COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
Thursday, January 30, 2025

The Council met at 9:37 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

In accordance with Rule 11.1 of the City of Winnipeg Procedure By-law No. 50/2007, the Speaker acknowledged that we are in Treaty One Territory, the home and traditional lands of the Anishinaabe (Ojibwe), Ininew (Cree), and Dakota peoples, and in the National Homeland of the Red River Métis. Our drinking water comes from Shoal Lake 40 First Nation, in Treaty Three Territory.

MOTIONS

Madam Speaker: We have a motion to allow two members of Council to participate remotely. Mr. Clerk, would you read that into the record?

Moved by Councillor Sharma
Seconded by Councillor Rollins

THAT in accordance with Section 9.1(9) of the Procedure By-law 50/2007 Councillors Orlikow and Gilroy be allowed to participate remotely in today's meeting of Council.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We'll now have the opening prayer. Please rise if you're able. And we'll hear from Councillor Wyatt.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Wyatt.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

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

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our pages for today's meeting, please welcome Vladyslav Tanasiichuk, from St. James Collegiate, who resides in the St. James ward, and Michael Mashinter, from Tech-Voc High School, who resides in the Point Douglas ward. Thank you for serving Council today. (applause). We will move into morning announcements. Mr. Mayor. You have the floor.

Mayor Gillingham: Good morning, Madam Speaker, to you and to all my colleagues, thank you so much for that introduction. Yesterday and today of course is a budget day. I just want to take a moment to thank the budget working group and all our city staff who worked on the budget and appreciate all the effort that has been put into a budget that I believe focuses on what Winnipeggers had told us are their priorities. I also want to take a moment on behalf of all of us, just to congratulate the newly elected Grand Chief of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, Kyra Wilson. I had a chance to speak with the Grand Chief this morning on a quick phone call, just to congratulate her on our behalf, and said that we certainly look forward to working with her in her new role, on important shared priorities. Later today, we will…in this agenda we will see that Winnipeg 150 has wrapped up. I want to, again, on behalf all of us, thank Felicia Wiltshire and the entire team that worked all though the year, on Winnipeg 150 events. I know almost all Councillors had an event or for sure participated in 150 events, in one way or another, it was a great year of several celebrations, marked by several highlights. And it will be good today to once again think about 150. I know that the concluding element of 150 was to seal a time capsule dedicated to future residents of Winnipeg, so somewhere down the way, 50 years from now, folks of this community will open that time capsule. Happy new year to everyone celebrating the lunar new year. This year is the year of the snake, which represents wisdom, charm and transformation. Several of us were able to attend, to come to the

garden yesterday, after our budget Council meeting, for a great evening of too much food and a lot of celebration. We do celebrate with all those who are celebrating this new year. In the coming days we will enter the month of February. February is black history month. Tomorrow morning Black History Manitoba will host their annual kickoff breakfast here at city hall. On Saturday, I will be at a book launch for the former Police Chief, Devon Clunis' new book. And we encourage everybody to check out the Black History Manitoba website for more events throughout the month. February is also 'I love to read' month. So, I and I know many Councillors also are looking forward to being at schools and reading to children. I will be reading a book entitled Zander Stays, by Winnipeg author Maureen Fergus. I am looking forward to reading that book with students. And of course, Festival du Voyager is a February tradition, and it kicks off on Friday February 14th. The annual 10-day event is the largest francophone event in Western Canada. Welcoming over 75 thousand festival goers annually. And my office sponsored the snow sculpture, which will be at the Winnipeg Airport, that is being installed this week, so I hope everyone is able to be there, as we celebrate the 56th edition of Festival du Voyager. Hey-ho, exactly. For more information hey-ho.ca is the website. Two final announcements. One is, there's certainly a lot of talk lately about tariffs and trade wars. I know all of us are paying attention to that, as Mayor and I believe all of Council, share the concerns that businesses have in our community. The tariffs, if imposed, and counter-tariffs, certainly could hurt our economy and local businesses here in Winnipeg. We, in this city, are a leader in manufacturing, agriculture, aerospace, transit, pharmaceuticals, industries that employ thousands of people in our community. And while cities really can't lead the fight against tariffs, we can play a supporting role, and I think it is important that we do play a supporting role. What I am doing personally is, on behalf of all of us, I think we need to stand together as cities and I am currently Vice Chair of the Big City Mayor's Caucus, we are working with the Chair, London Mayor Josh Morgan, to ensure the cities across Canada support our Premiers and our federal leaders in presenting a strong united response. And second. I think it is important that we support our Premiers in breaking down inter-provincial trade barriers that can help offset U.S. tariffs, and to provide markets across Canada for our own businesses here. I fully support Premier Kinew, in advancing this cause, and I've asked our team here, even in my office to begin to explore ways that we here can make it easier for businesses across Canada to invest and compete in Winnipeg. And I think its important also we make sure that we do all we can do to make sure our city is investor ready by improving customer service, cutting red tape and making it easier for businesses to grow here. On a very personal note, individual by individual, I think we can also take the opportunity to buy local, to support Canadian businesses when we have a choice. That too will make sure that our local businesses are more so protected. Finally, I know we were sorry to hear the news of the passing of the Minister Nello Altomare, his recent death. A dedicated public servant, a community leader, an advocate for Transcona, and in fact all of the province of Manitoba, who was passionate about education, dedicated his life to building a better Manitoba. And I can tell you this that in my most recent event that I attended with Nello it was quite remarkable. It was in September; we were at University of Manitoba for an event that was being hosted for middle school students. And we walked into the room. And I was talking to some of the adults at the door. Not Nello, he beelined for the students immediately and he made his way to almost every table, asking about the students' work, encouraging then, affirming them. And by the time he left kind of every table, I thought this guy is like a fish in water, right here. This is his element. So, his passing is a huge loss to our entire community and to our entire province. On behalf of all of us here at city hall condolences to Nello's family, friends, colleagues at the Manitoba legislative. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next speaker, Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Chambers. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today to share that Black History Manitoba is proud to announce February 2025 as black history month. I want to thank the Mayor for his comments with respect to this matter. A time to honor the rich contributions, achievements and resilience of black Canadians in our community and beyond. This month-long celebration will feature a vibrant array of events, activities and educational programs designed to celebrate black culture, history and heritage. Throughout February, Winnipeggers are invited to participate in a plethora of activities that highlight the diverse and dynamic contributions of black individuals and communities. From art exhibits and film screenings to panel discussions and cultural performances. There will be something for everyone to enjoy. As the Mayor Gillingham had mentioned, tomorrow January 31st will be official kickoff of black history here at city hall, and thank you to Mayor Gillingham for hosting that. There is also a film festival that will take place throughout the month of February. Caribbean market and cultural affair, empowerment workshop, and of course the 23rd annual career fair at Holy Eucharist Church on February 22nd. The month will culminate on February 28 at the RBC Convention Centre with the closing gala ceremony. Black history month is not only a time to celebrate but also an opportunity to reflect on the challenges faced by the black community and recommit to work to building a more inclusive and equitable society. The City of Winnipeg encourages all residents to participate in these events and learn about black history and engage in meaningful conversations and diversity and inclusion. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Eadie, do you have a morning announcement?

Councillor Eadie: Will Councillor Lukes go before me?

Madam Speaker: She does not.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yesterday I've received some sad news for both you and I for sure, Madam Speaker. But I think for all of the City of Winnipeg and Council. The sad news is that Mr. Chris Sobkowicz, who served as a Coordinator of the Access Advisory Committee for 12 years passed away on December 23rd, 2024. He leaves behind his wife and sons and a daughter-in-law who actually works here at city hall, Madam Speaker. And there is an obituary that I am not really going to read from because it talks about his family life and he was a solid family man. A good husband, a good father. But I am here to speak today to talk about Mr. Sobkowicz's amazing effort, Madam Speaker, in making sure that the City of Winnipeg dealt with disability issues. He helped keep our Access Advisory Committee organized, as you know, Madam Speaker, having served on that for a number of years, along with myself. And I had the opportunity to work with him when I wasn't a city Councillor with the committee. And there is many issues at the city level and there has been a lot of improvements as Mr. Sobkowicz undertook his work. He advocated and actually, Councillor Gillingham in St. James, was, as the finance person was…Chris was quite expressive to say that we are not providing any accessibility at the Empress overpass and all the work that was done there. That's just one of thousands of disability issues that he worked on over 12 years. And I have to say I am really sad because I relied on him. He always made sure that we were on top of the issues as advisory to City Council. And it is with that that I just wanted to acknowledge his service, because the service that he provided to us was a service provided to all persons with disabilities in the City of Winnipeg. And he had respect of all of them. And I want to leave it at that because there was somebody who had his own disabilities, always worked independently. Never let it stop him. He used his wheelchair and I should mention, he was good curler. And people might know him out in the community from his curling. So yes, at that, Madam Speaker, I don't know if we could have a moment of silence, but Mr. Sobkowicz served this great City of Winnipeg in an amazing and very responsible and passionate way.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie and remarks were very heartfelt. Appreciate you putting those on the record, thank you. Councillor Schreyer will you move the minutes of meeting held on December 12, 2024, be taken as read and confirmed? Councillor Mayes. Oh okay, I'm sorry I mixed that up with Councillor Mayes. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I want to rise and praise a couple colleagues here and thanks to the Clerk's Office who supplemented my handwritten research with some, using actual computer to do some research. Only 10 women have served on EPC in the post 1993 period. And that is when EPC contracted of course. Some powerful names in there…Paula Havixbeck, Jenny Gervasi, Brenda Leipsic. Just doing my research. Between Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Rollins who both made it, well six years for Councillor Gilroy and a little over six years for Councillor Rollins, those are longest serving, except for Lillian Thomas, who had, we are trying to nail it down, we think about seven years. Susan Thompson, of course, six years. Obviously as a Mayor for two or three years but not a Councillor, she was the Mayor. So, just…a word and praise. I know it is a challenge, as Councillor Lukes said, it can be a difficult job to be on EPC. It can be a difficult job to put up with the pressures, colleagues, etc., so just a word of praise of Councillor Gilroy's six years and Councillor Rollins' six plus years. Not quite as long as Lillian Thomas but still, accomplishments I think we should make note of. Thank you.

MINUTES

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes for noting that.

Councillor Schreyer moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on December 12, 2024 be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now get into delegations. First up is David Grant, appearing remotely on a number of items as outlined in our agenda. Mr. Clerk, David Grant? Yes, I see him with us. Welcome, David.

DELEGATIONS

David Grant: Good morning. And that's good to hear all those announcements. It is good to see how things are going. Getting right into it. On Public Works topic four, the TRAINFO thing is very intriguing, but it seems that the deliverables are very hazy, they are not very certain at the moment. It may help with dispatching emergency services. But it seems it is something that we might use individually when we are making choices to leave the house or not leave the house. If we are going to be held up by a train. But anyways, the deliverables are pretty uncertain at this point. And it is unfortunate that they are asking for a modest amount of money. Half a million or so. Anyway, moving on to topic one. EPC one. Winnipeg 150, that was a great idea, the celebrations. But we should be entering the stage where verbal reports aren't

needed. And we should probably have a brief written report on the celebration program. And unfortunately, when we would see that. On topic eight. The new copter for WPS. One of the principal uses for the current air one is IR surveillance, it's wonderful, it can find a person in a field, whether they want to be found or not, and follows vehicles. Before we commit to buying or renting the second one, I believe we should be exploring the use of IR drones. After a year of using both, we will be in a stronger position to justify the most expensive option, which is obtaining a second copter. We need this info if we are to provide best police service. Remember that there are hours every week, when the big copter is not available. With two or more IR drones and control teams, this would never happen. If two events occur at once like a diversionary one, WPS could cover them both with drones. We could save a lot of money, reduce the chance of a catastrophic officer injury, and provide much better surveillance with two or more drones than with decades old technology. On topic 9, TIF for 450 Portage. We have been told this building will eventually serve only public interest purposes. Has the City been assured that the building owners will at that point be paying the estimated amount of property taxes when construction is done? Personally, I have issue with the whole idea of TIF, giving people city tax money on the hope that they will be…the same people will be paying taxes years later. The owners have access to many sources of funding. The City is out of money. Until the emergency fund has been replenished, and until the SCO has met all the conditions, why is no one contemplating a delay in funding. On ASF, essentially the U.S. tried to prohibit the sale of alcohol. It did not work and its use continued. Now the Liberals are on the way to another attack on the wrong thing. The ASF program is diverting valued WPS resources from the real policing we need. We should be lobbying instead, for new means to find guns and other weapons on the street before they are used in crimes. A check-stop program, on sidewalks and roads but for weapons this time, would be far more effective than the ASF. Street crime people seem to involve and prefer the thousands of stolen and lost police Glocks to a hunter's rifle. Let's enhance the ability of police to find those guns. Topic ten, arts funding, this item proves, I believe, how far City Hall has veered out of its the lane. When the City has no money, why must we bend the rules to hand money to those who do not qualify for our donations? How are you going to tell the folks, who can barely afford rent, that they must pay even more, so that's (inaudible) organization can buy more bells and whistles. On clean-up, topic 11, the idea of spending 170,000 when, again…that you do not have, and that was not budgeted, is an example of fiscal imprudence. It seemed like a good idea at the time, but saying no to that spending would have met the goals of us being out of money. On topic 12. While I have supported the creation of CCO position, since idea was first mentioned, concerns remain. We have given unusual powers to individuals in recent years only to learn that these currently good people had veered out of their lanes and had made bad decisions. Those decisions cost City Hall a lot of public support, and millions of tax dollars. It seems that those persons were allowed to not report, as often as they should. Will functional audits and CCO reporting schedules adequately protect taxpayer interests from analogous trouble stemming from the actions of new CCO? On topic 13, there are more people in Winnipeg than we have homes for. We have all seen the suffering that has gone on because of that. We were told that the HAF would reverse that trend, and do it in months, not years. Then we find that the HAF funds will be spread out over several years. From the announcement of the program until the last money is handed out. We find that none of that money will cover the cost of infrastructure improvements to support those new homes. In this By-law revision we see that projects involving HAF funds face the same level of bureaucracy as have residential developments in the past. We also see that people are still flowing into Winnipeg far faster than the net new homes are being added. This logic would conclude that HAF is not meeting the promises that were made for it when it was announced. And that is it. Do you have any questions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David for your presentation. There is no questions today. Have a wonderful day. Our next delegation is Chris Benson, here in person. Program and Events Coordinator with the Manitoba Wildlife Federation in opposition to item seven of the report of EPC Dated January 21. It's regarding the Assault-Style Firearms Compensation Program and Contribution Agreement.

Chris Benson: Thank you. Thank you very much for allowing me to come speak today, Madam Speaker and Councillors. My name is Chris Beson, and I am here representing the Manitoba Wildlife Federation. The Manitoba Wildlife Federation is a nonprofit organization based here in Winnipeg that represents over 12,000 members across the province including many who reside in Winnipeg. Our membership is made of...largely of hunters, anglers, and sports shooters. Most of whom are also licensed firearm owners. The MWF recently learned that the Mayor's Executive Policy Committee is recommending that the City of Winnipeg implement the Assault Style Firearm Compensation Program, which is part of bill C21. I am here to voice opposition to this motion, on behalf of our 12,000 members. First, I would like to clarify the term assault style firearm, is a misnomer as it does not accurately describe any firearm under Canadian firearm regulations or classifications. If you were to ask the average person what an assault style firearm is, they would most likely describe a fully automatic firearm. Or one that is capable of shooting a large number of cartridges at a time with a single depression of the trigger. These types of firearms are in fact illegal in Canada and have been so since the 1970s. Large capacity magazines are also illegal. Most semi-automatic centrefire rifles are limited to just five rounds. Canada has three classifications of firearms. Nonrestricted, which refers to shotguns and rifles, which are frequently used by hunters and sports shooters. Restricted, which largely refers to handguns. And prohibited, which refers to firearms that were once legal but are no longer legal for private citizens to own. These owners have been allowed to keep these firearms through a grandfather clause. Since December 1st, 1998, no new prohibited licenses have been issued. Once a prohibited license owner passes away, all prohibited firearms are destroyed. The assault-style firearm ban targets firearms found in the first

classification of firearms. The nonrestricted level. And it's based nearly entirely on what the firearm looks like. And not the internal workings of that firearm. Legal law-abiding firearms owners are not the source of violent crime or gun violence in Canada. Bill C21 is an ill-conceived plan meant to appease those who know nothing about the current firearm regulations into to thinking that progress towards safer streets and neighborhoods can be achieved through confiscation of private property from legal firearm owners. Pledging millions of dollars for a firearm confiscation program will not address or decrease violent crime. Instead, the money should be invested into supporting police initiatives, targeting social issues, gangs, poverty, and addressing the root cause of crime. Stronger penalties for straw purchases and illegal firearm imports should be another main area of focus. The overwhelming majority of firearms used in criminal activity are in fact not…are illegally smuggled firearms or ghost guns. Legal firearm owners are not the cause of firearms being on our streets. Numerous members of the Winnipeg City Police, Premier Wab Kinew, Justice Minister Matt Wiebe, among many others...leaders publicly oppose C21. With a federal election on the horizon and the official opposition stating that they will scrap the firearm legislation it is reckless for the City of Winnipeg to enforce this impractical approach. MWF and our members seek a commitment from federal, provincial and municipality levels of government, as well as the City of Winnipeg to focus their law enforcement efforts on organized crime, gangs and other illegal firearm activities as the root causes of firearm-related crimes. And not to burden legal firearm owners with ineffective and unnecessary restrictions on recreational firearms. In closing, I would like this opportunity to briefly touch on the Canada's current firearm legislation, as well as MWF's role in this matter. I myself, I co-manage the hunter education program, on behalf of the MWF. I am responsible for training new hunter instructors, which currently number over 160 instructors in the province. In the last year, 2024 we graduated over 1700 students. This program teaches firearm safety, hunting ethics, conservation, and other skills hunters are required to know. This is a required course to take in order to purchase a hunting license in Canada. I also teach the Canadian firearms safety course. A course overseen by the Canadian firearm programs, a division of the RCMP. This course covers firearm and ammunition safety, the history of firearms, as well as the legal and ethical responsibility of firearm owners as it pertains to home storage, transportation, temporary storage of these nonrestricted firearms. Both courses are a minimum of 8 hours with final exams at the end. Upon completion of the Canadian firearm safety course the individual must apply to the RCMP for the firearms course...or firearms license, pardon me. After thorough review the individual may be issued a license. From that day forward, that individual is subject to daily criminal records checks from the RCMP. If an individual wishes to own restricted firearms or handguns, they need to take yet an additional course called the Canadian firearms restricted safety course and pass an additional written and practical exam. I have been for the last 23 years running learn-to-shoot programs, (inaudible), and introduced hundreds of Manitobans to the outdoors and safe firearms ownership. I would like to thank the committee and yourself Madam Speaker for allowing me to speak on this matter today. And I look forward to any further discussions in the future with any Council member or the City of Winnipeg on this matter. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now take questions. Councillor Duncan. Followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, through you to Mr. Benson, a couple of questions just first off, I agree with most all of your points there. You know, our law-abiding citizens who use firearms for sports are not the problem. You identified several sources that could benefit from funding. Again, agreed with you on almost all of those. However, my one question for you is more of are you aware and perhaps you can give input on this, the funds that are being allocated here are for the Police Service to actually process these weapons and destroy them and what not. So, it is not really us voting whether to implement the law or not today. Are you aware?

Chris Benson: Thank you. Yes, we at MWF we really have to turn on a dime when we see anything that is endangering our members' opportunity to go hunting. I did learn that some of the money is going to go towards the staff allocations of if anyone wants to turn in those firearms. So, I was pleased to know that the City is not actively going out and confiscating. So that was great to hear.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Me, who has hunted before, you said rifles and shotguns are not restricted. I don't understand. I am confused about your opposition to the matter here if we are talking assault rifles that are being confiscated. They are banned already. Why are you in opposition to something that would make our streets safer?

Chris Benson: So, the misconception is…the firearms that we are currently allowed to own are under the classification of nonrestricted. Those are your general shotguns and rifles. The assault style firearm is, as I said in my presentation, a misnomer. It's not what the gun does, it's what it looks like. So, when people think of a hunting rifle or a hunting shotgun, they think of, you know, the Grandfather Woodstock. You go out...

Councillor Wyatt: Winchester.

Chris Benson: Yes, sir. The assault style firearm…the internal workings of it are the same as grandpa's shotgun from the 50s or 60s. The difference is it looks different. It's in synthetic plastic; it has a bunch of addons to make it look like it's a military firearm. But it isn't. The internal workings of that firearm are the same as that grandpa's shotgun or rifle. The way that I describe it is if, you say, a 2002 Toyota Corolla, put a spoiler on the back, put the numbers on the side, put a racing stripe on it. That doesn't make it a racing car. That is still the internal workings of that car are still a car. It's still a 2002 car. Fully automatic firearms, where you have seen in movies, in action movies and in the States, those aren't legal in Canada. Those have been banned since the 1970s.

Councillor Wyatt: I appreciate the answer, and it adds clarity to the matter, but you are aware that quite often our officers in uniform have literally seconds sometimes to make a decision on a scene. And it could be life or death for them. And if they see a firearm that looks like an assault riffle, or a semi-automatic rifle, even those disguised as such, even though it is not. It could mean either life or death for them or for the person who is pulling that firearm. Why would we want to have those types of firearms on our streets. Why can't you have a regular looking rifle like everybody else?

Chris Benson: Well, you know, much like the cars, everyone likes cars that look different. For firearms...the firearms...when an officer is presented that situation most often that firearm that is in the opposition, that the perpetrator has, is an illegal firearm that has been smuggled into Canada, or it has been a ghost gun. The vast majority of firearms that are used in crime are not sourced from legal firearm owners.

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Wyatt: Last question. Do you understand why we would support something like this in light of the fact that this could make a difference, life or death, to our officers out on beat, that we would want to be on the benefit of the doubt here?

Chris Benson: Yes, I can understand when an officer is faced with a criminal with firearm that they want to be able to protect themselves. What our position is, that those moneys could be better allocated to better source.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the delegate for being here today. And I do agree with the comment that it is not usually the licensed owners who are the problem. And as licensed gun owner myself and as a hunter myself, I do appreciate that comment. I just wanted to…I guess my question, through you Madam Speaker is, would the delegate please take back and communicate to your members clearly that this is not a confiscation program but it is a voluntary program, where owners of licensed guns can, if they come to the place where they say we don't need these, want these, this one happens to be now a prohibited weapon, we would like to surrender this or turn these over. We don't know what to do with them. Turn them over to the police. We can get compensated for this. This allows the owners of those…or the possessors of those weapons, those guns to be able to get compensation for them so that nothing happens as in they get stolen and end up in some sort...you know, used in some sort of criminal use or some form of criminal purpose. So, this is voluntary program, it's not a compensation program. That is my first question to you. Would the delegate be willing to communicate that, reiterate that to his members?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Chris Benson: Yes. Thank you very much and thank you for the clarification on that. And we certainly will let our members know through our different social media and e-newsletter that that is the type of program that you are running. And when someone does not want a firearm in their possession or wants to turn it in, turning it into the proper authorities to have it destroyed or have it removed from their home is certainly something we are supportive of. We encourage and through our programs like the hunter education program and different various leadership programs, mentor hunts, the emphasis is always on safe ownership and safe use of the firearms and being able to take part in all the activities. Thank you.

Mayor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes, as one that took the firearm safety programming years ago, yes. Safety is the emphasis there and how to properly handle the firearm. My second question directly is: would the delegate also please be willing to make his members aware that this is a recommendation actually from our Police Service because there's costs that will be incurred with this program. And the federal government is willing to provide those funds to our Police Service so that our officers don't have to come off the street and be doing other work. But this can be done through special duties. Would he be willing to make his members aware that this helps to offset the cost associated with the program, so we don't use other tax dollars and take from other places. Thank you.

Chris Benson: Yes, absolutely. We can do that. Thank you.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mayor Gillingham basically took the words right out of my mouth. Again, it is a voluntary program. Police aren't going to be knocking on doors. If people want to participate in this program, they are more than able to do so. And receive compensation for the weapons they are turning over. So, thank you, Mayor Gillingham. Thank you for your presentation. Mr. Benson.

Chris Benson: Thank you for your comment. And MWF is pleased to hear that is the direction of the City of Winnipeg is taking with this. And that is something we can support.

Councillor Chambers: It's the Federal Government that came up with this initiative and they are providing the funding for the service. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Mayes, Councillor Eadie, and then Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you for the presentation and thank you for raising this issue. I heard from a number of your members, all politely, I have to say and thank you for following up with my questions. I know Councillor Santos voted in opposition at EPC, and I am still trying to get handle on, because there appear to be a number of provinces opposed to this, including, perhaps, the Manitoba government for reasons that I am not 100 percent clear on. Can you elaborate on, the Minister of Justice being opposed...can you elaborate on that for us?

Chris Benson: Sorry, I missed part of what you were saying there. I apologize.

Councillor Mayes: You had said a number of provinces oppose this federal legislation, including the provincial Government of Manitoba, it appears. Firstly, I wouldn't mind…anyway, I will speak to this when we come to it. But what are the concerns of Matt Wiebe and Premier Kinew?

Chris Benson: A lot of the concerns of the firearms that were banned were firearms that people…

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

Chris Benson: Thank you. The opposition to it is that a lot of the firearms that were banned were legitimately hunting rifles used by licensed hunters, as well as our First Nations, indigenous hunters who, I'd like to remind have a constitutional right to hunt. There's…a lot of the firearms have no rhyme or reason for why they are on the list. Most of the firearms on there are, as I said, sporting or hunting rifles or shotguns.

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

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I will pass it up. I'll speak on the report when it comes up.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: My questions were answered, thank you. I would like to make maybe a did you know, in this case, maybe it's an the aside, but it's kind of important, it's fundamental. Thank you for Mr. Benson for being here. He thanked us for allowing him to be here. You don't have to thank us. This is your right. We are here to facilitate that, and I am grateful for those that facilitate your being here by the Charter of Winnipeg and by the Government of Manitoba, that it is your right to be here today, and thank you for being here.

Chris Benson: Thank you for that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further, Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: Just a follow up to your last response to Councillor Mayes' question. Is it that the firearms that were banned, they were banned even though they're not semi-automatic or assault rifles, but they were banned because they replicate or physically look like an assault rifle, is that why they were on the list? Is that a fair summary of why the federal government banned the lookalikes?

Chris Benson: To tell you the truth, some of the firearms that are on that list, we don't know. A lot of that seems like it was very random…a random choice. I am sure that the Federal Government has, you know, maybe an expert that is advising them, but as I said, fully automatic firearms, the ones that are a real danger are not on the…are banned in Canada already, they are not in the hands of legal firearm owners.

Madam Speaker: The time is…I think we have asked several questions; there is no extension. Thank you. Chris Benson, have a great day. Thank you for being here. That concludes our delegations. We are going to move on to committee reports. But before we do that, it is important to get to the motion that was circulated. Motion 1 of the committee composition and the deputy speaker position. So, if I can ask for suspension of the rules to deal with that at the outset of the meeting. Mayor moves extension...moves suspension. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Thank you, Mr. Mayor to introduce the motion that we collaborated on.

Motion No. 1
Moved by His Worship Mayor Gillingham
Seconded by Councillor Sharma

WHEREAS in accordance with section 67(1) of the City of Winnipeg Charter, Council must appoint Councillors who are not members of the Executive Policy Committee to be the Presiding Officer and the Deputy Presiding Officer;

AND WHEREAS the position of Deputy Presiding Officer is currently vacant, due to the appointment of Councillor Eadie to the Executive Policy Committee;

AND WHEREAS the City Organization By-law 7100/97 requires that at least one of the members of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development must be a Councillor whose ward lies within the area governed by the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law (namely, the Point Douglas, Daniel McIntyre and Fort Rouge East Fort Garry Wards), and the Downtown area Councillor position is currently vacant;

AND WHEREAS Councillor Dobson has chosen to vacate his seat on the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and the Environment;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Councillor Orlikow be appointed Deputy Speaker.*

2. *That Councillor Santos, be appointed to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development as the Downtown area Councillor.*

3. *That Councillor Rollins be appointed the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and the Environment, in place of Councillor Dobson.*

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I do want to thank…

Councillor Santos: (inaudible)…as an aside to our meeting, that's occurring to the right, which is very… (inaudible)

Madam Speaker: Thank you…that's been solved. Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. As I rise to move this motion, I do want to thank you, Madam Speaker, in your work to help coordinate changes necessary with the changes of committee members here. So, I will just read the therefore be it resolved. Therefore, be it resolved that Council Orlikow be appointed deputy speaker; number two, that Councillor Santos be appointed to Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development as the downtown area Councillor; and three that Councillor Rollins be appointed Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and the Environment, in place of Councillor Dobson.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Question: One assumes then that Councillor Eadie is coming off Property and Development? Though that is not specified…

Councillor Eadie: Yes. (inaudible)

Madam Speaker: Yes, that was listed in the e-mail that I circulated yesterday. Thank you, good question, though. Mr. Mayor to close on the motion.

Mayor Gillingham: You can call the question, please, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favor of motion one? Contrary? And that is carried, thank you. We will now move in to reports. First, we have item six of the report of Executive Policy Committee dated October 16. There was one item that was laid over from last month. October 16th. EPC, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED OCTOBER 16, 2024

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, I would like to introduce item six of the report and move adoption of consent agenda item six.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And it's being stood down. So, we will take a moment to do that. Mr. Clerk.

Item 6 – Proposed Asphaltic Concrete Lane Pavement Local Improvement on Block Bounded by Dunraven Avenue Blenheim Avenue, St. Mary's Road, and Overton Street

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I've had the chance to talk to these people. We had a little townhall with my assistant and I out there at Glenwood Community Centre. They are wanting to wait to see what happens with the fourplexes and the...and if you have a gravel lane you may not be eligible, may not be part of the package on fourplexes. So, I shall move to receive as information then. I don't know if I need to amend the Mayor's motion. But not proceeding at this time.

Madam Speaker: Ok, thank you. Councillor Mayes, I don't see any motions that were circulated here. So, you are amending or will be noted in opposition, I think. Is what you are saying?

Councillor Mayes: To accomplish that goal, one would then just simply vote against the recommendation.

Madam Speaker: Ok. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: I guess we can call the question…you can call the question, Madam Speaker. Sure.

Madam Speaker: Calling the question on item six. In favor? Contrary? There is a noted in opposition Councillor Mayes, Councillor Wyatt, Councillor Duncan. And that is carried.

Councillor Mayes: (inaudible)…there was a procedural confusion that frankly I have caused, so I am trying to amend.

Madam Speaker: (inaudible)…deal with that eight now?

Mayor Gillingham: If we can, yes, I know there was a vote call, but I think there was a bit of a confusion related to this. I think that the Councillor wanted to bring something forward that we should look at, to be frank.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Mayes, I want to rescind, does someone want to rescind that motion, so we can discuss it? Okay, thank you. Concurrence of Council all in favor? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Mayes I am going go back to your speaking time for a moment, if you can clarify.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, let's…I would encourage people to vote no. The people no longer wish to proceed at this time with the paving project because of the, frankly, the uncertainty around our moving on fourplexes. So, we may yet come back to this. But for the time being, I would ask people to vote. It's already been laid over twice, unfortunately, I don't think I can lay it over again.

Madam Speaker: You can if you wish, maybe that would help with some of clarification.

Councillor Mayes: Can I lay it over until June? I will lay it over until June, and…

Madam Speaker: Okay. So, Councillor Mayes are you laying over to next month or June? Ok, So Councillor Mayes is moving lay over.

Mayor Gillingham: Call the question Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: I will call the question on that. All in favor? Contrary. That is carried. Thank you. We will get to the Executive Policy Committee dated January 21st, Mr. Mayor.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED JANUARY 21, 2025

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda, items 1 to 19, but I would like to pull several of them, please. 2, 10, 12, 19.

Madam Speaker: Just a moment. Okay, so two was Customer Service wait times 311, 10 is Downtown Arts Capital funds grant. Number 12, Chief Construction Officer. And 19 is the North End Sewage Treatment Plant. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: 8, 9, 11, 13, 17.

Madam Speaker: 8 is the Award of Contract for the Police Helicopter. 9 is the Contribution Towards Redevelopment of the Former Hudsons Bay Building. 11, Update on the Encampment Plan. And 12, the Chief Construction Officer. 17, Development Agreement Parameters Update. 13, Multi-family Sustainable Housing Infrastructure Program. That's been pulled. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: 7.

Madam Speaker: 7 is the Assault-Style Firearms Compensation Program. Councillor Gilroy, I believe you wanted 8 pulled.

Councillor Gilroy: 8 and 11, please.

Madam Speaker: 8 has been pulled and so has 11. I am going to call the question on 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6. 14, 15, 16, 18. All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 – Customer Service and Wait Time Improvements within 311 Service

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know this is just an extension of time, because the staff needs time to get the final 2024 numbers into a report. But I just want to pull it to highlight the good work that has been done and funded by this Council in a previous budget. That report that we received just earlier this month from (inaudible) Wiltshire indicates that in 2022 the average wait time at 311 was 11 minutes and 22 seconds. And that was in the year where there was 578,000 calls. In 2024. That average wait time was drastically cut from 11 minutes and 22 seconds in 2022 to a minute 43 average wait time in 2024. At the same tine, the calls went from 578,000 in 2022. Up to 850,000 in 2024. Bottom line is more requests, more calls, shorter wait times. That is a result of good work by our staff. And it's a reflection of the investment that we made in 311 bearing fruit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. First speaker. Okay, thank you. Call the question on item 2. All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Item seven

Item 7 – Assault-Style Firearms Compensation Program (ASFCP) Contribution Agreement

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do want to thank our delegate once again for coming forward. I agree with the delegate that it is not law-abiding registered gun owners who are the problem. That being said, this report that was before us is related to...not to confiscation of firearms. It is a voluntary program funding for which the operation of the program is provided to the City of Winnipeg by the federal government so that our officers, our Police Service doesn't have to incur its own cost in playing its part in this program. So, I will be supporting…with that understanding I will be supporting this report.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I would like to move layover for a month. It's not (inaudible) I know Councillor Santos voted in opposition. It's not clear to me why the province is taking…it seems to be in opposition here. It's not in the report, it's not

mentioned in the report. So, Federal money that isn't tied to zoning reform for once, perhaps I shouldn't pull it. But I would like some sense of the Provincial position on this. So, I would move lay over for one month.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes is moving lay over to the next Council meeting. Mr. Mayor. Do you wish to speak?

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, I appreciate that the Councillor would like more information about the province. I will not support the lay over, because I don't think the Province's position has any bearing, for me anyways, or really for our Police Service, as to whether or not the Federal government will provide funds to our Police Service to play their part in implementing this voluntary program. So, I will not be supporting the layover.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now vote on the motion to layover. No, we have to deal with the vote on the lay over. Okay? All in favor of layover? Contrary? That is defeated. Okay, back to speaking time. Councillor Mayes, do you wish to continue?

Councillor Mayes: I think in light of that for today at least I am not going to support it, because it's not clear to me what the provincial position is on this. And that certainly a number of…I know Councillor Santos was against it at EPC, I am not sure why. But for today at least, not knowing really why various provinces were opposed to this. And it does seem to be a voluntary program to get banned items off the street. Which it doesn't seem to me to hang together too well. So, for today at least, I appreciate the sentiments voiced by many Councillors. I am not going to make a big deal of it. But, for today at least I would be opposed in light of not having that information.

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

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I am actually going to support this. It is a federal program. The funding mechanism is there, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to speak to this issue, though. In light of today and what is happening. The advocate for legal gun owners spoke today, Madam Speaker. And he rightly mentioned the issue of smuggling of illegal firearms. While there are firearms that can be stolen from people's private property, different securing mechanisms may exist. There is the problem that stolen guns, stolen legal guns can end up out there on the street as well. And I know of some experience. But Madam Speaker, the smuggling, where are the illegal firearms coming from? I'd like to actually, and I think that the federal government should try to find out. Like, how many illegal firearms are ending up in Canada from the United States of America? They talk about us and fentanyl. These illegal guns are killing people in Canada, the country. They get smuggled in. And I just want to say I am supportive of this report. But I just want to say when is the Federal government going to slap a tariff on the United States of America for all of the smuggled illegal guns that come into this country? I want to know.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Eadie for his passion on this. I am rising to support this motion as well...this information or this request for the City of Winnipeg to allow the Winnipeg Police to accept the 3.2 million dollars for this program to take place. Again, it's a voluntary program. You know, yesterday we voted in budget to increase support for police. You know, dedicated towards community safety. It would seem disingenuous for us in terms of having that vote yesterday to increase community safety and then turn around today and vote down this motion here. The Federal government back in 2020 created a list, or even before that, created a list of weapons that, you know, they believe are not necessary on the streets here in Canada. I recognize the fact that there are sport hunters and whatnot. But you don't need these types of weapons to be out in the fields taking down these animals. So, the rifles that our grandparents used, our great grandparents used, those hunting style rifles are what are approved for hunting. When it comes to assault-style rifles and automatic weapons, again, guns are a huge issue for the police. The amount of illegal weapons that are coming into Canada through the borders and a lot of them are being mailed in various pieces and then assembled here in Canada. So, it is a problem. It is one less problem if people are turning over their guns, getting compensated for it and then those weapons are destroyed. It is my understanding that there is no testing of these weapons that may associate them with other crimes. It's an amnesty during the period of January 1st, 2025, to October…let's see here…December 31st, 2025. So, again, it's an amnesty period. It's an opportunity to get these assault type weapons off of our streets. One less problem for police. It is unfortunate that the actions of a few bad people are having an impact on an entire community of law-abiding citizens. But unfortunately, it is not a fair world. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. To the questions around, what does the provincial government think of this? I mean, I would assume that they are not offered any funds at this point in time. So, that's a do you like the law or not question that has nothing to do with 3.4 something million dollars that is coming to WPS. But I can tell you from this report if those of my colleagues and the community read it. It is out on the agenda of the January 30,

2025, Council regular meeting agenda. The funds will be used for planning, coordinating, administration of projects to securely remove ASFs from individual owners, and collection, verification, transportation, storage. It also funds compensation to owners who surrender. It also funds special duty officers to execute. It also funds secure storage. I mean this is not a question of do you like the law or not. It is a question of do you want to accept the money from the federal government to allow WPS to not incur any costs out of their existing budget. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am going to be supporting Councillor Mayes' position on this one. I've got some questions, but he asked the questions that I was going to ask. Yet again he makes the point that I wish to make. And that is often, when it comes to things especially like this. It is good to know where the Province is coming from, because we coordinate with them on a more innate basis than we do with the Federal government. I understand this is a federal program, in which they go directly to municipalities. But in a case like this, especially when, well we are half the Province, the Province ends up having more influence over these things in the end, independent of the individual programs or initiatives that the Federal government launches. We are, innately, in a day-to-day basis, working with the Provincial government on these kinds of thigs, not the Federal government. And that is going to be the case in this case. And so, it is good to know where the Provincial government is coming from before we make the decision. I really would like to understand that. I think we are in a position to make better laws, because it is going to be with the Provincial government that we are going to have to integrate. And, on that basis, I support Councillor Mayes' point of view. I respect what we are doing. I don't see the rush on this. What is wrong with waiting to find out the Provincial government's point of view. Because that is going to be where our policy implementation issues are going to be with. So, on that basis I would prefer to wait. And therefore, today I am going to have to vote against it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: So, yes, thanks to Councillor…my councillor colleague for bringing up some of the concerns about Provincial government. I do agree on some of the points he made. But I also…my reasons, I didn't quite put on the record at EPC, but I will put them on today. As more in respect with the Federal government. We know that what they are proposing raises significant concerns about its implementation and the impact on law-abiding firearm owners including hunters, farmers and sport shooters in our community. And we heard that from the delegation, and I do agree with some of his concerns. I have had veterans, as well as some hunters and sport shooters actually reach out to me, expressing their concerns, as well, and some clarity on the Federal program is what is required. We have seen this in the past where the Federal government sometimes like to bypass the Province of Manitoba and go straight to municipalities when they want to hand out money. We have seen that during the HAF program, and you know, as a city Councillor who supports housing, I supported that but, obviously, questioning some of the HAF. Here we are seeing very, very similar tactics. And I am quite tired of what the Federal government is doing bypassing the Provincial government. Obviously, the Province has made their concerns about the bill. And they don't support it. And I don't support it at this time. While I agree with some of the comments that were made by my councillor colleagues, we know that it is important that we tackle illegal firearms, trafficking...illegal firearms that are being trafficking. The gun violence I agree with that. I think money can be spent better tackling those problems. And at this point that's why I am not supporting the report as it is, because I think it is important that we have further dialogue with the Federal government. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am reluctantly going to support this report as well. Again, as Councillor Duncan, I think, articulated very well. We are just the service provider involved in collection of this. The Federal government has been sort of hellbent in introducing some programs to make look like they are doing something on guns. Legal gun owners are not really the ones who are problems. These are people with registered guns that are now available with the amnesty program. It was interesting, back in 2020 around the FCM table we had people from both sides of gun issues vehemently opposed to what the Federal government was trying to do. We had people, you know, from very rural communities, that are very…where guns are more of a way of life. And then we had, you know, urban Quebec Councillors who were going…if every community gets to choose...at that time the version of the program, to be clear, at that time the version of the program was communities would opt in or opt out of even having gun restrictions on these new weapons…or this new list of weapons. Anyway, it is a bit of a bit of a gong show since the beginning. It has changed over time. Again, the notion of returning guns through Canada Post was turned down by the Post Office and the union, for very obvious reasons. This is a reasonable way to safely remove these weapons from circulation. It's a silly program, and it could change when the government changes. But regardless, I will be supporting this today.

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

Councillor Wyatt: I just want to state that I will supporting the EPC Report as well. And as someone who, I think, like many in this chamber, I was strongly opposed to the long-gun registry when it existed. And it has been abolished. And that's not what we are talking about here. I think that should be made very clear. It sounds like there is a fear whether it is real or not that the federal government may be going down the same path, but you know, rather than trying to look at shadows or guess what somebody may want to do in the future, let's look at the facts of the situation and what the federal government has passed. This is not the reinvention of the long-gun registry, which I would be 100 percent in opposition to. And therefore, I will be stood on the side on side of our law enforcement officers and men and women on the street who are trying to make the city safer for themselves and also for those who have these weapons to ensure they are not in a situation compromised and there is injury, or heaven forbid a loss of life. So, you know, Madam Speaker, I support the clause coming out of EPC. I am not sure of what the province's take on this, and frankly I really don't care. We have a program here before us today and let's get moving on with it and take advantage of it, while we can get…we often talk about getting Federal money, well here we are getting it. So, why aren't we taking it up? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, back to you to close. Pardon me, one more speaker. Councillor Dobson.

Councillor Dobson: Thank you very much. I have a number of concerns here. I am concerned that the...our Province is not on board with bill C21. I am concerned that the official opposition down in Ottawa may cancel this program if they got elected. I am also concerned with the additional work that the WPS is going to have to do to in collecting all these firearms. So, at this time I am not going to support this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. Good discussion all around. Call the question, please, Madam Speaker. I think I have made my point. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: I'll call the question on item seven. All in favor? Ok. All in favour please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His worship, Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Duncan, Eadie, Lukes, Rollins, Wyatt, Orlikow, Gilroy, and Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Dobson, Mayes, Santos and Schreyer.

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

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Item seven passes. Item eight, Mr. Clerk.

Item 8 – Award of Contract – Provision for the Lease to Own a Police Helicopter – Bid Opportunity 677-2024

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I know there will be good discussion about this item as well. I have been supportive of the police helicopter and its usefulness in making the city of Winnipeg safer. Helping to search for individuals, even lost individuals. Certainly, helping to assist with vehicle pursuits and allows the police service to not have to pursue with their cars when the helicopter is in the air. Many, many years ago I did take a ride with the police service on the helicopter. And I saw it in use firsthand, it's quite remarkable. That helicopter can get from one side of the city to the other in just a few minutes, where if it was a cruiser car it would take half an hour to 40 minutes to traverse from one side to the other. But I did ask the question, and I think someone mentioned, today I think, one of our delegates. I have asked the Police Service this question about the use of drones. And whether we can get to the place where drones, a series of drones can do the work that the Police helicopter does right now. That is something that Police are looking at, but, again, they are not there yet. Which we appreciate and understand. So, in the meantime, having the police helicopter on a lease to own basis, not laying out all the cash at once with clauses within this contract that would permit them time to reassess to throw out the contract I think is what is before us today. And so, by all means I think we should, as a city, be looking at the use of technology. It's one of things that I know that Councillor Matt Allard, you know, when I asked him to serve in the role of identifying technology opportunities where we can provide better service to residents, better customer services

and answer our own service within the City of Winnipeg, he has taken that very seriously and is working on that. But when it comes to Police Service, I know that they are exploring technology, and various technology. They report publicly to the Police Board on a regular basis on the work they are doing. One of the things that they have indicated they are looking at is the use of drones in various ways. We know our Fire department is using drones right now. So, the technology continues to develop, continues to advance. And as that unfolds perhaps there will be a time in the future where the police helicopter can be replaced with other technology. Today we are not there yet. And so, I will be supporting this request.

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

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to put on the record as well, that this is not the purchase of a second helicopter. This is a replacement of the original or existing helicopter. If you look at the fly to operations unit, and this information is publicly available online, it does talk about the fact that the police helicopter is in use 247 out of 364 days. They have confiscated, and this is the report that I am reading from; they were able to take 318 firearms, and weapons, and assault type weapons off of the streets. They attended 2,247 events. And located 574 missing persons. And had 95 vehicle pursuits. Now, again, it shows the utilization of the police helicopter. Mayor Gillingham talked about the use of drones. And again, this has been a topic of discussion as we look at technology to fight crime. I had the opportunity, while I was in Vancouver, on a conference to attend the Vancouver Police Department, and saw their flight operations unit, which included a drone program. And with drones they were able to deploy them and actually see a drug transaction while the drone was in the air, several thousand feet in the air. You could see the color of the currency that was exchanging hands. Yes, it is an effective tool. It's more cost-effective, but there are limitations with its usage that the police helicopter expands the usage and keeps our streets safe. I also want to put on the record the fact this is a lease to own as was mentioned by the Mayor, the monthly costs are around 74,000 dollars, which rolls up on to 800 or 900,000 dollar a year investment. Included in that cost, though, are the maintenance costs. Every couple of years the current helicopter has to be taken offline and stripped right down to the frame, inspected and put back together. This is part of the agreement that the service has, in terms of the agency that administers flight operations in Canada. And that comes at a significant cost. Close to 600,000 dollars every time that helicopter, every couple of years, is taken offline for that inspection. So, the cost of doing that for this new helicopter are borne in the lease agreements. It is also important to note that while the helicopter is being inspected it is taken offline for up to two months. Which has vulnerability here in the city. So, with this new lease to own, again, the company would provide that back up helicopter when needed during the inspection periods. It is also important to note that we are going from H120 helicopter to the H125 helicopter. The pilots that are currently operating the current helicopter have the experience of operating the H125 as well. So, there's no additional training needed. And the equipment that they have on the H120 is compatible with H125. So, no new equipment has to be purchased. So, this is a good deal. It keeps officers safe, it keeps residents safe in terms of those vehicle pursuits that happen where they utilize the helicopter for that surveillance, you know, allowing for those car pursuits to happen at a more safe rate. It is also important to note that through this lease agreement if new technology is on the horizon and they want to move up, they can opt out of their agreement. So, this is a good deal for the Winnipeg Police Service, it is a good deal for the citizens of Winnipeg who have wanting to see us invest in safety in our communities. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker I rise to speak. I will be supporting the clause. When the police helicopter came forward as a discussion point, originally to Council, it was myself and Councillor Gerbasi who voted against it. The concern we expressed at the time, and I think it's still relevant today is the resources that it does take and that in some ways it's not the issue of opposition to the idea of a helicopter rather the comment that a helicopter is needed in the first place. In other words, the state of our city, the social and economic challenges faced in our neighborhoods that require a helicopter to be able to enforce the laws that we have. And as well the concern at the time which was expressed that it is better to have officers on the ground and in our community, proactive community-based policing, neighborhood policing that is approachable and visible. That these are the things that we should be concentrating on, rather than the fancy technology which often is very attractive. Having said that, I know that the helicopter has been a great use to the Winnipeg Police Service. I am looking forward to the hiring of our next Chief of Police so that hopefully we can have a rededication to community-based policing that we once saw in this city. Policing that is accessible, approachable, and I know our Winnipeg Police Service work very hard in that already. But it is something that we need to recommit ourselves to. And I will just point out the fact that we have the resources here to lease a helicopter 300,000 a year and going up. But we still have the east district and the west district station closed to the public. And I have to question, why is...and now the north district, why is it that we built this multi-million-dollar facilities, and then we lock the doors to the public? And if the citizens of Winnipeg want to make a police report in person, go downtown. And many of them do not. Because they do not want to have the headache or the time or the fear of being downtown now, perceived or otherwise. And that actually drives down the actual recording of statistics that are necessary to determine our level of policing in the city, which feeds into itself by the irony of having the district offices closed to the public. The pandemic is over. The district offices should be open to the public. Councillor Duncan and I have spoken more than once at the Winnipeg Police Board on this, and it has

gone...obviously fallen on deaf ears. It's extremely frustrating that we have a report here today, that we have resources for the helicopter, which again I am supporting, but we still have these district offices closed to the public. We need to get them back open again. And if anything, you could argue it is symbolic in terms of the approach to community-based policing. I take it further than that. I think it is integral to the idea that our law…that our officers are approachable by the public and at their offices. I appreciate the fact that it is not like a firehall. Police are out on the streets all of the time, they are always on patrol. But there are times when members of the public do need to access the police district station. Its simple, sometimes it's as simple as making a police report for the sake of an auto accident that they have been involved with. You know, but we cannot do that with these offices closed. The time has come to open these offices. It has been two years since the last election. When this was an issue in the last election campaign, the public was outraged. The pandemic is over. Get these offices open. We spent millions of dollars building these facilities and they are still closed. And the Police Board does nothing, absolutely nothing to address this concern. It is growing. I can tell you the public is losing their patience for the fact that these district offices remain closed. So, I am supporting this. But I would like to see something done soon to get these district offices open to the public so that they can make police reports, they can come and speak to officers about concerns and issues in the community. And keep in mind, Madam Speaker, that we went down from a six-district system down to four. That is how we built these stations. And the rationale at the time, was that they would be better facilities, that they would be accessible to the public and open, being that they are more centralized. We got one, we went down from two stations down to one on the entire east side of the Red River of the City of Winnipeg. Entire east area of Winnipeg. There used to be one Provencher office serving southeast Winnipeg, and at Pandora and Plessis serving northeast of Winnipeg. We amalgamated it all into one. And the rationale in the report, given to us by the executive at the time, and the administration, and the Mayor at the time, Glen Murray, was that this would be better Public Service. The district offices will be more accessible, and here they are remaining closed. Contrary to the intent of that report that was passed by Council in July of 2003. The time has come to reopen these offices to live up to the promises made to the public when those multi-million dollar brand new facilities were built and make them accessible again so we are getting a true picture, Madam Speaker, of crime and issues in the community that people can report rather than people just saying, ah, I am not going downtown to make the report, too much headache, where am I going to park? I don't feel safe, whatever the case may be. Get the district offices open that was the commitment gave by this Council to the public when we reduced the amount of police services centres from six to four. And spent tens of millions of dollars of public money building these new facilities. And the fact that the Police Board continues to ignore this request is frustrating. And I can tell you the public is getting more and more frustrated as they try to go to these offices and it says: closed, go downtown. You know. So, that's my comments, Madam Speaker. I am raising it now because of the fact we have money here to be supporting this. Even though I didn't support these helicopters in the past. I support it with the hope that my words or the concerns that I am hearing in the community get addressed, soon by the Police Board and/or the new Chief of Police, whenever that should take place. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a concern I want to bring forward at this time when we're dealing with a police matter, now that I am learning as new member of Community Services. It really kind of goes into what Councillor Wyatt was saying. There has been some changes at the City. And I don't want to take up…I mean, Councillor Lukes did a great job advocating for more transparency at city hall, and I don't want to take up her space. She did a great job, but, you know, when it comes to transparency, we are actually decreasing it right now. And part of that with the police budget here is that we used to have it come forward at Community Services. And we have taken a big part of our Community Services budget and our policing stuff and now goes forward to EPC, and I think that it is critical because I think that the community we all get the calls in our office about policing. The lack of policing, or what they would like to see or what they are spending. We get those calls. And yet you have to be a member of EPC to be sitting there asking the questions and really getting the information that we need. We all know the importance of sitting down and having something on the agenda and non-EPC having the ability to directly ask the administration questions. Now we don't have that. And we used to remember a time when we used to be able to do that at Community Services and really go through the budget with our Public Service, with our Police force and really ask questions that we want to hear. And now, you know, this has really been taken away from us as non-EPC Members. And I think that it is important to remember that, you know, somebody that has been on EPC and not on EPC. You know, when you are on EPC you have your own file that you are really worrying about. And I think that that is a good thing, we want Chairs to be well knowledged. You know but having somebody that is a non-EPC member being able to ask questions to Public Service, scrutinize the budget, scrutinize policy directions, I think is really really critical. And so, I am very...I guess upset that we have changed the system and now it's going directly to EPC. Which gives us even less of a contact. I'm already feeling like I don't have a connection with our Winnipeg Police because we have a Police Board, we have this kind of system. And I really feel the public feels it is not working. And so, us having to manage a budget and then having really very limited access to asking the questions we need to have, you know, is very concerning. When I as a Councillor asked for a Council seminar, we used to have many seminars on multiple things. And now we get very little information, very little seminars. And I should be able to ask for a Council seminar on what is going on with the hiring of our Chief of Police, what is going on on police matters, those are things that I should be able to ask. And you know what, it is really denying the community access to

information when they would be able to come to another committee to be able to come in delegation and ask questions and also scrutinize what we are doing here at the City in terms of policy and budgets. So, I want to share that. Because I really don't think that my Councillor colleagues know that this has changed. And I want to bring it up because it maybe was not the intention of this change. I'm hoping it wasn't the intention of this change. And I'm hoping that we can really see this move back to Community Services where we can have a more equitable lens on the budgets and policies of policing and also our Community Services, it has now been taken out and put into the CAO's office. Those are critical things that we as a Council should be viewing. And not just EPC. And so, that is very, very concerning. And, you know, the last Council was very concerned about transparency. And I am seeing less…and I want to raise this because I don't know if it was the intent, but this is a major concern for me. Somebody who gets multiple calls over policing and wants to be more engaged. And it is really not the same by…Councillor Gilroy, you can pick up the phone and kind of call somebody. No, it is very different when you are at a committee, it's on the agenda, and all your Councillor colleagues are feeding off each other and scrutinizing and asking questions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers. Councillor Gilroy, are you done your presentation?

Councillor Gilroy: Yeah, I am just about done, if I can have a couple of minutes.

Madam Speaker: Then again, just remind you we are on the report of police helicopter.

Councillor Gilroy: Absolutely. And we didn't have an opportunity at Community Services, to really engage in this topic, and many of the topics that Councillor Wyatt was talking about. So, it has everything to do with the Police helicopter. I will be supporting the police helicopter. Hopefully maybe when the Mayor closes, I am hoping it's going to be a quieter one. That is one of the things that I do hear. But I do think that it is important to raise this because not everybody is getting the same level of access to the information, and that needs to change, Madam Speaker. And that has very much about the police helicopter. So, I know somebody raised this, but this has everything to do with the budget that is right in front of us and what we are doing right now. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. I would like to support this, but Councillor Schreyer knocked it out of the park yesterday pointing out throughout the simple question that it is not addressed here, which is. Inarguably in 2010, and there was a report at the Community Services committee back in 2010, inarguably the price was 3.49 million. That is in media reports, that's in 2010, that's for the same company Airbus, but for an older model. 3.5 million with a lot of provincial assistance. Then Premier Salager with then Mayor Katz. So here we have, he said 260 percent more, I would say 3 or 400 percent more, depending on how one does the math to get to 14 million dollars. But it is inarguably 900,000 dollars a year, for 15 years. It's 75,000 dollars a month. For 180 months. Why is it four times depending on how you do the math. Why is it four times more expensive? Oh, we are leasing it. Well, that doesn't answer the question. Maybe it would be smarter then to buy it. Which is not provided as an option anywhere in here, because we seem to have the money in the budget, this report says. Although, it is a 15 year-long commitment and there are operating costs in addition to capital costs. So, how we can say we have it in the budget for next 15 years is a bit mysterious. No evidence of any provincial support to this, which is what Council had in 2010. I am actually not opposed to the idea of the police helicopter. I served on Police Board. I am opposed to a report that says it's 14 million dollars. It doesn't say anywhere the very question Councillor Schreyer asked yesterday. Hey, that seems like a lot more. Is it construction inflation is it, aerial or… who knows? But it is certainly 3.5, we'll round up, 3.5 million in 2010. Same company, it's now 14 million, for one helicopter. There is a maintenance cost built in here. Well, if you look at the report from 2010, which is on DMIS, the 3.5 million included the cost of building a hangar. So, not really adequate information, I am afraid. Perhaps going to Councillor Gilroy's mouth, would have been helpful to have a Council seminar on this. I have supported a number of police initiatives over the years, when people around here voted to try and unilaterally change the pension plan. I opposed that. People around here voted against the plan on parking. I opposed that as well. It was 13-3 actually in favor of that. So, where we proved, we didn't have to pay anything on that one actually. It was a very good bit of public policy. So, in short, I don't oppose a helicopter, in theory, I oppose the report that is a 400 percent increase. That is how I would do the math, I don't know how Councillor Schreyer got 260, but I am going with 400 percent. From 3.5 million in 2010, 14 million now. It's a huge increase. Maybe there is a good explanation for it. It's the same company. It's 10 percent faster, if you look at the speed, roughly 120 knots going up to 130 knots, it's louder, it's not quieter. So, to me no additional cost being spent for noise deflection or noise muffling. So, I would like to be more supportive. I suspect moving a layover would be pointless, it seems. So, I know the Mayor and others have a good record, in term of supporting police initiatives, I don't…trying not to put things in a dichotomy here, I am trying to elevate the debate. But for today at least, I don't feel I have the information in front of me to explain why has there been an increase in 15 years. Councillor Schreyer has done all the math. Wages certainly haven't increased by 400 percent since 2010. Why then does the cost of a single helicopter, a helicopter which included provincial help, which included building a hangar in 2010. Why is it now that much more expensive? That's unanswered, so with reluctance, I would be opposed to this at this time.

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

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise actually in support of this report. It is on the EPC agenda because of its budgetary effect. And EPC is, as everybody on Council here knows, EPC handles the money requests. This isn't a contract renewal that may show up on Community Services agenda, Madam Speaker. I first want to talk about the helicopter, when it was first brought in. And, so, one thing to be clear while the helicopter can be across the city quite quickly following say a stolen vehicle chase or a robbery and a vehicle involved, yes, the ability of the copter to follow it. So, what happens is...just to be clear, it is not that the police cruisers don't have to get over towards where that stolen vehicle or robbery-involved motor chase. What happens is the police officers don't have to take the public's risk in driving at the speed that they need to to deal with that motor vehicle. The chopper is in the air, it's followed, very important. Now, you could probably do that with a drone as well, Madam Speaker. And technology is being looked at. I don't know how big of a drone it would need to be. You know, it is still, somebody is still controlling it, Madam Speaker. But one thing we should note. The biggest issue back in the day when we were looking at the helicopter was people's privacy, Madam Speaker. You have a Police Service flying over people's property. The drone does the same thing. So, if you are looking and you're opposed to helicopters or anything like that and I know there was a number of people in my ward who were quite upset about drones or helicopters in the air interrupting their privacy when they haven't done anything wrong. So, that is one of the issues. Now we do have to be interested in the public's safety. And so that is why I agree with moving ahead with it. And try to avoid privacy issues regarding people who are just legally doing whatever they are doing in their yards or whatever. Noise is a factor, Madam Speaker. I get calls about that. What I've noticed about the helicopter because I sit out on my stair stoop over on Scotia, and I hear the helicopter. However, it is in a quiet mode until it has to get somewhere fast. Then it is making a fair amount of noise because it is running at full power and there is a lot of noise. So, hopefully…noise attention…offsetting that is important. Now, I want to go back to something here. The Province of Manitoba created…well, made Winnipeg create, the Winnipeg Police Board, Madam Speaker. To deal with all of these...make a budget recommendation to the City. For what they need to do, for what the Police Service needs to do to keep our community safe. And so, what one would find while members of the Winnipeg Police Board are not to talk about issues, I have gotten in trouble there in the past. However, what I will point out is, every Winnipeg Police Board meeting there are reports. They had a meeting to deal with their budget request of the City. And the helicopter would have been part of that. And so, what I would say is, for my Council colleagues, if you showed up at that meeting and you read that report, you could go there in delegation and say, well, this kind of information is missing. Can you please get us an answer by the time it arrives at City Council. On some of these issues you are quite capable of doing that. For those who really want to know internally all that about the Police Board, I believe once the Chief is hired there will be a position that is open for any Councillor if they want to be on the Police Board, because there are two members on there, of Council. There is a Chair appointed by the Mayor and then there is another position and, we heard what we heard at our organization meeting after the 2022 election. So, I don't know what will happen by November. Hopefully, the Winnipeg Police Board is moving as fast as they can to have a new Chief of Police but digressing a bit on the helicopter. To say that EPC somehow, we became privy...EPC would have become privy once the Police Board submitted their request of the City of Winnipeg. Yes, there is back and forth during the budget process where there are discussions regarding that budget. And, you know, I'm not going to bring up any issues. But I will point out that yeah, EPC would be able to…or the budget working group even, we never had the Police Board come to us as the budget working group when I was there. I don't think it did this year either. Because it is the Police Board budget people who are putting forth that to city Council according to the rules of the Province of Manitoba. So, I just want to remind everybody of that. And we do need the helicopter. It's a 15-year agreement, I think it is. It's leased to own, so I don't know if the maintenance is built in. But the lease to own, the actual lease component, because we end up owning it, it is a capital item. And the maintenance part would be an operating issue. And I think the Mayor might be able to clarify, hopefully something regarding the maintenance of said new helicopter. And I will just end by saying I am actually kind of disappointed. Originally the concept was, when I was on the Police Board. The concept was that we would lease, not lease to own, but we would lease the helicopter and hopefully, if it needed repairs, the leaser would provide us another one, so that we could stay in the air as long as possible. So, anyway, aside from that though. I am in support. And I hope that my colleagues, and we should spend more time understanding how the Police Board…you should spend more time going to the meetings if you got questions on all these reports. It doesn't matter what the issue it is, those reports show up on their agenda.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, do you need more time? Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, good discussion. Indicative of the problem. First of all, I want to say that Councillor Gilroy was completely absolutely in order when she was talking about what she was talking about. Why? Just like yesterday. It's not like we don't want community connections, and things like this. It is a matter of making priorities. We have to compare one option to another. Absolutely. That is exactly what yesterday was about. Our priorities. Everybody individually has to make their own decisions, their own priorities. But collectively as City Hall, as Council, we decide either we do this, or we do that. When I said in my prayer yesterday, that I did the city hall prayer was in solidarity with city hall and my fellow councillors because they have to make difficult decisions. And those decisions are one versus another. That is exactly what Cindy Gilroy was talking about. So, thank you. So was Russ Wyatt. That is all we do here. Make this

decision instead of another one, it's called priorities. That is all Cindy Gilroy was talking about. Priorities. We do it all the time whether we acknowledge it or not. I am not against the helicopter. It is a question of priorities just like Councillor Mayes said. And by the way, I was going to wait to save this for the inline, but if it wasn't for construction inflation, capital inflation, we wouldn't even be having this conversation. Let's face it. We literally, this report item wouldn't have been stood down. So why is this stood down? Because people have to make a decision over cost. We are going to put on this, instead of somewhere else. That is the decision we are making today. No one is saying the helicopter is bad thing, it is about priorities, right? Like everything we did yesterday for 2 billion dollars. Priorities. Now, thank you to Councillor Mayes for doing a little bit of a refinement on the inflation rates over 15 years with the…some form of refinement on that over 15 years between the capital costs of the helicopter versus the servicing costs. And of course, Markus Chambers did make the point as he was willing to be forthcoming yesterday, in terms of the difference in the lease, and I do appreciate that. However, Councillor Mayes made the point, which I didn't realize. That the original 3.5 million versus 15 years later 13.5 million or 14 million, that capital asset, that capital acquisition, that purchase of 3.5 included the building of the hangar, included the construction of the hanger. Well, I didn't fit that into the equation. But it kind of proves our point. Construction inflation, capital inflation, the inflation in capital assets. Am I exaggerating? In what way am I exaggeration? I'm being understated. Or this, it is just a fact. What is it that I am saying is not exactly somewhere not quite right? Well, we can talk about the minutiae. Including our priorities. The people here that are in support of this are basically because of it is worth the money. Okay. That is your priority. You made that choice. Councillor Gilroy made the point, I think Councillor Wyat too, in terms of if we are serious about optimizing our resources and our technology and our capital expenditure and the police, that also includes police engagement. I believe the point was made, that when you separate people from the police, by the way our new district offices work, the police can't get as much of their work done. Well, that's worthwhile, isn't it? If we are talking about...of a helicopter, which will cost a capital cost plus extra…they say there is service costs involved. But that doesn't mean it's all the operational costs. And on that basis, if the points being made by Gilroy and Wyatt is, if we are concerned about the police being able to do their job, help them, because when we have greater connection between the public and the police, the police can do more work, they can do a better job. So, if we are worried about this, and think the helicopter will solve all that, well it won't. We need a greater ability of communication physical, between the people of Winnipeg and the police. So, that was a priority expressed. That is how we think here at city hall. Councillor Eadie made a point. Further information was available to Councillors before today's vote. Fair enough. And I think some of that has been offered. But I am going to make the point that not any true discussion was going to be availed by the Police Board and the Police, in terms of the nature of the dilemma we are in today, more than we were 15 years ago, in terms of the dilemma of increasing costs, not labor costs, not operational costs. The literal cost of buying things, the capital costs, of building, the construction costs, the capital inflation. I don't think they are going to offer that, but we have to make these serious decisions of priorities. So, I am going to say, in favor of what Ross Eadie is saying, because I think he is one member of EPC and would vote for a true, normal, natural, actually robust report on construction inflation, on capital inflation. And how it affects every decision we are making more and more every day. So, if you want that forthcoming information and context of making decisions today about things getting way more expensive than taxpayers can afford. Then we should have that report on construction inflation, on capital inflation. I know Councillor Eadie would vote for it. because he voted for it before. How many minutes do I have left? Um, unless you think I am wasting your time right now. If you think that someone else has been saying what I have been saying in this circle right now, tell me to sit down.

Madam Speaker: Stand up.

Councillor Schreyer: Really? Are you serious, is that sarcasm, let me know. Because people need to know. People are watching. Am I wasting your time? All right. Councillor Santos says I am not wasting your time. But I am almost done. As a matter of fact, let's look at this because let's face it, we are looking at alternatives, we are looking at priorities, we are looking at this versus that. Let's face it, the cost of really, really good drone. 0.2 percent of the cost. That is very loose estimate. 0.2 percent of the cost of the helicopter including its operation and maintenance. Bear that in mind, when we have to look and make hard decisions, that get harder and harder, because we are not contending with, we are not dealing with how the cost of capital assets, things that are built and constructed, is going way beyond the people that build the wages and salaries of the people that build them or the taxpayers that pay for it. I'm going to make that point again, because yesterday during the budget meeting and all of things, it was implied that all inflation is the same. Wage inflation is the same as construction inflation. When in fact, if that were the case, we wouldn't have inflationary problems. The problem is it is getting harder and harder for people to pay for it. That is inflation. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Miigwech.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, thank you. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will take this opportunity to make a couple of comments related to some of the comments, questions that were posed by councillors. One I think, Councillor Schreyer's comment about construction inflation. Bear in mind as well, in 2010 the Canadian dollar was much closer to par than it is today, as well. So, costs of procuring anything that may come from the United States, which I don't know exactly what it is, but again, the cost of procuring anything from outside of Canada certainly has risen as well. To Councillor Wyatt's point, as a member of the Police Board, certainly not speaking for the Board, I am speaking as a member of the Board. I appreciate his

comments regarding district offices. I can assure him, as a member of the Board, that the Board takes that very seriously, that his comments, requests are noted, once again. And then, as per...through you, Madam Speaker, the concerns raised by Councillor Gilroy, I just want to remind the Councillor, the Police budget has been on no less than three separate public agendas. The Police Board public agenda, the Executive Policy Committee public agenda, and also, of course, the Council's public agenda as well. And so, I do know that if there is questions that the Councillor wants to ask related to the Police budget, I am very confident that, certainly, I as a member would be willing to try to get the information for any Councillor or member of the public for that matter. And certainly, I won't speak for them, but I will speak for them. The Police Board Chair, if I can, I am sure would be open to fielding any questions as well. The bigger thing I think, that perhaps, I don't want to speak for her, but perhaps, Councillor Gilroy's frustration in part, stems from the fact that, in 2010 or so, as we know, the Province of Manitoba instituted the Police Service's Act and brought in Police Boards. Police Boards are charged with providing civilian oversights within governance, respecting the enforcement of law, the maintenance of public peace and the prevention of crime in the municipality. And the Police Service's Act goes on and on to talk about the role of the Police Board, which is distinct from, and separate from Council. Part of rationale, if I recall, back in that day to bring Police Boards into place in the City of Winnipeg by the Province of Manitoba is to try to separate any potential of political influence or interference that could have been possible and remove the oversight of the Police Service and put in the hands of a civilian body. And we know certainly across Canada or Police Boards across the U.S. in some parts as well, but…and the role of the Police Board is spelled out in the legislation. We as a City are required obviously to comply with that legislation as well. And Councillor Eadie was talking about that, and I appreciate his comments on that. Back to this helicopter, though. Just going back in reference here. The first mention of the fact that Police Services was looking into put out a tender to look for a new helicopter was four months ago. So, this has been, certainly in the public domain since October 1, 2024. So, this has been a matter that has been known and circulated in the public for at least four months now. And so, when something has been in and made public and been known or available for four months. Getting information on it, is something that I encourage all Councillors to do, and if there's more questions to be asked then they can ask that. I do want to address this as well, the Councillor from Daniel McIntyre referenced a Council seminar request. I do know I saw an e-mail about a request related to the Police and the Police recruitment process. I would remind all of us that an HR recruitments process is just that. We wouldn't have a Council seminar in the middle of an HR recruitment process for Chief Financial Officer or CFO, as we know, because many people around this table have been involved, in one way or the other, on the selection committee or HR process to hire someone. Aspects of that are confidential and for good reason. You take a look at, for example, candidates who may want to put their name forward. To put their name forward and have that as an example exposed in the Council seminar or some information sharing session in the middle of the recruitment process could jeopardize that person's current workplace and employment. So, the HR processes, kind of writ large, have a method that they follow and steps that they follow and having a Council seminar in the midst of them would not be something that I don't think I would see ever happen in any HR recruitment process. So, hopefully that helps. But again, if councillors, if colleagues and members of the public want information further to the public information that is given, this, as I said, this issue of the helicopter has been known for four months now. The Police budget has been no less than three public agendas. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. And Councillor Mayes and Schreyer noted in opposition. Thank you. Councillor Gilroy did you vote for this? No. She voted for it. Yes, so the opposition is Councillor Mayes and Councillor Schreyer. Anybody else? Okay, and that is carried, thank you. Next item, Mr. Clerk. Item ten. Item nine.

Item 9 – Contribution Towards Redevelopment of the Former Hudson's Bay Company Building Located at 450 Portage Avenue

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

Mayor Gillingham: I will wait to hear from my colleagues, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stood the item down. This matter pertaining to the…was before us because a number of months ago we had True North before us along with Chief Jerry Daniels related to the Portage Place redevelopment at that time. And they were here and made that delegation on that issue. At that time, members of Council were able to ask them questions. I asked the Chief Jerry Daniels questions upon which the response was...I was concerned and I guess I still am concerned the issue or the question I asked was how long or when will we see the undertaking of the redevelopment of Hudson's Bay underway? And the opening of a new facility there. And the response was kind of like, two to three years. It was kind of vague coming from the Chief. I was concerned about that. I am still concerned about that. I am very supportive of the project. But there has been a commitment of significant public dollars. Our TIF is tied, by the looks of it, to the improvements to the sidewalk and streetscaping in the area as well, and I am sure the project itself. However, there may be…you know, I'd like to know, I guess, in terms of response or in terms of any

comments that can be shed on this by the Mayor, or any other member of Council. In terms of whether or not they are having discussions. We have in the past, for example, placed sunset clauses on TIF agreements where, in the event we want to see a project moving a little faster, we will, and we don't see it moving in the direction we want it moving in we place sunset clause on the TIF agreement saying it will expire by such and such date, if the development permits are not pulled for the sake of the TIF. And right now, this, just to keep in mind members of Council that, as per the report here Council voted prior to the last election June 23, 2022, to approve the tax increment financing grant to the Southern Chiefs Organization with respect to 450 Portage Avenue. So, we are coming up to three years of when the TIF was approved. I'd would like to know the progress on that project. It is an important project for downtown. It's a historic building. There has been a major commitment of public money. And we want to make sure that the commitments made are fulfilled. And if there is any issues or concerns or if they are having difficulty of any kind, that we are here to assist them. But that we see this project move proactively in light of the public commitment and public funding that has been given to this project because as we know as well, the longer it takes to do a project, the higher the costs go. And my fear is that the longer it takes that there will be more requests for more public funding because of the delays in bringing the project forward in the first place. And that could be quite substantial if these delays are allowed to continue. So, I would like to hear what is going on with the project. And those are my concerns and why I stood the report down, to see what is happening. We have asked for 90-day extension which I am fine with. But clearly, we need to see this construction project under way and the renovation of that building. And the important part that it plays in terms of reconciliation for Indigenous community, which I am also part of in this chamber. And you know, but to get it moving and to see if the Southern Chiefs Organizations needs any assistance from the public service of the City of Winnipeg or the Province of Manitoba, or what? You know, in terms of whether it will be pulling permits, or assistance in terms of development planning. And, you know, we have a new head of CentreVenture, who has stepped up, maybe they can step up to assist. You know, what can be done here to assist to get this project moving so that we can prevent a request for further funding because of the costs rising because of delays in terms of a construction project, which we know when you have delays in a construction project and construction costs. I don't want to say the term construction inflation, but I just did, to be related to the project itself. Anyway, that's my concern. Very supportive of the project. Very important to reconciliation, very important to the City of Winnipeg, very important to downtown Winnipeg, let's get this project moving, let's work with the Southern Chiefs Organization to make it happen. For the good of our community both indigenous and nonindigenous. And so those are my thoughts, and I want to thank the speaker for allowing me this time to speak. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. This is an extension of time. Mr. Mayor do you wish to close?

Mayor Gillingham: No, just simply say that I would recommend that Councillor Wyatt reach out to our CAO. I don't have that information that he is seeking at this point. But perhaps the CAO would have the information. So, you can call the question, Madam Speaker, Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the vote on item nine. All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Item ten, Mr. Clerk.

Item 10 – Downtown Arts Capital Fund Grants

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

Mayor Gillingham: Yes. I stook this one down, Madam Speaker, this is a good news story. It's great to see our support for arts community, performing arts community as well, who are so important to our downtown. So important to the culture of our city as well. And appreciate the investment that is here. It's 2 million dollars over four years. One, you can see here, the Manitoba Opera Association for a computer system and ticketing technology upgrade. Two grants of 87,500 to the Performing Arts Consortium of Winnipeg for the Pantages Playhouse Theatre and then also the same amount for the Royal Winnipeg Ballet for the Campus Modernization and Expansion Plan. Up to 300,000 to the Manitoba Theatre Centre for the Community Safety and Accessibility grant. So, it is good news. And then, of course, up to an additional 750,000 in future years to the Performing Arts Consortium for the Pantages Playhouse and same amount to Ballet for the Campus Modernization and Expansion Plan. And we know these arts organizations have been so central to the life and vitality of our city, they are so important to so many. Remind us all, for example, that the Winnipeg ballet, we have students that, literally move to Winnipeg from all around the world to be part of our renowned RWB School and program, and training program. The RWB recently just announced their new Artistic Director, Mr. Christopher Stowell. We welcome him and his new role that he will be taking on. I am glad that we as Council are supporting our outstanding arts organizations. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: It is a good initiative. I will be supporting it. It is unfortunate that, as you know, Madam Speaker, I have been the Councillor up on the WAG board for some number of years now. And the WAG had a proposal in, but this isn't determined by the Public Service. So, I just hope the WAG comes back with an ask, we did just approve almost 14 million

dollars in new spending on a Police helicopter. So, yesterday was certainly new spending. Hopefully we can work out something with the WAG, they do a private money, they do a Provincial money, they need to replace the elevators and the infrastructure project, elevators that date back to the opening of the WAG in 1971. Most of the WAG not (inaudible). Obviously, these are worthy recipients doing some good work as well. But hopefully if the WAG does come forward with an ask then perhaps in the interim measure or in the next budget, we can make that work. They are at risk of losing quite a bit of provincial and private funding. But certainly, this is a good initiative from the Mayor. So, I am supporting it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any other speakers? Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: I am going to declare a potential conflict of interest. My wife is Chair of the Manitoba Opera, so I will recuse myself from this vote.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Mr. Mayor. Do you wish to close? Call the question on item ten. All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Next. Shall we get into the next item or take a recess now?

Councillor Eadie: Could we call lunch and come back at 1 20 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Okay, we will take a recess now and reconvene at 20 after. We would like to begin on time. So please come back at that time. Thank you.

Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
January 30, 2025, at 1:29 p.m.

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of January 30, 2025. We are on the report of the Executive Policy Committee. Item 11, Mr. Clerk.

Item 11 – Update on Encampment Clean-up Pilot

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I am not sure who pulled this down, but I will wait to hear from my colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I stood it down. I have had a read of the report, and I just want to point out some concerns. I guess, that should be highlighted here, that the work of the removing of the encampments had benefits that are often missed, it would point out in the report the pilot created unexpected and positive outcomes, including enhanced relationships between encampment residents and outreach agencies, and offered new work experience opportunities for participants to clean up the site and MOST programs. I don't think this issue is going to be going away any time soon. And though we have taken this position now, encampments I think are definitely a sign of the need for us to address the homelessness crisis in our city as well as the mental health addictions crisis in our city. And it will only get worse. And I refer again to the illicit drug task force, the report came down five years ago last June. That had amazing recommendations in it for all levels of government to act upon. But it has sat on a shelf with very little done pertaining to those recommendations. And that if we were to take that report off the shelf and start to act upon the recommendations of the illicit drug task force that was set up at that time by all three level of government. You had on it Mayor Bowman at the time, Calvin (inaudible) and the Member of Parliament, Falcon Ouellette, the Federal government. The recommendations were solid, but unfortunately, there was not a, the five Ws tied to the recommendations: who, what, where, when, and why. And when I asked one of the citizen members who were appointed to the committee why did it not outline in the recommendations who is implementing these recommendations? When, where, why, how? And his response to me, well, Russ, that is what the levels of government wanted. Which is somewhat cynical, of course. Why would you write a report and then not have the recommendations in the report, excellent recommendations. I encourage anybody who hasn't read that report to read that report. We are struggling with the challenges in our streets today. You don't have to reinvent the wheel. That report outlines the problems clearly on various levels. And a whole host of recommendations that if we acted upon them could make...even a fraction of them, could make dramatic changes in our streets today. And for the individuals out there who are sick and suffering. We wouldn't have to necessarily have these encampments coming up over. And I just want to put for the record as well that, there are many encampments that were not identified, there are folks out there on the sides of riverbanks, under bridges, missing in a sense from our view and our vista, but very much there. And we can't forget of the kind of city that we are. We are a cold city, in terms of our climate. And there has to be a better way. And there is a better way. And that way was outlined in that report. I would encourage the Mayor's Office, and other levels of government too,

to dust it off and start to implement some of the recommendations, some of the very simple things that we could be doing. Even we as a City, you know. The idea of having first primary housing for those who are coming out of recovery. Having housing that is available for employment opportunity, plugging services in. Having proper men's and women's detox facilities, having proper recovery facilities that are available immediately when somebody asks for help, which is not the case. Having wet and dry facilities for people to live in overnight. And what that means people who are still drunk or high somewhere to stay. They are turned away from Siloam Mission if they are drunk or high. But for them to stay overnight in a place, even if they are suffering at that moment, in many cases does not exist. Especially if the Main Street Project is full. We have to do more, in terms of this file. Much more. And though they do not vote in many ways, and though we do not hear, but…there is one issue that I was remarkably touched by during the last election. Especially when I read the difference between…and Seniors blocks. The Seniors, many were concerned about what is happening out there. And many I think had family members they didn't want to necessarily say who were struggling. And it should be pointed out. That the overdoses that take place in the city, Madam Speaker, are not in the inner city. The highest levels. They are in the suburbs. where people are unfortunately quietly dying in their homes. And that the crisis is not just an inner city. It is right across the city. And that there is so much we could be doing. And I know that the model has been pointed out down in the states. The reality is that we don't have to go that far. The Province of Alberta has been leading the country with regards to what they have been doing with regards to this. So much so that, for the first time in August of last year overdoses...the last statistics I saw, was August last year, the overdose rate dropped by 44 percent. I mean that was unheard of, for the first time in this country. They are building the facilities, they are building the rehab facilities, they are building the secondary stage housing, they are getting folks out. They have decided that it is not the substances that should be stigmatized. But rather the trauma that people have lived through that they are struggling with, that causes them to fall into substance use, whatever the case may be. So, I would encourage members of Council and Mayor's Office to reignite this issue that this can't be the last thing, we have so much we must do on this. And the illicit drug task force gave amazing recommendations that if even we acted on 10 percent of them we would make a huge difference in our community out there. So, thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't going to say anything. But Councillor Wyatt made some good points. It's talking about recommendations from a report as well as the content of that report and how these reports are prepared. Where the information comes from. It is really important where the information comes from. And so, as we dust these things off and as Councillor Wyatt said himself, this isn't going away soon. On what basis is it? Is it therefore static? No, it's constantly changing. This isn't a new issue. It has grown to the extent where we have to look at it in a new way. It has been there for a long time. It's an expression of something that has always been there. But in this day and age, and I am going to go into the factors today. But in this day and age, given a few heavy factors, it is getting worse. I want to mention the fact that there have been organizations over the years that have been involved in helping people that are homeless living on riverbanks. And these are the people to speak directly to this report and in context of what Councillor Wyatt said as well. Where do our recommendations come from? And I want to thank those community organizations that have been on the front lines for years and been witness to the growth of this. In particular, given it is my experience in my ward. I want to thank the Chalmers Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation and those involved over years in assisting me in my initiatives and in my trying to maintain some sort of active, on the ground, interaction with those that are homeless in our community living in the riverbanks in my neighborhood. Again, I never talked to this in my first two terms on Council. But then again, it can be therefore misinterpreted in terms of my understanding or my knowledge. I just wanted to point I do live across the street from, 30 seconds from, a homeless encampment because I live across from the Red River (inaudible) bridge. I live two minutes from a couple more on the other side of the bridge. I live five minutes from a few more. A 15-minute walk, I am talking on foot. And so, I walk with the...I have had four different incarnations of a foot patrol community walk in my 10 years as Councillor. Having founded the West Kildonan foot patrol 25 years ago, the year 2000 seemed so futuristic back then. Now, what we learn is…what I have learned, especially from walking with the CNRC, with the Bear Clan patrol. I want to thank Lorraine Kaler, I want to thank all those that have led the community walks in my ward. Because I've learned from it. And therefore, I know that when it comes from these reports, the City can learn from it. Councillor Wyatt just talked about the building relationships. That is one thing that I was fascinated with walking with the Bear Clan, the Elmwood Bear Clan back, back in…maybe it was my second incarnation of a community walk in my ward that I was assisting with. And what I was astounded by…what struck me the most was the trust. The trust that at that time in that incarnation was called the Bear Clan walk. And what I saw was the trust when we walked towards these people living on the riverbank. And that is important. So, when Councillor Wyatt mentioned the...building those relationships. That's what I was witness to. And it is really important, and we can all learn from that. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to talk about how we got here until today. Last year, or actually two years ago, when I was re-elected myself and Councillor Lukes, the Mayor, some public staff had met with some residences within the Point Douglas ward. One in waterfront drive, the exchange district residents and some people who

lived nearby in an encampment, in Waterfront Drive. And at that time there was discussions about encampments and how we were going to solve homelessness. There were differing opinions and views on how that looked like and what the outcomes were going to be. But I knew at that time there was definitely a commitment from all of us that we were going to need to work together with nonprofit organizations, province of Manitoba, federal government to solve or reduce the chronic homelessness that we see today. But I knew when I was walking down Waterfront Drive the garbage was a lot. It was very disturbing to see encampments leave as they leave the wintertime and nobody was going in and cleaning up the riverbanks. And there were some serious concerns about a lot of this was going into our lakes and rivers. So, at that time last year I had decided to move a motion to at least start a pilot project to do some mindful cleanups. Working with some nonprofit organizations was an idea that came about to, yes, create, build capacity in making those connections with people who are living in encampments. On seeing if they need housing or what services they needed. But at the same time, helping them with some of the large debris or the smaller debris that they bring there…now, there are some challenges with that. And I won't get into it, but I am happy that EPC at that time supported my request from my office to at least see what the cost would be. They also did a cross-jurisdictional scan of what a sanctioned encampment site would look like. They had mentioned that they would work with some nonprofit organizations to see how much it would cost to…what a mindful weekly cleanup would be. And so fast forward to today. We have a report in front of us, and yes, it is to say to discontinue. But I also want to highlight the report comes at very timely juncture. Just recently and before the report came live, we heard from the provincial government that a new Manitoba-made plan to deal with encampments came abroad. And I read that report. I want to thank Minister Bernadette and her cabinet to meet with me shortly thereafter it went live. To go over the plan and have further dialogue about what that looks like. Because I did have some concerns about how they were going to clean up the site, where they were going to locate them, you know, with the social housing that they said that they were bring online. What those wrap-around supports looked like, and she mentioned that they would do everything in tandem and continue to work with the City of Winnipeg. The document is, you know, not perfect. I know there are some significant challenges, and again, some different philosophies with respect to how to deal with homelessness. But at least we are doing something. At least the province and the City of Winnipeg finally have a plan to deal with encampments. And I like to believe that what we have done at the City of Winnipeg with this pilot project, had kind of led into what is possible. And how much it costs to actually do some of the work and the cleanup. Now we actually have the data. Now that we have proof that going into encampments and being mindful and building bridges and building those relationships in a more mindful way, we can actually have a very successful Manitoba plan. I have it here. Your way home plan. A very successful plan moving forward. And so, I am happy to receive this report for information. Maybe at different time if there was no Your Way Home plan I would be asking, you know, the public administration to continue on. But we are not there. We have a plan that is moving forward to deal with encampments one at a time. And I am supporting the recommendation of the Public Service. Thank you.

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

Councillor Gilroy: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. And I just want to thank Councillor Wyatt. He made a lot of really good points there. And I also want to thank Councillor Santos. Because this was a good pilot project, and this was something that she brought forward and ushered in. I can tell it's a really good thing. In my own ward I've had to use my own expenses to actually clean up some of my encampments because the City wasn't acting fast enough and the funds weren't there. It was a very, very good project overall. My question comes and maybe the Mayor can respond in his close, because he is a bit more familiar with the Provincial plan. I guess I am just trying to understand if the City is at all involved in any of the cleanup. I know that right now we do do cleanup. There is a cost to us. You know, we have are checking on encampments, we have to make sure that once encampments are dealt with there is somebody to keep going back and keep checking on them. And I just want to make sure that that work is going to happen. I heard lots about the provincial plan. But I didn't hear how the City was going to support the plan. Or if we budged it in into those costs. Where is the province paying for the cleanup? Or is this something the City is going to have to fund? That would be helpful for me to understand a little bit more. And then, in terms of yesterday's debate on the community connections space, this is an area where I think the downtown safety partnership fits, in terms of doing that work. So, and I know that they were part of the pilot project as well. So, just some clarity, because I mean, this could be something we could keep going if we were…I guess I am worried about the cost of these cleanups and who is paying for it. I didn't hear that the province was paying for the cleanups. So, if they are that then that's great. And if the Mayor can maybe just provide us some clarity on that. I don't think we budgeted for it. So...but if we are receiving this as information, it would be nice to know if there is cost to the City for monitoring or any kind of cleanups. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to my colleagues for their comments. And yes, I mean, I would be glad to respond somewhat to Councillor Gilroy's question there. With the Your Way Home plan that the province has brought in, I am really, really pleased that we are working off of one coordinated plan now. Ultimately, what that plan calls for is, all the different entities and agencies who are doing a part right now. Including the City of Winnipeg, to continue to do a part and play a part in the plan and in the delivery of the one plan. So, there is roles there for mobile outreach

agencies, there is roles there for folks that work in housing and there is roles for the City of Winnipeg. This is a brand-new plan. It's going to be continued to be worked out. The Province developed it in consultation and in dialogue in a regular basis with folks like Chris Brens and our interim CAO, and others as well, fire, paramedics folks. So, yes, there is a role. Roles, I should say, for the City to play. One of the roles is to continue to participate in the cleanup. So, the goal ultimately in simple terms is get people out of encampments into housing, with wraparound supports, as we know. Once an encampment has been identified, and ultimately, people taken from there. There is a dialogue. It's not we are just taking you out of there forcibly. That's not what it is happening. It's an ongoing relationship that some of our front-line agencies and those third-party agencies already have, with the individuals within the encampment and working with them to get from the encampment into the housing, with the supports. Making sure that all the belongings they want to take with them, are taken be with them. Then yes, to Councillor's Gilroy point, our staff will go in and clean up. It is the roles that we are to play. I had a discussion with Minister Smith, quite some time ago, related to this is, as she was talking about this, the plan that they were developing. And a couple of things that she said clearly, is that she appreciates…the Province appreciate the roles that we play, for example, our funding to 24/7 safe spaces, our funding to mobile outreach, our coordination with them, with Fire Paramedic, our coordination with them working in partnership with other agencies and the work that we do to clean up encampments. And her request was that the City of Winnipeg continue to play those roles for this plan to work. So, it's a long answer to say, yes, we will continue to, as a city, as partners of the plan, be kind of the cleanup agency when the time comes to clean up the encampments when they are fully vacated. So, with that, Madam Speaker, I invite you to call the question, Thank you. Sorry. And I know Chris Brens is available for any Councillor that wasn't in the Council seminar. Maybe not everyone could be there. But if you have more questions for Chris Brens, he said right now, we could do this within the budget for this year. That is the plan. And then five to six months from now they will watch as a department to see if they need more funding and FTEs of just whatever, so, feel free to reach out to Chris Brens. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour, item 11? Contrary? That is carried. Item 12.

Item 12 – Chief Construction Officer

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

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, really pleased to stand and introduce this today. very excited to see the recommendation that has been brought forward by the committee. And I want to stop and thank right here and now Councillor Mayes and Councillor Dobson and Councillor Schreyer for their good work. They worked many, many hours on identifying the appropriate candidate. And we have here the candidate they have brought forward Mr. Thomas Sparrow of Victoria, B.C. be appointed to the position of Chief Construction Officer of the City of Winnipeg effective no later than April 1, 2025. Initially, this position was something I campaigned on. It was a campaign commitment but on October 17, 2023, I want to make clear, that this really became, and I thank Council for this, a Council position and pursuit. And therefore, be it resolved that Council seek to hire a Chief Construction Officer as soon as possible. And I commend all of Council for identifying the need for this individual and this kind of work. I know that the recommendation that the group has brought to us is very, very timely. And just a few moments from now we are going to deal, for example, with item 19, which is a NEWPCC audit report. There are major capital projects that we have that we really need to make sure we have all levels of oversight that we can have and someone with the skills that Mr. Sparrow has and experience and background both public sector experience, private sector experience, knowledge, in this case someone who comes from outside the city I think it will be very value as well. I will maybe say a few more things in the close. But I want to thank the individuals around this...the councillors around this chamber who worked so hard to bring this name forward. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, this was a campaign commitment of the Mayor that I certainly agreed with. That was a good line up, we had in there. The Mayor, in diplomatic excess perhaps, had mentioned from his office, Brian Kelsey was actually a good part of the team and Brett Panteluk from our city staff. So, very good lineup. And a good hire, I think. I did call him yesterday for people to elevate the debate. So, I will take my own advice. There were some comments I was going to make, but I am not going to make. So, yeah, I will leave it at that, good process, good group. Certainly support the recommendation and hopefully we can get this person up and running and get them focused on some of our major capital projects.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Madam Speaker, I guess something…part of what I am going to say is a little redundant, given what Councillor Mayes just said. This was an excellent idea. I really do want to thank Brian Kelsey. Yesterday we were told not to disparage the staff of politicians. Well, is anybody going to stop me from thanking Brian Kelsey for his good work here. And quite frankly, his inspiring words, how he expressed his motivation for being part of the process, being

part of the initiation of this process to find a suitable construction…Chief Construction Officer. I want to thank Brett Panteluk from Human Resources excellent way of formatting the process. I am not saying I would agree with the entire process. But, you know, any individual running that would have maybe done it a little differently. I certainly learned something from the process, in terms of what human resources, what they have learned and what they can apply in something as serious and complex as running something like finding a suitable Chief Construction Officer for the City of Winnipeg. It was a pleasure to work with Sherwood Armbruster, who is also on the Committee. It was a good Committee. And learned stuff. And I don't want to waste people's time. But this is really important. And if you don't want to take my work for it, take Brian Kelsey's word for it. Because he expressed that in an excellent way to all the candidates. And we had excellent candidates. Quite frankly, I mean, considering the caliber of candidates we had. I am going to mention this: Tom Sparrow is really something. And you will see. I am not going to get into his background. But this guy is super-qualified. Having said that, we are getting into super-difficult times when it comes to how we create efficiencies and effectiveness in our construction contracts. Why? Because of the need to prioritize and be as efficient as possible and as effective as possible, given construction inflation. Got to say it, it's actually contextually involved in almost everything we do. So, hats off. And congratulations to Tom Sparrow. You will learn about this fellow. He is going to have big challenges, that's the reality of it, because we do. I wish the best for Mr. Sparrow and us, as we move forward with a brand-new concept of Chief Construction Officer here. And I want to thank his worship, Scott Gillingham for being part of this initiative, for initiating this, which we had to do. The challenges in a sense, will start now, now that we have an extra conduit of accountability. Literally in the middle of everything, trying to be as efficient as we can. I will leave it at that and then we will move forward from here. Tom sparrow has his hands full. And he will with me as well. But I know he is good at his job. We were even discussing, if we can have like an assistant construction officer we would have. Because there are some fantastic candidates out there. We are going to learn a lot from now on as well. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close…or Councillor Wyatt first.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now that everybody has finished patting each other on the back. I just want to say a couple of things. Number one: we are looking here at a new position, a significant position, an officer of Council reporting and accountability measures similar to those in place for the statutory officers of Council. Which acknowledges that the chief construction officer position is not statutory within the City of Winnipeg charter. So, we will be looking forward, Madam Speaker, I will be looking forward, and hopefully along with other members of Council I am sure, with seeing new policies coming into place, new direction with regards...led by the chief construction officer. We want to be able to see measures taken to improve our existing tendering processes. To see hopefully cooperation take place with tendering between the City and province of Manitoba. Hopefully ideas around accessing both labour as well as products such as aggregate. But to be able to bring down the cost of construction in the city with regards to roads and to put the City of Winnipeg more in the driver's seat, when it comes to our tenders, where we are often tendering late in the process. And we wonder why the tenders come in high. We are looking forward to that entire supply chain that I just mentioned being addressed by the Chief Construction Officer. Something that is going to be crucial. And the fact that the position allows for them to directly report through to Council without necessarily having to go through the director of Public Works or another director of the City of Winnipeg. They will I am sure be working with those directors in terms of improving their processes. But to be able to bring forward significant new policy initiatives that will dramatically change how we do construction in the city to improve our position when it comes to getting value for money for the capital projects that we have. And that is not just pertaining to roads, though I have talked about that. Also, we have many other projects underway as is pointed out, there is the North End Treatment Plant, not to mention all the underground work with the Water and Waste department. Not to mention new rec facilities that we are attempting to build. All of these things are crucial, I believe, for this position to be able to address to ensure that we are going to have the policies in place so as to minimize the risk associated with construction when it comes to the City of Winnipeg's point of view. I am looking forward to that. And I am hoping that these new policies will be coming forward sooner rather than later. And I am assuming that will be done via the Executive Committee not via Standing Committee based on the reporting structure as I see it here. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I agree with a lot of what Councillor Wyatt has said. I just wanted to reiterate something he touched on. This is a new and unique position, and so, Mr. Sparrow's reporting will be new and unique in the sense that this is not a position that will report to the Mayor, to EPC. This is a position that will report to Council. And that is always the way it was intended. That's the way it is going to be structured. He is not a statutory officer but will function somewhat like one. The accountability measures is similar to those in place for statutory officers, that is right out of the motion that as Council we agreed to. And so, this is about kind of making sure more information is accessible to all councillors faster related to the very important work that he is going to do. So, I think that is the decision that we collectively have made. And I am glad for that, because that was always the intention. I do want to acknowledge Mr. Kelsey from my office and the great work he has done. On this work and with everybody and the priority time and effort he has placed on this. I just did speak with him this morning. He kind of smiled and said: Well, he understands that Mr.

Sparrow is kind of waiting, and as soon as we approve his name the first bit of reading material that he is going to break open is the KPMG audit of the north end plant. So, he is poised and ready. I guess that he can print at this computer or something, or read online, I don't know but as soon as we say yes to him, he goes to work. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'll call the question on item 12. All in favor? Contrary? That is unanimous. Carried. Thank you. Next item Mr. Clerk.

Item 13 – Multi-Family Sustainable Housing Infrastructure Program (MSHIP)

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will wait to hear from colleagues.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes. Councillor Wyatt, you stood it down? Okay.

Councillor Mayes: I have the word elevation written in front of me, which is not really a U2 reference but an admonition to myself. So, this report on the infrastructure portion of the housing accelerator report is kind of a child, a offspring of the report that we had in December on all aspects of the housing accelerator report. You may remember that that report, as it went through EPC said well, we are just going to get a delay of the time. The Federal government is going to give us a delay of a period of time on the infrastructure. And that, unfortunately was not the case. So, we got the rather last-minute amendments before the December Council meeting about the infrastructure plan. I will be supporting this today. And the by-law is part of the infrastructure plan as if it was presented, somewhat hastily in December. Lesson learned there, of course, is our staff may think the federal bureaucrats are in support of something, but until we get that in writing, we should be cautious and that will be very important as we go forward. Number of positive things to reply, to elevate. I want to thank Richard Mahé and Elise Finnigan from the HAF Office for talking to me about a number of HAF initiatives. The report that came forward in December from Matt Dryburgh and Richard Mahé was actually very good. Say something positive about that and that it had an element of reality to it. It did say that HAF funding is subject to parliamentary appropriation in each fiscal year. Therefore, there is the potential for change in the priorities. In other words, that was a realistic apprehension of what might happen in the coming federal election. And for that the author should be commended. Phrased in a different way, as Councillor Lukes said in December in the debate on this item. Well, what probably will happen is a change of government. So, I think that is important to make that realistic note as we go forward. So, commendations to the staff on that and to Councillor Lukes for being open to say look, the Government will likely change, so we should be cautious as we go forward in our debate in June. And I do say in June…again, as I am told earlier today: ask questions earlier. Well, I have been asking questions about this and, unfortunately, I recently was told that the feds will have to sign off on information. That was not the case, and I did get a 52-page disclosure to Mr. Mahe, to his credit, and Denise Jones' credit. The report that was submitted on HAF, interesting reading for me. Interesting reading, and I want to commend our CFO Tracy Graham to elevate the debates. Say something good about Tracy Graham, Because the attestation that went with that report, that went into the federal government says…just one attestation saying: "I am not aware of any circumstances that can prevent the recipient from completing or achieving the commitment or the timeline set out in the contribution agreement." So that resolves the thing we were debating in December. We said, let's have the hearing in June on the fourplexes. We thought oh it's risky might miss deadline. No, as it turns out…well, first that we got the second tranche of money, and good work by Mahe and Finnigan and company there. We did get that second 30 million dollars, but, more importantly, we have an attestation from our CFO saying, I am not aware of any circumstances that can prevent us from getting done by June 12 timeframe. So, good, we will have the hearing then in June. That seems to resolve that matter. There have been some concerns, oh, we can't have the hearing on the fourplexes in June. Clearly, we can. Nothing…and the report that went in, the 52-page report multiple times talks about the hearing being in June. So, we are on the same page here. The hearing is going to be in June. So, I will have questions for the Mayor later, trying to get some more information about what's made public so we can have a good debate in June about the fourplexes if indeed we have to, there may be an intervening Federal Election, there may be an election campaign on when we have that debate. But in terms of the infrastructure part of this. This, of course, is hopefully we will get to spend some of this money, I suppose, if we get a third tranche. I know this has been Councillor Browaty's goal under the housing accelerator, to his credit. We had been told, the report says 35 million, that was the only be number we had. Now we are being told 12 million, unfortunately, but alright, at least it's a commendable bit of real politics from our staff. Saying, well, we are going to push that off to the third year of the infrastructure. Because frankly, we are not sure if we will ever get money, because of changing realities, and the threat...well, as Councillor Lukes said, what will probably happen is a change in government in the coming federal election. It is interesting to note, again, thanks to Mr. Mahe, for a report that came to EPC recently, we are already at 1002 units of missing middle housing. 1002, up from 850 just a month before. Why does that matter, you say? Well, because our goal over three years for the missing middle. 1026 units. We are at 1002. And we added 150 in one month. By today we are likely over the target. So that, at least, boils us down then. So, when we meet in June, for that week or two weeks of hearing we will be able to say the only rationale here is to do this for the money. Because we will already have met the target. It won't be something we need to do to meet our target. We are already almost there, due to some work. We got

to only spent 1 million dollars of the 30 we've got, that's in the report. And we have already almost hit this missing middle target, which includes things like fourplexes. So, in short, it's good to see some straightforwardness from the staff on the realities that it faces. Good to see the staff saying we can have that hearing in June. There aren't any issues that complicate the agreement. The public attestation on that. Good to see the staff, Mr. Mahe and others saying, you know, we are already at 1002 units on this missing middle. The infrastructure money isn't going towards the fourplexes, so there is no implications there. The infrastructure money...there is a rather exotic and lengthy series of maps attached to your...covering, I think of all of the wards, or close to it. Seems to make sense, in terms of where the infrastructure money would go if indeed, we ever get it. So, I will be supporting this today. And it's sort of a...trying to be positive. Trying to elevate here, it's some good work by the staff in answering some of the questions I've had about this part of the housing accelerator and other parts. So, as we turn the corner and head toward that hearing in June. There is certainly time that we have to get that debate going. I will be asking the Mayor about that later today. We had good briefing December 9 and 10 and have heard nothing since then. So, I know when we all voted as a majority to have the hearing in June. It was to have more public input. Well, we should be getting the documents made public so we can start debating. But for today it is really about the infrastructure part of this. Again, thank you to Mr. Armbruster for answering questions at various hours of the day and night on this. But we do need to clarify for people, because it is in the public report. 35 million, that is not the correct number. Sherwood is saying yes, the Federal government inserted that number. So, it's only 12 million, frankly we will probably never get that money, or get to spend it. But the positive part is, we know now that we will be proceeding in June on the fourplex vote. And we know we are most of the way well, frankly, we've met our target on that part. So, I will be supporting this report today and supporting the By-law.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Madam Speaker, I stood the matter down because there appears to be an error in the Bylaw page 13 of 21, the mapping. The map is referred to as Kildonan Park. There is a map here also Polo Park, which is the Polo Park area. I am assuming that they meant Kildonan Place, not Kildonan Park. Kildonan Park is up on Main Street. Kildonan Place is out on Regent Avenue. And the mapping is incorrect. And I just need to get clarification on that before we vote on the matter. If the By-law would be corrected, because it's specifically, the report refers to the Bylaw to amend the Housing Accelerator Fund Capital Grant Program By-law be enacted in accordance with this report, a draft of which is attached hereto as Appendix A to this report. So, I need clarification on that prior to the vote if this will be corrected. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk: Does the Councillor just mean the title of the map? Yes, we will have to go back and check with Legal Services on the Bylaw.

Councillor Wyatt: (inaudible)…come down and then come back to it later on, we have other items on the agenda (inaudible) time to consider. The correction that I think, probably needs to be made. I am assuming the title on the map, is incorrect.

Madam Speaker: Are there any other speakers on this item? Not at this time. We may not get an answer immediately. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes. I think there is a way, to the Councillor's point, to proceed with other items in the agenda and just come back to this once we get an answer today. I'm assuming it is a simple answer. A yea or nay. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Yes, we will do that. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So, we will stand that item down. Proceeding then to the next item. Item 17.

Item 17 – 2024 Development Agreement Parameters Update

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. I will wait to hear from my colleagues on this item. Thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, I stood the item down. And I would like clarification on the item. Simply that under the clause it states that the development agreement parameter be amended as follows: delete Section 7.3 in its entirety and replace it with the following. I tried to look through the document to see where the original 7.3 was, and exactly...and maybe I am missing it, but we have the current wording and then we have a proposed new wording. My concern, Madam Speaker, is that the clarification on this is that the developer will provide a two-year warranty to the projects at hand. Why would we be choosing a two-year warranty versus even going further? That would be the concern.

I would like to hear back from the Mayor on this. Previously, it was one year maintenance warranty. But we know that the concern that I have is that the two-year warranty is quite often not…pardon me, the one-year warranty…a two-year warranty would be far better than a one-year warranty, which is what the proposed wording is right now. And I always took the understanding that, when it came to a lot of our streets, we actually had a warranty longer than that. But correct me if I am wrong, it says right now, one year warranty, can we also get a clarification on that from the Mayor of how this is an improvement from the point of view from the city, from the city's perspective when it comes to the developers at hand that we are dealing with?

Madam Speaker: (inaudible) speaker? Seeing none, Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, Madam Speaker, the question posed by the Councillor, although it's not a question period. (inaudible) looking for information that I don't have in front of me, certainly, as to the detailed background of this. But I do know that a two-year warranty is better than a one-year warranty. But I can...I don't have the answer in front of me.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I am going to call the question on item 17. All in favor? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt noted in opposition. Next item. Councillor Orlikow and Wyatt in opposition. Item 19, Mr. Clerk.

Item 19 – North End Sewage Treatment Plant Upgrade Projects Audit Report

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I probably will have more to say in the close. But just simply to say that this report that was commissioned by our audit team and then done by KPMG, it reveals exactly the reason that we have an auditor, and we do audits. Ultimately reveals that what we've got here in the north end plant three phases is a project the scale, the magnitude, the cost, and the complexity of which the City has never undertaken before. And though our staff is, you know, following policies, the procedures, and doing the work, as they should, ultimately what we've got here is a government structure for this project, among other things that is not fit for purpose. In another words, we need to do something different and more, because this project is something different and more than we have ever seen before. And so, I know that the Executive Policy Committee, my assumption. I'll be careful in assuming, but I would believe that certainly the majority of all Council would feel the same that we want to make sure that we are implementing the recommendations of this audit. The first and foremost recommendation is to change the governance and the governance structure to add more to it so that we have a governance entity to oversee this project that matches the complexity, scale, and cost of this project. And so, that is one of the first urgent recommendations that we are taking very seriously. The amending motion that accompanies this report that were put forward by Councillor Duncan, then in the role as Chair of Water and Waste is something I will certainly support. To have KPMG come in and assist will the establishment of that governance structure, that means that they will work with our staff, kind of side-by-side to make sure that we get the structure in place that is required to provide the oversight that this project warrants and needs. And I know now Councillor Eadie has already expressed his absolute commitment to give his oversight in his new role as chair of the committee to this project. So, I am looking forward to hearing from the Council colleagues on the report of this audit.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This was stood by Councillor Eadie, and then Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Eadie: The Mayor stood it down himself…

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Rollins, next speaker, then Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Rollins: I think, Councillor Eadie, did you want to go…I recognize the speakers…

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor Eadie, go ahead.

Councillor Eadie: I did ask to speak to this. So… Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, of course, I am supporting this report, and I do thank Councillor Duncan for moving forward with the amendment to get this governance aspect done on this huge project. And I just wanted to speak to it a bit more, Madam Speaker, in terms of…at our next agenda has been set for February 3, Water and Waste and Environment meeting. And I think my colleagues who are on there had an opportunity to see all the reports. There are some delegated authority motions that are on that report. And that is one of the items that KPMG, the external auditor pointed out. That when you have a progressive design build project, especially of the size that this is, that because it is progressive, you need to actually be able to respond quicker at the ground level. And so, you do have to trust and allow for greater delegated authority. But that greater delegated authority, once our governance of this very large project is in place will...that governance mechanism will learn and know what the delegated authority had to put forward to the company doing the progressive construction and we also have an owner's advocate that complicates things in this particular audit. There was a look at how the whole project was progressing. But not really…not every aspect was

looked at. I'm hoping to see...and there will be more audits, Madam Speaker. Because there is a need, again, it's huge. And it needs to operate. So, this is a publicly delivered progressive design build. In the private sector, and there is a lot of reference to the commercial aspect of this project, that would be considered to be the commercial portion. And some of those mechanisms need to be looked at. This was the first publicly delivered progressive design build in Winnipeg, Manitoba for sure. There have been a number of them out in British Columbia. And I believe the main audit person is coming from BC, I believe, and knows of how, and maybe there were some problems with that publicly delivered progressive design build in Surrey, British Columbia and there is other ones going on as well, Madam Speaker. So, I don't want to berate this a lot. But I paid very close attention to when the auditor was presenting this to us. And I will diligently try to make sure that their recommendations get accomplished so that this project…well, so that there is transparency, accountability, we need to make sure that things can run in an efficient manner. Progressive design build is supposed to be better, and it doesn't matter whether it is privately or publicly delivered, but it has to be delivered in the right way. And that is what our recommendations here are. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker Councillor Rollins, followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is very good to know that the Chair of Water and Waste noted the motions on the record. And in the main that is the comments that I have today. You know, the motion is to receive the report as information. And it feels like the motion itself isn't, to quote the report, fit for purpose. That being said, there is a lot of work to do. And to that end I want to underline some of what I will be hoping to work with Council on. Number one, Council's role oversight and leadership. We do play a crucial role in providing direction, oversight, and accountability for NEWPCC. However, we don't have a Council committee like we just had on the development agreement parameters, which arguably is multi-millions. And I can see my colleague on the development agreement parameters, and I appreciate that more than she knows, nodding her head, Madam Speaker. To this end, we really should be considering creating a dedicated project oversight committee with the authority to provide some strategic guidance here and this should be a motion, Madam Speaker. The pace of implementation decision-making, you know, it has been over a year when I thought as Chair of then Property and Development that I should turn to my then colleague, Chair of Water and Waste, and really meet with him every two months to just get some momentum under our belts. The delays in decision-making costs us millions. And I will stare over to Councillor Schreyer, who reminds us of what construction inflation is and does at every chance he absolutely has. But the cascading effects on project timelines and costs are really overwhelming on this North America's generational project. It isn't just Winnipeg's. And, you know, we aren't some pow duck town, Madam Speaker, as you know, we are one of Canada's capital cities, Canada's big cities, but boy do we feel like we are an elevated city when we have this generational project that is so important to the red river basin. So, the pace of implementation and decision making needs to be underlined and there needs to be a motion here without waiting, to ensure those operational hurdles that have been just really provided the most basic of brush strokes in this report. So, it is really good to hear that there is going to be another meeting with KPMG because they had reached out to those of us who I guess appeared most inquisitive. Transparency and accountability. The reporting and accountability framework is essential for not only the stakeholders but the business community, residents, and really environmental groups. The regularity of the updates should be provided, not only to Council, but to the public. Really outlining key milestones, the challenges, and the financial status. Madam Speaker, it shouldn't be lost on any of us that we were one of two generational projects mentioned in the fall fiscal updates. But what I found really difficult, was that there was no member of parliament that did a victory lap around that structure. And perhaps it was because of the drama that then unfolded to the point where the Chrystia Freeland couldn't even deliver the fall fiscal update. But that underlines the all-party necessity of this project and necessity of our result and organization. To that end, you know, we see conservative, new democrat, and liberal MPs in the social circuit. But it is really key that we have some transparency, accountability and just an underlining of the pace. As well as very a healthy relationship with our colleagues in Surrey, who are a little bit ahead of us in terms of developing the structures necessary and they are ahead of us in terms of the federal government's investment in what arguably is, you know, their generational project. But the two biggest ones in Canada that we have an international support working on our behalf right now. Whether it's the amazing professionals at AECOM and more. I mentioned stakeholder engagement and communication, and that I think is really important to this project. It requires really strong engagement with a really wide range of stakeholders, and I've made some of those calls already. This communication strategy is key. It is key to those involved in the process, but it is key to the government structures that has to develop, not only ours, but within the province and the federal government to wrap their heads around what generational projects mean with the population growth. So, to that end, I will look forward to working with colleagues to establish recommendations on a dedicated governance committee, one with the delegated authority for operational decisions and what comes next month, I think, only touches the surface within an existing structure where one lone staff Cynthia does this off the side of her desk. I look forward to a motion on creating a clear reporting framework, a comprehensive reporting system, not only implemented with stakeholders including the public, but regular reports to Council and those that need to get involved that are not involved. Ensure strong stakeholder engagement and really set timely milestones and targets for this. So, the north end sewage treatment plant, Madam Speaker. I used to look forward to Councillor Mayes leaning in as he did yesterday on combined sewer. Why? Because it really took me six years to really wrap my head around this Water and Waste file. And I would still argue we still require advisory members, help from international consultants, like KPMG. But the critical project for the City of Winnipeg, the success of our city hinges,

not only on the technical execution, and by that we do have an embarrassment of riches in Tim and Cynthia, but they can't do it all. But also, on making and ensuring accountability, maintaining transparency, Madam Speaker. The City…oh I apologize, I just need an extension for a second here. The City really needs to embark on this generational challenge. Embark on it like we've embarked as a team at no other time. To ensure the success of NEWPCC projects and to position the city for growth, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Next speaker, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker. I just want to get clarification, and maybe the Mayor can speak to this…the reporting back, in terms of the implementation of the key audit recommendations by the end of the second quarter of 2025. I don't see a mechanism; I don't see a recommendation coming out of EPC. I heard what Councillor Eadie had to say with pertaining to delegating authority in terms of reporting or not having reporting. I was a little confused about that. I need to get an understanding on what the reporting back is, in terms of this audit and the recommendations as well. Overall, the size and the scale of project would trigger, and I am making the assumption, though I think I am right. The regular reporting through the Finance Committee still, based on scale and the size of the project. And I just want to know though, in terms of the recommendation here, that there will be some sort of trigger that will follow up to ensure that the report is back to the EPC and Council and pertaining to the audit being implemented in a timely manner itself, with the recommendations which are attached hereto. So, I just need that clarification on that. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To speak well of Councillor Duncan, he managed to get going in his relatively brief term on Water and Waste. Work is underway on this project. The biosolids building. Contract 447/2024. It's an 8 million dollar, so it's not trivial, it's 8 million dollars of work underway on the site. So, what I would like to see at the committee, and which I will talk to my new Water and Waste colleagues about, it's some sort of monthly update on the work as it is unfolding on…it is underway. We seem to already have this delegation of authority piece of the audit puzzle coming right away to the committee and yet, we don't have the other piece. Let's get Council more involved, let's have more oversight. So, certainly, as a first step, Monday I believe, we can hopefully get talking about getting some reports on the progress of work, the work is underway, to the credit of Councillor Duncan and the staff. 8 million dollars worth of it already going. So, that is positive, because we do have a timeframe here to be done by 2030. So, I will look forward hopefully to getting that motion passed at the next Water and Waste and start getting monthly updates on how the work is progressing. We are underway, which is good. But we are up against the clock of 2030. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: I will just speak briefly, Madam Speaker. We had our first water treatment plant. How old is it now? 100 years? 90 years. Vivian Santos wins the (inaudible) topic today. And we should consider what the costs were back then. We, in the hearing now have to deal with what we have to deal with, when it comes to construction, when it comes to something as important as this. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, most of the time, because construction most of our capital investment is…has a certain amount of essentiality to it. We have to do this. Not only do we have to do it, we have to do, one reason is, because the Provincial government mandates it. So, directly, not by virtue of our Charter, but by virtue of a separate legislation. So, this is what we have to do, Madam Speaker, and I am going to say it again. As alluded to and stated by Councillor Rollins. The only reason I talk about construction inflation to the extent I do, is because it is disproportionately not stated to the extent that it is an influence here. To the extend that we deal with it, every single day. Because if it was dealt with to the same extend it was talked about, to the same extend as other challenges we had, I wouldn't be talking about it as much and it certainly wouldn't be disproportionally on me. But bear in mind, Madam Speaker, we say we should…it doesn't matter because it is an essential or the impression of things I hear. But it is an essential thing, we have to do it. That is true. And because we have to do it, I am going to make the argument therefore it is even more important when you deal with the costs. Some things that aren't as essential, the cost doesn't matter as much, does it? Because if it is not as essential you just do less of it, or you can get rid of the program, if it's not essential. We do that here. Just like community connections. You know, we have to decide whether we are getting rid of it, kind of thing. How essential is it in the breadbasket of all these other services that we provide? Many aspects of construction, Madam Speaker, are essential. And on that basis, it takes more dedication, it takes more focus, it takes more concentration, because the costs are that much more important. That much more influential. And therefore, possibly that much more detrimental. So, Madam Speaker, we talk about all sorts of things here on a regular basis, all sorts of problem. We talk about homelessness, every Council meeting. All of us, as a Council, as administration, we talk about poverty, in some sort of a general way, recognizing that it exists. We will talk about it. Any member of Council will talk about that. On any given day in this building while they are doing their other business, including their official business. How often…what days do we go by on a city hall business day when we don't talk about any or every member of us, doesn't talk about homelessness or poverty or will talk about inflation in some general way like it is a magic thing, or it's a nebulous thing. That is not to be dissected seriously piece by piece. We will talk about the cost of food. We will talk about the problems

with housing. But the underlying point here is the inflation rate. Relative to people's income, of course. We've talked about how there is inflation everywhere. Madam Speaker, I am going to mention the name, Robert Loiselle, as an example, the new MLA for St. Boniface, he and I took the same courses at St. Boniface College back 35 years ago. And recall my Quebecois economics professor talk about the classic economic model in which, if all things go up at same rate of inflation, (French spoken) If it is the same thing, at the same rate. (French spoken) …it is ideal because it doesn't change anything. That is true. If all things go up at same rate of inflation. It is not inflation that is the problem, Madam Speaker. It is the difference in inflation rate. And I am going to tell you here, might as well know, if you don't know already. The rate of inflation, and some things are 10 years, some things has twice the rate of inflation as something else in 10 years. It's not going to stay at twice the rate. It's not going to stay at that. It's going to be another 10 years it's going to be four times, in another 10 years it's going to be eight times. And that's the reality of economics, Madam Speaker. And so, when it comes to these essential services this is really important. We say when it comes to capital investment that growths our economy, Madam Speaker, we also have to understand why we have schools and hospitals. Why we have police, why we have fire and paramedic services. It's because all these things as well grow our society, safeguard our society. Not just socially. Economically as well. When we don't deal with these things as well it affects us economically. So, Madam Speaker, all the best to Evan Duncan, to all of us, for our new era, for our new century of a new sewage treatment plant. And bear in mind we will be bearing the cost of this. It will be affecting us in all other ways as we have had to deal with yesterday painfully, and my speech is finished now. So, Russ Wyatt can come back to the Council Chamber.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. We'll go back to Mayor Gillingham, and I know we do wish Councillor Eadie, the new chair, the best with that committee. Mayor Gillingham.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much to my colleagues for their comments. And yes, just looking again at what the audit recommendation includes, and there are, I think, perhaps, points to clarity that Councillor Wyatt was seeking. The key recommendation on the governance model, would be, among other things, that the governance and the new governance and oversight committee should be elevated. Ultimately, chaired by CAO and report directly to Council. So, we are going to…the matter here with KPMG and hiring them to assist our staff in establishing a development model, all of that clarity will come as to what the governance model should be ultimately that they are proposing to us here. So, more to come on that. But appreciate the input here. And lots of work to do. Thank you, Madam Speaker, you can call the question, please.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. All in favor of item 19? Contrary? Carried.

Mayor Gillingham: And you can go back to item 13, right now. I wasn't standing in contrary to…

Madam Speaker: Yes, okay. Item 13. The item is ready, but we do need to do some other work on the By-laws. Let's go to question period right now, for the Mayor. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. On December 18, we got an e-mail from the Mayor indicating the federal government's fall economic statement promised 150 million dollars towards the Biosolids project. We have received no further details on that. There are at least...there are several problems on this. Number one, the fall economic statement has no legal force and effect due to prorogue of parliament. Number two, the Federal government in its announcement said this money would flowing through the federal-provincial stream, part of the housing. This is different, this is not part of the housing accelerator. This is a different fund. There is no provincial agreement in place, there is no sort of funding in place, that we are aware of. I've tried to contact the Federal government, could not get any answers. Yes or no. Was this signed by deadline. So, my concern here is, part of the Federal condition is, 4FAOR Fourplexes as of right everywhere throughout the city…so, different than the housing accelerator. I wonder if the Mayor can reassure us that there won't be any application brought forward to Council in February or March to access funding without reference back to...we will now have a hearing in June on the fourplexes. So very good work by Mr. Kelsey, back when we originally debated this about putting limits on that, lot size, environmental, gravel lane, etc. The limits on the fourplexes, under this new thing, are limited exceptions to the zoning requirements and the federal government will decide that. So, I don't want to have to rush to a hearing of some sort in March, when we are clearly heading to a bigger hearing with actual By-laws in play in June. So, what can the Mayor tell us then about the requirements under this Canadian Housing Infrastructure Fund, and can he reassure us nothing will be coming to us in February or March by which we will have to vote on some sort of application.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. I want to thank the Councillor for the question. So, what is happening right now is, yes. That fall economic statement, the 150 million dollars from the Federal government was announced on a day when there was a lot of other things going on. So, it didn't get a lot of play, but we certainly did see it and notice it, and it was raised to us. We…when I say we, right now, my office but also our CAO, interim CAO, Corporate Finance and others are trying to get clarity from the federal government right now related to the application process. The City is working with Daniel

Blakey, who is working on behalf of the premier in coordinating federal provincial funding related to…any increased funding to the north end plant. And determining what stream and what application process is required. Yes, we are also asking the very question you are asking as far as timelines and how that relates to what the federal government has said that there are conditions on accessing this funding. So, all I can say is, this is a very…a few times a week conversation between our staff, my office, our administration, the province of Manitoba and the federal government as well. And believe me, as soon as we have clarity and understanding as to what the next steps are, and the sequence of them, we will absolutely be providing them. But we are seeking the clarity as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, and I should say, I mean, it is good news if we get money towards the north end. I know, and unfortunately the money has been promised in 26 and 27 and years after...it's actually extended to be 5th through the mandate, potentially the way that the wording comes. So, the wording is not coming before the looming...the money is not coming before the upcoming federal election. Can we get assurance from the Federal Government that the fourplex wording is roughly as Mr. Kelsey drafted it, subject to whatever debate we have here in June, because the wording they seem to be floating is, dealing with yet another set of federal bureaucrats and on a very different template than what was drafted by Mr. Kelsey in good faith back in 2023.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, as I said a moment ago. We are seeking clarity on all things, all the requirements, all the application avenues. And frankly, you know, doing all we can. We will do, I will do and staff will do all we can to get this 150 million dollars locked up and assured. And if there is a way. If there was this such a thing as a way to go from a commitment to a certainty that could transcend governance. It that opportunity is available, by all means, we will be looking to that as well. We all know around this chamber. We just were talking about...the size and complexity of the north end plant has been our conversation around here for years and it'll be our conversation around here for years to come. Every available dollar we can draw down from the federal government and provincial government, we are doing all we can to make that happen. Because, as we know, the treatment plant in the north of Winnipeg is tied directly to our capacity to grow as a city, to develop as a city, to expand our economy as a city. The expansion and growth of our economy is of interest and in value, not only just to Council but most certainly to provincial and federal governments as well. So, there is a real vested interest that they have. Their fortunes are tied up with this project as well. And so, as I said, this is the top priority in our discussion and dealings with. I am really pleased that we do have, and credit to everyone involved in this so far, that we have an announcement of 150 million dollars from the federal government. The Province has indicated obviously the 30 million dollars, which is for the reallocation of the strategic infrastructure basket, the Premier indicated there is more to come. So, I ran into…I had a discussion the other day with finance minister Sala, who restated what the Premier consistently says. And he said, Scott, this project is a priority, it is the priority for us. So, that is good to hear that it is everyone's priority. Bottom line is, you know, we need money, we need signed agreements of the funding that will come to the City of Winnipeg. And that is a priority work that I am doing. And I believe a lot of us are doing as well. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Final question.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, just for clarity in the announcements to date...and again, I have no idea what the connection is between infrastructure money and zoning reform, because this is sewage treatment plant. But in any event, that seems to be the condition the Federal Government is trying to put on it. I appreciate the efforts trying to get funding. I've tried myself for many years. But the condition though...well, can the Mayor confirm that the money that was announced, which will be under the provincial stream and there is no agreement yet, and there is no provincial funding to match that starts in 26-27, under the fall economic statement. Do we have any indication that the money might be coming sooner?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: We don't. I, the team, everyone I think around here on the political side and the admin side is working to get the money as soon as possible. I will note as well that the last thing I read on the federal website was that it said that we had to approve...I don't want to get the words wrong, it was something about spring, fourplexes by spring, not June, but by spring. So, I just want to flag that. I know we are going to get clarity on that as well. But it did say spring, June is later than spring. I will tell you this, I don't want to jeopardize federal money that we can secure if the date is spring. So, I just…I flagged that. More to come.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mr. Mayor, I rise, back in June of last year there was a tragic and terrible explosion that occurred on Camrose Bay in my ward. Thank goodness there was no loss of life that took place. However, residents have been displaced, and I know that you were out there and spoke to residents at that time, and I know people really appreciated seeing you there. Since that time, homeowners at 33 and 37 Camrose Bay and if you need to take this under advisement, I'd appreciate that. Camrose Bay and their contractors have been hired by the respective insurance companies have been very frustrated over their ability to pull permits on a timely matter from the City of Winnipeg Property and Development department. And in some cases, I give the benefit of the doubt to the Property and Development department in my preamble I do want to state that. Sometimes it is information, not necessarily flowing to the contractor to the permit staff. I don't necessarily therefore say it is the Property Development department, but it could be, in terms of the timeliness of acquiring demolition permits and then of course, development permits and building permits. The homeowners in question have had the inconvenience, they are living in temporary housing, rental housing that the insurance company of course is paying for. Their insurer, but it has caused a lot of trauma to the families involved. And I had an opportunity to meet with them prior to Christmas on the street talking to them about and the frustration they are feeling and the sense that they're feeling they are facing red tape with the City. Could you, and your office, Mr. Mayor, look into this matter to see what could be done in any way, shape or form to expediate the permit process in light of the tragic event that occurred on that street? Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for the question and I am absolutely pleased to ask the Councillor's office to forward to me and I would say Councillor Duncan, as the Chair of the Planning, Property and Development Committee forward the information to us, if there is anything we can do to look into this that would assist we would be glad to do it.

Madam Speaker: Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: More are you aware. We will follow up with your office – are you aware question. And I look forward to working with your office and Councillor Duncan as well, regarding the PP&D, so that we can get this information to the residents and contractors as soon as possible, are you aware? Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mayor Gillingham: I am now. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Councillor Mayes, back to you.

Councillor Mayes: Alright. Thank you, Madam Clerk, we spoke earlier, a while ago about the disclosure that came through on to the credit of the HAF office and to Ms. Graham, the disclosure on the Housing Accelerator Fund report that was issued in December. Again, I want to thank CFO Graham for putting the attestation out and making it forward that there is no complexity, there is no issue with having a hearing in June. So, we will be having that hearing. But we voted last month to have more time for the public to have input. We all got a briefing December 9 and 10 on staff plans for the missing middle, for the fourplexes. We were told at that point that they would be going to the public in January. We have seen none of that. So, the question is, in light of a report that says there will be a series of public open houses out in early 2025, can the Mayor tell us: when will the public see these documents? When will the public see what is being proposed? There was supposed to be a series of public open houses. The information was to come out in January. What can the Mayor tell us about when that information will be coming out?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for the question. I don't have a date on that. But I certainly will look into and ask our CAO to look into the timing of the release of that information. That's the second question first. There was a comment I want to go back to, he referenced June. I just want state again, I guess, I want us to be clear and give thought to this. We don't have to decide this today or tomorrow. But for sure we have to give thought to this. If indeed, 150 million dollars from the federal government, potentially, for the North End plant, and potentially some incremental funds related to that plant come from the provincial government and if that requires us to move quicker on our hearing on the fours and fours, in fact to move it back to spring date I know I…would have it sooner, I certainly for one would vote on the Council, I certainly for one, would not want to jeopardize 150 plus million dollars for our north end treatment plant, second phase based on a few weeks. So, just put that as flag to ask us to consider that. No decision, no comment has to be made today, if no one wants to. But just a thought on that. I don't know but…if it does come to that, we would need to I think give a sober consideration to moneys made available with dates attached to them.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: What will jeopardize money coming in 2026 from the Liberal Government is the looming Federal election. With all due respect not any actions by me or the people around this table. We have in writing a public attestation that the June hearing can proceed. So, we'll leave it at that, if the Mayor is able to finesse 150 million dollars payable before the federal election, we should certainly look at that seriously. Second question. We were chided earlier today about not asking more questions earlier in relation to some item I have been asking questions since at least October about where is the map. Mr. (inaudible) had a draft, to his credit, circulated it a year ago about 800 meters for transit stops, frequent transit stops. For my ward, it is still a pretty accurate map, to his credit. So, when will the map be made public? We were told to ask questions earlier. I have been asking since October for the map. When will the map be made available to the public, showing where the 800-meter zone is for the greater height limit?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. Certainly, I can through you, Madam Speaker, I will include that question with my e-mails. I don't know if perhaps, I don't know the answer to this, if indeed the motion to delay the hearing three months had any impact on the timing of the open houses, perhaps. I don't know the answer to that. I will get clarity on both those items. And I will just maybe add, I know there is a lot of talk about the possibility of, the likelihood of a federal election reminds me though that the current leader of the opposition has been very clear, very consistent that he, and if he forms government, would certainly want to see more housing built in cities faster, not slower, but faster. In fact, he has considered, you know, in the past he is on record talking about maybe even putting conditions on the Canada community building fund, which is informally known as the gas tax. That is a fund right now that has very little, if no conditions on it. We rely upon it as every municipality does. But I think we have to be really aware, as a Council, that both the current government and the, you know…identified as the government in waiting arguably, both have been clear they want cities to build more housing, faster and so, I think that whoever ultimately ends up as the next prime minister or next two prime ministers in the next 12-14 months, housing, and getting housing built in cities quickly is certainly at the top of their agenda.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Notes that the leader of the opposition has also said that he would scrap the housing accelerator fund, which is very source of the funding we are talking about. Can we also get clarity in the e-mail, then. One of the items that will be coming to the June hearing is 20 to 30 local area plans, we keep getting told 20 to 30. Can we get a list of what they are? What the proposed amendments are? Councillor Allard, for example has already flagged on this floor. There could be posting requirements around French language. As the Liaison on French Language Services this is a concern. Unless none of the plans have that requirement. But we don't know the 20 to 30 local area plans that are going to be subject to public consultation and a hearing to be held in June. So, can we get clarity then in that same email on what the list of plans? What is the list of plans and what is proposed amendment?

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, I will ask that question as well, to see if, you know, as the staff can come back with that. I appreciate also that the Councillor notes that, you know, Mr. Pierre Poilievre, he has indicated he would scrap the housing accelerator fund. Not only that, he said he was looking at the Canada housing infrastructure fund, which you know, we rely upon, and both the direct stream and the indirect stream. The direct stream is right from feds to municipalities. The other stream goes through provinces. So, I guess the moral of the story, in my mind is, when the window is open to access funding, we jump through it quickly. So that is why I think we need to do all we can to expedite in every possible manner our opportunity to secure funding for the north end plant. If there is an election, when there is an election, we don't know the details. There is tons of speculation. It is very, very likely. If the polls are right, it is likely we have a different government. That Pierre Poilievre is the next Prime Minister. That is not today. That is tomorrow. What we do today, I believe what I am doing today, what Council should do today is to try to draw down every single dime available to the City of Winnipeg to fund our infrastructure. And I would say, and I would argue, we should do nothing to jeopardize our opportunity to secure what may be available to us.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that concludes question period. Councillor Wyatt. Okay, Councillor Orlikow, did you have your hand up? We will come back to you Councillor Wyatt, because you had some opportunities. Councillor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Well, I appreciate the Mayor's comments today. I know that we've applied for 192 million dollars for the housing accelerator fund. The Mayor's negotiation resulted in 122 million dollars. And resulted in calling people that would have a say in the development of the neighborhood. I got that. I understand where he is coming from. So, can he explain to me that should we agree for things to get the money ahead of time before the money is secured? This is including things like the Canadian infrastructure fund, but also including the transit fund, where it requires that we as City of Winnipeg avoid parking restrictions which would be a very big concern for neighborhoods to cap the money on the transit fund. And then to wonder where are we at? It seems that we acquiesce to the federal government, regardless, just to get the money. Where is the Mayor on this? Where is he saying that money is important, I don't disagree, but where

are we lined up on today…yeah, we don't disagree, we need money. But where are we deciding that the public interest for Winnipeggers may be not aligned with the federal government's prerogative to tie federal money to things that are really municipal issues? I would like to know that, because I am concerned, that we will acquiesce just to get cash that will actually have a very adverse effect on some neighborhoods.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Orlikow, specific question.

Councillor Orlikow: I just would like to know where the Mayor stands on that.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. I want to thank the Councillor for the question. Well, first of all, I think one of the things that we…remind us again as Councillor Mayes and I were just going back and forth on. There is a public hearing, on the next aspect of this funding. And so, there is public input. There is no acquiescing. There is public input on, for example the fours and fours, there is a hearing process where Councillors and members of the public will be able to have their say to shape this. You are right, it is a negotiation, not every city got everything they wanted or applied for. We...if you remember, I remember when Moira Geer was here and she told us that she was basically aggressive in her application. If we would have got 192 million dollars, I would have been shocked. There is always negotiation between the City of Winnipeg and the federal government as they negotiate on this housing accelerator fund with every municipality. But for sure, when it comes to the next steps and the next tranche of this funding, there are future tranches to the funding, we require a hearing process. There will be public input. Every neighborhood can have their say. Every neighborhood affected can have they say, I mean, everyone, it's a public hearing, anyone can have the say on it, including, certainly including councillors, so we continue to negotiate. We don't roll over and show our belly, and just say whatever you want you go ahead and do. We don't do that. I can assure you of that today. And I will make this commitment when it comes to things like applying for and seeking access to transit funding from the federal government or anything else. I will do my level best to talk to…keep Council informed on these things. I know we have had housing accelerator fund information and reports that have flown. Flown from our staff to Council as well. And if there is information people are seeking, please, I will do all I can to provide it to you and ask our staff to do all they can to provide it to people. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Councillor Orlikow: The second question then would be. Does the Mayor agree, that we should accept or regardless of how much money from transit funding to waive parking minimums to receive the transit funding? What is his position?

Madam Speaker: Can you restate the question, Councillor Orlikow? It is difficult to hear.

Councillor Orlikow: We know that transit funding that has been proposed by the federal government requires that we…the City of Winnipeg waive parking restrictions from 800 meters from frequent transit lines. So, I would like to know, does the Mayor have a position on that, or is it more important to get the money for transit?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: That's a very great question, and I have not looked at that one specifically, my focus has been…that's a good question. My focus has been on the north end plan funding, the funding for the north end plant that has been the focus of the dialogue. I personally, have not looked into the details of the transit funding application, but I will. And I thank the Councillor for his question.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Did the Mayor, for what he is able to speak to, in terms of this, and if he needs to delegate it through to the Chair of the Police Board, I understand that sometimes the question period needs to be delegated that way. Shed some light, in terms of the position we are at, in terms of the hiring of our new Chief of Police. I know I am getting lots of questions pertaining, from rank-and-file officers I see at the Community Club, hockey arena, you know, when we are going to have a Chief of Police? And to shed some light on where we are at this process. We have been reading what we have been reading in the newspapers, and online and CBC. And I just do not always want to believe what I read. And so, I would like to hear where we are at, in terms of that process right now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you. And just before I answer that question, through you, to Councillor Orlikow, if I may, just down and just, you know, was thinking about the fact that…again, I will look into that Transit funding requirement. I did run

on a commitment to waiving...being open to waiving parking minimums on corridors. I know you are talking about like 800 meters, so beyond the corridors, but certainly on corridors, which we approved malls and corridors just recently, so. But I will get more details on that. Yes. Through you, Councillor…Madam Speaker to Councillor Wyatt. I am the Mayor, I sit on the Board, but I am not the spokesperson for the Board. But I will just, I think echo, what our Board Chair has said consistently. is that there is a process in place. In the process, in December, we, and I think everyone around this chamber, got information. The Board is taking every step, every bit of information, seriously. And is following the process and takes the information that it gets seriously. And so, there is a process to be followed and once the process is complete, the Board will have an announcement. I believe that is what the Chair said, something to that effect.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question.

Councillor Wyatt: The hiring firm that was hired, then rehired for the purpose of concluding the hiring or has that been now delegated to the law firm that we are…has been hired, the external law firm, just to get clarity.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I think the Councillor is asking an HR recruitment question that I am not prepared to answer.

Madam Speaker: Thank you., Final question.

Councillor Wyatt: Once all the decision is made and the hiring has been made would the Mayor or the Board be prepared to release all that information pertaining to hiring and pertaining to the costs involved, i.e. the contract costs, whether it be the legal or...and/or hiring of the hiring firm since this would be public costs, nonetheless?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: The Board falls under the City of Winnipeg consolidated financial statements and details as far as expenditures are part of the City's documents.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I appreciate the comments about jumping through windows and accessing funding. But just for clarity, obviously we can't get any of the Housing Accelerator money any additional money until 2026. We know that. The announcement from the federal government, which doesn't have any legal effect. I think we're all in agreement on that, because it was in the fall economic statement, but the other fund, the CHF, that also starts in 2026 and extends over four years, so it is currently. So, because if we are going to engage in what is arguably the biggest re-zoning in the city's history, I just want to make sure the public is aware none of the funding we are talking about is at this stage set to flow, before the 2025 federal election. Is that correct?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yeah, I think what I have read here is that really whether, you know, we agree with it or not, the funds that the Councillor has identified that were flowing in 2026 appear to have conditions in 2025.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, any further questions? Seeing none. That concludes question period. Let's go back to the last EPC report section. Item 13, Multi-family Sustainable Housing Infrastructure Program. Okay, we will have a motion to amend the map shortly when we deal with By-law section.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, we have been really clear about, you know, making items available to the whole of Council. And this here, once again, we have got a map. There is a mistake. But not all of us are able to see said map. So, I have, you know, I have done some work with the department on explaining why this is such a problem. So, I do not see a description here either. So perhaps there is one available, but...

Madam Speaker: We will get into that shortly, thank you. The map, I believe it is a titling issue, and not so much to do with the area of the map...pardon me? Yes, it has been circulated. It is Motion 3. We will deal with that in the By-law section. I believe we were at the point where the Mayor was closing on this item.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, I just wonder how we handle that. Do we…do I just wait and introduce amending motion now?

Madam Speaker: That will be with the By-laws, correct, Mr. Clerk?

Mayor Gillingham: Oh, that is with the By-laws?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we are going to deal…well, it has been prepared with the By-laws section.

City Clerk: So, we have been able to confirm with Legal Services that the map should indeed just be called Kildonan. There has been an amending motion for the By-law that has been prepared and distributed which basically changes the name on the map to just Kildonan. And again, this is just correcting an error. The motion to deal with that amendment would be done just before we actually get into the by-laws. Motion on a by-law, so when you speak to the item, before the by-law…

Madam Speaker: We were still at the speaking time, so the Mayor has not closed yet. Councillor Schreyer, I don't know if you spoke to this item. Just a moment. Okay, so the Mayor, Councillor Wyatt spoke, Councillor Mayes. So, not to…

Councillor Schreyer: (inaudible) is this a motion to speak on? Ah, it is a motion to a by-law. Having said that, may we speak on the motion, on the main motion of this…

Madam Speaker: That is right. Item 13.

Councillor Schreyer: Okay. All I wish to say, I am not trying to cause any further consternation, but even in conference right now with Councillor Wyatt, we did think, believe in our briefings that it did not say Kildonan, which has evolved more onto the west side of the Red River in terms of turn over the decades. And I can explain that. Having said that, we thought it said in the briefings Kildonan Place as a general area from which you can see is the core from which these corridors spurn on the map. I just want to make that point in case anyone from the Administration is listening. I would not have said it otherwise. I just don't want any, since we are on this issue, since Councillor Wyatt paid enough attention to bring this back to the floor of Council that that in fact is the intent of the administration, seeing that we thought it said Kildonan Place. Why would it say Kildonan? That is my point, Madam Speaker. Why would it say Kildonan? There has not been anything named Kildonan itself, on this side of the river since Peter Fox was the MLA for Kildonan back in the '80s. And, on that basis the word Kildonan only refers, now, to my understanding to the fellow Councillors from the East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee, both Browaty and Wyatt might have something to say about that. The only thing I know (inaudible) constituency of Kildonan, most recently, has been exclusively on the west side of the river. The fact that it would bother saying Kildonan Park, that there was another word to it, makes me add to my belief that it said Kildonan Place. I just want to add that, otherwise…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Schreyer, we got your point. Now, we do have this circulated. Just a yes or no, Councillor Wyatt it meets the intent of what we are trying to do? Because your name is on that motion for later. It is not speaking time, just yes or no.

Councillor Wyatt: I am taking the good advice of our administration who came back and said they meant to call it Kildonan. I hear Councillor Schreyer's point. The irony is that, for us on the northeast side of the river, Kildonan…when you say just Kildonan, Kildonan often implies, we think, Kildonan Park…

Madam Speaker: Point taken.

Councillor Wyatt: We think West Kildonan.

Madam Speaker: Your name is on the motion for the by-laws section You are good with that?

Councillor Wyatt: If that is what our public service wishes, I will support what our public service wishes, at this point.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I have not spoken to this report at all. I am going to rise now to speak to it. And I am glad that Councillor Wyatt did find the error in the naming, because we are not building any housing in Kildonan Park. But Madam Speaker, soon as I heard they are just turning it to Kildonan, I said where in Kildonan? North Kildonan? East Kildonan? West Kildonan? Old Kildonan? It seems to me on the map where they have got the word Kildonan, it is kind of near public road, north of public road, has traditionally been North Kildonan, around Perfanick Drive, all in that area, all the way up to Knowles Extension past Lagimodiere is being called North Kildonan. And as far south, I think, Public Road is slightly north of Concordia. I believe, if somebody can help me out. And it sounds like where this Kildonan word is situated is north of Kildonan Place in that area around, let's say Perfanick Drive, all the way up to Knowles, you know, I do not know. But it is east of Lagimodiere. So, it is very confusing. I am glad that the word park is not there. But you are going to confuse...people

in the future are going to say: What does that By-law Kildonan? They are going to go: What? So, I am just leaving it at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor to close.

Mayor Gillingham: I'm closed.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question on Item 13. All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Thank you. Now onto the By-law section. Mr. Mayor.

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

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 2/2025 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 2/2025.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the following By-laws be read a second time. By-law No. 74/2024, By-law No. 86/2024, By-law No. 142/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 74/2024, 86/2024 and 142/2024.

Madam Speaker: Now the motion before us, Motion 3. We are going to vote on that, and that is clearing up the map. Councillor Wyatt, take your seat. Okay, so Motion 3 that has been circulated in paper copy, moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Duncan. All in flavour? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Eadie in opposition. Now the next set of By-laws as amended, Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: Just for clarity then. Is this correct: I move that the following By-laws be read a first time. By-law No. 1/2025, as amended, and 9/2025.

Madam Speaker: Yes. All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 1/2025, as amended, and 9/2025.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Oh. No, not yet. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the By-laws No. 1/2025, as amended, and 9/2025 be read second time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 1/2025, as amended, and 9/2025.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I move the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 1/2025, as amended, and 9/2025 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Thank you. Next section. Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment. Councillor Eadie. Please share on the report dated January 14.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
DATED JANUARY 14, 2025

Councillor Eadie: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. My first one. I rise to move the consent agenda of the Water, Waste and Environment Committee meeting of the said date. Report Item 1.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favor of that Item? Contrary? Carried. There is no motions. No By-laws today. Any questions for our Chair, Councillor Eadie? Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and through you I want to welcome Councillor Eadie to his role. Thank you for taking on the role of Chair of Water and Waste, and just in general, just, if he could tell us what his priorities of this new role will be.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Chair.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the Mayor. Well, we do have some very…the priority is to try to ensure that all of these major changes that we have coming regarding NEWPCC and we have some solid waste changes, and we have many different reports. But my main focus is to try to figure out, Madam Speaker, how we keep things affordable for Winnipeggers who are actually paying for all of this. Whether it is through federal, provincial, income taxes or sales tax or whatever it is or through property taxes, Madam Speaker. Essentially these are important services that we do need. And we need to figure out how we can do it in the most affordable way for Winnipeggers. So, that is a priority. And I also wanted to say that I looked, when I accepted the…when I accepted the appointment, Madam Speaker, I also noted the talent that was on my colleagues that are on that committee. And I thought, wow, that is a really good team. We have Councillor Mayes and now we have Councillor Rollins and we have Councillor Chambers. Madam Speaker, I will be working along with them because I know that they have in mind what I do in terms of trying to deliver for the City of Winnipeg and our residents. So, I will be working with them as much as I can. And I think that is it, Madam Speaker. I just, you know, I am still in shock, right? I appreciate, Madam Speaker, that I have been given this role. I know that I am ready. I know, actually, this file quite well. I have been on the Standing Committee. And I have worked diligently in these areas and have known and been immersed in it. I am on…this is my 15th year, like you, Madam Speaker. And I have to say that, yes, it actually didn't take me long to figure out things. I think one of our bigger challenges besides the major projects that we have to deal with, Madam Speaker, is just how we can work on the environment and make sure that we are meeting the needs of, as Councillor Allard put it today, the needs of Gaia for us not to over-pollute and destroy our earth. And I think those kinds of things are very important as well. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, next question.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes. I just want to say thank you and absolutely appreciate the Councillor and working to do all we can to maintain affordability is critical. I agree. Thank you.

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

Councillor Mayes: Yes, congratulations. I was not going to raise anything, but if the Mayor is going to raise something. Well, I would ask Councillor Eadie if he can, at some point, take it under advisement, get back to us when the next…when next the administration is planning on going to market for garbage and recycle pick up. That occurs roughly every seven years. I think the group who was on Council in the last term never saw this issue. So, it comes up very rarely, where there was a ton of litigation coming out of the last go-around. Grievances with CUPE settlements, allegations of breach of settlements, on and on it went. Councillor Eadie would be familiar with all this. So, I won't ask for your position on any of it today. You have been a good voice on bringing bulky waste in-house and other issues. But for the short-term, if you could find out when is the administration next planning to go out to market, look for bids on garbage and recycle. Because I would think hopefully before they do, we can deal with some issues this time. Because last time, as Councillor Dobson will remember, we ended up in a ton of litigation. So, if he could just let us know. Take that under advisement and let us know when the admin is planning to go to market.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I am watching for that, and it is my understanding there is some changes to how recycling is going to work in terms of provincial legislation that the current government is considering passing. So, I will…I will be paying attention. And we do know when we eventually go to curbside composting that there will be contracts that will have to be renewed. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I, too, wanted to rise and congratulate Councillor Eadie. And definitely he will do an excellent job as Chair of the Committee. Which is to pick up on, I guess, partly on where the Mayor left off, which is, in terms of the Water and Waste plant, the North End Treatment Plant, and I know Councillor Eadie is aware of this, but…that we often fall back. We think the Chairs of the Committee are ministerial in the sense of, you know, the Minister must know everything at all times. But rather the Chair is the Chair of the Committee that, in the event, the challenges with that project become large that it is a responsibility of all of Council, not just the Chair that is there. So, I just want to make it clear that buck, you know, that it is not falling on one person and, as unfair that would be because it is not a ministerial system. But I want to thank Councillor Eadie for stepping up and filling the role, and I think he will do an excellent job. And I know that is really not a question, it is a statement, but I will say it as it is. Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, I will just rise and make comment. When I took the job, I knew that it was more than just me. I have been on this Council for 15 years, as I have mentioned. And I have been on all sides of everything. And I have to say that we have to respect our public servants as well, and we work with them as we move ahead with these important projects. It is not just us, Governance, Council, it is all of us that have to work together. And I can tell you right now that I have already been on…what have I been on this now for a week…yes, today is Thursday. For a week, and I can tell you that there is a lot of people working to make sure that things are affordable, and to make sure that all these things do not go sideways, and it is not just one person. Yes, absolutely. And, you know, we are governance at this level. And we have to look at how things go for our public servants again. They are working very hard. I know that. We ask them to work for us. We ask them and we challenge them. And they come back. But we are showing great respect for our corporation and the employees, the public servants. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And that concludes our question period under this committee. Very good. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services. Chair, Councillor Santos.

REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES DATED JANUARY 10, 2025

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services dated January 10, 2025, and move Items 1 and 2, and I am pulling 3 because there is an amendment on the floor.

Madam Speaker: Three is Video Camera Enforcement Program. Two has been pulled. User Agreement Between Swim/Natation Manitoba. I will call the question on Item one. All in favor? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

Item 2 - User Agreement between Swim/Natation Manitoba Inc. and the City of Winnipeg

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

Councillor Santos: Sure. So, this is a user agreement that has been made between the City of Winnipeg and Swim/Natation Manitoba. It is a 20-year user agreement. Basically, a near-exclusive use of the Pan Am Pool training tank, which is located at Pan Am Pool. The Councillor did sit on the Committee when we were discussing it and had requested the Public Service to go back and continue on with negotiations. So here we are today. The terms and conditions have been added. And I think what has been really good to note is that every year there will be an increase that is appropriate to the CPI Index, and that is what has been agreed on, as well as some exclusive and shared access to offices, storages and training spaces. And I think something that is also new within this agreement is that a reserve account is going to be created by Swim Manitoba or Swim/Natation Manitoba, and that any revenues or increased revenues that have been generated by Swim/Natation is going to go into this reserve account and used exclusively for maintenance, if required, for any facility improvements to this Pan Am Swim Tank. So that is something new and that is something to be proud of. We want to note the, obviously the continued contribution by Swim/Natation. But that is what this report is about. Thank you.

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

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I stood the matter down, and Councillor Santos is quite correct here, quite involved with the Standing Committee when the matter was there before us before. I stand it down simply just to make a few comments. I am pleased to see that the user agreement has come forward. Though I will say that one of the challenges I think we as a city have had when it comes to our approaching not-for-profit groups. There is too much at times, I feel or I sense, and I could be wrong, that there is kind of an us versus them, when we are really all on the same team. These are not-for-profit groups offering services to the citizens of Winnipeg in our facilities. And quite often offering services that we ourselves are incapable of offering or not offering, in terms of recreation in this case. And I think we have to have the approach, Madam Speaker, more so that we need to work with these groups in a cooperative fashion to find solutions versus the us versus them approach. And that is one of the challenges that I think we still have as a city. And what I find interesting as well is that this is called the user agreement. This is not called a lease agreement. We have this interesting dichotomy where we have lease agreement again with not-for-profit groups using our facilities versus calling it a user agreement. You talk to the Real Estate Department of our city who oversees the lease agreements. They would be more than happy to get this off their workload because they are very time-consuming. They are not really revenue-generating vehicles. And they are really more geared towards user agreements. And anything we can do, Madam Speaker, to simplify the user agreement process I think would be a positive thing. And I know I worked with Councillor Duncan at the time, who Chaired the committee, and, you know, that was something that we really were concerned about, of how we can simplify the user agreement process. You know, I go back, and now I realize this was a different time. 20, 30 years when we had user agreements that were two pages long, you know, with a community group. Now I realize that this is a larger complex. There is more issues at stake here. You know, not all will fit the same. But the reality is there are things we could possibly do just to make the process more streamlined, simpler for not-for-profit groups rather than always having these issues come up where it takes so long to get something like this back to Council. And this has taken a long time. And this is just simply that kind of customer-friendly approach that I think we need to have with not-for-profit groups. As a former person in insurance, I have often not understood why we cannot add not-for-profit groups under our global insurance policy (inaudible), saving them possibly thousands, tens of thousands of dollars, especially in third-party liability costs. Especially if they have a proven track record when it comes to their insurance history and their risk history. And, you know, so there are steps I think we still need to take in terms of these user agreements to make the system far more user-friendly when it comes to us approaching these not-for-profit groups. Their intent, I think, is very positive. Their contribution to the community is very positive. Again, they are doing and offering services above and beyond what the City is prepared or able to offer at this time financially. And therefore we should find it to make the process as streamlined, as simple as possible for all these groups, and if there is a way, as per my conversation with the Real Estate Department, to move away from these lease agreements, especially we have lease agreements with so many daycares and all these other groups that are using City facilities, then move them to a user agreement and simplify that user agreement so that it is user-friendly. You know that would be a wonderful step in the right direction to making us more customer service oriented and more, again, getting away from that mentality it is us versus them. We are really on the same time. We are trying to offer some municipal services. Sometimes our facilities are underutilized, and you have community groups that have been there for decades ensuring that the facilities are actually being used proactively, and that there are services being offered in the community that may not be there. And many of you on Council know those groups that you have in your community who are using and leasing City facilities that we, as a City, are not offering those services but a not-for-profit group is. And so I really wanted to make the statement...these comments about this. This has taken a long time to get here. I think it speaks to the need to simplify the process, and I think there is a real opportunity to move a lot of the stuff that Real Estate is having to deal with towards a user agreement system if we can make that system more streamlined and fair and more user-friendly from the not-for-profit group standpoint. So those are my comments. I want to thank the Public Service. I know they worked very hard on this to get it to this point. And I congratulate Swim/Natation Manitoba for the new agreement and hopefully the obligations on them are not too dear that we have to revisit this in the future. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos to close, or I can call the question.

Councillor Santos: Nobody else had any other comments? Yes, no, I am good. These comments are noted and I appreciate his feedback.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Call the vote on Item 2. All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Item 3, Mr. Clerk.

Item 3 - Video Camera Enforcement Program for Illegal Garbage Dumping

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos and following that we will hear from Councillor Eadie who has circulated the amending motion.

Motion No. 2
Moved by Councillor Eadie

Seconded by Councillor Santos

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 3 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services dated January 10, 2025 be amended as follows:

- *Add the following to the end of Recommendation 1.B.:*

  ", broken down into dumping on public property and private property."

Councillor Santos: Yes, so I want to thank Councillor Eadie for coming up to me today saying he wanted some clarity on the current motion, which I am supportive. During the committee meeting we had discussed about the renewed video camera enforcement program to be reestablished, and he was looking for costs. So, we flushed that out through the committee. It was originally 150,000 dollars, and of course that was back in 2018. Those costs have now increased to 175,000 dollars. And then we had Winston Yee come in and talk about how the cameras were situated and where they were situated and agreements that were needed to be made with Hydro. That they are not against obviously doing this enforcement program. But I think it is important to look at some of the data first and ensure what the cost…what the total budget was for enforcement and remediation of illegal garbage dumping in and around the city. And so, the amendment kind of breaks it down. Councillor Eadie is looking to break it down between public property, so anything that is public, which is lanes, parks, sidewalks, even City of Winnipeg properties that are in between residential homes that are getting illegally dumped items on there, and then as well as private property.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I understand there is a cost to the video camera thing, and it has gone up somewhat, but the technology has gotten much better and probably uses less electricity and so on. But that aside, the recommendation from the Standing Committee is fine with me in a way. I know that Solid Waste has been doing a great job. They are spending money, but they are doing a great job cleaning the back lanes that we know every year in Daniel Mac and in Point Douglas and in Mynarski. We know the back lanes. People are dumping stuff and they, I mean, there is people also rifling through the garbage, but there is a lot of dumping happening from, you know, a block over or from another neighborhood or even from another ward. Where people are too lazy and do not want to spend the money to go down to Brady to get rid of the bulk waste. But Madam Speaker, so just to clarify. I want to clarify because the City is spending quite some amount of money to clean up the public properties. And whether it is public…whether it's parks and open spaces or Public Works or Solid Waste. We know that the City is putting a lot of money…and we will find out exactly how much altogether through A. B, the recommendation, I just want it to be split up because I have been trying to…I have tried a couple of things. I am reflecting the frustration of private property owners. It is not their garbage. It is not their mattress. It is not their stuff. But we send By-law enforcement down there and we order them, whether they have money or not, we order them to clean it up. Even though they never created it. They are a victim. We need to try to do something to help those victims, to prevent it. Now, I will point out that the Selkirk Avenue BIZ, through funding through the Mynarski office, the Selkirk Avenue BIZ is going to attempt, to try a pilot project. We will see how it goes. If it does prevent private property. If it does work, maybe that is the next thing we bring down the pipe, Madam Speaker. But we need to resolve this issue. I will, again, explain just one small restaurant in the North End at Salter and Aberdeen. Luda's. They take care of their garbage. They have a bin. They keep it locked. They take care of it. They need to have parking for their customers that come. But there is dumping. People come driving down Salter. And they, oh, look, there is a…yes, we will just dump our bulk waste here. Then nobody wants to pick it up. They have a city service actually at Luda's. They won't pick it up because all this bulk waste is dumped around it and they can't get their truck into it. And it is…that is not the city contract to move the bulk waste, right? So, here we are, we have a private property owner who is trying to make ends meet, trying to make a living. It is actually a family living at Luda's restaurant. Now, she is going to build her own fence now, and hopefully people are not kicking it down or not. But she does not have a lot of money, we will see if a fence. She is not going to be allowed to build a 7-foot fence which does work, along Salter probably. I do not know. There will be issues there. She is just trying to protect her property. So, we need to take care of the people whose private property is being abused by others dumping their garbage. So, it will be good to know what kind of numbers we are talking about so you can see how bad it really is. I know actually the City owns private property through tax sale. On Selkirk Avenue they have had to pay. I do not know if we had to issue an order against Real Estate or not. But it is always getting mattresses and stuff dumped on it. It looks a mess. So actually, we have the Selkirk Avenue BIZ keeps reporting, ordering, like get it out of there because it makes the neighborhood look awful. Anyway, I will leave it at that. Thanks for accepting my motion to the Chairperson. And let's find out really how bad it really is. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos to close.

Councillor Santos: No, you can go ahead.

Madam Speaker: Call the question on the Amending Motion 2. All in favor? Contrary? Carried. And the main Item as amended. All in favor? Contrary? Carried. We will now move into By-laws under this committee.

Councillor Santos: No, I have one more report. I move the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services dated January 15, 2025. And Move adoption and consent agenda Item No. 1.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favor? Contrary? Carried. By-laws. Councillor Santos?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Councillor Santos: Just so you know this is my first time moving a By-law. Yay. Anyways, I move that By-law No. 11/2025, be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 11/2025.

Councillor Santos: I move that By-law No. 11/2025 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 11/25.

Councillor Santos: I move that the rule be suspended and By-law No. 11/2025 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried. We will now have question period under this committee. Any questions for Councillor Santos? Councillor Chambers.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the Chair of Community Services. I probably should have approached you prior, but I am receiving e-mails from constituents in my ward with respect to Margaret Grant Pool and early swim times. I am just wondering if the Chair could find out more information for me. The information that I received is that Margaret Grant is accommodating some swim times with respect to the closure or temporary closure of Bonivital and it is taking on some of that activity. But swimmers in my ward want to know how this might be impacted once Bonivital Pool is open. So, if you can get information to me with respect to Margaret Grant Pool and what the operating times will be throughout 2025. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Yes, thank you for that question. I, too, as the Chair of Community Services have been receiving similar e-mails and concerns about Margaret Grant Pool. I have been working closely with the director. She has advised right now no hours have been changed. But new schedules will be set for April and, of course, we can have that ongoing conversation. And you are correct. Hours have been extended at Margaret Grant Pool while Bonivital Pool is due for closures and renovations and some continued ongoing conversations with respect to how the hours are going to work at Margaret Grant Pool. And maybe what does that look like? I do not know what that is going to be, but I am happy to take this offline.

Madam Speaker: Any further questions? Okay, seeing none, next is the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes, the report.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED JANUARY 9, 2025**

Councillor Lukes: Great. I would like to bring forward four reports from Public Works dated January 9, 2025. And I would like to move adoption and consent agenda on Items 1-4.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried. Right into By-laws, Councillor Lukes. Councillor Lukes.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS**

Councillor Lukes: Okay. I would like to move that By-law No. 14/2025 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 14/2025.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that By-law No. 14/2025 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 14/2025.

Councillor Lukes: And I would like to move that the rule be suspended, and By-law No. 14/2025 be read a third time and that the same be passed in order to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favor? Contrary? That is carried. Now we will have question period under this committee. Councillor Wyatt.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
QUESTION PERIOD**

Councillor Wyatt: I rise and it's related to one of the reports on the agenda that I didn't step down, I thought of speaking to it but then I thought maybe I could ask through Q and A and that's Report No. 1, North Garage Replacement Project Budget Status. Specifically, the recommendation of the report speaks to the need for the…the fact that we as a Council reduced the scope of the North Garage Replacement Project and its…and its…implimication, or…its possible ramifications for the Winnipeg Transit Master Plan which we voted on prior. The report requests 150 days be granted to come back to the Standing Committee in terms of that. That's cutting it tight with regards to the impact with regards to the Transit Master Plan as we know, the new transit system is being rolled out at the end of June. Is there any concern that the chair has with regards to that and could she give us some indication pertaining to that, of how that will actually work, in terms of routes that could be impacted pertaining to the new Transit Master Plan?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: So, the expansion of the garage is not going to impact the…right away. It's not going to impact what's happening in June, all right? So, our routes are all going to be changing, but this is the north garage that the expansion is being modified, and I think you were on the committee at the time where we sent this report off. They're coming back saying, they need to have more time to get a better detailed analysis of the structure and then the implications that will follow from modifying the structure to fit the budget. So, ultimately, if we don't get additional funding in the future to continue the expansion, 3 to 4 years down the road when we have a great uptake in the next couple years of people riding the bus because of the new system, and, you know, the desire to buy more busses to support the demand that we're anticipating, but not having garage to put them in. So, it's…it isn't connected, but not immediately. If we don't, you know, if we don't get additional funding in 4 to 5 years, then we're going to see a bigger impact.

Councillor Wyatt: …confirm. Thank you. So just to confirm then, the impression that you…you're correct, I was on the committee at the time. So, the impression that we got on the committee or at least I got on the committee was that…that this could happen direct impact immediately, that is not going to be the case now in terms of the Transit Master Plan.

Councillor Lukes: It won't immediate. Just to recap, if we see, you know, which we're totally anticipating because we've got frequency routes coming into service, we're anticipating a higher use of transit service. More people using transit, which will create a demand to buy more busses, which will create a need to have more storage. So that…that's, you know, for a period of years, but ultimately, we're going to have a challenge because right now, we've got a set budget for this garage that reduces its size. So, there's a lot in transit that's coming down the road that, you know, can cause concerns, but it's not going to impact our route changes this year.

Councillor Wyatt: And…and this may lead to another round of questions, but is the transit department still contemplating the use of hydrogen versus electric knowing the unknown implications pertaining to the building code that they were aware has not been sorted out with the requirements that a potential building code construction requirements on the north garage in the event that we decide to use hydrogen versus, let's say using hybrid-electric or electric busses. Has there been any further discussion on that and are we still going down the road of the hydrogen versus electric bus route.

Councillor Lukes: So, the transit department is working with other transit departments across Canada and with various fire regulations currently that have set up federally. They are constantly aware of the regulations, nothing major has come through in changes like we had talked about, you know, with the stabilization of a building holding electric busses with the fire protection with electric busses. So…so there's nothing…no federal regulations that have come out, there's a lot of dialogue on it, but nothing they're aware of it. So, there's nothing, no changes yet. I fully anticipate something to come of it eventually, because of the challenges putting out electric fires. As you know, we…after this last batch of electric busses that we get, we're not purchasing anymore, that was passed in the budget that we're not purchasing anymore. We're purchasing diesel busses, and we're talking to the department about innovation, using hydrogen and diesel together. Councillor Allard, myself, the department, we're looking at some innovative processes that Calgary's using that we might use here. So, lots happening with all these different forms of fuel.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes Question Period under this committee. Councillor Wyatt, okay. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay. The Transportation Master Plan, what is the status of that? I know there are some significant changes in recommendations to the Transportation Master Plan that I…that could be somewhat controversial, in terms of…issues related to wards, sorry, long day. And I want to know, what is the plan, what is the schedule, is there any idea of what we're looking at for the rollout of the Transportation Master Plan at this point and time, and when, where, how, all that sort of stuff.

Councillor Lukes: So, the department had, you know, spent a long time working on this plan through COVID and now, the Province was looking at it. So, we thought it would come forward a little sooner than it was planned, but the Province is looking at it. So, my understanding is that it may be coming forward in March, for sure by April. My goal is to have another session, an information session, with councillors, you will recall we had a couple of them a year ago, year and a half ago. But, you know, we all have a lot of information to absorb and I've asked the department if we could have a couple councillor information sessions again before it hits the agenda where we have four days to look at it. So, I'm waiting to hear back, the director was gone, we've got a bunch of plans coming up for the new year, and one of them is to have an information session on the Transportation Master Plan because it also includes the Goods Movement Plan, it includes the Pedestrian Cycling Plan, it's a huge amount of information and I think we need to kind of break it up for everyone.

Councillor Wyatt: Recently, residents of my ward received a mailer from the Province of Manitoba pertaining to the North Perimeter Functional Design Study, which I found very interesting because the flyer that we received was exactly the same flyer we received about a year and a half ago when the previous government was still in power and doing the functional design study for the North Perimeter which I'm assuming they have re-dusted off the study and are now underway as the new government. Have we received any information even though it appears to be the same study that's underway? Has there been any changes? Is there implications to our transportation system which I'm sure there would be, and what sort of interface has there been at the staff level and with ourselves with regards to that functional design study from the Province?

Councillor Lukes: …announcement. I didn't get a flyer but I saw that announcement about three or four days ago, I think they did a public announcement on it. So, I have a request in to find out. I don't know. I would like to think that that department is in conversation with the Province. I don't know. I'd like to think they are. So, I'll get an update on that, too.

Madam Speaker: Final question.

Councillor Wyatt: Are you unaware, and this is somebody who receives a flyer as well along with all the other residents, that the flyer was exactly the same as the flyer that we received a year and a half ago, two years ago, from the previous government. So, are you aware of that? I mean I'm glad that they're working on it. I'm glad it's being pursued, but I just want to make sure that…that the project is being discussed at…between our staff and theirs.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, I'll find out, get back to you on that. I know we had many discussions with the Province, I felt a little late in the game on the twinning or re-routing of McGillivray, so…and we've seen other incidents where there's sort of been a breakdown in discussions. We don't have a regional plan, really. So, I hear you loud and clear.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thanks, Madam Speaker. Since we're on the subject, last year during a Finance Standing Committee meeting, getting a briefing from the administration on the Transit Plan. They were talking about the…trying different modes of power sourcing for transit system. They were calling green alternatives or green transit, and that included the use of hydrogen fuel cell. I have explained, the record, right here, in the Council, not in the seminar, right here in the Council chamber, that…how it is that the hydrogen source at this time is a fossil fuel because it's stripped from methane ethane ethanol, and therefore is absolutely unequivocally a fossil fuel source. They explained during the seminar that the reason they were doing it is because there were, in context of developing this idea, there were two locations in the United States that were using this or proposing it. I asked where they were, they didn't know whereabout these two…whether they in fact they even went forward with it. Want to know, since the question therefore is, since Councillor Lukes it was mentioned Calgary, are we saying that Calgary, although I'm very aware that they're experimenting with hydrogen fuel cells in Calgary, we don't know at this time whether Calgary's using the hydrogen fuel cell for transit, do we?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I'm not clear on that. I can get back to you.

Councillor Schreyer: That's all, thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, through you to the chair. I would like to know if she was aware that I also received the same flyer, and in fact, I attended and thought the same thing as Councillor Wyatt, that the information and the flyer looked like identical to the previous one, and is the chair aware that I attended the open house and found out that in fact the session presented the preferred option. They provided at each of the different places on the north Perimeter Highway, from Assiniboia Downs through to at least Dugald maybe around to the Perimeter Highway, the preferred options that they had settled on from the work that I've started previously. And is the chair aware that apparently councils in East St. Paul, West St. Paul, Rosser and Springfield received consultation from the consultants while we here did not.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: I am not aware of that, that's very interesting. Again, I'd like to reiterate and hope that the Province and their department did work with our staff at the Public Works Department, but I will investigate that further.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That concludes Question Period under this committee. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and Economic Development. Chair, Councillor Browaty.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 17, 2025

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of January 17, 2025, and move Report 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will get right into question period. Any questions for the Chair? Seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Chair Councillor Duncan?

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
DATED JANUARY 13, 2025

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Before I introduce the report, I just wanted to extend a thank you to Councillor Rollins for her work as Chair of Property and Development over the past two plus years and on EPC for the last six plus years. I know she is a strong housing advocate, and I look forward to continuing to work with her in her role as Councillor for Fort Rouge and East Fort Garry. I would also like to acknowledge Councillor Eadie, being the first Councillor from the Mynarski ward to represent the ward on EPC in 30 plus years, and the fine work that he will do, already in some pretty consistent dialogue with the Councillor on transitioning that file over to him. He knows it all already, so we are good to go on that front. And with that I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of Consent Agenda Items No. 1 through 17 on the report of January 13, 2025.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, Item 8. Councillor, we are going to stand that one down. We will deal with the others first. Councillor Wyatt? Councillor Wyatt. Stand down number eight. I will call the question on 1 through 7, 9 through 17. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Councillor Wyatt, you are declaring a conflict on Item 8? And the conflict is? Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

Item 8 – Extension of Time – Subdivision and Rezoning –
1419 Ravelston Avenue West – DASZ 38/2021

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Call the question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Any questions for the Chair under PP&D? Councillor Mayes? Yes, we do have By-laws. Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Councillor Duncan, by-laws.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT – CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY

Councillor Duncan: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to move that By-law No.12/2025 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 12/2025.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Duncan.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON
PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT – CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Councillor Duncan: Madam Speaker I would like to move that By-law No. 13/2025 be read a first time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 13/2025.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: I would like to move that By-law No. 13/2025 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 13/2025

Councillor Duncan: I would like to move that the rules be suspended, and that By-law No. 13/2025 be read a third time, and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Schreyer: I do not recall. Did we actually do No. 12 a third time? I do not recall hearing that phrasing.

Madam Speaker: That was the first reading? Yes. We will now move into question period for the Chair. Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Some of us or perhaps just me, but I suspect some of us have been getting emails from concerned members of the Granite Curling Club. Just…can you clarify if you are able to, I think it's a public hearing, I think it's coming to Community Committee, I'm…various agendas that have not yet quite been published. So, if people are emailing us, we can say, better appear at the public hearing. It will then roll upwards if proved or not, but if you…if you're a member of the public and you want to speak to that item, you're going to have one window presumably which is the public hearing. This isn't…this isn't some other…this isn't a land sale or a closing of a road or something. Can you…if you can, (inaudible) portfolio but, can you clarify what we can say to people who might be concerned. I know there's two different sides to issue and, not been siding it but, what can we say to people who might have concerns on that file?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yes, thank you Councillor Mayes. Through you Madam Speaker, the meeting of Property and Development Standing Policy Committee will take place on February 6th, where there will be a public hearing regarding this matter. And those that are interested in speaking or registering, should register through the Clerk's office.

Madam Speaker: …question.

Councillor Mayes: Just not through Community Committee then, it's coming to a hearing at P and D on Feb…Feb…thank you to…Feb 6. Just…why isn't that going through Community Committee, I guess is the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question that was, Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Yeah, I…I would have to get clarification. I believe it's because it's a matter of Housing Accelerator Fund that…that Council already voted on, yes.

City Clerk: Downtown Zoning By-law.

Councillor Duncan: Downtown Zoning By-law. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Very good. Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, no further questions. Okay, that concludes Question Period under that committee.

REPORT ON A COMPLAINT BY CITY OF WINNIPEG INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

Item 1 – Report on a Complaint by City of Winnipeg Integrity Commissioner

Madam Speaker: Next is the Report of the Integrity Commissioner. This is an investigation…investigative report on the Acting Integrity Commissioner on a complaint made pursuant to the Member of Council Code of Conduct By-law 19/2018. The item was laid over from our November 21st meeting and subsequently from the December 12th meeting. As for the

procedure by-law, a member of Council subject to such an investigation may not participate in the debate or vote but is permitted to address Council. Councillor Wyatt, would you like to address Council?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. This is fine, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank this Council for the opportunity once again to speak before you to address the recommendations made by Miss Jamie Pytel, the Acting Integrity Commissioner of the City of Winnipeg. I want to state right now that I believe that I have done nothing wrong. I simply was doing what is my responsibility to the citizens that I represent, as under the oath of Council, to hold accountable our senior, most senior, administration. I still believe that any senior administrator who does not act upon a decision made by a court to award damages against the City for a 5-million-dollar loss because of the direct actions of an employee, and in this case the employee is still on the payroll and neither terminated or administrative leave, ultimately falls on the shoulders of the responsibility of our CAO. On that matter, any other employer, any other employer out there, and I've talked to many of them, small and large businesses, would immediately take action in terms of dealing with that employee, but not the City of Winnipeg. Not the City of Winnipeg, Madam Speaker. There's no accountability, it seems, inside the City of Winnipeg when it comes to being found liable in a court for malfeasance. You can have a 5-million-dollar award against the very employer that you're working for because of your actions, and there are no consequences, no accountability, no transparency. To me, the higher calling, our duties to serve our citizens as elected members in this chamber and the right to freedom of speech is what is at stake here today. The right of an elected representative of Council to be able to speak their mind, to be able to say what they see as right or wrong is a direct responsibility and obligation to the people that that person was elected by. It is to the very essence the heart of our democracy, and it was hard enough before holding the administrative state accountable. But if you decide to punish and attempt to silence my voice, be very wary of such a decision going forward, for at the end of the day, it is all an individual member of Council has, especially if they are not on the Executive Policy Committee. All they have is a microphone given to them by the people of their ward, who elected them. And in my case, the good people of Transcona, to hold senior administration to account, which even now is being threatened to be taken away. If you make this decision to punish me in any way or form, be very careful because today it may be me, but tomorrow it could be you. Council policies, the Charter, the obligation to the public good, and the public interest, I believe, is a higher responsibility and a higher calling. But even now the Code of Conduct is being weaponized in my opinion and used politically against members of Council, which was not its intent. I ask you and I remind you to remember the fact that Mr. Jack was not a staff member of mine, as Miss Pytel wrongly contends. He was not an employee of mine. My employee is my executive assistant, Mr. (inaudible) who I have employed because he's a lot smarter and more talented than myself, and I always like to hire people who are smarter and more talented than myself to make up for my shortfalls. And I have many faults, but one of them is not ingratitude. I am grateful to the people who have elected me, and I am always mindful of the obligation, the responsibilities that come with that, including holding the person who is the highest civil servant to account, as hard as it may be. And it should be pointed out at this time, again, that in light of the fact that he was not a staff person of mine in no way, shape or form did I harass him in any way as Pytel contends in her report wrongly. I did my job to hold him to account. Do not take that power and that responsibility away, Councillors and members of Council, from elected members of this body because one day, you as an elected Councillor, may be in a position to have to call for the resignation of a CAO or a senior administrator. And if this precedent is set, I believe your powers to be able to do so will be greatly diminished. And therefore, I say to all of you here today that I did nothing wrong. I spoke my mind. I asked a serious question on behalf of the people I represent, which is what we all have sworn an oath of office and are elected to do. Indeed, there are many of you here in this room when the CAO, Mr. Jack, was terminated could arguably said far worse. And Mr. Jack found it in his righteous mind, though, to be able to hold, to file a complaint against me, but he didn't file a complaint against any member of the Executive Policy Committee even though, as I mentioned, some things were said at the time of his termination that could be arguably far worse than what I said when I called for his resignation. And I say this to you today with the greatest respect, that we must not allow the Code of Conduct, which is there for a good reason, to ensure dignity in the workplace and respect in the workplace for employees to be used in any way, shape or form and weaponized as it seems to be today against elected members of our body, including members of Council. It will send a chill across our entire organization. And freedom of speech, as we know it, will be altered potentially permanently. And I can tell you as well that according to my own legal counsel, this Council does not have the jurisdiction to do what is being proposed in the motion before you today. I have sought legal counsel, and I am prepared to do what may have to be done following this, and I pray though that I will not have to go to that extent. Mr. Jack was not and is not my employee. So, I ask all members of this Council, Madam Speaker, let us not tread down this dangerous path because you may not think that it is being…because you may think that it is me being punished today, but tomorrow, it could be you. And you will not only be restricting but setting in motion a precedent that will cause every member of Council to have to look over their shoulder in the future, whenever they want to stand up and speak the truth, as they see it, and as they were elected and sworn to do so. And that, my friends, will be a real threat to our local democracy. I thank you for this time. My legal counsel has advised me that I should not take questions in light of the fact that depending on your decision, this matter could be addressed before the courts. So, I will be stepping away from your discussion at this point in time. I would respectfully request that you receive this matter before you, as information and let us get back to work and focus on the real priorities of the citizens of Winnipeg. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. There is no questions at this time. Yes, for Councillor Wyatt, as we have noted. There is no questions. I would like to take a moment to distribute a motion. Motion is moved by the Mayor, seconded by myself. Yes. Yes. Mr. Clerk has Councillor Gilroy…if she could receive a copy, please.

Moved by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Sharma,

WHEREAS in the report dated October 28, 2024, the Acting Integrity Commissioner found the Respondent to be in violation of the Members of Council Code of Conduct By-law 19/2018;

AND WHEREAS the Acting Integrity Commissioner has recommended that the Respondent be required to make a public apology for their conduct prior to the December 12, 2024 Council meeting, and if an apology addressing the issues outlined in the Integrity Commissioner's report was not issued in that time period, Council issue a public reprimand;

AND WHEREAS at the November 21, 2024 Council meeting, the Respondent addressed the Recommendations of the Acting Integrity Commissioner, and acknowledged a correction of his statements in the media that the appeal was not a delay tactic, and is a right the City of Winnipeg has (Recommendation 1. D. and 2.), but to date has not issued a public apology in accordance with the remaining Recommendations;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Respondent be reprimanded for violating the Members of Council Code of Conduct By-law 19/2018, as outlined in the report of the Acting Integrity Commissioner dated October 28, 2024, and not issuing a public apology for his conduct

Councillor Gilroy: Could you maybe have the Clerk read out my motion?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we will explain it momentarily. Just in a moment. We will have everyone get a copy. No, the motion before us. Mr. Mayor, if you would like to speak. And certainly, we can have the Clerk read any clause into the record you wish, unless you would like to.

Mayor Gillingham: Sure, Madam Speaker. I am wondering if we could just give, maybe, as you said a moment ago, we could give Council a moment just to read through it, and then I will be glad to speak. I will maybe just wait a moment.

Madam Speaker: Yes, we will do that.

Councillor Gilroy: Do we have our Integrity Commissioner online?

Madam Speaker: Yes, we do.

Councillor Gilroy: To ask questions?

Madam Speaker: We can get her on the line, yes.

Councillor Gilroy: That might be nice.

Madam Speaker: Okay, there are questions of clarification. They were asked previously as well. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to speak. We will bring in the Integrity Commissioner, Mr. Clerk, online if needed. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: I am not sure about our online members of Council, but this, we did ask the Acting Integrity Commissioner a whole host of questions.

Madam Speaker: Yes, we did. That is correct. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the motion is fairly straightforward, and I will just note that be it resolved is basically to implement one of the recommendations cited by the Acting Integrity Commissioner in her report. And so that is what the motion states clearly, and you can…just that the respondent be reprimanded for violating the Members of Council Code of Conduct, By-law No. 19/2018 as outlined in the report the Acting Integrity Commissioner dated October 28th, 2024, and issue a public apology for his conduct.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? If there is questions of clarification, but we did do that previously as well. Councillor Eadie?

Councillor Eadie: I would like to speak to it and Councillor Schreyer does not remember maybe, he can ask a question. But Madam Speaker, I am going to rise and speak to it because I questioned…I had some concerns. I did get the answers I was seeking from our Acting Integrity Commissioner, who, while from Edmonton, did...knows and read through these Members of…the City of Winnipeg's Members of Council's Code of Ethical Conduct By-law. And Madam Speaker, in there it does set out procedures to follow when complaints are filed. And I will note, I do not see…my first problem is Councillor Wyatt somehow alludes that if we are going to follow this motion, that somehow that is illegal. It is specified in the by-law, the process. It is specified what the outcomes might be, Madam Speaker. Now I do not exactly follow the interpretation of the word "authority" as it is laid out in that by-law. When we look at authority over the City of Winnipeg employees, over employees, we have a structure that's set up. But a person does, at a minimum is just a member of Council, not on EPC, not on a hiring committee…EPC you could argue would have authority as it is the human resource committee of the City of Winnipeg, our City Council. And we also have a Chief Officer who has moved a motion, because not only is Mayor Gillingham the Mayor, he is also the Chief Officer in the Charter that we have for this city from the Province. Chief Officer means Chief Officer. We have a Chief Financial Officer. We have a Chief Administrative Officer. We have a Clerk. We have an Auditor. I think that one should be a little more at arm's length, but needless to say, the Mayor is actually ultimately like a minister of the Province. So, then we have EPC members, and I am now on the human resource committee. Okay. So, you could say that I have some authority over a CAO and over the, maybe even Directors or whatever. It might be, Madam Speaker. But no member of Council. We need to define the word "authority" because there is no authority. Now I just want to speak to, in this chamber, the member of Council does have a responsibility not to impugn the motivation of…for decisions and votes made, Madam Speaker. What Councillor Wyatt is guilty of in my mind…so I do not see the authority, but what he did do in public was impugn the motivation of the then-Chief Administrative Officer for appealing a decision that we represented. We were all offered a seminar. We had a discussion about that lawsuit and what the outcomes were. And we had a chance to talk to our legal advisers, Madam Speaker. In no way was the CAO motivated in the way that Councillor Wyatt stated. And he should apologize for that. Yes, he has the freedom to go out and say we need the CAO to be fired. Fine. That is fine. I have done it as a matter of fact, myself. My first term, calling for the resignation, the firing of a CAO. And I was right, in the end, Madam Speaker. However, I digress. I never said or accused anybody of anything. I just called for their resignation because of the sideways movement of a particular project the city was undertaking. Now I am just going to conclude by saying that I am in support of this recommendation from our Chief Officer, from our Mayor, and I believe seconded by you, Speaker Sharma, or Madam Speaker. Sorry.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Eadie: So, we know what the rules are. We read them. I debate the interpretation of authority, and after this is all over, I have spoken to our existing Integrity Commissioner, who was in a conflict and was unable to interpret or make decisions on this. But the Acting Integrity Commissioner, I think, did a thorough job. You do not have to agree with everything that she presented but, which I do not. The only thing I did not agree with was the authority, interpreting what authority we have over our public servants that are the CAO and down. And so, I will leave it at that. Take it to court…

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Eadie: I was found in violation of the Winnipeg Police Board's Members Code of Ethical Conduct. Yeah, I admit I violated it. But I would do it again, and I said that in a public meeting where I was condemned for my actions. And I think that...I think that Councillor Wyatt has gone overboard on his presentation there. I think it is just way overboard. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Sorry for the interest of all, I require a larger fund. Look, I am going to repeat some of the things I said the last time on was on the record for the record. I am also going to say and note for the record the intervening time that stands out for me. And I will say, I believe the penalty imposed, Madam Speaker, by the motion that you and the Mayor have signed is inadequate. And I am going to ask this Council to consider the nature of the offending behaviour, the duration, what I see to be clear persistence at the podium yet again. A deliberateness at the podium yet again. And whether the member, Councillor Wyatt, tried to remedy that. And we know there is no remedy when you defy and actually note you did nothing wrong. And then finally, another factor, past record, that I have some experience in I think, Madam Speaker. I want to first to respond to what we heard in terms of freedom of speech as a fundamental right. But we know, and I think Councillor Eadie laid it out pretty well, that we are wrong paradigm. Wrong time, wrong place. We know freedom of speech is not unlimited or an unconditional right. The principle of freedom of speech must be balanced with responsibility to ensure that individuals are not subjected to harm, harassment, or discrimination, which was found here, especially in professional settings, such as local government, here. The idea that limits of freedom of speech can serve as an excuse for elected officials to harass or publicly disrespect city staff is not only legally and ethically flawed, Madam Speaker, it also undermines the integrity of the Public Service and the functioning of local government. A professional, nonpartisan Public Service is fundamental to the functioning of our democracy. Civil servants are essential

to the efficient operation of Council proceedings and the completion of city business. And when these individuals are publicly disrespected, particularly by elected officials, it severely undermines the ability of the city to function and serve the public. The Integrity Commissioner's report posted November 15th and discussed during November 21st Council agenda, specifically addresses the conduct of Councillor Wyatt. The report concluded that Councillor Wyatt had publicly disrespected and harassed the CAO of the City of Winnipeg, now Deputy Minister Mike Jack. He did this, it says, through a series of comments in the media which were found to be unfair, inappropriate and personally attacking. The report further recommended that Councillor Wyatt issue a public apology. Why? For those of us who have been around, when you do something in public, the Integrity Commissioner will say it ought to be publicly apologized for. So, he was to issue a public apology acknowledging the inappropriate comments and committing to treat all city staff with respect and professionalism moving forward. Why? Because at issue, I will remind you, and I think it is really important to remind you of this, that there is a current member of our staff at issue here. His comments in the media concerning Mike Jack was that he should have fired a current member of our staff. They remain a current member of our civil service that often appears before Council and certainly the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Madam Speaker. Councillor Wyatt's continued defiance and disregard for the Integrity Commissioner's finding reflect a disturbing pattern that I believe we have all witnessed firsthand, and I believe we all hold records that are illustrated to us before us, in the intervening time. I have particularly experienced what has been described and do not believe incidents pertaining to Mike Jack are in isolation or unique to Mike Jack. I have had other members of the Public Service debate since this debate started in November, whether they should even bother submitting an Integrity Commissions report based on what this Council said last time. This ongoing pattern raises quite a few concerns for me. The lack of response even more. I believe that is a continued show of disrespect. In media interviews, you will recall, following the release of the Integrity Commissioner's report, Councillor Wyatt persisted in his negative remarks about Mike Jack, and the Property and Development staff in question. He did so again at the podium, even after the report's recommendations had been made clear. His comments continue to ignore the process and the integrity of those involved. It exacerbates the situation by repeating it, so much so I was concerned I should just start anew, write a new Integrity Commissioner report. He repeated all of this again. Today. He repeated it in November. He repeated it again when it hit the agenda. Again, I have had senior public servants disclose troubling matters to me pertaining to Councillor Wyatt. While we do not police other members of Council, and believe you me, I have spent a great deal of time with Sherri Walsh as a Chair of Property and Development, in particular, since Council has…Council appointed him to the Standing Policy Committee. We do not police other Council members. That is for the Integrity Commissioner. And we do not write Integrity Commissioner reports on behalf of staff, per se. We have Council through, Madam Speaker, we have a growing list of women that have left the Public Service. Our CFO, our Director of HR, our Manager of Permits, and our Deputy CAO. Who I'll note were recently replaced by three men. I think this is not sufficient. We have not suggested mandatory training. We have not allowed for even one meeting, time-out, Councillor Wyatt. Taken together, I can not support the motion. My own decision, Madam Speaker, I need one more minute…

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

Councillor Rollins: The pattern to behaviour creates an atmosphere where our civil service staff could feel marginalized, undervalued, and ultimately, discouraging their participation in senior level roles and leadership within the city. I am really concerned about that. When the CAO can be harassed by Council, anyone can be harassed. So, my own decision to step down as Chair of Property and Development was driven by growing concerns of transparency and government. But in November when this Council put Councillor Wyatt on the very committee where he continued his actions, not once, not twice, but three times, four times today, that concerned me. It underlines an overall toxic work environment, I believe. It is a consistent issue. I think there is consistent disregard for professionalism and respect. I am concerned about ongoing behaviour. I believe it is damaging to the city's ability to function effectively. The lack of meaningful action or change to address these issues is in part why I felt it necessary, among other things, to step down. I believe that until this issue is adequately addressed, we will continue to see the same patterns of disrespect, dysfunction, which will ultimately harm the city's ability to serve the public in a professional and effective manner. I would like to see two additional items. One: Mandatory training. I would say he does not return to this chamber until he gets it. And two: I believe he should be suspended for one meeting of Council. You all know I wanted him off the Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development. I believe he is off now…

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: I believe he is off now. I believe that has not been confirmed for Council, and I believe that that is unfair.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Well, I certainly hope this is the last time we have to deal with this. So, let's…whatever we do, let's make a decision on it because the circus has come to town with this thing, so let's just deal with it. Not a bad motion. It is a compromise, I think. So, thanks to the Mayor, Councillor Sharma, I will be supporting this. I would not support the

additional items Councillor Rollins is suggesting. I would rather vote for nothing than for that, thank you, so. But I will support this. A number of things. Look, I think Mike Jack is a friend of mine. I think Councillor Wyatt is a friend of mine. I can not quite believe this thing could not get worked out. Allard and I and his former assistant must have had numerous shouting matches. We always worked it out. You know, we get along pretty well now. So, it is not beyond the skills of human beings to resolve this sort of thing. So maybe four or five things. Number one: Yes. As Eadie said, this is probably over the top from Wyatt. But we have to have the ability to criticize the public service otherwise, why are we here? Number two: A lot of people in here who said a lot of stuff about Mike Jack in this chamber before he left. There is a lot of people who have wanted him out. So, it is a little crocodile tearish to be saying oh my god, Councillor Wyatt was critical of Mike Jack. Well Mike Jack is not here anymore. I do not want to get into any details, but let's just play this it as it goes here. Let's deal with the comments here. But let's not pretend that there were not…there were a lot of people here who did not want Mike Jack to still be around. I was not one of them. I thought he was a good CAO. Regardless, the context here is important, right? Why was our Integrity Commissioner not on? Well because her law firm is involved in this litigation against the City of Winnipeg and some of its employees, litigation in which we lose. But within that…and we are appealing, and we should appeal, and Mike Jack was right that this breached public comment about strategy on appeal and any discipline would be crazy to do before an appeal was decided on. So, you know, like we will play this out. We will see what happens after the appeal judgement comes down. But bear in mind the big defence of some of the City staff in that litigation was Councillor Orlikow is responsible. We were just following orders from Councillor Orlikow. That is on the record. Councillor Orlikow was not a party to that. Councillor Orlikow was not advised to that. Councillor Orlikow had to respond to the media after the judgement from the Court of King's Bench, might have been Court of Queen's Bench at that point, regardless, after the judge brings down the decision. Orlikow, hugely traumatic for him I am sure, he has to go forward and defend himself against these arguments. If I were representing the City of Winnipeg staff, I would have made that argument. That is their job as a defense counsel, especially if you are being sued for…well, you are not defense counsel, you are defendant counsel. You are being sued for millions of dollars. You make a defense. But it might have been nice if the Public Service of the City of Winnipeg had let Councillor Orlikow know that these comments were being made about him in a court of law. He had to respond in the media. So, a lot of accusations are going back and forth here. So, Eadie spoke well. This is, I think, over the top by Russ, which is too bad. He has had his chance to apologize. He did not. Not a bad motion from the Mayor and Councillor Sharma to say, well, look, this is…this is…he has not apologized so we will issue a reprimand for whatever it is worth. That is fine. There is maybe one person who comes out of this looking good and that person is John Kiernan of all people, who was a defendant in that litigation. Because a couple of years ago when John Kiernan was still working here, and there was one of his staff very publicly on social media trouncing me. And I think Councillor Rollins, in demanding that we do certain things that did not conform with the directions of that first boss, John Kiernan. In other words, do not follow the senior civil service advice. Do what we say or, well, we will make sure you are voted out. And I went to talk to Mr. Kiernan saying, well, how might you deal with this? Isn't there one Public Service here? How am I to deal with this? Mr. Kiernan dealt with the problem, talked to the employee, who I ended up talking with and we, I think, had a sort of (inaudible). But you got to have a one public servant. You have got to have mutual respect, is my point. The comments here are not respectful. I am not going to pretend otherwise. I will vote with the Mayor on this. But it is a two-way street, man. You can not have public servants saying, hey, you should be doing this project not that project, even though my boss says you should do the first, and you will get trounced if you do not agree with him. I will trounce you as well very publicly. What kind of workplace is that? How is that not insubordination? So, we have…anyway, Mr. Kiernan dealt with that problem. I hope other civil servants do the same around here, so we try to have some unity of purpose. But for today, yes, please, whatever we do, let's deal with it today. I would not support additional penalties. I do not think it is really fair to start talking about how Catherine Kloepfer's left and Moira Geer's left. I have talked with both of those former employees, and they were not blaming Russ Wyatt or citing Russ Wyatt as the reason they were leaving, so, all of which is hearsay. But I did not want that insinuation to be lying out there. So, I will go with, you know, this seems like a reasonable compromise, the motion you put forward, Mr. Mayor and Speaker Sharma. So, with some reluctance, I will certainly back it. But let's get this behind us and move onto something else.

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

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, a bit of a dilemma here. We are told it was the perspective from our Acting Integrity Commissioner from Calgary, that I am the boss of the CAO. When I was elected no one ever told me I was the boss of the CAO, that the CAO worked for me as an individual Councillor. Collectively as a Council, and only in this room, we hire the CAO. Thus, we may fire the CAO. That is my role, I believe, unless somebody wants to make a point of order. In this chamber only, I am involved in the process with my vote and my comments of hiring and firing the CAO. I still do not know if I am the boss of them. No one ever told me I was the boss of the CAO. But I am allowed to have a vote in firing the CAO, just like I hire the CAO, have my vote, in this chamber alone. I am not the boss of the police. I am not the boss of the Police Chief. I am a citizen outside this chamber like everybody else. In this chamber, I have a vote in hiring and firing the Police Chief and other members of the administration. I do not…we don't? The Police Board? Okay, there we go. And we elect a voting member to the Police Board from here. We have…oh, we decide their salaries. But I cannot tell a police officer what to do. And if the CAO does not respond to one of us, does not do what we ask, does that mean that the CAO is not doing their job? Oh, wait a minute. That is a grey area, because that can happen. But I am not

the boss of the CAO, to my understanding. And therefore, we have got a dilemma here. It is a bit of a grey area. But how do I say that Russ Wyatt is the boss of the CAO? And that is a pillar of the consideration here; that he can not speak of the CAO that way because he is the boss of the CAO. But I do not see it that way. I do not see myself that way. How can I see it in terms of Russ Wyatt? I have never called on anybody to resign here. But Council, and I believe the only way I can do this as a member of Council, I can move a motion, can we not? We can hire; we can move a motion to hire a CAO. We can move a motion to fire a CAO, can we not? Has someone ever said we cannot, the Council cannot fire the CAO? And if that is the case, we have to make the motion. Certainly, this is not so private these motions can be made public before the motion comes to Council. Therefore, it is the prerogative of any member of this Council to make a motion to fire the CAO. And presumably, they will make those comments publicly, and they will defend them publicly. Happens to be that it is being said that Councillor Wyatt has repeated his comments over and over again. I would have to perceive that as Councillor Wyatt continually defending his comments, and thus the comments get repeated or brought back up by the media, or whoever is asking him. Thus, they are repeated or brought back up again, as he defends what he did. So, it happens to be, in this city, it does not happen very often, but it happened here in Winnipeg, and it took place, some of it took place in this Council. I am going to make the argument not enough took place, because just before I got elected, we had this very issue in which it is already been decided by the provincial courts and this province. 14 counts, and a conviction. 14 counts against a previous CAO of the City, defended by the Court of Appeal, which the court said was nothing short of astonishing. Not in my words. That is the court's official record in defending the convictions against the previous CAO. Russ Wyatt was one of those few people that said that the CAO should be fired. Was he wrong? Did he do it wrong? Did he do it in a wrong way? He said that the CAO should be fired. And all right. He was told he was on the Human Resource Committee, but he was a member of Council. Was he not allowed to do that as a member of Council? Is one allowed to do that as a member of Council to say so? Am I allowed to say that? And on that basis, have we ever thanked Councillor Wyatt? Have we said in some way, shape or form he was inadequate in what he said? Oh, we know City Hall was inadequate. The whole system was inadequate. I mean, how does this happen? But at least Russ Wyatt said the CAO should be fired. Russ Wyatt did. Have we thanked him? You know, it took a lot out of…I am going to make the point that that took a lot out of City Hall. It took some of the heart and soul out of City Hall…

Councillor Rollins: (Inaudible) it is hard to not see this as Councillor Schreyer repeating a pattern that is harmful to Mike Jack. And so, while it is really difficult to talk and there is clearly differences of opinion, it is really hard not to see this as problematic for Mike Jack and, frankly, for us.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer, just a reminder, we have a motion before us.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes. I am referring to the motion. I would not have said any of this if it wasn't for the motion. I can not imagine saying anything I have just said right now if it wasn't for the motion on hand. I do not think I am referring to anything else. We have to look at…I think, maybe okay, I will bring it around in a few seconds here. We are talking about precedent. We are talking about example. Right here in Winnipeg. I am not talking about a theory. This really happened in Winnipeg. It really happened with a CAO. Look what the Supreme Court…what do I need to say? We are talking reality here. It happened. Not a theory. Not somewhere else, way in the past somewhere else. Right here in Winnipeg just 12 years ago. What am I…I do not know what to say. I am not talking theory. I am talking us. Some of us were on Council. I do not know what to say. It has taken the heart and soul out of it. You know what this does to demoralize our administration when this happens? And I said it last time, too. In his parting words, Brian Bowman said that we are still reeling. I do not want to put words in his mouth; I have to paraphrase now. We are still recovering from that era. Our former Mayor Brian Bowman just says we are still recovering from that era. How did we thank Russ Wyatt? I understand it maybe suits his personality. But was he wrong? I am glad he said it. It is unfortunate. I have never said such a thing. But am I supposed to say that what he said was wrong? So, now what do we do? Russ Wyatt has been right in the past. The court of Manitoba has proven it, and the Court of Appeal defended it. Brian Bowman said it himself, that we are still healing from this. Are we healed? What are we supposed to do without these tools? I am not sure. I am not sure. I do not want that to happen again. At least Russ Wyatt was there. This is not theory. This is the reality. And our previous Mayor just said we have not recovered from this. And it is not Russ Wyatt's fault.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next Speaker, Councillor Allard?

Councillor Allard: Yes, okay. I have quite a bit of notes on this, and I think I have analysed the documents that we are evaluating today. And so here we go. The process that we voted for. The process for an integrity complaint when the Integrity Commissioner finds a City Councillor has been involved in harassing a member of the public is outlined in By-law No. 19/2018. The Members of Council Code of Conduct By-law. So, October 24, I am looking at the Council minutes. It said that this report was moved by Councillor Eadie, and that it was carried and that Councillor Mayes was absent from the vote for the motion. There is a few comments I would like to make related to the conversation. The idea of going farther than what was already voted on, on the Code of Conduct does not sit well with me. I think the Code of Conduct is quite broad in the authorities we give the Integrity Commissioner to make the determination about a member of Council's conduct. And if we are to make the Code broader than it is, I think that we should do that and that we should judge the

Councillor's conduct based on the codes of conduct that are approved at that time. On this particular complaint, we are dealing with the older code of conduct, not the one that was passed in 2024. And so, that code we have already updated one time. It does, by the way, remove the word "harassment" but it does broaden the allowances for the integrity commissioner to look into a matter. Regarding the idea of the public versus the staff. The old Code of Conduct states that all members have a duty to treat members of the public, one another and staff with respect and without abuse. Harassment or intimidation…harassment includes any behaviour that a reasonable person should have known to be unwelcome and that is inappropriate, demeaning, embarrassing, or otherwise offensive. And so here, I think, is the heart of the matter in terms of the Code of Conduct and the text that we are judging and whether or not we agree with the Integrity Commissioner, so please bear with me. So, there are two conditions that need to be met. Any behaviour that a reasonable person should have known would be unwelcomed. Unwelcomed is one. And then there is a list of other words where it is any of the other words because the qualifier is or. So, inappropriate. We have unwelcome. If that is granted, then we have to decide if inappropriate, demeaning, humiliating, embarrassing, or otherwise offensive. In that list, the one word that stands out to me, in particular, is humiliating. And that is the one word that was taken out of the new Code of Conduct. We are, however, taking into account this complaint based on the older code, so I am using the language that was part of the code then. So, I do not think it is germane that the CAO was an employee, because as an employee, he is also a member of the public, which is also covered by the same provisions. And so, I do not think that is…I do not think that is an important determination in this debate. I think that is it. For me the…for me what has made this issue clear, is that one sentence about what harassment is. So, behaviour that would be unwelcome and any of these: Inappropriate, demeaning, humiliating, embarrassing, or otherwise offensive. So, based on that one sentence I think I agree with the Integrity Commissioner's evaluation. Going forward, if we as a Council think that we have too wide a net based on Council behavior we can change it. But I do not think that we should govern ourselves with something that is over and above the code that we have already voted on. And I guess that is maybe the last point is that whoever was in the room, I know I voted for this code, most of us voted for this code. It passed. And for that reason, I believe that I have endorsed that particular sentence, and reading the facts in the reports, I think that this sentence warrants the recommendation of the Integrity Commissioner. So, I will be supporting the Mayor's motion. I will not support going over and above what is already the code. And public life is already living under a microscope. We do need to hold staff accountable, and I think there is a way that we can do that and be respectful. So, I will leave my comments at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Maybe if the Mayor, when he closes, can just…I think what I am understanding…I am not sure if I am understanding this right, if we are actually going to do a reprimand at the next meeting and decide what that reprimand is. I am kind of not clear, under Item 3, that if apology is not given, that the next meeting we would decide on what that reprimand is. So maybe in his close, he can share. Like, I do not know who decides that. I know that when I was on the school board, we did this and we did remove somebody from the meeting, from the actual public meeting. And I think that that is very fair…you know, I do think that our words matter…

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy…Councillor Gilroy, if I may, I would like the Mayor to just speak to the reprimand in the meeting because it has come up before. If you would not mind, Mr. Mayor…I will come back to you….

Councillor Gilroy: Sure, yes. And then can I go back?

Mayor Gillingham: Through you, Madam Speaker, I offer to answer because it may change what my colleague is going to say, through you. No, the intention, through you Madam Speaker to Councillor Gilroy, is that we would deal with this today. This motion would be the reprimand, and the matter would be over today, if this is what Council agreed to. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. Well in that case, I do not believe that we just say verbally he is reprimanded. I do not agree with that. I think that, from my understanding of the policy when we worked on it, that we would be making decisions on what that would look like, whether that was a removal from one meeting...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Gilroy, I just wanted to interject. The public reprimand that is listed here in the motion is something that comes from the Integrity Commissioner as a recommendation, as well. So, it is a statement. Council…yes, okay. So that is coming from the Integrity Commissioner as a recommendation.

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. Yes, no, that is very helpful and I appreciate you interjecting because I…yes, that is helpful. I do think that as politicians, I mean, we are really struggling with what we are seeing down south and the changes in how people interact with us is changing. And I think, you know, how we communicate is really, really important. I think there is a way, I agree with Councillor Allard, there is totally a way that we can communicate and still have disagreements and still

show how unhappy we are. And I think that, and I also think that I do want to talk about Councillor Eadie put some really good words on the table, too, to remind people it was not necessarily that he is the employee or any such thing. There are other things around that, and Councillor Eadie said that a little bit more poetically than I can. So, comments that were made very publicly and, you know what, I think that it is very disturbing to find out that, you we have had two chances, and he is not listening to what our Integrity Commissioner has said. So, I am going to support this, but I do think that Councillor Rollins is right. I can not believe on the school board; we had the ability to remove somebody from one public meeting. Actually, it was actually three public meetings that we removed the person from, and we do not have that same access here is concerning. Because I do think that we, as Councillors and politicians, need to be setting the bar higher. And I found it very hard to come back and work with our Public Service, and I have had to build up trust with our Public Service because they did not trust me. That is because of how they were treated in the past on the information that they were given to other Councillors, and that hurts everybody because that hurts not only the Councillors, but it also hurts, you know, the public that we are trying to serve…. if they do not feel that they have information…

Councillor Schreyer: People got it that way, got demoralized, because of how they were treated by the senior administration.

Madam Speaker: Order. Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Gilroy has the floor. It is especially difficult to hear because she is presenting remotely.

Councillor Gilroy: Oh, sorry. That is okay, I am done. I just…I will support this, but I do want to raise a concern that something maybe Governance should take back and really talk to our Integrity Commissioner about, like we need more than just we are reprimanding. I think that, you know, the public needs more, right? And I think that if we want to be held to a higher regard, we got to hold ourselves to a higher regard, right? And so, I hope that that gets taken back by the Governance Committee that is listening here today. Thanks, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Mr. Mayor to close. Oh, Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to think that I get along with every member of Council here, and have the ability to communicate effectively with them. I also like to believe that I get along very well with our Public Service. And when questioning can ask questions in a civil manner that provides a response to the question I am asking. I say that only because I have been in a Standing Policy meeting, and I do not know if I am conflating issues here, but I have been in a Standing Policy Committee where Councillor Wyatt has made comments, not necessarily against our Public Service, but against other members of our community. In a particular incident, it was some derogatory comments that were made to a cycling community. I say that, I raise that, again, to demonstrate that there is a pattern of lack of restraint in terms of the comments that are being made. So, if anything, a consequence has got to be set so that it prohibits that kind of language or that kind of sentiment from being stated. Not to muzzle an individual, but to use better words to express or convey concerns, or to ask a question to get a proper response. So again, the consequence here has to be fitting in order to give pause whenever this particular Councillor is addressing somebody, whether it is part of a Public Service or part of a group that is speaking in delegation at a Standing Policy Committee, Executive Policy Committee, or at Council. So again, it is a pattern of behaviour that we are trying to change. And so maybe the consequence should match the condemnation that Councillor Wyatt expressed, and hopefully, give him pause for using better language, more appropriate language, in this context. So again, just a reprimand, I do not know that that would do that. But certainly, having a consequence fitting the actions that he took, I think, would serve this, the interest of our Council better. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Mr. Mayor, to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the comments of each of our colleagues. I won't say much, but just simply to say, just I want to wrap up with a couple of things. The Councillor in question here when he was making his statement said something to the effect of fulfilling our higher calling effectively. I truly believe, and I think we all in this Chamber believe, we can fulfil our higher calling of elected office in a manner that is consistent with the member's Code of Conduct. When he cites freedom of speech, we all know that yes, there is laws around freedom of speech, but freedom of speech in this country does not mean you can say anything at any time. We are not base animals, or whatever the case may be. We can…we have the ability to discipline ourselves, our comments and our conduct. We put the Member's Code of Conduct in place as a Council. It was a Council decision. We supported it. We established an Integrity Commissioner because we said that is important to us. The Acting Integrity Commissioner has presented to us a report. Her findings and recommendations are that we have options in what we do in the case that the Councillor in question does not issue an apology. He has not done so. I do appreciate that other Councillors around this Chamber believe we should come down on a different recommendation and a different outcome, and a different level of treatment. The motion is before us. I certainly respect how anyone and everyone will vote at this time. But I think all of this to say, and several Councillors here have said it here already and I thank them for it, is a reminder to all of us that we can do our jobs with diligence and

effectively, holding the Public Service to account. We can do so in a manner, though, that is consistent with the rules of the Code of Conduct that we established and we agreed to. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I will call the vote. All in favour please rise. All in favour of Motion 4 as presented, please rise…just the motion. That is the only vote on this matter. Mr. Clerk?

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Santos, Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Rollins and Schreyer.

City Clerk: The vote, Madam Speaker. Yeas 12, Nays 2.

Madam Speaker: Motion forward carries. Councillor Mayes will you move adjournment.

Councillor Mayes: So moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will have roll call, Mr. Clerk.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma. His worship, Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, and Gilroy.

Council adjourned at 5:11 p.m.