is going to be part of our lives, it's going to be part of our future, and it's how we manage it in terms of moving forward, recognizing that those risks still exist but not to the extent that they did even two or three weeks ago. So, I won't be supporting this motion today, Madam Speaker. Again, I'm of the position that, for me, who is triple vaccinated, still plans to, you know sanitize my hands and exercise the social distance protocols that are in place where possible. In large crowds, I will likely still wear a mask just to protect myself and my aging parents because I do want to visit them, I do want to spend time with them, and I want to make sure that I'm not bringing any illnesses to them that will compromise their health. So, I will from time to time be wearing my mask in public places where there's a lot of people, but while I'm in my office, while I'm here at city hall, and exercising those proper hygiene practices that help promote, you know, health…proper health, those are the things that I can dedicate myself towards but also moving towards reopening our economy and getting back to some normalcy. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Orlikow: I'm a very talkative man today. I know, thank you very much. I'm glad to be back in the room. I'm just going to read the 'therefore'. We have a lot of verbiage today about, you know, opening up the economy, getting people downtown, all very important stuff. I also just want to point out that, this morning, the Province did reiterate to the Chamber that those that want to...businesses that want to keep the vaccination card going and the ID card and masks and social distancing, they're going to keep that system running. So, it is a choice, and we're…and that's what we're talking about today. But we're not talking about, you know, the issue about downtown, bringing staff downtown, which is very important. We all agree with that. It's...we're not talking about every building, we're not talking about your council rooms, we're not talking about the hallway. What it's talking about is council chamber and committee rooms. That's what it's saying right here. It's not talking about everything else that's…libraries…some of us may want to talk to. I'm not sure how we enforce that. Transit, same thing, I'm not sure how we enforce a mask requirement and who would do that kind of work. That's very difficult. So again, we can have that discussion, but today, what we're talking about is, and I'll read it, "Mask requirement while participating in meetings in the council chamber and committee rooms". Again, where I do have a little problem is, is for all employees, because I believe that is the preview…purview of the CAO, and I believe he's already implicated that that is so. I'm going to see if he's replied yet, but I think…so the employees are. So, what we're really asking here is elected officials. Us, us. That's all we're saying here. When we're in committee rooms with our staff or we're in the council chamber with our staff, we...it doesn't actually even say that people who come in delegation need to wear a mask, but we as elected officials, because that's really all it is, we are going to keep wearing a mask. Like a restaurant can do, like any business can do, they can just say, you know what, we feel out of an abundance of caution, that it's important or it's recognized that it's good to wear a mask for the time being. Again, does this mean that the economy is going to crumble down around us because we're not…we, in council chambers, are wearing a mask? I don't think so. I don't think so at all, actually. I think it's out of an abundance of caution that some people around this table be concerned about hanging out in a room with other councillors who aren't masked. You know, I don't like wearing a mask, but as I've done throughout the COVID experience is, I respect other people. That's why I got vaccinated. I need to respect other people. It's not about me, it's about them, it's about you guys, you other councillors who are concerned about being in a room with a whole bunch of other people who aren't wearing a mask. This motion has come from that place, I believe, because there's concerns to do that. So, I don't really want to wear a mask any longer. I don't think anybody is jumping up and down, saying this would be great if we could do it. You know, how long this would last for, I don't know, but we just…we're just leaving omicron. We're just maybe getting out of it. Even the Premier's announcement (inaudible) has, "If things remain the same". Again, so they even a…this little part there that says, things could still go pretty bad. So again, if you're asking me today, which this motion is asking me, that's all it's asking me. Me as an elected official, when I come

into this chamber or into committee rooms, am I willing to wear a mask? Besides all the other verbiage or we're saying in hyperbole that we're talking about today, that's all this motion is asking. And me, as a person, as a councillor, I am willing, out of an abundance of caution, for a time, not forever, for a time, to continue to wear a mask. And that's all that's being asked today. So, again, I'll be supporting it because it's very limited. It's within our scope, it's talking about what we…it doesn't say libraries, it doesn't say other admin buildings. We do have control because that this is the only place where I will agree that City Council has full control of council chambers and committee rooms because those are ours. And so, out of an abundance of caution and the care for every…my fellow colleagues, which are you, and I believe some people would like me to wear a mask continually for a little longer, I will do so. So, I will be supporting the motion.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yeah, this is a really unusual debate we're having here. We're talking about apparently something that only...it's almost like a governance issue, something that only affects, you know, 16 people. Okay, look, I'm taking my lead, actually...Brian Mayes mentioned Zach Fleischer's, you know, point of view on this and his…regarding how it is on buses. And quite frankly, if we're not showing that concern on the buses, I just don't know how that applies here. I still might wear a mask here at city hall and as I probably will on a bus, but I just don't get it. Either it's we can go on the buses and it's safe not to wear a mask or it's not. And isn't that where we make our most serious decision? So, I'm going to take that as the…in terms of precedent on this and go with the decision we made…we're going to have to say. I never said it wasn't. I have to say, a very serious decision to allow going on buses without masks, and how does that not apply to this council chamber? And on that basis, I just will be begging off voting for that motion.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? Okay. We'll call the question on this notice of motion. Mask policy. All in…all in favour? Contrary? It sounded like it was lost, but is…okay. Okay. Thank you. Let's move on. We've got a long day ahead of us, let's move on.

Councillor Lukes: Can you update me to what the result was?

Madam Speaker: Yes, the motion was lost. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Sorry, do we…do we have a...

Madam Speaker: No one asked to be recorded in opposition.

Mayor Bowman: But it'll be recorded later? No? Is it too late to ask for a recorded vote then? I'm sorry.

Madam Speaker: I think it is. I think it is. The vote's been called, yeah. Okay. The next item? Next is...yes, motions under the Executive Policy Committee. Motion 2, moved by Councillor Klein and seconded by Councillor Nason, regarding a return to work plan. This is an automatic referral to the Executive Policy Committee. Motion 3, moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Santos, regarding vaccination requirements for elected officials and their staff. This is a notice of motion for next month's Council meeting. Councillor Eadie.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS after two years of coping through the COVID-19 pandemic, the Province of Manitoba announced their intention to lift COVID-19 Public Health Orders;

AND WHEREAS during the COVID-19 pandemic, the Chief Administrative Officer also instituted numerous measures to help mitigate the spread of the COVID-19 virus, including the requirement for members of the Winnipeg Public Service to work from home, where possible;

AND WHEREAS the Chief Administrative Officer has advised that there are currently 1800 members of the Winnipeg Public Service who are still working from home;

AND WHEREAS Winnipeggers now need to change our focus from restrictions, to the future, from division, to uniting us towards one goal, rebuilding our economy;

AND WHEREAS one of the pillars to rebuilding the economy is providing a solid foundation for small businesses to succeed in our downtown;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Chief Administrative Officer be directed implement a return-to-work plan to begin the process of bringing members of the Winnipeg Public Service back to our downtown offices in a safe manner, complete with multiple return dates, with a firm objective of having all staff working back downtown by April 19, 2022.*

2. *That the return-to-work plan be made public.*

3. *That the proper officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.*

Motion No. 3
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Santos,

WHEREAS on September 29, 2021 Council adopted item 19 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21, 2021, which required elected officials and their staff to receive a COVID-19 vaccination, within a timeframe that mirrors the City of Winnipeg staff;

AND WHEREAS it is the intention of the Government of Manitoba and its COVID-19 response team to lift requirements to use proof of vaccination cards in March, 2022;

AND WHEREAS City Council members and staff continue to have the ability to work remotely if potentially exposed to COVID-19 or experiencing COVID-19 symptoms;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba and its COVID-19 response team will still expect Manitobans to follow appropriate practices to avoid contracting COVID-19;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council decision of September 29 2021, with respect to Item 19 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 21, 2021, regarding vaccination requirements for elected officials and their staff, be rescinded.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I'd like to move suspension of the rules to deal with this today. It's probably more relevant to deal with it today.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Motion 3, Councillor Eadie has moved suspension of the rules to debate the item today. All in favour of suspending the rules? Okay. Please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Browaty, Eadie and Nason

Madam Speaker: I want to make sure, is everyone paying attention?

Clerk: Santos, Schreyer, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Madam Speaker: Those opposed to…Councillor Allard.

Councillor Lukes: I didn't hear my name called.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Clerk, back to the screen.

Clerk: I did, yes, Councillor Lukes.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Yes, you've been counted, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Lukes, were you in your chair? Okay. I'm sorry, there's lots going on here, so Mr. Clerk, do you have the count or do you need anything from us? Okay. And myself. And those opposed, please rise.

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Gillingham, Gilroy, Klein and Mayes

Madam Speaker: Well, this is why I asked the question earlier. Yeah. Okay, the vote is on. Okay, let's have Motion 3 in front of us, the paper copy. It's moved by Councillor Eadie and seconded by Councillor Santos. It's regarding vaccination policies for elected officials. Councillor Eadie moved suspension of the rules so it could be debated today, rather than...Councillor Klein, I'm over here...rather than having it posted to next month's Council agenda. So, all in favour of debating this item today, please rise. We're going to do it again.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Allard, Gillingham, Gilroy, Mayes and Orlikow

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. So, this item will appear on next month's Council agenda. Okay, next is Motion 7. I'll introduce it. Motion 7; it's moved from Councillor Allard and seconded by Councillor Gillingham. It's regarding an audit of intersection signal infrastructure. It's, again, a notice of motion for next month's Council agenda. I'll now recognize you, Councillor Allard, and you wanted to move suspension?

Councillor Allard: Yes. Do I get to speak?

Madam Speaker: I just recognized you, yes.

Councillor Allard: Okay. How long do I get to speak?

Madam Speaker: What is it that you'd like to do? You'd like to move suspension of the rules?

Councillor Allard: I'm wondering about the rules of order, yes. And I'd like to do that, but do I get to introduce…

Madam Speaker: No.

Councillor Eadie: When moving for suspension of the rules, isn't it just that motion?

Madam Speaker: That's right. Yeah.

Councillor Allard: Okay, so I'm moving that.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. So, Councillor Allard is moving suspension of the rules to debate this item today. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Nays

Councillors Gilroy and Nason

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

Madam Speaker: Okay. Suspension passes. Councillor Allard, you have the floor to introduce Motion 7.

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

WHEREAS the Riel Community Committee passed the following motion on February 23, 2022;

WHEREAS there is significant concern in the public and on Council regarding potential waste and mismanagement of City of Winnipeg signal infrastructure;

AND WHEREAS information has recently been shared with the City Auditor regarding potential waste and mismanagement of the City of Winnipeg intersection signal infrastructure;

AND WHEREAS some of this information may suggest intersection signal infrastructure is being replaced before end of life, or intersection signal infrastructure is being relocated inconsistently, or that other intersection signal infrastructure work is being undertaken that does not appear to be necessary, or an efficient use of taxpayer monies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council direct the City Auditor to initiate an investigation into the allegations of potential waste and mismanagement surrounding intersection signal infrastructure;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT if the preliminary investigation suggests an expanded scope of investigation is appropriate and exceeds the current resource capacity and will require additional resources of the Audit Department that this be communicated to Council to secure the required resources to complete the investigation in a thorough and timely manner;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Auditor report back to Council in 120 days with the results of the preliminary investigation;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT in the event that intersection signal infrastructure is being replaced before end of life, or intersection signal infrastructure is being relocated inconsistently or that other intersection signal infrastructure work is being undertaken that does not appear to be necessary or an efficient use of taxpayer monies, that the auditor provide recommendations for Council to consider for implementation to ensure signals installed are necessary and an efficient use of taxpayers monies.

Councillor Allard: Thank you. So, there's been a lot of talk in the public, amongst councillors and the administration about the possible apparent rework and replacement of materials of our signals infrastructure before end of life. I want to give a bit of an update to Council in terms of how this came to my attention and the actions taken to-date. So, as you may know at this time, based on media articles, independent researcher Chris Sweryda who has been collaborating with my office for some time, he approached our office late last year, had a presentation that involved…well, into late last year, about our signals infrastructure. Mr. Sweryda had concerns regarding, well, our signals where signals might change from configuration A to B and then back to A over the years. And so, that's just part of the presentation, and there's an incredible amount of work that has gone into Mr. Sweryda's presentation and research. So further to the presentation with Mr. Sweryda, after, you know, like, asking a lot of questions and got to a point where I wanted to…I was concerned that there was enough to be concerned about that I should bring this to the City Auditor, which I did. And so, I brokered a meeting with the City Auditor, Mr. Sweryda in my office, where the City Auditor saw Mr. Sweryda's presentation. And out of that meeting came a disposition for me where I understood that there was a policy recommendation to move from what we were seeing in the presentation, and that was to standardize our signals infrastructure, and the other disposition was that there should be...there should be increased scrutiny into the granular data that Mr. Sweryda had identified, and that that would likely be an audit function that would be necessary. So further to that, I brought forward a motion at the Riel Community Committee where I informed, well, my colleagues and the public that independent researcher, Chris Sweryda, had worked on and identified potential re-work and replacement of materials before end of life. So, that was January 5th. And so, that motion passed. It went to IRPW. At IRPW, the Public Service said that there had been considerable discussion about signals at the January IRPW meeting, and so that motion asking for standard…standards for signalized infrastructure be ordered from the IRPW Committee so that happens. And then after that, met…I had a…my office had a

second meeting with the City Auditor where it became...well, I was convinced at that point we really needed to move forward on this. The City Auditor confirmed to me that if there was to be an investigation that went further, there would likely…there would likely be a need to have additional resources as Mr. Matt…Mr. Brian...well, our City Auditor's office budget is fairly limited, and that in order to get to the bottom of a lot of these questions, there may be a need for additional resources. So, the City Auditor told me that they'd be looking at specific...specific cases where there seems to be perhaps more merit to investigate than other cases as part of this presentation and any other information coming from Council or other members of the public. And based on that preliminary analysis, the City Auditor would be able to give us a recommendation in terms of whether or not more resources were required to properly investigate the issue. If I were to guess, I think probably that that...that would be the eventual recommendation from the City Auditor, but I think...I think it's a positive step forward if we give the green light from this council to the City Auditor formally requesting an investigation into this issue that has garnered much media interest, I think much interest from Council. And if we're suspending the rules today, I think members of the public are looking for answers, members of Council…members of Council are looking for answers. And I think what will clarify things for everyone is if the City Auditor can weigh-in on whether or not we should investigate more than we already are with additional resources or if the City Auditor has found some explanations. And regardless of that, if there is...if waste mismanagement replacement of infrastructure before end of life is identified, then a part of the motion which…which we added at the Riel Community Committee, is to get those recommendations from the City Auditor in terms of City policies that we could adopt so that in the event where there has been waste mismanagement or replacement of signals before end of life, that there be recommendations for Council's consideration to implement. And the last time I recall auditor's recommendations or the…the time that I recall that...where there was...there was much media attention and Council attention on auditor's recommendation was on the police headquarters scandal, where there was three real estate audits with 40-some recommendations from...from auditors, and this council ordered the implementation of all of those recommendations. So, that's...that's my pitch to...to Council at this time. This motion, if adopted, has no financial implications. It orders the Auditor to formally investigate this and to come back if there is a need for additional resources. I understand that Mr. Sweryda had offered information and presentations to several members of council, and I think probably several members of Council at this point have seen the presentation. I believe the presentation is now public. But all that being said, given the...the number of intersections and the amount of information that would need to be is processed or looked at in order to get some...some answers in terms of potential possible waste replacement of its infrastructure, we rework that we would need a professional auditor to take a look at those and make recommendations to Council based on what that professional office would do. So that's my...those are my introductory comments. I hope we can be unanimous in supporting this. And that's...that's my pitch. Look forward to hearing all of your comments.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in…I rise in support of having the auditor's office…the auditor, the City one, have a look into the submissions discovered in the report from Mr. Sweryda. Madam Speaker, I agree with the mover, this is not the fire hall fiasco or the police headquarters fiasco. What I believe, and I've heard most of the report, and Madam Speaker, you know, some people might hate me for this; there is a waste of money here, I have to say, Madam Speaker. What I heard, from what he's reporting, it's not corruption. There's no corruption involved here. What people don't understand, and what we're not really understanding...and Mr. Sweryda, I appreciate. He's actually done a lot of work that our staff have not been able to do. But really, what it is, is it's a communication and a coordination problem with the standards that we have. But not only that, Madam Speaker...and the Auditor can look in…Auditor can look into this. I don't know if there's records, because some of the stuff I heard goes back to 2008 with issues, Madam Speaker. But when people don't realize that Manitoba Hydro changes what they're allowing us to do and not do. Happens all the time. Happens with business improvement zones, Madam Speaker. And as a matter of fact, there was reference to light pole standards that were, really, in many cases, were initiated and installed due to business improvement zones. Back in 1998, Portage scape, you'll see, they have those decorative lighting poles. Well, there was a controversy around that, Madam Speaker, that a lot of people didn't even know, it didn't go public, but persons with disabilities know all about how things go wrong at intersections, street renewals and so on because sometimes, and I'm not blaming this all on our traffic engineers who work in traffic signals or whatever. It's…the real problem is, the City cut out a lot of middle management over the years. Middle management are the ones that helped coordinate things and especially when, you know, you have to have divisions talking to other divisions when you're doing a street renewal, make sure everything's done right. There's universal design standards, Madam Speaker. For example, they will go ahead and do a street renewal, major renewal project, and they're supposed to put in the yellow and black warning surfaces on regional and P2. What happens is, sometimes they forget. I don't know why. Whatever. Sometimes it's the contractor, and they have to come back and fix it, or…and then, there's all kinds of issues. But for example, some people will install a pole for traffic signals, and it impedes the clear path of travel in the universal design guidelines, Madam Speaker. So what Mr. Sweryda has discovered is what persons with disabilities and the Access Advisory Committee for years and years understood was a coordination problem making sure that all the standards that are supposed to apply when you're at an intersection are taken care of. And then, there's the hydro issue. So...and then, sometimes it's…like, business improvement zones try to put things on light standards, and then Hydro tells us we've got to take them down. They let us use it for a little while, but then they say, oh,

we have a different need now. Goodbye. Take a hike. So long. So then, you have to change it. So, all these things happen. So, the general public doesn't understand this, but there's a lot of people...and it is inefficient. Don't get me wrong. We could be doing things way better so it doesn't cost us more money, but again, it isn't what some people wanted to make it out. So, let's have our Auditor…it is an auditor issue. But…and I think the Auditor is going to have a real hard time taking a report with 75% of the intersections, that's 75% of 600 and whatever intersections. And Madam Speaker, you also need to remember, there's all these different traffic signal programs that we have. For example, the accessible signals, audible signals program, which requires certain standards to be met and poles of being able to…if there is a need for a push button, to have the push button in the right place. I'm going to go test out, actually, one that I heard about. A pedestrian corridor, frankly, that we…I don't think the City should have put the money into by St. John's High School at Church and Salter when one block away, there's a full traffic…signalized traffic intersection just a block on the…on the north side of St. John's High School. Like, the real thing there is, I never supported...I don't know why or how that popped up, to put in a pedestrian corridor there, when only a block away, you have a fully signalized intersection for pedestrians to get across safely, Madam Speaker. So, but I'm going to go test out where the buttons are because you have to push a button for a pedestrian corridor, and apparently, when they redid the street renewal on Salter, instead of where they had put the push buttons for this pedestrian corridor. If the new buttons are not on the path of travel, Madam Speaker, people who are blind aren't going to be able to find it, or you're going to take us off our straight travel and then the next thing you know, you're searching around for a button, you push a button, and then all of a sudden, you're diagonal to the middle of the street. So, Mr. Sweryda doesn't understand those standards, Madam Speaker. So, I'm going to go look at it, maybe they're going to have to go redo it because there was no coordination on the design. When we're renewing the streets, coordination with various programs, not just traffic signals, traffic controls, but Madam Speaker, let's start talking about the active transportation. Do this, don't do that, it's in the plan. But anyway, there's no coordination, no coordination. This is the problem, that's the travesty. And you know, when the Auditor is looking at it, he'll decide if traffic signals, traffic controls, have…have somebody there that's able to coordination with other divisions and other departments. It isn't just Public Works, Madam Speaker. It isn't just Public Works, it's our departments. They don't talk to each other. They don't work with each other. That's my budget, that's your budget, stay away from it. That's what they do. That's what happens, Madam Speaker. That's what the public doesn't understand is that they think we as Council and everybody work together. Anyway, I'll be supporting this for the Auditor, but I think the Auditor's going to have a real difficult job looking into this. Thank you.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a no-lose situation for the mover of the motion because the mover already has a motion that's approved to go to EPC. And at EPC, the Auditor could have a chance to speak to it. So could Public Works have a chance to speak to it. The mover has also talked to the Auditor a couple of times. You know, and I appreciate him making the opportunity to, you know, circulate it to Council members, I believe it was for his motion at community committee, but I had some questions for him and I didn't get a response. I haven't landed on if it's waste or what it is. As a former project manager, I can say from a scope creep, certainly was there. You know, project management, probably was there. Some challenges, which lead to financial waste. But the mover of this motion was aware of this in early November. I have an e-mail to that effect if he wants to challenge that. That he met for an hour and a half with Mr. Sweryda. And he's also indicated that he's met a couple of times with the Auditor. We've had Council in November, we've had Council in December, we've had Council in January; yet the mover did not move anything at those committees. But once the news story broke, we've got two motions from the mover on the same topic. He's wanting to jump ahead right to the audit, but yet, this same person voted against an audit on a whistleblower motion with regards to tree contracts in April of last year. Several members of this council voted against an audit because the Auditor was overworked and didn't have capacity. Thankfully, when it got to this level, again, after going to EPC that was going to can it, got to this level, amending motion was moved and was successful to actually have an audit move forward, results of which have yet to come back. Now, the seconder of this motion is seconding a motion that has no price tag attached to it. I know he's criticized every motion that's walked onto this floor that does not have a source of funding attached to it. The Auditor is tapped. Is he going to have to go external and bring people in? This amount of work is incredible. What was presented, and I was successful in organizing part one meeting that took over two hours with Mr. Sweryda. It was a lot of information to take in, he gave a lot of examples, and yes, it's been published publicly. He's got more that he wants to share with Council, which also would be recorded and shared because that's open and transparent. It's his position. He could have done it on his own, but he gave us the opportunity to have audience. And I appreciate the colleagues that responded and attended, and I appreciate those who responded and saying that they were unavailable. It…I won't support today because I know…like I say, there's one that's already making its way through the system that will go to EPC and have the opportunity for EPC to discuss with the Public Service. I know our CAO has been reluctant to drive this forward without seeing the evidence. You know, the evidence hasn't been provided to him. I know he used the term of "us". I don't know who the us is. It could be the Director of Public Works. It could be the manager, as well. I'm not sure who the full "us" is, but from a perspective of the Auditor, it's, you know, based on the assertion from the mover. It's my understanding that the Auditor has had a meeting with the person making the charge. So I'm wondering, you know, if that's the case, then I guess the Auditor should be heard. And to me, the best place for the Auditor to be heard before we move forward would be at EPC to make a judgment, if it isn't truly meeting that threshold of an audit or if it's simply that it needs to go back to IRPW for a full review of the undertaking

and then come back with recommendations to perhaps improve what appears to be project management challenges. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you...thank you, Councillor Nason. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll certainly support the motion. I supported the motion, it seems like weeks ago, but it was just yesterday at Riel Community Committee, a very similar motion. And I want to thank Councillor Nason for arranging for councillors to see some of the raw data, some of the presentation from Mr. Sweryda. We got through a couple of hours worth yesterday, and I don't know how far in we are, but clearly, there was more to come. I'll support it. A couple of caveats, caveats, warnings, though, I guess. For the Auditor to really wade through all of this, to do an audit, would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. I think if you've got an individual saying they've spent hundreds of hours going through hundreds of intersections, each one of which looking at a Google image over several years. Luckily you can date them because different political posters appear in the background so you can go, okay, Ted Marcelino's on that one. Ted's a friend of mine, and I like Ted, but you know, okay, Ted's been out of office for a while, so that's an older image. But I mean, it's a huge undertaking, and we didn't get through all of it. So, the potential cost to wade through all of this could be massive. It doesn't have a price tag now, and we do need to preliminary look at it, but that's a concern. Number two; there are different elements to this. Some of what was in the paper today; the lower level flashing lights were not put in at pedestrian crosswalks. Well, I don't think the Auditor is the person to say, yes, the traffic engineers of 2014 were wrong and now they're right in 2019, the traffic engineers. Or Mr. Sweryda was right in '14 and the traffic engineers were wrong. The Auditor is not a traffic engineer. Mr. Sweryda is not an official traffic engineer, though he's obviously passionate and knowledgeable. I had more run ins with Luis Escobar than probably anybody in this building, but he was a traffic engineer, he was passionate about what he did. I agreed with him some of the time. He was serious about what he did. I don't think there was ever an allegation of corruption there. So, I don't think the Auditor can get into that. Also, some of the presentation yesterday was, well, this pole got added just two years after that one, and they should have done it all at the same time. Well, if that's the standard, we could go through a whole lot of different things we do in this place and say, well, that's a scandal or possibly incompetence or corruption. We add things in after the fact sometimes. One of the examples yesterday; well, the cyclist actuation or activation buttons were added in and they did it right at these two corners, but not at the third. Well, that would seem like the department mostly got it right then, not that they got it wrong. And things like the countdown lights, those were added in, the pedestrian crosswalk countdown lights. That was a good achievement. I can't remember exactly when we started it, but we certainly mandated that that be done. It has rolled out in a logical fashion to various intersections throughout the city. So, some of that, I'm sure, was grafted in after the fact. It would have been good a year earlier, but we didn't have it. Maybe it was more financially beneficial to put up a second pole with the signal than it would have been to try and go back to the original pole, so there creates clutter. I'm not sure the Auditor can really definitively comment on clutter at intersections, but there does certainly seem to be some that…it's very concerning when you see a pole moving 18 inches multiple years back and forth. It's round, it's square, it's round. What could excuse that or motivate that? So, we do need to look at this massive amount of data. But mostly what we need to do, mostly what we need to do, is hear from our own Public Service to say, yes, we can't explain that one from 2008 to 2014, but we can explain this particular one. We…I am…as I said yesterday at Riel Community Committee, I don't want to throw people under the bus. I've had many arguments with public servants here. I've been thrown under the bus by some of our public servants, but two public servants who haven't ever thrown me under the bus are David Patman and Jim Berezowsky who are senior people in Public Works who are very much going to be involved in this process. So, I do feel it's very important that we give people the chance to defend their work, to defend what's gone on. A lot of it will pre-date this current group's hiring or employment or senior activities, so some of this is…you know, what we're going to conclude someone is corrupt in 2022 because of something that happened in 2015? I don't think that's fair. So, we need to give our chance, need to give our staff who have been…frankly, these two individuals have been more flexible and more willing to talk to me about ideas like the advanced yellow light that's now in place, I'm quite proud of that on Bishop Grandin, as one goes eastbound. I couldn't get that in under some previous civil service regimes. We did get that in. Nason got one in…there he is…onto his credit, on Lag. I'm proud of that. I'd like to see more of them. So, yeah, sometimes politicians get their way and sometimes you get staff who say, I have a different view than my predecessor. I agree, those yellow flashing lights could be beneficial, if you can find the money, let's go do it. So, the political dynamic changes over time. Different individuals have different views, doesn't always mean there's a scandal or there's incompetence. So, let's go forward with this. Thank you to Councillor Gillingham, thank you to Councillor Allard, but let's also give our staff; Micheal Jack, Mr. Berezowsky, Mr. Patman, others, a chance to say, look, we can…we can…there's a reason for some of these. Some of these, we don't know. That's fair enough. We do need to look at it. There's a ton of data here. I'm not trying to minimize it in any way, but I am going to say, look, I'm not throwing people under the bus. I do want to hear what our staff have to say. I think this…I think there's some serious allegations here, but also, we have overtime made different positions here on the lower level blinking lights at crosswalks. We've gone to the countdown signals at intersections. I know that Gord Steeves got a crosswalk in that wasn't in the official plan because he was willing to put money into it and then I had to make up the balance because he hadn't put enough in. I don't regret that. I know John got one in, Councillor Orlikow, that he wanted to get in. It was the right thing to do. I voted for it. Others have done the same. I got one in with Councillor Allard at St. Mary's and Carriere right at the ward boundary. Proud of it. So, sometimes there's a political reason behind

these projects. Sometimes it'll be different staff views over time. So, we do need an audit. I'll be voting in favour, but I very much would like to hear the views of Mr. Patman, Mr. Berezowsky and others.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Allard for the motion. I'm glad to second it today. Serious allegations have been made, and we owe it to the people of Winnipeg to make sure that Winnipeg taxpayers are getting the best value for their money, and that the allegations that have been made can be looked into and responded to. And I think we're looking at doing this in several different ways, and I support them. One of the reasons I'm supporting the motion before us is that it doesn't…does not direct the Auditor to go and spend unlimited amounts of funds on an audit, it calls for the Auditory to initiate an investigation. And then second of all, if the preliminary investigation suggests an expanded scope, the Auditor is to come back to us. And so, we have that check in the motion there. And I want to thank Councillor Allard for including it and writing it that way. it's one of the ways that…one of the reasons I'm supporting it. I've also called…I've also called for a special meeting of the Finance Committee where we can have Mr. Sweryda, give him the opportunity to present his very serious allegations and all of his work in a public forum so the public has a chance to see it, he has an opportunity to express it publicly. And as Councillor Mayes points out, it gives our public servants, also, the opportunity to respond to the allegations in a public forum as well. The audit may take several months to do. A Standing Policy Committee of Finance meeting, a special meeting, we're trying to arrange it in short order here. I've been working with the Clerks and the members of the committee to try to find a date as soon as possible. That will be a public meeting and it will be as soon as possible so it won't drag this out. We owe it to the people of Winnipeg once the allegations have been made to find out really what is going on, and I think by having these two processes; an audit, and a Standing Policy Committee on Finance meeting, a public meeting, we will…we'll be able to provide the people of Winnipeg the answers, I hope, and...that they need and that they deserve. Thank you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I'll acknowledge and thank the movers of this motion to have an audit done. But I, too, have concerns. I have concerns that we feel this might be the only situation where we may be having some management issues and financial mismanagement issues that are being alleged. I'm concerned because we had the…an audit done in 2010 of this very department. And if you look at the ongoing review of our audits, it clearly states that all of the recommendations, there were 19, have been achieved within the department. And I say that because, well, then how do we know, as city councillors, yes, but as those that are responsible for tax dollars or running the business if you will, that the implementation of audit items are maybe done and then a week later, be gone. I think that this requires a deeper discussion. I appreciate the fact that it will go to S…the SPC on Finance, but I want to, again, mention it before Councillor Lukes does, we don't have an opportunity to speak to the department. We don't…and by asking questions during that meeting. We can appear for ten minutes and that is…and we can speak our piece, but we don't have that opportunity to ask the questions that would grill down and try and lead us to the issue at hand. I watched through the presentation, I listened to everything that was presented and the facts that were provided, and I think that, yes, this is something that is concerning, but I'm not convinced that it's the only department where we have concerns. And I'm not convinced having the Auditor do a report again, since we've done one already and everything was implemented, but we seem to be back where we were, is the right path. It's the path that's in front of us, it's the path that our councillor colleagues have put forward, but does it go far enough? As a city councillor, I think I can speak for all of my colleagues, we've heard from residents on this issue. We would like the opportunity to question the Public Service, to hear their responses, to understand how the problem...like, what happened with the last audit? Do we follow up on the implementation or once there's told that it's been implemented, that's the end of it? There's a lot of questions, I can go on for hours and hours. If this was in the private sector, we'd be having meetings on a regular basis with the department management to find out how do we fix it. Is there a problem, first of all, and if there is, how do we fix it? What's the…what are the milestones to ensure that we have mechanisms to know that it's being done and it's taken care of before we move on to the next item in that department. I'll support this going through because for some reason, this is the…this appears to be the only option, but I would urge my colleagues to add, and I could have done it through an amending motion, but I would urge them to also ask for a response to the last audit, and show us, and prove to us that every recommendations, indeed, remains and is in place. And I would urge my colleagues to look at our department heads in the Audit Department that have training and (inaudible) and have them sit down and review the department processes because I tend to agree with some of my colleagues that this could be more about process than financial mismanagement, but you could call it financial mismanagement if you'd like that as your headline. But I mean it's processes, it's collaboration, it's communication on projects when you really dig deep into what was being told. So, I don't want to just scratch the surface with an audit report and be right back to where we are. I want to drill down and understand the entire problem. So, I'm hoping that somewhere along the line and I know we've already had one request, and I'll make another official request by e-mail, that we have an opportunity to sit down with the Public Service and talk about this. I think we owe that to the residents. We don't…I appreciate the fact that one or two colleagues can move motions and have their committee meetings and get this going forward, but we all have an obligation to look into this. And I would prefer that we have that opportunity so that Councillor

Santos or Councillor Schreyer or Councillor Rollins or whomever can ask the questions that need to be asked so we can feel confident that we are managing these departments appropriately and that we have accountability measures in place and that when we do an audit report, that it is being followed daily, not just for a certain amount of time. And I'm not saying it is, I'm saying, it certainly would appear that way. So, we'll…we can do the audit, it's an internal audit. Yes, you're right, we're not saying, spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on this, but if we're losing hundreds of thousands of dollars, why aren't we having that discussion to say, look, we've got a bigger problem here. We need to dig deeper because spending a few hundred thousand dollars today might save us millions tomorrow. Those are the discussions. We're reacting to what was in the media. But we really have to dig deep. We really have to look at our processes. We really have to look at our project management because if some of the work was done and then street repairs were done and then it was changed again, well that talks project management. There's all kinds of opportunities to dig into this and help resolve more than one problem because I'm not convinced that it was done maliciously, and I'm also not convinced that it's the only department where we have these issues. That's why I called on a zero-based budget review years ago, and I was turned down. It's now saved the City of Calgary over 200 and some odd million dollars and they're not done yet. They do one department a year. So, they understand every cost and these are the line items that would come out. These are the line items that you will not find on the GL system that's made available to us. Look, this is not politics right now, this is about the operations of the city. We need to be good stewards of this city and dig deep into the problem so that we can help find solutions. And there's probably various, various amounts of solutions, but we owe it to the residents to be digging deeper and looking at the overall picture. I'll support this going forward today. I don't…I'm not in a position as a standing policy chair. I don't have the ear of the Mayor. I'm not on EPC. I can move my own little motions like I have during the past three years, but I'm urging and I will send the e-mail to the CAO myself, and I'm urging you to support me to say, we need to have a discussion, and we need to address the larger problem.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Over to Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Here we go again. I will be supporting the audit because I have many residents calling me and asking me, what is going on with the Public Service? Why is there no oversight? They're demanding to know why there is no oversight and accountability. So, Madam Speaker, as Councillor Klein said, we have a bigger problem here. So, this is what I explain to residents. I explain to them how the city is governed as per the Charter. And I explain to them that it is actually the Mayor and the EPC that directs the CAO to ensure oversight and accountability. The councillors don't…it's not our role to oversee operations, that it's the CAO's. And that the CAO reports back to the Mayor and the Mayor's EPC. So, I explained this bigger picture related to accountability and oversight in…and oversight in the City of Winnipeg. So, let's look at the bigger picture, the governance of how the City is run, and whether the signals claims are true or not. Factually, the City has been very much rudderless in Public Service oversight since the Mayor was elected in 2014. The City has been plagued by constant CAO turnover. There have been five, five CAOs, which equals no consistency in a management approach. The seeking of accountability and oversight for 10,000 staff is just not there. 2014, we started off with Deepak Josh. 2015, we had an acting CAO. 2015 to 2019, we had Mr. McNeil and we had multiple audits under him. 2019 to 2021, for over two years, again, seeking a CAO. Fortunately, we had the CFO step in, but since the pandemic hit and finance was the CFO's focus, really, the CAO was focused on pandemic and money and I dare say, not as much on accountability and oversight of 10,000 staff. Now, we have a new CAO, the fifth CAO. So regardless, there's going to be issues with departments when we've had so many CAOs, we don't even have a strategic plan. As a councillor, it's incredibly difficult to deliver a high level of service and ensure accountability and oversights to residents when the internal operations of the organization aren't working. Under the five CAOs we've had, this is what we've seen: a departure of six senior transportation engineers in top leadership roles leave the Public Works Department. The departure of over half the Legal Department, including the City's top solicitor. We've seen missed deadlines for filing of legal claims related to water and waste. We've seen contempt of court charges being laid against the City of Winnipeg for violating a Court of Queen benches' order. We've seen complete chaos occurring with the staffing and accountability in the Property, Planning and Development Department. External audits revealed a failure to communicate both within the organization and to the public on the capital planning process involving millions…multi-million-dollar projects. Lack of defined roles and job descriptions within staff departments. Lack of criteria that identifies files that posts significant risks to the organization. That was the Sterling Lyon Parkway audit. We've seen the breakdown of the frontline service centre; 311's public service for delivering enquiries resulting in councillors being 311 operators. And like I mentioned, we're the only city in Canada that does not have a strategic plan because leadership did not want to in…to do one. When there's no consistency with the CAO's Office and constant turnover, the direction and oversight and accountability of 10,000 staff goes off the rails. You can't tell me otherwise. And today, we've got very serious concerns about signalization, again, with huge questions of accountability and oversight. I saw most of the presentation, which raises incredible concerns. I will be supporting the audit, but I think everyone needs to look at the bigger picture of why we have these problems or why we've had them over the past eight years. And I think we all need to be very thankful that a leadership change is on the near horizon. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, good speeches on this. I was…depending on who I spoke after, I was going to mention how good the speech is. However, I happen to be right after Councillor Lukes, and that was an excellent explanation of some real systemic problems we have in terms of oversight and accountability. And thank you, Councillor Lukes, for giving a pretty concise explanation in just a few minutes and it…because it's relevant. It comes down to strategic management. And I've always been saying, hey, look, you don't have accountability over your infrastructure and construction, well, voila. Now we've got a misunderstanding. Councillor Eadie says, you know, we don't understand it. As yet, we…you know, we need that report. We can't…and this is true, I don't want to…I don't want to draw a conclusion. I don't want to, you know, make presumptions here. But I have to say, I'm chomping at the bit or...Councillor Mayes may correct me, I'm champing at the bit. I'm not sure. Either way, I want to know what happens. Councillor Nason, you know, he's got…his concern about (inaudible)…in terms of process as does Councillor Klein. And I understand. Look, the best I think we can do is go with this. If we find that it's still inadequate in terms of the…in terms of a proper form of accountability and accounting here at city hell, I would suggest we move another motion after this. And because Councillor Nason organized for us was basically introducing us to someone the likes…the likes of which…the research of which I've never seen in my life. Not like this. Not this kind. Not in…800 hours, and maybe there's some logical explanations for a lot of it, but I really want to know what they are. Because what I do see, I don't really see a logic. What I see is, a lack of coordination amongst the (inaudible) what Councillor Eadie had mentioned. But having said that, if that is the case, how many years can this go on? Because from what I've seen of these hundreds and hundreds of examples, it's just something without…we absolutely owe ourselves an explanation. And by the way, given what's happening now, people are see this, we're going to owe the people an explanation. This is by no means, could possibly mean…be the biggest challenge we have in building our infrastructure. We've got a major crisis in account…in accounting of our infrastructure and construction contracts in this city, not just Winnipeg. I never said that. But as it has been said here today, do we have to wait for another city to do what we're…we should be doing any way? And on this, we've just got to do this. Now, in terms of the process here, I do hope it goes to Finance. I happen to be on Finance Committee, but I don't want to deprive other councillors. And I certainly don't want to deprive Chris Sweryda of…you know, to the extent that we can optimise his insights, his questions and his ability to cross reference this. He's been all over this for years before he brought this forward, and we owe an explanation for all…to all his work. And I like Bryan Mansky. I trust Bryan Mansky. What I don't trust at city hall is how his office is dissed. We diss ourselves. We diss this city by dissing Brian Mayes and his office. He doesn't have enough to do this and that and this and that, but we hire an extra…an extra external audit for this and that, and I don't buy it. Of all the audits we do and see, I would say, he's the one in his office. He's the one we can trust so long as we give it what it deserves. Give him and his office what it deserves. We have to…we can't do a proper job because it doesn't have the budget to do an accounting and an auditing of those things that over time will absolutely be saving us money. So, you know, the irony that we can't spend money on...what do we spend money in this city on? We don't even question when our construction contracts go up. We don't even question it. But Brian Mansky wants to look at the construction, where we have some problems. Oh, oh, we've got limited…limited office. Well, I didn't like how they did the audit we did…we got back from the Deacon Water Treatment Plant. I didn't vote for it. I didn't believe it. That also didn't come from Bryan Mansky and our in-house Auditor's Office. And so, I will leave it at that, but we…I do look forward to this and whatever type of format this takes place, and whatever we are missing, we should carry on and get greater accountability. While we've got this information on-hand for everyone to see, give people a great idea about how we can actually change our ways here, and at least in terms of hey, there's nothing really wrong that they did, we will see. But at least in terms of having for once and for all, a proper accounting at least one minute aspect of the management of infrastructure contracts here at the City of Winnipeg. Megwich. Merci.

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

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, this motion resolves to get the City Auditor to initiate an investigation, to look at whether or not the preliminary investigation suggests…is suggestive of an extended scope necessary, to get the City Auditor report back to Council in 120 days with the result. And in the event that the intersection signal infrastructure is being replaced before end of life or intersection signal infrastructures being located inconsistently and so on, that the Auditor is provide recommendations for Council to consider implementation. Now, I'm reading this because we're…I'm not finding, Madam Speaker, is…and I'm not…I'm not finding…and to the colleagues that moved it, I'm really not finding a discussion with the Public Service here. And so, I was hoping, because I'm still on the fence, Madam Speaker, with respect to my support for this motion, I'm hoping to the movers if they will conclude…if I could just ask them if they would conclude with their discussion with the Public Service. And I'll tell you why I'm interested in that. So, what happens after the audit, Madam Speaker, is of critical concern, I think. 120 days later is what Winnipeggers would theoretically have to wait, and I think that this is an interesting proposition for Council that would be considered…that needs to consider about the good running of the city. True or not true, we haven't asked the Public Service. And when I came to Council, Madam Speaker, we were a city, I want to recognize, that didn't have a business plan. We have one now, and that's really important work in terms of plans and priorities for each and every department. But as a councillor that sits on IRPW, Madam Speaker, you know that you have a deeper ability to ask questions being on that standing policy committee. I know because I really do…as Chair of Protection, Community Services and Parks, I get every month the opportunity to sit in in-camera, really, in in-camera meetings with public servants and get a briefing before we go into the

monthly meetings. And as Chair, I do have that privilege as a councillor on Executive Policy Committee. And I want to acknowledge that as a privilege, and it's also a responsibility. And so, my colleagues on EPC have that opportunity, that same opportunity, and so I'm concerned that this hasn't been done. Why? Because there's about six to eight different things you do after an audit, and I'm concerned with that. Number one, you look at the losses of key personnel, and Councillor Lukes seems to know about those losses, right? She was the former chair, and she seems to know. Are they contributing to a department that needs...and I'll say, I think there needs to be more staff under traffic planning, Madam Speaker. I think that there's two staff I could have felt compelled to do this budget, as a matter of fact, in traffic planning. And I want to acknowledge that, because I think the Public Service are…servants are listening. And I want to acknowledge some of that work. The standards that we need, that's an assertion Mr. Sweryda has made. And I want to acknowledge all the e-mails he provided to me. Why wouldn't we just go ahead and motion that? The lack of objectives and targets, the training and qualifications, the failure in internal processes, management…this is all risk management that I have not heard from the Public Service, and I'm keenly interested. Why? Because I'm a councillor of this city, I'm responsible. The buck stops with us. And so, throwing it off to an auditor is one thing for 120 days, but concurrent work can be possible, too. And I stand shoulder-to-shoulder with each and every public servant that works here in good times and bad. Why? Because I have to. The buck stops with me. And you, Madam Speaker, and the rest of the members of Council. So, I like the idea of an audit. I worked with…for more inquiries than I think any other member of Council, Madam Speaker. I see audits and enquiries as useful, but I think that what happens next is actually the meat and potatoes of the work that the citizens elect us to do. They don't elect us to move it out for 120-days, they elect us to do the job today. So, what I don't see is that discussion with the Public Service. I am interested, as a member of Finance, to talk to the Public Service there. I don't know if I can support that today…this today, but to the movers of the motion, you know, please hear me. I'm on the fence, but I am interested in why the motion at this time doesn't include the Public Service. I know as a member of Finance, like I say, that will…that meeting will include the Public Service, but really interested in knowing, you know, as I do, that it's…it's really…you can jump into an audit or you can jump into the work implied. And I'd rather see work...that work…that we're getting at that work. And we can assume you're…we're failing an audit, we can assume we've got one, but this really should include the department, the personnel involved, and their management processes. They have a sense of that. I want to see them included. They're not included enough in this motion, Madam Speaker. And I think Winnipeggers actually would want us to start...get going on the work.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: On language, not to be combative, but Madam Speaker, I just wanted to...I've been listening to the debate, and I don't...utilizing…using words…using phrases that might be discriminatory, I just wanted to point out, when using "the buck stops here", evaluated, it's not discriminatory if you're talking about a dollar, but if you're talking about accountability, that is a phrase that was very discriminatory that's been used for like a hundred or more years. And I just wanted to point that out for our members that if you're going to use that term, it needs to be phrased in terms of a dollar. Like, a buck is a buck.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. And I don't think that was the intention, but thank you for that notation. Thank you. We learned something. Next speaker? Okay. No further speakers? We'll be back to you, Councillor Allard, for closing.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, I hope everyone here can support this motion. Councillor Rollins...or Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Rollins, the issue of working with the Public Service; as soon as this matter came to my attention, I brought forward a motion asking for our Public Service to report back on standards for signals infrastructure. And the comment at that time was that there had been quite a bit of talk about it prior to that motion. So, the Public Service is aware. The Public Service is working on the report. So, in terms of that work, I think it's already ongoing. Councillor Gillingham's talking about a public hearing, so that's…that may be occurring in the future at Finance. I...so for...other than moving another motion, where we ask the Public Service to weigh-in again, I think we've achieved the objectives that we're looking to achieve. There's a public forum at Finance. There was a motion that's been passed that standardize our signals intersection and there's now a call for an audit so we can have a granular look at what has occurred. So, I think...I think this is the way to have everyone's concerns addressed. There's a public forum, there's an audit, and there's a call to fix the policy regarding the signals infrastructure. It needs to be fixed. And I think there was…I think there is an acknowledgement from many on Council and in the administration that there needs to be standardization. So, I think the job is being done. And I hope everyone can support. Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Rollins, I hope Councillor Rollins can support. Councillor…through you, Madam Chair, to Councillor Nason, you've confirmed you've known about this since November. I took the information, I brought it to the Auditor with Mr. Sweryda, who has the authority to immediately investigate once…once the Auditor has information. That's what I did. When I heard about problems with signals, intersections, I moved the motion to standardize...or signals inter…our signals at intersections. So, I know…I feel that I've taken the information, I've brought it to the relevant parties, and I think with all the actions that are taking place, the report being commissioned on the signals, asking the Auditor to look into it at no cost, coming back to us if there is additional work required, as well as a public forum potentially being hosted at Finance. So, I think we're covering our bases

here other than perhaps having another…yet another forum at Public Works, which we've already had, we could certainly bring that back, but at this time, I'm asking for consent on…on the audit. The Auditor did confirm that if Council does direct this that it shows political support. It is a good thing in terms of his office in terms of pursuing this further, and getting that direction to report back on additional resources is also important in this motion. So, with all that said, I think Winnipeggers want it…wants…Winnipeggers want answers, councillors want answers. Please support this motion. The Auditor will look into this further and let us know if additional work is required. And I don't know why you would not support this motion. And yes, it's true, there's one coming up from Riel to Executive Policy Committee to Council, but we have an opportunity today to get answers sooner, and if we wait for the other process, then we have to wait another month before we can give that green light to the Auditor. So, I don't think we need to be wasting any more time here. Some of us have seen Mr. Sweryda's presentation since November. Some of us have taken concrete actions to get the job done. And I hope we can all support this audit motion so that we can get to the bottom of these questions. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question.

Councillor Schreyer: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Yes?

Councillor Schreyer: Councillor Allard was talking about the green light. Sometimes those lights were red. I saw the photos.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. We'll have a recorded vote on this notice of motion moved by Councillor Allard. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I just wanted to point out, by the way, just procedurally, public hearing was mentioned. Public hearing is a term that…of legislation that we use here for a development application. So, the item might be on a future agenda of a committee such as Finance, but it is not as public hearing. Next, and also wanted to point out, in about an hour, we'll take a short recess, at around 5:45. Okay. Next, we're moving on to by-laws. By-laws under EPC, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

Mayor Bowman: I'm optimistic that we'll be efficient over the next hour, Madam Speaker, and so I'll try to facilitate that as best I can. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law 20/2022, By-law No. 21/2022, By-law 22/2022, bit of a tongue twister there, By-law No. 23/2022, Madam Speaker.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 20/2022, By-law No. 21/2022, By-law No. 22/2022, and By-law No. 23/2022.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Sherwood did that much better than I did. I move that By-laws No. 20/2022 to 23/2022, both inclusive, be read a second time, Madam Speaker.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 20/2022 to 23/2022, both inclusive.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Bowman: Thanks, Madam Speaker. I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 20/2022 to 23/2022, both inclusive, be read a third time and 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 for the Mayor. I'm going to pass the Chair to Councillor Eadie, to our Deputy Speaker. Councillor Eadie.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, maybe somebody wants to vocalize. Does somebody have a question for the Mayor today? I'm not hearing anybody having a question. Okay, then we will move on to the Innovation and Economic Development Committee. Councillor Browaty, you're up.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 24, 2022

Councillor Browaty: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of January 24th, 2022 and move Items 1 through 4 as consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Did anybody want to stand down any of the…I think there's four (inaudible) reports.

Councillor Browaty: Yes, correct.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No? Okay. Then I'm going to call the vote. All those in favour? Any opposed? Mr. Clerk, please record me in opposition. I'm not opposed to all of them, but I'm just going to…record me in opposition.

City Clerk: To clarify, Councillor Eadie, you're in opposition to all four items?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yeah, just to make it simple. Yeah. All right, there's no by-laws, so I'll open it up for question period for Councillor Browaty, the Chairperson. Do I hear any questions? No? Okay. Then we'll move on to the...sorry, I'm just in here…property...please forgive me. Property Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Councillor Gilroy? And oh, there's a whole bunch of motions here, so I'll need the Clerk's help. Thanks.

Clerk: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We do have amending Motion No. 4 on the only item on this report, Item 1. So, you can have the Chair introduce Item 1 of this report.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Is that for...which committee date? Is this a different date?

Clerk: January 17th, 2022.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, okay. So, actually...so, the Chairperson wants to introduce this report?

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 17, 2022

Councillor Gilroy: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that there is an amending motion on the floor as well. And I will be supporting the amending motion. This is looking at waiving the cost for some of our veterans. And it's also looking at, for our future costs, I think it was roughly $25,000 a year, roughly. And it's waiving the costs for this year, and then looking…the amending motion will be looking at making sure that we can look at future years through the budget process. And just in lieu of everything that's going on in the world, I'm wearing the Ukraine colours here today. And just in lieu of the many men and women that are going to be in battle right now, I think this is a great time to support the amending motion that's in front of us here today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Who's moving the amendment?

City Clerk: It's Motion No. 4, councillor…Mr. Deputy Speaker, from Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh right. Okay. Councillor Nason, to introduce this.

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

WHEREAS the report of the Winnipeg Public Service identifies that the annual cost to provide Veteran interment in the Field of Honour at less than $23,000 annually;

AND WHEREAS this undertaking is to support Veterans of our nation in their final resting place;

AND WHEREAS this motion would enable the ability for the City of Winnipeg to salute those Veterans that are selecting to be placed in the Field of Honour amongst Veterans from prior conflicts, wars and peacekeeping missions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 1 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development be amended by deleting Recommendation 1 and replacing it with the following:

1. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to authorize the interment of Veterans based on approved criteria for 2022, up to the amount of $23,000, funded from within existing Departmental budgets.*

2. *That the matter be referred to the 2023 Budget Review Process to address this matter for future years as part of a mill rate supported undertaking.*

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise to speak to this as, you know, Mr. Martin has been a great champion for veterans, bringing voices and helping with remembrance that we'd never forget. This amount of…in the motion, putting forward $23,000 annually, specifically in 2022 as the amount that was identified by the Public Service, I...I want to thank Councillor Gillingham for seconding the motion to get this ball rolling. You know, I know we all have busy schedules, he did happen by to grab my ear last week before EPC. And of course, with everything going on, everybody's busy, I did craft a motion through talking with Mr. Martin and getting Councillor Klein to second it. So, I want to thank Councillor Gillingham for at least getting it on the table to begin with and his work as the Veteran and Military Liaison. We have two Fields of Honour in the city of Winnipeg, one in the west and one in the east. The interesting part about the one in the east, in case anyone wasn't aware, is not actually in Transcona. It's in the RM of Springfield, but it's known as the Transcona Cemetery. The Field of Honours are where people can choose to be interned, and it's a place that we gather at Decoration Day, we gather at Remembrance Day and other times of through year as public officials and as family members going to remember family members. When Mr. Martin brought this to my attention, yeah, it was a very noble idea. One that you have to sit back and wonder why we ever did charge. And I've had, pardon me, family members ask, well, is this retroactive? Now, we're forward-moving. It's unfortunate that councils passed didn't try to push this forward, but here we are today. We are, you know, at least for this year, setting a tone that we can go this route. And I thank those that have reached out to me to say that this is a good motion and a good amendment. It's good to hear that the Chair is on board with the amendment motion…amending motion. We don't know who's going to be around this table for the next budget session 2023, nor do we know what economy we're going to be facing or, based on today's undertakings, and I do pray for those in Ukraine, that we don't know what the global conflict situation is going to be. And I pray that we do find peace, because I know for generations, we've been asking for peace in our time, and unfortunately, we've never seen that globally. But I want to thank my colleagues for this opportunity, and I do hope that I can have your support, and will be seeking a recorded vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You will be? Sorry.

Councillor Nason: Will be.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I wanted to thank Councillor Nason for the original motion, and then for this motion, and thank Councillor Klein for seconding. I certainly will be supporting it. And yes, as Councillor Gilroy, who's dressed appropriately today in Ukraine colours, Ukraine flag colours, appreciate that. As she indicated, I think, you know, just the fact that we look on our TV screens and we look on our social media feeds and our news feeds, and we see nothing but war and battle and people losing their lives as…really, as we speak because those reports are coming in. So, we thank our veterans. We thank our men and women who have served. We thank those who are currently serving as well. I want to acknowledge, again, the…first of all, the…Mr. Martin and others who have given voice to this and this

matter. I want to thank our staff, also, that work in…our cemetery staff. The Field of Honour out at...at Brookside Cemetery, other places, other cemeteries where there are internment sites for veterans. Our staff, I know, takes great pride in those sits and maintaining those final resting places and markers for the men and women who have served our nation. And so, I'm glad to support this motion today; the original motion and certainly, the amending motion today as well. And I want to thank all of those who had a part in putting it together.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody else who wants to speak?

City Clerk: I do not see any further hands, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Then I'm going to...Councillor Nason has called for a recorded vote, so I'm going to call the question on the...

City Clerk: You should now close by Councillor Nason and by Councillor Gilroy, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, sorry. Sorry, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Nason: I'm fine with my close.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Or Councillor Nason. Sorry.

Councillor Gilroy: You can call the question, too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. Sorry. Please forgive me. All right. All those in favour of the amending motion from Councillor Nason, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. I'm not going to call any…for anybody to rise, that's unanimous. Now, on the…on the amended report. All those in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: And Deputy Speaker? I'm usually at the end.

City Clerk: The vote Mr. Deputy Speaker, Yeas 15, Nays 0, with Councillor Orlikow absent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Absent? Okay. All right, so the report passes. I can't quite…I guess it's unanimous within the room. Councillor Gilroy, the report of February 17th, 2022.

City Clerk: Sorry to interrupt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's actually a report A from January 17th with one item.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh. Please forgive me. Sorry about that.

REPORT 'A' OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED JANUARY 17, 2022

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Consent of Item A?

City Clerk: Item 1 of the report I guess.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Report number one. Okay. Does anybody want...I guess I'm just calling the vote. Nobody wants to speak to it? All right. Then all those in favour? Is there anybody opposed? That carries. Thank you. Now the report of February 17th, sorry. Is it 7th or 17th? In favour of 8?

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, it was just a group of voices.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Oh, 7, sorry. Please forgive me. Councillor Gilroy, first. Something about report three.

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Introduce the reports.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT, HERITAGE AND DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DATED FEBRUARY 7, 2022

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, for February 7th, consent agenda Items 1 through 15, please.

Councillor Sharma: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll take the Chair back for this section.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yeah, sorry, because there's a bunch of amendments. But Madam…Madam…but hold it. What I'd like to do while I'm still the Deputy Speaker, I believe the protocol is for you to report that Report No. 3 has been withdrawn, Councillor Gilroy?

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, sorry. Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Yes, No. 3 was withdrawn by the applicant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you for that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Item 4, I'll note, has an amending motion. Are there any other items to stand down? Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Can I have 8, please?

Madam Speaker: Yeah, and 12 will be pulled as well. Item 8, Councillor Klein, Roblin Boulevard. Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: Item 4, but there's an amending motion on there?

Madam Speaker: Item 4, yes, has been pulled. Any others? Okay. Seeing none, I'll call the question on 2, 5, 6, and 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15.

Councillor Gillingham: Pull 15, please.

Councillor Gilroy: Did someone pull 1 or?

Madam Speaker: 15's been pulled by Councillor Gillingham. Councillor, 1 is not pulled. Councillor, 1 is…Item 1 is not pulled, is there a desire to pull that? No? Okay. Any other? Yes. Okay, I'll call the question on 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Item 4.

Item 4 – Waiver of Sponsorship Policy – Lease Agreement for 50 Provencher Boulevard – Biomedical Commercialization Canada Inc. o/a Manitoba Technology Accelerator

Madam Speaker: Thank you. There is an amending Motion 4 corresponding with this. I'm sorry. is it Motion 11 for this one? I don't have that, Mr. Clerk. If you can give me a moment. Councillor Allard, do you wish to rescind Motion 11? I think it's replaced with 12. Is that your desire?

Motion No. 11
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated January 17, 2022 be amended as by adding the following new Recommendation a2 and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:

"2. That the waiver of the Sponsorship Policy will not apply to naming rights of the leased premises or for sponsorship agreements that are for a period in excess of two years"

Councillor Allard: Oh, yes.

Madam Speaker: Motion 11, and with the concurrence of your seconder, which was Councillor Klein, you wish to rescind motion…

Councillor Allard: It was just the date, it was changed.

Madam Speaker: Yes, but we need to…needed to recirculate something. So, with the concurrence of the mover and seconder; all in favour of rescinding Motion 11? Contrary? That's carried. And now, Councillor Allard, to introduce motion…yes, Councillor Gilroy, to introduce the item.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you very…thank you very much. This is Item 4, just to be…just to make sure I'm on the right item. Madam Speaker, 4?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. Waiver of Sponsorship Policy; and that's the lease for 50 Provencher, which is, I'm sure you're all aware, is the…the bridge. And you know, we've had several different proponents in that space and unfortunately, we haven't had too much success. We finally have a new proponent that's coming in and what they're wanting us to do is waive the sponsorship policy. This is a common policy. We do that at places like…like, the Goldeyes have one. You know, the stadium. Just spaces that…you know, places that are public. They are intending to use this as maybe even a space where they hold venues. So, for example, if FCM came to town, they might hold…somebody might want to hold an event there and on the screen might have the business that is sponsoring that event. So, they want to be able to have that flexibility, and that's going to be changing all the time. So, having a policy that has to come back through Council, and it would really get caught up in our bureaucracy. So, this would just allow the director to have care and control and to really monitor. That doesn't mean that they're going to be allowed to put signages up on the building, this is really intended for the internal use of the space. We did hear during the…during the time that we were debating this item at Council, at committee, we did hear that they plan on using this as a venue place. They want to have screens. They are a tech company, so they want to have screens, and they might want to have people like FCM come in and, you know, whether it's the union sponsoring a night or, you know, the Social Planning Council sponsoring a night or even our business council. They'd be able to put that up without having to worry about the policies…going through the bureaucracy because that's going to be evolving and changing. So, this is just letting the director have kind of care, custody and control. We can always kind of monitor this and ask questions later on. There was quite a debate over our policy…sponsorship policy at our committee. There are…there's a lot of flaws, there's a lot of bureaucracy that goes on with this, so this is just allowing the group to be able to use this as a real…a real good event space, and incubator, and allowing them to be able to put posters and different companies up that are sponsoring these events. And so, I hope that you all support…support this. I will not be supporting the motion from Councillor Allard. I think…I think that the work that they're going to be doing is not going to be impacting, you know, the bridge itself, it's really the internal use of the space. And I think that we do…we do do this on other occasions. This isn't something new. And the director could have…can have care, custody and control of that and we can always be reviewing it in a year or so. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard to introduce your amending motion.

Motion No. 12
Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Klein,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development dated February 7, 2022 be amended as by adding the following new Recommendation 2 and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:

"2. That the waiver of the Sponsorship Policy will not apply to naming rights of the leased premises or for sponsorship agreements that are for a period in excess of two years"

Councillor Allard: Thank you. The reason that I...that I moved this, inspired by a presentation...representation this morning. Mr. Kleinschmit and I have agreed on many…on some matters and disagreed on some matters, but on this one...this is a…this is the Esplanade Bridge that we're talking about here. The Esplanade Bridge is an iconic landmark in Winnipeg. It's very important to the St. Boniface community, but I think it's very important to Winnipeg, to Manitoba in terms of economic development and tourism. In terms of information that we have, in terms of information Council has on this…on this venture. There was a report that was passed last year, it might be something like four or five pages, there was a ten-minute presentation made at committee. There were commitments made verbally. There was a lot of uncertainty I heard and in the opening remarks, I heard things like we might review things like that. Well, that's my concern, is that we're about to waive the rules, and once they're waived, they're waived. And as part of the RFP, it'll be contractual agreements, and I don't think that we can un-waive them without having a material impact on the proponent. So, in terms of what Mr. Kleinschmit was saying this morning, this is a material difference in terms of what the R…the original RFP had been…had put out. The original RFP didn't say, you can…you can have the space and by the way, we'll waive the sponsorship policy. There might be opportunities for Winnipeg to benefit financially from…from whoever occupies the space. So, I think this is a compromise motion, and I hope that Council can support it. It's not saying no anymore to this proponent. I had asked the standing…the standing policy committee to not accept this RFP at this point. We have this waiver of sponsorship policy basically saying, well, you can do what you want as long as the Director's okay with it. Well, that's not a whole lot of…that's not a whole lot of Council…possibility for the…for Council to be able to provide feedback, so I'm worried about this space. There's been very little detail on what's going to happen. There's supposed to be a technology hall of fame, we don't know how many square feet that's going to be. I haven't seen any drawings. I think the proponent had said that they hadn't yet visited the site. There's so little detail on this proposal, yet we're about to sign a blank check on our sponsorship policy. Well, not quite blank, with director approval. And I don't see this benefiting the city in any way and I do see it as a material change. What if…what if another proponent might have come forward if they knew that they could waive the City of Winnipeg sponsorship policy? This is a prime spot. It's a great location. So…so, anyhow, this is a compromise. Like, I'm willing to support personally, and I think this is a really important space, and we need to make sure that what we're doing is what we want to be doing with it. And I'm not comfortable delegating the authority to the Director. And to make that part of the contractual agreement with this proponent means that we will lose that Council oversight, and I could see situations where we're not…we're not happy with that. So, I'm hoping you can support this amendment. It basically says, yes, we'll waive it for two years and then we can revisit, but if we go and give them the full five years as part of the RFP, we won't be able to revisit this. So, I hope we can…well, I'm asking you, please support this compromise. This gives us the opportunity to come back in two years and see, okay, did it work, did it not work. And if we go ahead then it's in the Director's Office and we don't have anymore Council opportunity in terms of…in terms of input. It'll be…it'll be a contractual obligation of Council for this…for this, well, policy that we're setting right now, to be accepted. And if we try and change it, the proponent will likely argue that they're being materially damaged. So, this is our opportunity to maintain some control over what happens in this space, and this space is very important for my community, but it's also very important for economic development and tourism in Winnipeg. I don't know how many know this, but Tourism Manitoba has the Francophonie, the French fact that Manitoba is one of their four pillars of attracting tourism to Winnipeg, and the Esplanade Bridge is on the way to St. Boniface. It's a natural economic development and tourism location, and I think we need to make sure that we get this right. And we're about to delegate all the authority without anymore Council oversight. So, please support this motion. It's a compromise. It says yes, go ahead with the proponents of two years to try and get out and then two years from now, we can re-evaluate, and if it's been going well, then we can…we can consider giving the proponent their waiver once again. But what are we, Council, getting out of this? Sponsorship policy is supposed to be about getting money, not about giving it away. So, that's my pitch. Thanks for your consideration.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Allard. Next is Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I was pleased to hear that Councillor Gilroy recognizes the very, very complicated process that is in place with the current sponsorship policy. The current sponsorship policy has prevented the City of Winnipeg from receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars. I know of many situations in different wards where donors wanting to give a gift just walked. And it needs to be overhauled. I'm looking forward to seeing that happen in the next term, but the sponsorship policy holds great opportunity for innovative organizations to leverage it to

relieve the taxpayer burden. If I look at Dakota Community Centre and see the hundreds of thousands, over million now…million and hundreds of thousands that have been raised that are not burdening the taxpayer, I say bravo. I also know that by following the sponsorship policy closely, they have also lost tens of thousands of dollars. That's just one example. So, in this report, you know, if you look at MTA, what Manitoba Technology Accelerated does, they're a very, very innovative company. They're going to look at ways to raise money to keep that facility in top condition, beautiful, to host the world. And I am quite confident that the Director of Property, Planning and Development is listed in here to approve any sponsorship opportunities. So, I'm…I do not want to see any changes made to this. I want to see that beautiful facility shine like it's never shined before, and Manitoba Technology Accelerator will do just that. And this is the opportunity to enable them to thrive and to not put a burden on the taxpayer. We're going through the same process with the new recreation campus. Public Service wants tax dollars to support it fully. I'm saying, along with the community, why? We've got lots of opportunities to raise funding for sponsorship opportunity. Sponsorship opportunity isn't about making the City money; sponsorship opportunity is about saving the City. And this lease, the way it's written up, giving MTA that opportunity is ideal. So, I'm fully supportive of it. I'm very confident with the Director of Property, Planning and Development since they have to approve the sponsors, you know, is going to do a good job of that. So, I'm recommending that we continue with the motion the way it...with the report the way it is and support the report. Support the report. Thank you.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to be supporting Councillor Allard's motion in this case. And actually, it's kind of consistent with the question I asked this morning of delegation, and it has to do with kind of admitting that, you know, the bridge restaurant, it's special. That area right between The Forks and St. Boniface is special. I've always felt, which is one of the reasons I always felt that St. Boniface Ward along the river should be given extra consideration because it was outside the downtown tourism zone, that it should be because it means a lot. And I just would like to try Councillor Allard's approach to give it that special attention by the elected representatives. As Councillor Lukes points out, I certainly have no problem with how the senior administrator for it could do the job, but I also like to see how we could just pop it, optimise it, to see what we could do with that extra political attention. And admittedly, it would be political, that political attention to what is…well, what I've always felt was a very special…challenging, but special, special venue. And on that basis, I will be supporting Councillor Allard's amendment as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Try to be quick, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting the amending motion. While the concept is kind of interesting, I listened to the debate at PDHDD when this came up and did learn that the sponsorship policy is being reviewed, thank goodness. I'm with Councillor Lukes on that. But so, giving the ability…and the Director is still keeping check on it, to support the facility on the bridge, it is a gateway to St. Boniface, Madam Speaker. And I think that it is very important that we give this technology group the ability to make it go because it's not going. And I would point out that a councillor from St. Boniface who wanted to be mayor lost because that…of that facility that was built that everybody seems to enjoy today. So, I won't be supporting the amending motion. I think under the whole five-year agreement it's fine. I don't see any reason or need to adjust it for only a two-year, and I'll be supporting the report. And again, I just wanted to say...mention, I forgot to mention, the review of the sponsorship policy, I see a lot of conflicting issues that will happen with the sponsorship policy as it might relate to naming facilities on parks and open spaces when a sponsorship comes, and then, is Welcome Winnipeg going to review the sponsor? For example, maybe you call it the Jim Gauthier Nomad's field house or whatever, I think there's…needs to be a review of the sponsorship policy because we have Welcome Winnipeg and who…like, who's deciding what that naming and all that is because ultimately, sponsorship results in naming opportunity as well. So, I'll just leave it at that. I'm glad that it's being reviewed, and I won't support the amendment and supporting the report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Yes. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Esplanade Bridge and this leased space is located in Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward. It's a very important to fort…Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward because the Esplanade Bridge is on the way to the heart of the downtown. This leased space, I want to note, I support the Public Service report, that makes sure that the sponsorship policy is waived and to conclude the lease agreement with MTA quickly. That's what I would like to see happen. This is not a compromise, this amendment. I believe this is a red tape. And I believe, too, Madam Speaker, it's important to set in context the long-standing and public dispute that the mover has with this lease space and what should, in concepts of what should and should not take place in there. And it's through those public comments that I reached out to MTA to let them know, number one, the space was located in Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry and number two, that I welcomed business incubators. Business incubators, in particular, that might create more business incubation and draw down more funding to this city. And as a councillor, I…that is exactly the kind of business that I want to see in this city period, full stop. And any impediment to business and business incubation, I'd like to see stopped. And any red tape, I'd like to see stopped, and I view this amendment as red tape. And I view this amendment as an extension of the public

statements. And I'll let you know a little secret, Madam Speaker, when I did phone, and I said your business is just a-okay by me, you know, have you signed that lease? I invited, once it was all said and done, no matter what, to have a drink at the promenade, the restaurant in St. Boniface. Why? Because that would have been the direct competition of any leased space with a restaurant in it. So, absolutely didn't want to see the City compete with the restaurant district in St. Boniface or, frankly, in my ward. But business incubation, let's get at 'er, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Allard: I've said what I had to say.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. We'll move on, Councillor Gilroy to close.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I also just want to remind everybody that we do have a Downtown Zoning By-law review. So, on the outside of the building, this would automatically…any signage on the outside would have to be reviewed through our Downtown Zoning By-law, so I just want that to be clear so people understand that. There's already kind of a review process for that, and this is a space that has been sitting empty for years. And we finally have somebody coming in and trying to do something with it. I think they need to get started. This is going to be a very different and unique space. It's not going to be a restaurant just opening up, it's going to be a very different space. So, I think that a five-year time limit gives us enough time to figure out if this is working. I'm just worried that a two-year time limit just wouldn't be enough. And I just think it just bogs down some of the workload our Property and Development team already has. So, I really think that that…you know, I think the motion is good as it is. I want to thank Councillor Allard. I do know, you know, he…you know, this was a challenge. The space was not really welcomed from some of his members of his community, this lease proponent, but I do think this is a good use of space. I think that making sure that our Director has care and control will help release…deal with the red tape issues that we are seeing especially in terms of this area space, which they're looking at hosting many different events, some of that many of us in this council chamber might be attending in the future. And if it was a City event, we would want to be able to put up a City…a City poster without having something to go through so much scrutiny and red tape. So, I think this is…I hope you support the main motion and don't support the amending motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we'll call the question on amending Motion 12. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. We need to have a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Klein, Mayes, Nason and Schreyer

Nays

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

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 5, Nays 10, with Councillor Browaty absent.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Amending Motion 12 is lost. And the main item. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. Okay, if the item carries, and Councillor Allard will be recorded in opposition. Councillor Browaty absent. Okay, with that, we'll take a recess. Yes.

Councillor Eadie: We also…if we're taking a break, we need to move a motion now to go past 6:00 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Sure. Thank you. So, we'll move a motion to work past 6:00 p.m. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. And the time? Yeah, I was going to suggest 20. Okay, let's…5:00 o'clock…6:00 o'clock sharp, just before…5 minutes if we can, let's be here. Okay. So, 5:55, let's be back here. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
February 24, 2022, at 6:06 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good evening. I'd like to reconvene our Council meeting of February 24th, 2022. Call the meeting to order once again. We are on Item 8 of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Item 8, Mr. Clerk.

Item 8 – Rezoning – 4025 Roblin Boulevard – DAZ 212/2021

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And is there an amending motion for this?

Madam Speaker: Not on…not at this time, no.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay, thank you, Madam Speaker. So, Madam Speaker, this…this was a rezoning for 4025 Roblin Boulevard, and it was a marathon meeting, Madam Speaker, for the Assiniboia centre community committee where they overheard 10 to 12 hours and a lot pertaining to this rezoning that we're discussing here today. The location is on Roblin and William Park…William Clement Parkway. I do hope you support it. We did support the community committee's recommendation at EPC making sure that this development will happen, but also listening to some of the concerns that residents had raised. Some of the residents had raised that they want to save some of the trees and a forest that's in behind, and those concerns were taken as part of our recommendation going forward. This is going to be an L-shaped ten-story building. It's about 199 units. It's a good development, Madam Speaker. It is exactly what we want to do when we look at making sure that we densify areas, making sure that people have different styles of living within a community. We want to make sure that there's apartment complexes and more people can age gracefully into a different form of apartment living from owning a house and stay within their community. That's kind of critical. And it also making sure that we're developing up, not out, so it's adding to that community, Madam Speaker. A lot of the development was going to be looking at limiting heights. There's going to be no vehicle access off of one of the streets. Everything will be coming off Roblin, which was a request to the community, Madam Speaker. That was something that they wanted. The Odd Fellows building that is also share…shares that site will still remain assisted living. And the community wanted the entrance off Roblin to help mitigate and save some of the trees. So, this was a really positive development for the community. We support the administration. It was supported at…all three councillors supported it at the community committee, and at EPC, we wanted to support that work that they did at community committee. So, thank you, Madam Speaker. I hope you support this motion moving forward. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Madam Speaker, I would like to move, like we did with Grassie last City Council meeting, to have this sent back to the Assiniboia Community Committee.

Madam Speaker: You have an opportunity to speak for a few minutes if you'd like. The clock, please.

Councillor Klein: Yeah, I would be happy to. I acknowledge the comments that my colleague made. Some of us know the area very, very well, some of us know it a little bit, but the problem that has…that was talked about during the public hearing, it needs to be addressed, and needs to be considered. And I think the Mayor would agree with me on this one is, we put the sign for 4025 Roblin on McQuaker, that has 11 homes, and we put it in the trees. We didn't put it on Roblin Boulevard, and there's a number of residents who weren't able to speak. Yes, we had a number of people speak and we were there for 11 hours, almost…well, 10 and a bit hours on that matter, but that's our job. We don't have time limits on when we make decisions, certainly, should not. So, I would respectfully ask my colleagues to support the fact that everyone, pardon me, everyone in the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Ward, but specifically Charleswood, should have been properly notified by the sign and this was not done. I'll acknowledge the Public Service said, according to their review, it was put where the Public Service said it should be put, but the address is 4025 Roblin, and no public notice sign was on 4025 Roblin. And it is for those reasons that I'm just asking my colleagues today to do like we did with Grassie, and reopen the public hearings and sending it back to the Assiniboia Community Committee to give an opportunity to the many residents that did not know about it because of the irregular placement of the public notice.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, would you like to speak?

Councillor Gilroy: Sure. Thank you, Madam Speaker. With all due respect, Madam Speaker, 130 delegations came. The administration had said the signage…the signage was done correctly. With that many delegations, Madam Speaker, there was quite a few delegations. And I'm sorry if I had the wrong amount, I will apologize for that, but overall, if you go back to that agenda, there's an overwhelming amount of delegations. There's clearly enough signage. And the administration has said the signage is done right. So, I really do not think that this warrants us prolonging this. This was a difficult decision for the community committee, it's a difficult decision going through the process, and the community members. A decision was made, and I hope that the Council here supports the decision that was made.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, we'll have a vote on the referral back to the community committee of Assiniboia. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Klein, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Schreyer, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Rollins, Lukes, and Santos

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 8, with Councillor Browaty absent.

Madam Speaker: The referral motion is lost…the referral. Back to the main item. Councillor Klein.

Councillor Klein: Yeah, I'll speak to it. I'm going to not support this. I'm disappointed in my colleagues given that last month, we did the exact same thing. We moved it and we put it back to ACC, why? Because you got a number of e-mails from residents telling you to do that. You all did it. We saw the e-mails were sent to everybody. I don't appreciate the fact that we hear in here often; we have to support the area councillor, we have to support the area councillor. How do we now go to the public and say, yes, we put the sign in the middle of a forest, down a road that only 11 people live in and move ahead with this? There is a historical building on the site that right now is being investigated because it was taken off the historical designation list and it's 100 years old. We heard that construction won't be a problem, that building will survive, but we've also heard that that's not possible because it's a stone foundation. I'm asking my colleagues to...I mean, listen, you don't…just because you think building up is the best way, you don't do it at all costs, right? We do this in a…with a process. We do this thinking of the future. We don't just say, in an area where there is no apartment buildings this size, well, it's okay to do that because this is what I think the city should be. I believe that this is what it's like because it's like this in this area or it's like that in this area. We don't do that or I'd be moving motions to have ditches put all through River Heights and St. Vital because that's what we believe, that's the right thing to do, we need to have ditches and you all have to agree to it because it would save us money. We wouldn't have the problems with sewer systems when we have ditches. Waterflow would just run down the ditches. I don't want to make light of the situation, but the reality here is that we just approved one less than half a mile away. We heard the traffic study, it wasn't convincing that it took into consideration the new development that was just approved. The fact that the sign was put on McQuaker, despite what the Public Service says, is not sufficient enough. We heard at the public hearing that even the planners thought, yeah, well, we asked them to move it, but they said no. These are all facts that we have to consider. I don't see the harm in any of your lies or to the City by sending it back and say, we have to have more discussion about this. We haven't thought this through. We sat here today and approved a motion for a building from 1964, the saint…the St. Boniface Police Station, we made that historical building, that means I'm historical. A building from 100 years ago, we haven't talked about enough. We didn't consider it there. Why? Because we were told we really didn't know it was a historical. And beside my colleagues comments that we heard it's going to stay as a long-term care facility, actually, we did not hear that. We heard that they want to take that building and turn it into a facility's building. You have to be licensed and you have to have certain staff to maintain a long-term care facility. There needs to be more discussion on this. The impact of traffic on Roblin, the fact that people call the Bill Clement Parkway, like, this massive parkway, let's be realistic; it goes two blocks. In most cities, we would be laughed at for calling that a parkway. It's not the Chief Peguis. That's not Pembina. It's two blocks with a lot of greenspace that was built in and approved by Council for reasons that they felt were necessary. The caveat not to go on McQuaker was there, that's why at the public hearing we heard it didn't go through. I think there's more to be talked about here. I'm not saying, and the residents weren't saying, don't put anything there, let's just be smart about it. And that's why I'm asking you. Put your, you know, personal feelings aside and look at this realistically and say, you know what, did we consider the facts enough? Did we consider the fact the sign was not seen by thousands of cars that drive by there every day, so nobody knew? Unless you drove down McQuaker to the dead end, you would not have seen it. We have to look at the facts that we asked for the sign to be moved. No. They would not hear that. That's not our problem. Yes, we had residents come forward. Why? Because there's 40-some odd homes behind that property that were impacted that also did not see the sign. Thankfully, a person on McQuaker notified a couple of the people that lived back there so that they could appear. We heard from three different planners during the public hearing with three different perspectives on what should be there and how it should be there. We only listened to the Public Service. That's it. We only listened to the Public Service. We made a decision, and I'm not going to begrudge anybody for that. I don't want to get into the political part of it. I want to talk about the reasonable part, and it's reasonable to send it back so that all residents have an opportunity to know about the development that's going to take place at one of the busiest corners in our ward that has a median, that the City is saying that U-turns are fine there. Well, I would venture to say, I'm sure the Mayor drives that road and I do, I don't know how anyone is going to be able to make a U-turn there in what we were told and was accepted, in less than

five seconds. There's just too many questions that haven't been answered, and there's just too much to consider with the signage of other residents that weren't heard. And let's remember, this is the very first one that is under the new process that was just implemented by the Provincial Government. So the appeal process is different. I'm here asking you as a colleague to support my motion. Turn this down, then, and they'll reapply, and we'll have a better opportunity to do what's best there and let every resident be a part of it. I tried to have it sent back to the community committee so that that saved you all from that, but I don't want to be one of those councillors that does it just because a developer said that's what I need to make money. I think we've heard those comments years ago and years ago. We're not here for developers, right? We want development in our city, but we want good development, proper development. We look at the problems that Councillor Mayes went through in his area with infill, the constant bombardment from residents. We're working to inform people better. The Mayor is working to make things more transparent. Putting the sign on McQuaker is irresponsible. How can you…how can you approve this motion for 4025 Roblin when the public notice sign was put on McQuaker? I would say anybody has a legal challenge with that, despite what the City thinks, because some of the planners said publicly, yeah, it should have been on Roblin. It should have been there. So, you have to ask yourself, why wasn't it? Thank you.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to speak to it, but I listened to great interest at the discussion at Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Committee meeting. I understand it was quite a long meeting in regards to this particular application, Madam Speaker. I'm just standing to say, I'm supporting with EPCs decision to do with this particular application. And while I do hear what the councillor for this particular property in this area, I did hear, Madam Speaker, that a number of changes were applied because of what was heard at that committee. And in terms of posting, I mean, if we could send every DASZ back to…or you know, a rezoning; we could send it back, all of them, based on posting of hearings. A good example is, we're going to be considering one coming up and the signs were posted up, the sidewalks weren't plowed, nobody's walking around, who's going to see it, Madam Speaker? Like, really, that's what happened. That's what happened. But the thing is, it was posted properly according to our rules. And you know, Councillor Allard in the past has moved to get a number of things changed about how we post these notices up and how we make it so that they can see them and actually give a better idea of what's actually being applied to do for. But it sounds to me like there was a number of changes made to the agreement, the application, in order to accommodate not too much height in the back...you know, I'm not going to get into all the things, but there were a number of changes, Madam Speaker. This one is not the same as the one in Transcona over on Grassie. It's not the same situation that I can tell, Madam Speaker. And you know, we talk about major corridors and doing U-turns; well, Main Street after Pembina Highway, I believe Main Street is the busiest street in Winnipeg. Although, Kenaston could be…is up there. But Main Street is definitely heavy on the…on the traffic, and even...like, even at late at night. They have implemented no left-hand turns, so you have to do a U-turn to get east of Main down into my neighborhood, Madam Speaker, but the U-turns are doable. People are doing that, Madam Speaker. Or they're making a...different decisions, whatever. Anyway, the people are making those U-turns, they're happening. So, I'm hearing some of the problems, and there was a lot of stuff presented. And Madam Speaker, every personal care home that's going to get built in the applications, they applied to the Province to get the proper funding for long-term personal care, Madam Speaker. They don't apply to the City of Winnipeg. Holy Family just built an independent…a big thing there. They didn't come to us to find out if the Province was going to fund long-term care there, but they are, Madam Speaker. That's not part of the application. The application is about the domain of the zoning. And I'll just point out that it is the first one or one of the first ones because the police station is also another one of those, and I can't remember what the grounds the Province has said that it could be appealable to the Municipal Board, Madam Speaker, but I think we convinced them to change it so that not only the applicant can appeal it, I think they put in a provision, maybe they didn't, I don't know, but there are people opposed to it for whatever reasons, and...but it was all considered. So I'm going to be voting to support the EPC decision on those grounds. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move referral back to the Property Committee for clarification on the signage plus the other matters that the councillor for the ward has raised.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Nason has moved referral…referral to the Planning, Property and Development Committee for further clarification on the signage, that is in order. Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to respond?

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I understand that on large developments like this, it is very difficult. It's difficult to make some of these tough decisions. I just want to show everybody, if you go and you look at how many people responded, how many delegates were seen, that's proof enough to me that that was enough signage, that the signage was sufficient. So, I really don't feel that that is a good argument in this case. And I do also want to talk about, I think it's really critical that as city councillors, that we're not always just going on with whatever our neighbouring councillor wants. And I think that that's really important, that we have this sober second thought through our different committee processes that allow us to ask the questions of administration, to allow us to look at this from different perspectives to come to a full

decision on the best interests of all Winnipeg. And it is not personal, it's councillors making a decision, and it's not because we have a best friend that's a councillor or you know…or that councillor just knows everything about the area and got to listen to them. It's really important that, as councillors, we be able to look beyond all that. And I think that that's critical in our structure. So, I want it to be known that this is not personal, it's just the fact that with the information that we've had, going up through administration, that that...that this should proceed. So, I don't believe that there needs, Madam Speaker, to be a deferral of this. I think the signage was sufficient. I think we know that from the amount of people that were in delegation and what we see here in our…in the file, if you go and you read the file, how many people responded. It's just that these decisions are tough and rough, and our job is to make them, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. We'll now vote on the referral to the Planning, Property and Development Committee for further clarification on the signage just from the administration, not opening a hearing. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Klein, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Chambers, Eadie, Gillingham, Gilroy, Rollins, Santos and Lukes

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 7, Nays 8, with Councillor Browaty absent.

Madam Speaker: The referral is lost. Back to the main item. Next speaker? You've already spoken, Councillor Gilroy, so that's not in order.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to acknowledge Councillor Klein for the passion and advocacy he is presenting for the residents of his community. You know, we are elected by citizens, we come to city hall to represent the citizens' desires, but we also come to city hall to look at the big picture and to make decisions based on the big picture. I just want to clarify a few things here that may have some factual inaccuracies. The sign that's being spoken of, the very large sign that goes up on a subdivision and rezoning, was legally installed. It was a question that I had, too. The frontage; what one would think would be the frontage on Roblin is actually City greenspace under the Parks Department. So, the frontage is facing McQuaker, and the sign is to be installed on the frontage, so the sign was absolutely installed correctly. The proponent came asking for a project that was ten stories and eight stories and I'll speak in terms of stories versus feet, and the reason…and I'll speak in stories under the understanding that all new developments, virtually all new developments, have nine to ten-foot ceilings, not eight…not eight…is it eight-foot ceilings, the lower ceiling, they have higher ceilings. So, the developer, the proponent, came proposed building a ten-story and an eight-story. Through 12 hours of discussion with residents, Councillor Klein, Councillor Gillingham and I unanimously approved two seven-story units. The residents wanted to save trees. Trees were saved. The proponent is having to put in additional costs to make access and egress onto Roblin safe. I want to point out the location of these two buildings. Two sides face residents, but the distance is between 60 and 100 feet on one side, and I believe it's 99 on the other, and I think, Councillor Klein, we amended the report, and we made it even further. And then the remaining two sides are on major transportation corridors. So, it's a rare opportunity that you get to put in a couple of larger buildings that have transportation corridors around them. If you look at how we approved and supported the development of OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities, these sites along transportation corridors are exactly what is asked of us to do when we build up on major and minor transit…major and minor arterials and transit corridors. This development is providing accommodation to suit a demographic who is downsizing. The community of Charleswood is one of our older communities. The age is older, and to downsize, there is not a lot of apartments that they can downsize to. No proponent is going to build a building like this unless they feel the market is there. Whether we have a low vacancy rate right now or not, Winnipeg will continue to grow, and the demographics are aging, and they want to move in to apartments, to affordable housing, where they can manage. And this is the other thing about apartments; sure, there's different terms of affordable housing, but apartments are places that people who can't afford a house can move into. They're places where people who want to downsize are going to move into. The proponent is proposing to connect to this heritage building and make it a very large amenity for the neighbours or for the people in the apartment blocks. This type of development is exactly what we've laid out to do in Complete Communities and in OurWinnipeg. I will absolutely acknowledge that it is a change for the residents in the area, but you

know, if we didn't change, if the city didn't change, we'd still be having oxcarts going up and down some of these roads and we'd be having…you know, this would still be farmland. Cities are living, growing, breathing organisms. I have taken much heat for urban sprawl for Waverley West, which is actually contiguous development. But I've also…also made a conscious effort and worked with residents to help them understand how our city is growing and how we want to grow, and worked with community and have been able to incorporate many infill, many, many large apartment buildings. Yes, Pembina Highway is not Roblin Boulevard. For sure, it's not, but at one point, it was. Things evolve over time. This is a difficult decision for the area councillor, and I acknowledge that, but how are we to grow as a city? How are we to grow up? If we are to do the 50% up, 50% out, this location is ideal. And the councillor, in the 10, 12-hour marathon session, agreed to it. He voted to support it. At the next committee, at PP&D, there was a request to reduce the height even lower. That went to the Executive Policy Committee with no recommendation and Executive Policy Committee determined that what was decided after the marathon public hearing session with residents and the area councillor to support that, and this is what we're voting on today. Like Councillor Gilroy says, this is not an easy decision for the area councillor, but we all have to wear two hats: our councillor hat, and our growing the city hat. This will be a beautiful, beautiful project for the residents of the area. It will be a beautiful project for people to move into and provide housing that isn't out there. And yeah, there's a lot happening on that intersection of Roblin and Sterling Lyon because it's a desirable area to live in; there's amenities, there's services, it's everything we want when we do develop up. So, I'm very supportive of this project. It supports so much of how we want to grow as a city, and we do have to make difficult decisions. And if we all supported the community committee, what's the point of having all of these other committees? Ah, that's an opportunity to discuss it further with the governance review folks, but that's another topic. So, I encourage you to support this, it's not an easy decision. And again, I want to commend Councillor Klein for…for his efforts, but the bottom line is, this is how virtually all of us voted to grow our city. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Klein, do you have a point of order?

Councillor Klein: Just a point of order, yeah. There…it seems like you're making it an emotional issue that I have for this. Some of the comments were not accurate that were just made. And it's not an emotional issue, it's one of legalities. So, I guess we'll find out now just who knew what they were doing.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Klein, thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I did vote for the referral, and that didn't succeed, I will probably just vote to move this forward. But Councillor Lukes' point right at the end was the valuable one in some ways, which is, what a process. You have the public come out to a hearing with their local councillor. You have 12 hours. Does the decision matter that much? Well, not necessarily, because it goes up to another committee where the administration is allowed to present at length to any question that's asked. Are the residents there? Is the developer there? No, they are not. Then you go onto the executive where, again, you can ask the administration enormous numbers of questions and get their feedback and they get to put their best foot forward a third time. You could even do it here today if you wanted to. So, unlike court proceedings, there are certainly proceedings where it goes from the Bankruptcy Trustee to the Court of Queen's Bench to the Court of Appeals to the Supreme Court. Sadly, I never got to the Supreme Court on the one I was doing. I got through the three levels. But these things can go back and forth. There can be multiple appeals, but you have a hearing. You hear from both sides. Sometimes it's an appeal just based on with the process, right? Sometimes it's a hearing de novo, we're going to hear it all over again. But here we have this…it's allegedly, it's theoretically a quasi-judicial process, but the group that hears it originally is then only three out of the 16 who eventually vote, but you can also hear from the admin at each and every step. It's really flawed. Councillor Lukes is right, this is…the governance review hasn't been something I've pushed and something she's pushed, to her credit. We really need to look at why we are doing things this way. Councillor Allard has pointed out many times, this seems to have grown out of the Old St. Boniface Residents' Association case of roughly 1992. Fair point, but whatever was created then, frankly, I don't think is working too well. So, I've had to vote on any number of these as have anyone in the room has voted on them. So, I appreciate the sort of oh, you're wearing two hats, but the process where you only hear residents at one level and then hear others at multiple levels is just clearly flawed. So, I welcome the chance under the governance review to at least try to change this.

Councillor Lukes: A point of order; how long has councillor…Councillor Glen Mayes been here? Yes, it is flawed.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Lukes, that's not a point of order. We're going to move on to the next speaker. Next speaker, Councillor Gillingham, yes.

Councillor Gillingham: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise just to say, I'm going to support this report to be consistent with my vote at EPC and then my vote at community committee as well. As Councillor Lukes has pointed out, it was a very long community committee meeting. We heard from many of the area residents and Councillor Lukes is right to point out, I give credit to Councillor Klein for his…all of the correspondence and discussions and meetings he's had with residents in the area. And we saw it, if you go back and, you know, and watch the video, watch the highlights anyways,

several of the concerns that the residents did raise, and there was a lot of...a lot of residents that spoke, several of the concerns that were raised were addressed or tried to be addressed in some matter, including the reduction of the height of the building. As Councillor Lukes has indicated, it was going to be a ten-story was being proposed or ten and eight, and it was down to seven. Also, the…I think what's also important on this site, the building that's being proposed is moved all the way to the, basically the street side, the William Clement Parkway side and the Roblin side, away from McQuaker, where there are homes. One of the other things I think that's important to point out too is the initial idea was that there was talk about accessing the site on and off McQuaker, which is a short residential street. That was done away with, and the site is going to be accessed off Roblin Boulevard. So, people living on McQuaker won't have all of the people that are going to live in this area…in this property, driving on and off their street. And I think it is important to point out as well that the location of the signage was in the very...was complied with, what the development process is saying. It was put where it was supposed to go as per the legal requirements. I know Councillor Klein, Councillor Lukes and myself, all of us, reached out to the…to our Public Service just to make sure that was, indeed, the right location. And we were all...I won't speak for my councillor colleagues, but Councillor Klein…or Councillor Lukes has indicated, and I can certainly say for myself, that our Property and Development staff indicated the sign was where it was supposed to go. Is it ideal from the site? No, I agree as well, but it legally is put…was put where it was supposed to be put. So, I'm going to be consistent with my vote at community committee and also at Executive Policy Committee as well. I will note this, and it's something I think all three of us as community committee members noted that evening, because the meeting went into the evening, much like this one is going, there were a lot of delegations, and all of them were…it was probably one of the most polite meetings I've been at. They spoke with passion, but everybody was respectful. The whole process, though it was long, was one where the residents and those that spoke at the…in delegation that night, just did an excellent job. And it was a long meeting, but appreciated the passion of which the community members spoke, and the way they presented themselves. So, I think at the end of the day, if you go back and see, that community committee resulted in a motion and a decision that is ultimately before us that represents give and take and represents the fact that many of, maybe not all, but many of the residents' concerns were heard and were addressed, and I'm going to stand behind the decision I made at community committee. Thank you.

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

Mayor Bowman: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support the disposition before us. I did so at Executive Policy Committee in support of the work at the community committee. The members of the committee have articulated their deliberations and work, which I want to acknowledge and appreciate on behalf of all of us here today. I gather it was a long meeting, and I'm not surprised to hear that folks were very polite, they're from Charleswood. People from Charleswood are very polite. It's a beautiful community, and as Councillor Lukes noted, part of the challenge in Charleswood, not dissimilar to some other areas of the city as well, is just there aren't the housing options that community members need, especially those that want to age in the community. And so, I've been…I was raised in Charleswood. I'm raising our two boys in Charleswood right now. I'm very proud to be from Charleswood. And you know, I'll just…I'll just conclude by two thoughts: the reason why I didn't support referring it back is I am concerned about the length of time this is taking and the message that further delays might send to the development community as a whole. This will be compounded if in fact, now under Bill 37, this matter is further delayed, which they will...the developer or enough citizens have the right to trigger a process where it could be reviewed by the municipal...municipal…oh, my gosh, I'm blanking on my words right now.

Madam Speaker: Board.

Mayor Bowman: Municipal Board, thank you. You can tell it's 10 to 7 at night. In any of event, so this could very well take longer because of that process, and so I don't want to do anything to further extend that for those that want to invest in the community. I will also just conclude by…comments were made earlier about the parkway. It's not the 401, it's not Wellington Crescent, it's not, you know…it is…it is a parkway. It's a very special place for the community of Charleswood, and especially the greenspace there. It may only be a couple of blocks, but it is named after someone who served in this floor of this Council, who I had the pleasure, as did other members of this Council, had the pleasure of knowing while he was with us; William R. Clement. And I just want to acknowledge that for those that, obviously, mourn him and recognize his work that he did on behalf of the citizens of Winnipeg.

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

Councillor Gilroy: You can call the question.

Madam Speaker: Okay. I'll call the question on Item 8. All in favour?

Councillor Lukes: Recorded vote, please.

Madam Speaker: Contrary? I've already called the question. Anyone recorded in opposition? Councillor Nason and Councillor Klein and Councillor Schreyer. And that carries. Next item, Item 12.

Item 12 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 80, 86, 90, 96 and 100 Sinclair Street, 485, 577, 581 McPhillips Street, 100 Battery Street – DASZ 44/2021

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy, to introduce the item, followed by amending Motion 9.

Councillor Gilroy: I'll just wait for my councillor colleagues on this.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Councillor Eadie moved a motion and seconded by Councillor Santos, yes. Motion 9, Councillor Eadie, your opportunity to introduce the item.

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Eadie,
Seconded by Councillor Santos,

WHEREAS taking condition "4." Out of the DASZ 44/2021 application means there is no requirement for the developer to pay the 10% cash in lieu of the dedication of land to the community as a legal agreement binding on the developer on behalf of the Winnipeg Police Service;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 12 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property, Development Heritage and Downtown Development be amended by reinserting the following Recommendation 4 and renumbering the following remain accordingly:

> *"4. That, in lieu of the dedication of land, the developer shall provide a cash payment in an amount equal to ten percent (10%) of the appraised value of Development Application No. DASZ 44/2021, as determined by the City's Director of Planning, Property and Development."*

Councillor Eadie: Yes, and I'll introduce it and I'll speak to…there is an amending motion…Motion 15, amending motion of this amending motion. So, I want to start off by saying that I totally support Councillor Mayes and Councillor Gilroy's amendment to the amendment, I believe it is. And so...so this is just...this particular amendment, it's housekeeping in terms of all DASZs, whether it's the city, although Number Ten Architecture, I believe, is the applicant on behalf of the City in this case, but they're all subject to 10% cash payment in lieu of not dedicating land for park space, park recreation space, Madam Speaker. And so, just for clarification, that's a Charter thing, and if you want to change the Charter, that's a whole different process. So, but what I want to speak to, so what it comes down to is a lot of problems, but the Winnipeg Police Service does need a new police station for district three. They've been planning to do it since 2004. Where it's going, there's a lot of people who are unhappy, Madam Speaker. And it did arise that nobody knew the hearing was coming up, so they didn't have time to present in opposition. Although, we did receive…the Clerk's and…we did receive some opposition, but…and what really gets me though is, on…now, this one is not so bad. I understand the reasons that it was done and I thanked EPC already, Madam Speaker, but ultimately, the ones that bother me are when a community committee's decision gets overturned at P&D or at EPC, contrary to the hearing that we…the previous one we just spoke to, which didn't get changed when it came out of the hearing. Now, people can't present on this after our hearing that we had, Madam Speaker, at Lord Selkirk-West Kildonan Community Committee, but I just want to express some concerns that I've heard. I was actually offended, Madam Speaker. So, I just...so the Winnipeg Aboriginal Sport Achievement Centre is an excellent organization, and in my past life with school divisions, I helped to introduce Mr. Chief who used to be the head person there, two school divisions, so that they could work with Indigenous youth to provide them opportunities as well as to provide service for those Indigenous youth, Madam Speaker. And so, they served the whole city, and their building needs to be taken away. And here's the thing: when I hear people say that, well, the old Ex arena or whatever it's called now, whatever, was…it's all low priority, the whole old Exhibition grounds, it's low priority, low priority, Madam Speaker. So first of all, now, it wasn't, you know, official sized hockey ice indoor, but let's get this straight: they stole, got rid of the old Ex hockey arena for the North End, where the people there have great difficulty finding transportation, and they've got to go play hockey far away, far from where they live. So, that's a low priority apparently, the ability for young kids to get involved in hockey and play hockey, Madam Speaker. Low priority. Not a priority for this city, $50 million that we got from the Province, Madam Speaker. Low priority. Geeze. Like, the Nomad's Football field's in bad shape. They need a new field house. Yeah, we've done some investments, it's great. They did not acknowledge that they took away a soccer-football practicing this when they presented the hearing to us, Madam Speaker. Offended me because they're not, as far as I can tell, it's not being replaced. So Madam Speaker, when I found out that $5.9 million investment for WASAC, because it's not about just WASAC, it's about the North End and the old Ex grounds, and meeting obligations, priorities. Instead of taking away, you know, let's provide more. That's what we should be doing. So that is why I'm explaining why we made that amendment in there because if...like, it just…anyway, the Manitoba Government gave us the 5.9 million for

enhancing recreation leisure facilities, and so on and so forth. And the Budget Working Group, of course, will know, you know, what was the real request for WASAC? Ask yourselves that, colleagues, ask yourselves that; what was the request, and what did they get? All right, so I've expressed my difficulty. The North End, the people immediately around there, they're still not happy, but you know, I just want to speak about some interesting design. I think that is great that they're going to provide for Indigenous cultural ceremonial space. The police station...and this is the Winnipeg Police Service who are reaching out to a community with which they have a…they don't have the best track record, Madam Speaker. And I think it's a good effort, but it's on their land, it's on the C1 property, so yeah, it's nice. But…so, I'm supporting this because we do need a police station. It's been too long, and I do understand the need for that police station to be on budget now. It's very controversial when police buildings go over budget, isn't it? Anyway, it is a smaller footprint. The amendments that we're moving today is Council acknowledging what's happening at the old Ex grounds in the North End. And again, I thank my colleagues. I think that there's not a lot of debate here. The motions, the amendings, it all fixes everything and things can move ahead. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes. Oh, yes, Councillor Mayes, you have amending Motion 15 going with this item. Moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Gilroy.

Motion No. 15
Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,

BE IT RESOLVED that Motion 9 be amended to add the following words to the end of Recommendation 4:

"to be funded from the net proceeds of future sale of the Police Service facility at 260 Hartford Avenue."

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thanks. I warned you some hours ago this was coming. So, this is the companion piece to No. 9, back there several hours ago on the EPC agenda, where we voted to have the sale proceeds from the building on Hartford pay into the two area councillors. We do have to put in what Councillor Eadie is putting back in, a provision about land dedication payment. That is, we believe, required under the Charter, so that's fair, but how to avoid the double payment problem then. The answer lies in this amendment, which it says, okay, it's the sale proceeds from the sale of the building that go into land dedication and then will come out to the two area councillors. So, hopefully that's clear. It's getting late, but Councillor Eadie is right, it's largely housekeeping to, frankly, correct something we did at EPC that wasn't done quite right. What was done right at EPC was a number of my colleagues who were here in the room when I was virtual tried to work out some compromise to acknowledge the loss of park space here. It's not a sale. We heard that term. It's not a sale of land because then you'd need two thirds because it's park land. It's a rezoning with the City as applicant. So, it…some good work here by Mr. Kiernan, by our Clerks, Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Eadie, to make this fit together. So, it does now with amending motions to reflect reality. Councillor Eadie's also right, Council did approve in its budget…I think Councillor Rollins and Councillor Santos had worked on the how do we allocate the $50 million that the Province put in for recreation and library. That's in last year's budget, it's again in this year's budget. 5.9 million of that goes toward what Councillor Eadie was saying, this particular project. So, there will be money, provincial money, but we have the ability to allocate that money. Councillor Rollins has certainly listened to my harangues on this from time to time and been a pretty staunch defender of things like Turtle Island and this project. So, glad we can seemingly all pull together on this. And you do need, frankly, both the motions to fit it together to avoid any sort of double payment or to avoid the reverse, which is you get nothing at all for the two area councillors. So, hope it can be supported. And Councillor Eadie is right, this has been around as long as the North End sewage treatment plant discussions, I think, this North End district police station. This has been like a decade. So, we approach…we approach shovel in ground, which I think is a good thing. Something to be proud of. I'm sure Councillor Eadie has had to steer this through some rocky shoals to get this thing, but we appear to be…have a resolution, some money going back into the ward and that's a good thing.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Next speaker? Seeing none, Councillor Mayes, do you wish to close?

Councillor Mayes: No, that's good. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes. I just want to quickly close. I think my colleagues know me really well. I hope they do. The money from the sale of 260 Hartford Avenue is not going to Councillor Santos and Councillor Eadie. It's money into the land dedication reserve for each of our wards so that we can improve the North End's recreation park facilities that are left. And there will have to be some of that done, but it's the North End's money. It is not mine, nor is it Councillor Santos' money. It's the North End's money. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Gilroy, do you wish to close?

Councillor Gilroy: No, you can call the question.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question, and we'll be voting on the motions in reverse order. So, first on Councillor Mayes' motion, Motion 15. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Let's vote on Motion 9, Councillor Eadie's motion. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. That's carried. And the main item, as amended. All in favour? Little louder. Contrary? That's carried, as amended. Okay. Next, Mr. Clerk.

Item 15 – Rescinding of Council Decision to Declare 4540 Portage Avenue Surplus to the Needs of the City

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

Councillor Gilroy: I think I'll just wait to hear from my councillor colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any speakers on this item? Someone had pulled it.

Councillor Gillingham: Just to record my vote, that's all.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Thank you. Any other speakers? Seeing none, I'll call the question. All in favour of Item 15, and call for a recorded vote. Please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

Councillors Allard, Eadie, Gilroy, Klein, Mayes, Nason, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Lukes, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma

Nays

His Worship Mayor Bowman, Councillors Chambers and Gillingham

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 3, with Councillors Browaty absence.

Madam Speaker: Okay. That item carries. Okay. Next here, the by-laws. Just one moment, I've got a mixed…something mixed up here. Mr. Clerk, if you give me a moment. Thank you. Okay, we have Motion 5, moved by Councillor Gillingham and seconded by Councillor Browaty. It's regarding CentrePort North. It's an automatic referral to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development. Now we'll have the by-laws. By-laws under this committee, Councillor Gilroy.

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

Motion No. 5
Moved by Councillor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Browaty,

WHEREAS CentrePort Canada Inc. was established in 2008 by provincial legislation known as the CentrePort Canada Act and is the largest inland port in North America;

AND WHEREAS the approximately 20,000 acres land area known as "CentrePort Canada" includes property located adjacent to the Winnipeg James Armstrong Richardson International Airport, with CentrePort North within the Rural Municipality of Rosser and CentrePort South within the City of Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS CentrePort North is experiencing consistent development due to the availability of water and sewer services, while CentrePort South is not presently serviced;

AND WHEREAS updates to the Airport Area West (aka CentrePort South) industrial and residential secondary plans were recently adopted by Winnipeg City Council;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg budget includes $20 million toward the first phase of providing water and sewer services to CentrePort South subject to matching funding from each of the Provincial and Federal governments;

AND WHEREAS formal requests for matching funding have been sent to both the provincial and federal governments;

AND WHEREAS servicing CentrePort South will make the land available for development;

AND WHEREAS the development processes in CentrePort North differ from those in CentrePort South;

AND WHEREAS CentrePort North is a designated special planning area under The Planning Act, with an Inland Port Special Planning Authority and a streamlined land-development approval process;

AND WHEREAS the Inland Port Special Planning Area is guided and regulated by the Inland Port Special Planning Area Regulation (MR 48/2016), and a clear Developer's Handbook provides information and answers to questions about land use planning in CentrePort North;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg has a representative position on the Inland Port Special Planning Authority and the seat is currently vacant;

AND WHEREAS development processes, costs and timelines in CentrePort South should align with and be comparable to those in CentrePort North to ensure Winnipeg's side remains economically competitive.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the Public Service be directed to:*

    A. *Report back in 180 days with recommendations on how best to align development processes, costs and timelines in CentrePort South with those in CentrePort North in an effort to achieve economic competitiveness for development in CentrePort South.*

    B. *Draft a Developer's Handbook to provide information and answers to questions about land use planning in CentrePort South.*

    C. *Consult with landowners in CentrePort South in the development of the above.*

2. *That the City of Winnipeg immediately nominate a representative to the Inland Port Special Planning Authority.*

3. *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 – 1ST READING ONLY

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to have the following by-laws read a first time: By-law No. 36/2022, By-law No. 37/2022, and By-law No. 38/2022.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour?

Councillor Klein: I would like to be recorded opposed to By-law 36/2022.

Madam Speaker: Okay, noted. And that's carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 36/2022, By-law No. 37/2022, By-law No. 38/2022.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

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

Councillor Gilroy: And I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a…read a first time: By-law 25/2022, By-law No. 26/2022 and By-law No. 27/2022.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 25/2022, By-law No. 26/2022, and By-law No. 27/2022.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I would like to move that By-laws No. 25/2022 to 27/2022, both inclusive, be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-laws No. 25/2022 to 27/2022, both inclusive.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law No. 25/2022 to 27/2022, 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 under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Gilroy? Councillor Nason.

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

Councillor Nason: Thank you, Madam Speaker through you I'll ask a very brief and quick question. She could provide an update on the status of 118…1101 Wabasha, otherwise known as Roland Michener Arena, that report will be coming back anytime soon.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: I'd like to thank Councillor Nason for the question. I don't have that information off hand, but I can ask the department and can get back to you.

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

Councillor Klein: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to the Chair, I would like to get an update on the sale of the Pantages Theatre.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, I don't have that, but I can get the Administration to provide an update. May be send an email onto…maybe all of Council, so they can get an update.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers…questions? Okay, seeing none, let's go to the next committee, the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks. Councillor Rollins, the date…the report dated February 4th, 2022.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROTECTION, COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PARKS
DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2022**

Councillor Rollins: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like to move consent agenda. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We'll now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Rollins? Any questions? Seeing none, next committee: Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works. Councillor Allard, the report dated February 6th, 2022.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2022

Councillor Allard: I'd like to move the consent agenda.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Okay, we've pulled 1. I'll call the question on 2 and 3. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Winnipeg Transit Plus Policy – Trip Priority System

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

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll try to be short. I note that the Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works Committee moved to not receive monthly reports on how the change in trip priority and all that stuff is working and to move to get an annual report. Now, I have been listening a bit, and I did receive many calls from persons with disabilities regarding the new system for providing trips under Transit Plus. And Madam Speaker, I heard about...what was it called? The wait list. So, when I hear wait list, and then I heard them discuss about, you know, no shows and information like that, but I didn't really hear any details. I heard about how rosy everything is, but I have to say, you know, they said, well, they met all those wait trips. In other words, they're waiting to find out if they can get a ride. That's still happening. Now, there's a frustrating part about that, Madam Speaker. I didn't hear any detail on that report. They just said we were able to meet all the wait trips. Well, they were able to meet them all, and everybody was happy, yippee-ki-yay, I got my trip finally, except I'm showing up an hour late or whatever, Madam Speaker. I didn't hear that in the report. I heard a rosy picture about how things are going. I don't know that it's that rosy. So, it would have been good to continue to hear and to actually hear…you know, I know our Public Service is doing their best and you know, they want to hear, but I really want to understand how well it's working. And so, like, just hearing how wonderful it is, like, it's not…there's an underlying thing there and I can't track every individual whatever. So, so I'm sure while they met those wait trips or whatever, that you know, they were I guess happy they got it, but were they that happy? They're still applying no shows or whatever and that sort of stuff. Well, when you have…when you have wait trips and stuff, how many of those wait trips actually turned out to be no shows? Did they tell you…did they explain that to them…well, you're on the committee, Madam Speaker; did they explain that to you? Did they give you the numbers? Because it's those people waiting around for trips, they're not going to show up if they already found an alternative or they just gave up, Madam Speaker. So, there's a relationship there that I didn't hear from any of those monthly reports, really, explanation how that's going. So, I understand that the committee is hearing that things are going good, and probably haven't received any calls, but being an experienced person in this particular field since 1991, Madam Speaker, Transit Plus, Handi-Transit, it's how I got involved in civic politics. Anyway, Madam Speaker, I guess we'll have to wait and see what that report is. But I have to say, I think what should have been specified in there, and I don't have time to amend it, but we should...what...what kind of report...like, what detail do you want to know in that report, Madam Speaker? Because you know, they might only want to report the good stuff, not the bad stuff. I don't…I don't know. We should list out what we expect to see in that report after it's operated this new way over its first year. So anyway, I just wanted to point it out. I will be voting, of course, for this report. So, I just wanted to point some things out.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, councillor. Any other…any further speakers on this item? Okay. Seeing none, Councillor Allard, back to you.

Councillor Allard: Yes, thanks for those comments. If there's any questions, happy to run it through the CAO inquiry line and get a formal…a formal answer. Councillor Eadie, if you want that information, I'll be happy to move it along for you.

Madam Speaker: With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Councillor Allard, by-laws under this committee.

Councillor Mayes: I just have a point of order on the by-laws, but perhaps the motion's jumping ahead.

Madam Speaker: Again, I...there's lots of motions here. I don't have 13. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Councillor Mayes, you were saying?

Councillor Mayes: I don't know if the CAO can speak to it today, and I don't want to drag things on, but one of the advantages of reading the communications item at the very top of these agendas is you sometimes learn something, which is, some of these by-laws are based out of committee meetings five years ago. I wondered why I didn't remember the water one, it's because it was from 2017. So, it is unclear to me why a local improvement would take five years from approval at committee to get here as a by-law. I appreciate the asphalt ones, and there are many. First come, first serve, we may not have been able to get to these ones, but the water ones, that's literally since 2017. So, I don't want to delay things, although it's been five years, but I...I'm...I don't know why this would take multiple years on the water ones.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes, there's no debate on by-laws. Of course, you're asking a question.

Councillor Mayes: That's why I made a point of order.

Madam Speaker: Yes, and we'll take that question offline for the Clerks and the CAO. Okay. Our Clerk is responding saying we can also refer it back to Legal, but there's no debates. There's no question period on by-laws. Is there an interest to…

Councillor Mayes: Am I then able to move 18 and 19 back to Legal?

Madam Speaker: That's under your section coming up.

Councillor Mayes: No, curiously, it's under this, even though it came out of the Water Committee.

Madam Speaker: This section. Yeah. Can you repeat your question, sorry?

Councillor Mayes: As indicated at the very top item on the agenda, the communication from Legal. These by-laws, some of them are coming out of committee hearings that were held multiple years ago. I'm not going to delay the lane ones, none of them are in my ward, but the water one is almost five years since the committee meeting approving it; November of 2017. One wonders why it would take that long to get here?

Madam Speaker: We could refer it to Legal, lay it over, Mr. Clerk? Refer it back to committee, so there's some options, but there's no debate or question period under by-laws.

Councillor Mayes: I'll…if I may, then I'll move By-laws 18 and 19 to the upcoming Water Committee meeting of the March...

Madam Speaker: They do fall under this committee.

Councillor Mayes: Though they came out of the Water Committee if you look at the agenda.

Madam Speaker: Okay, I'll have the Clerk…

Councillor Mayes: I'll move it…if that's the…

Madam Speaker: Think about that in a moment while we deal with the motions. Just a moment. Councillor Mayes, we'll have one of our Clerks come over, but at that time, you're correct, it was under the Water Committee and that's why back then and…anyways, Mr. Clerk, if you could have a conversation and I'm going to take a moment here myself. Councillor Mayes, you were initially saying referral to committee; is it a referral to committee or rescind that and lay over? What is your desire?

Councillor Mayes: Let's lay over. Let's lay over to the next meeting on…just on 18 and 19, and let's roll forward on the others then, I'm fine with that. But just 18 and 19, the water one, that's anomalous.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We do have…okay, we do have the motion. So, let's do that. You want to refer...yeah. And that will be Councillor Allard or Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Allard: I can do it.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Councillor Allard's willing to do it. Okay, 18 and 19, laying it over to the next meeting of Council. Okay.

Councillor Allard: Yeah. So moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Allard: Okay. So, I...

Madam Speaker: We'll go back and deal with the motions if you don't mind. Just give me a moment. So, we have Motion 13; moved by Councillor Klein, seconded by Councillor Nason. It is regarding Narcan spray, and it is an automatic referral to the standing policy committee. We have Motion 14; moved by Councillor Chambers, seconded by Councillor Allard. And this is regarding snow removal and garbage collection days. It's an automatic referral to the standing committee. That is a notice of motion, actually, so it will appear on next month's Council agenda. Okay, back to by-laws, Councillor Allard, the remaining by-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS

Motion No. 13
Moved by Councillor Klein,
Seconded by Councillor Nason,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works within 90 days with strategies to place Nasal Narcan Spray in transit buses and a plan to provide online training videos that will teach people how to use nasal Narcan Spray to save a life."

Motion No. 14
Moved by Councillor Chambers,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS Winnipeg is a winter city and continues to monitor and review snow and ice control policies with a view of continuous improvements to manage costs while maintaining a high level of traffic safety throughout the winter months;

AND WHEREAS during high snow events in our city, residential parking bans are announced to reduce the accumulation of snow on residential streets;

AND WHEREAS there are instances where residential snow clearing plows coincide with residential garbage pick-up days resulting in areas being plowed at the same time when residents have put out bins for collection;

AND WHEREAS it is recognized there is a 5 day collection cycle for garbage pick-up and typically a 3 day cycle for residential snow clearing cycles;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to review its policies regarding snow-clearing in coordination with garbage collection days to refine these operations so they do not impact on one another when residential snow plows are announced.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Winnipeg Public Service report back to the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works and or the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment within 180 days, on recommendations to better address coordination of snow clearing and garbage collection.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the proper officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

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

Councillor Allard: Yes. I move that By-law 16/2022, by-law of the City of Winnipeg to impose local improvement taxes in respect to the cost of installing a 14 feet wide, 5 inch thick asphaltic concrete lane pavement in certain public lanes within the city of Winnipeg. Am I reading the right script? It seems long.

Madam Speaker: It's a…16 and 17/2022, moving it a first time.

Councillor Allard: So, moving 16/2022 and 17/2022 a first time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 16/2022 and By-law No. 17/2022.

Councillor Allard: Sorry. I move that By-law No. 16/2022 and 17/2022 be read a second time.

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

Clerk: By-law No. 16/2022 and By-law No. 17/2022.

Councillor Allard: And I move to suspend the rules and By-law No. 16/2022 and By-law No. 17/2022 be read a third time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, onto question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Allard? Councillor Chambers.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL AND PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I apologize for the Chair, I didn't get the chance to just give him a heads up that I'd be asking a question. But residents in the St. Norbert-Seine River ward, especially those living in St. Norbert have had now, almost two years of experience in utilizing the Blue Line that travels down the rapid bus corridor right into the community of St. Norbert. A few have asked me, Madam Speaker, and through you to the Chair whether…and we know that there is a Transit Master Plan that has both longer term objectives and shorter-term objectives. But with respect to the Blue Line that is currently functioning within St. Norbert, a few residents have asked me if there is an opportunity for Winnipeg Transit to move ahead in building bike racks or bike storage racks, allowing more of a Park and Ride or Cycle and Ride opportunity to utilize the Blue Line and experience some modal shift and increasing, you know, the ability to both ride and utilize the Blue Line as opposed to personal vehicles.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: That sounds like an excellent idea. I look forward to a motion from the Councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: Yes. Through you Madam Speaker, just a question of a… something that unfortunately is… oh, I'll wait to see if…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Allard, a question for you.

Councillor Allard: Sorry.

Councillor Nason: I'll start again. Madam Speaker, through you, I'll ask a question pertaining to an unfortunate tragedy that has been reported of a loss of life in a transit shelter in the City of Winnipeg, and there's… of course online chatter that there's been others that have been unreported. My question specifically is with regards to Transit supervisors, and Transit drivers, and monitoring bus shelters…is there anything that the Chair can help direct with regards to better insuring persons are not left to succumb to cold or whatever it may be in our Transit shelters in the city of Winnipeg?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Nason. Thanks for the question. There's quite a bit of talk at the Transit Advisory Committee last meeting to talk about homelessness in bus shelters. It's not an easy situation. The solutions are not…are not easy with the drug and homelessness crisis, and we see more and more homelessness and that in the winter, people gravitate towards the bus shelters. It's terrible to see loss of life. We talked about the Downtown Winnipeg partnership and how we want to talk about how those safety…Downtown Winnipeg Safety Partnership, how those efforts are going along, and so the next step of the Transit Advisory Committee is talking to a representative from that organization. There are multiple organizations involved, whether it's Main Street Project, St. Boniface Street Links, police, emergency, our emergency services or transit inspectors. There are many organizations and personnel involved in these matters, and it's not an easy. From the (inaudible) in my opinion, the solution is, the traditional… we need more social services; we need more housing; we need more education; we need more addictions' facilities. Those are the things that are going to solve some of problems that we're seeing today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Nason: Madam Speaker, through you, there are… I travel fair a bit through the City, there are two stations that I see one in front of U of W and the other, right in front of, the Chair may be aware of it, from (inaudible). Those two stations have been filled for weeks, if not months, with materials. I'm wondering if there's anything that Transit's doing to effect and clear these out to be used for Transit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thanks. I understand that Transit is cleaning bus shelters when appropriate, when they know that it's appropriate to do so. I know that in the case of encampments, my office works with St. Boniface Street Links in order to ensure that we're not taking away people's possessions. As...Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Nason, as you know, this is not a simple issue. And if you…If you have a be it resolved, Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Nason, I would love to hear it. I understand their issues, and Transit is working on them, and so our local organizations. If you have solutions, I would love to hear about them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move to the Standing Policy Committee on Finance. There's no report today. We'll go right into question period. Any questions for Councillor Gillingham? Any questions? Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Nason.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Lukes: Yes, my question would be…if Councillor Gillingham could report back to all of Council with an update on the cost of snow removal to date. I'm sure he can't get that, including this current residential plough. But may be in a week's time, he could get the update and provide it to all of Council. If he could also provide the number of courtesy tows that occurred during this residential plowing, so… Is that possible?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gillingham.

Councillor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, through you to Councillor Lukes, thank you for the question. Yes, I will get the information as soon as I can and send it to all of Council.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Nason.

Councillor Nason: It's relatively simple, I hope question. Through you, Madam Speaker, the most recent Super Bowl, so lots of ads for digital currency. I'm wondering if the Chair Finance would answer, if he could, has there been any talk about accepting cryptocurrencies or (inaudible) for alternative payments for City of Winnipeg fines payments, taxes or otherwise?

Councillor Gillingham: Ok. Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Councillor for his question. Good question. I don't…I haven't had any discussions to that end, but I'll certainly ask our staff then I'll email all of Council to see if there's been anything to that paying discussion.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. Of course, I head through the news and through email Madam Speaker, that Finance Committee was going to ask questions of the Public Service in regards to, what it looks like wasting of money and inefficiency. My question is, I heard that all councillors are able to…that he would try to facilitate and getting answers to all of our questions, what is the process he's setting up for us to submit potential questions to ask the Public Service in regards to the traffic signal, intersection, street renewal…report that Mr. Sweryda is providing?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Gillingham: Through you Madam Speaker, I want to thank Councillor Eadie for the question. What I will do, I will send out an email fairly shortly. We'd be working today. The Committee and I have been working today with our Clerk Mr. Lemoine, trying to find a date that would work for everybody and then we would have to request of Council permission or approval for a special meeting. So, I will submit that, that email to everybody hopefully within the next 24 hours here. In that email, we'll include also may be a suggestion for how Councillors could submit their questions to make sure that we take them as a committee and ask as many councillors' questions as possible. So I will try to include all of that in an email in short order. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move to the next committee; the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment, the report dated February 2nd.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT DATED FEBRUARY 2, 2022

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to speak briefly to Item No. 1, so I will stand that down and shall I just speak to it now then or introduce it?

Madam Speaker: Well, we'll introduce it, thank you. Mr. Clerk.

Item 1 – Bidding Requirements for Phase Two of the North End Water Pollution Control Centre

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

Councillor Mayes: Yeah, I wanted to thank Tanya Paulson from Building Trades and Sudhir Sandhu from Building Trades who have been very supportive of this push. Certainly, a number of their concerns are not entirely dealt with here, but they're somewhat dealt with, as you heard 11 hours ago, 10 hours ago in delegation, that this is an attempt to send a signal to industry about…concern about hiring of under-represented groups, including Indigenous populations, trying to get more local labour into these projects. Also, a good process with our Public Service who didn't say, no, you can't do this, they said, well, we don't like the original motion, but we would suggest this. We're not trying to water it down, we're trying to keep it legal. So, my thanks on that as well. So, hope it can be supported unanimously, but it's an attempt to make sure we don't miss this whole concept when we go to…and hopefully it's soon, a phase two of North End, which is a $500 million project. We shouldn't wait until the whole social procurement framework is in place, as you heard Ms. Paulson say 10 hours ago, that could be years before it's implemented and we certainly hope phase two North End isn't going to take years. We need it to get going, we need the federal go-ahead, we've got the provincial go-ahead. So, it is…it is I think an important signal to industry about what we want to see happen as we go forward with phase two. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, call the question. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Just for the record, Councillor Lukes has been here almost as long as I have. It's only two years different from what…when she asked that several years…several…several years ago, several hours ago. Yeah, no, this is I think straightforward and certainly hope we can all support the motion. It's not full framework, but it's what we can do in a short-term.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I'll call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. We have Motion 6; moved by Councillor Nason and seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It's regarding large sewage discounts…sewer discounts, pardon me. It's an automatic referral to the Standing Committee on Water and Waste. We have no by-laws, we'll now go into question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Any questions for Councillor Mayes? Councillor Lukes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT
MOTIONS

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

WHEREAS on March 20, 2020 the City of Winnipeg approved a decrease in Large Volume Sewer Discounts from 30% in 2020 to 0% in 2023;

AND WHEREAS the elimination of the discount will present a competitive disadvantage to many companies that have received this discount when combined with the effects of COVID-19, international market pressures and soaring costs of doing business in Winnipeg;

AND WHEREAS the long-term effects may result in a loss for local economy and potential negative pressure on some of the sewer systems in and around Winnipeg if this discharge does not remain in the sewer systems to move downstream for processing;

AND WHEREAS as all sewage releases are not the same, the approach for removal of discounts should also not be treated as the same;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste, Riverbank Management and the Environment direct the Winnipeg Public Service to:

1. *Provide verbal reports within 90 days on the following:*
   - A. *Impacts to local industry of the discount reductions to date, which have exceeded the $150,000 credit threshold as of January 1, 2020.*
   - B. *Locations where the elimination of large volume sewer discount for customer operations would have a negative impact on sewage effluent flows.*
2. *Provide a written report on ways to mitigate the impacts of discharge rates for more environmentally friendly alternative means*
3. *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
WATER AND WASTE, RIVERBANK MANAGEMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Lukes: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Councillor Mayes, I am anticipating there may be floods this season. Do you have any idea or can you update us on anything that you've heard from the Water and Waste Department regarding flooding?

Councillor Lukes: You may not have heard it anything yet, but I'm just wondering if you could keep us posted.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thanks Councillor Lukes for the question. I have not heard anything yet. Traditionally, Council has been briefed by the Public Service. Obviously, some years, far more implications than others. Certainly, in my memory, both with…you had parts of St. Norbert, Councillor Swandel. Of course, before you… a number of those addresses come up year after year in St. Norbert, but then (inaudible) Councillor Chambers' ward now. I think they are. Yes, I'll certainly circulate that to Council if I get anything. And yeah, unfortunately given me near-records snowfall, near record we may have that look forward to. But if I hear anything, I will certainly circulate it to Council. Fair question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, let's move on to the Governance Committee of Council. Councillor Eadie, will you take the Chair so I can move the report?

Councillor Eadie: I most certainly will, Madam Speaker.

**REPORT OF THE
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL
DATED JANUARY 21, 2022**

Councillor Sharma: I'll move adoption of the consent agenda Item 1.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right. Nobody wants to speak to it? Okay. That's good. All those in favour? Those who are opposed, anybody? No? No, okay. Did you wish to be recorded in opposition? Pardon me? Okay. Okay, then that item passes. Thank you, Councillor Sharma.

Councillor Sharma: Call the question, maybe. Yeah. Oh, you did.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I did, yeah. It was carried.

Councillor Sharma: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: You have the last motion for us?

Madam Speaker: Yes, that concludes our agenda. Will you move adjournment?

Councillor Eadie: You want me to? Okay, I move adjournment.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

Council adjourned at 7:37 p.m.