# COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

# Thursday, March 27, 2025

**The Council met at 9:52 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.

The opening prayer was read by Councillor Browaty.

## ROLL CALL

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

## INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. It's wonderful to see Clerk Brenden Harris in the chamber with us for the first time today. Welcome. Yes, let's give him a round. We'll now introduce our pages for today's meeting; Sally Leask from Churchill High School who resides in the St. Vital Ward, and Vladyslav Tanasiichuk from St. James Collegiate who resides in the St. James Ward. Welcome. Thank you for serving Council today. We'll now move into morning announcements. Councillor Mayes? Oh, Mr. Mayor, of course, you first.

**Mayor Gillingham:** I can go either way. That is fine. Thank you. Appreciate that. Good morning, Madam Speaker. I want to begin by wishing everybody in advance a wonderful and safe spring break next week. I know many people will be taking a bit of time to be renewed and refreshed as schools are closed next week and the City of Winnipeg Public Service libraries, recreation, community centres and indoor pools offer a variety of fun and cost-effective activities for kids and for families. For those looking for some spring break fun. I want to congratulate the Royal Winnipeg Ballet on a successful fundraising event this last Saturday evening. Marla and I, my wife, were pleased to attend the ballet's first annual masquerade ball, as the RWB is celebrating 85 years of dance. And then, earlier this week, Graham Avenue, in front of the Royal Winnipeg Ballet campus, was designated as Honourary Andre Lewis Way in recognition of Andre's extraordinary 50-year career with the RWB. His leadership and artistic vision have shaped the RWB into one of the world's premier dance companies. And so, it was great to pay tribute to his legacy. Want to just take a moment, too, to welcome Christopher Stowell who is moving to the RWB. He's coming in from Seattle to take over the reigns as the RWB's new artistic director. I want to thank the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce for organizing another successful State of the City luncheon. I also had the opportunity to meet with the Chamber board of directors yesterday to discuss priorities that we share; revitalizing downtown, improving public safety, driving economic development, enhancing city services and investing in infrastructure. All are critical to Winnipeg's future, and all are focuses that this Council has placed a lot of emphasis on over the past two-plus years. Also wanted to note that as I stated in the State of the City, this federal election that is now upon us is a time for us, a time of opportunity. I will be focused on…in this election on calling for further bail and criminal code changes to keep repeat violent offenders off our streets. Also in the call is a further investment and strategy related to rehabilitating those who are coming out of prison so that they have a better chance of success and are less likely to reoffend. And so, I invite all councillors to…who are willing, to join me in that call and speaking to candidates who are running elected office. Finally, today, on behalf of all of Council, I want to offer my deepest condolences to the family of Ashlee Shingoose, as well as to Chief Flett and the Council of Saint Theresa Point First Nation. I had the opportunity to speak with Ashlee's parents, Theresa and Albert, the other evening and offer my condolences on behalf of all of us and offer them our support. Ashlee Shingoose, Morgan Harris, Marcedes Myran and Rebecca Contois mattered. And their lives and the loss of their lives continues to be felt through our city, across our province and across our country. As mayor, I'm committed to supporting the search of Brady Landfill so that Ashlee can be returned home. And more of that to come related to a search and the details of that are yet to be worked out. But as I said, when I spoke to Albert and Theresa, Ashlee's parents, I offered not only my condolences, but the condolences of every member of this council, as well, to them. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We'll hear from Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you. Thanks to the mayor for those comments. A serious matter and I don't want to take away from the seriousness of what he had said. Two items I wanted to mention. First, I spent four hours Monday night watching varsity basketball finals, watching Dakota Collegiate, my old school, lose both ends of a doubleheader; girls and boys. But Councillor Schreyer is going to come to that. So, I will rise to congratulate the varsity…junior varsity girls. I should have gone to that game. Kelly Ryback invited me to go to that game. So, the Dakota junior varsity girls were the provincial champions this year in basketball. And I also wanted to say a few words in memoriam for one of the senior civil servants who had been here for…many of us overlapped with Clive Wightman. Only three years older than me who passed away recently. Often, people have good, long retirements, so the councillors they worked with have moved on. That is not the case here. Many of us would have worked with Clive. I think I once said on the floor of Council, nobody argued more with Clive Wightman than me. And there's some truth in that, but the anecdote I'll tell is just this. Near the end of his career, somebody came to see me and said, you know, that guy, all he does is prefer inner-city kids. And I laughed and said, well, I've actually accused him of, you know…but no, all he does is prefer suburban kids. And I've said, I've accused him of the opposite, only caring about inner-city kids. Then the person laughed and said, yeah, but I'm right, eh? And I said, no, I've…so, I said to Clive afterwards, I had this epiphany that Clive actually cared a lot about all kids. He had a job like ours though, in some ways, he had to balance interests. If he was somewhat pissing off everybody, he was probably doing a pretty good job, was what I came. And luckily, I was able to share that with him before he left the City. So, Clive cared a lot about kids. I think Clive did a good job for all parts of the city, in retrospect. And you know, we sometimes argue with our civil servants, I certainly did with Clive, but he cared deeply. And I remember saying…him saying to us in about 2012, Councillor Browaty was there, do not cut the Aboriginal youth funding. That is the best million dollars you spend. And we never did and I think part of that was Clive…Clive's influence. So, thank you.

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

**Councillor Schreyer:** Sure, thank you, Madam Speaker. And encouraging the development of our youth, one important aspect of that is to encourage youth in sport. And on that basis, I would like to gloat for a moment and congratulate the Kildonan East Collegiate Reevers AAA…sorry, AAAA, boys varsity basketball team for capping off a perfect season of basketball winning the provincial championships on Monday night. And this is the second provincial title in the school's history, and its first since 1990. And congratulations to the Kildonan East boys varsity basketball team. Also, to the girls basketball team for having a good season and trying hard as well. And that's the most important thing. I also want to congratulate…kudos to Councillor Brian Mayes for sitting through the entire championships on Monday and having to bear witness to the fact that the Kildonan East Collegiate Reevers beat the Dakota Lancers 67-52 for the provincial finals. Thank you. Miigwech.

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

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's been three years since families have asked the City of Winnipeg to search landfills. And I want to acknowledge the families and community in mourning. I want to acknowledge the 2SMMIWG implementation committee in Manitoba for standing by the family's sides, the community's side. And I want to acknowledge that the initial decision of this city was not to search. And consider the words of Chief Bowers in acknowledging that fact. The remains of Morgan Harris, (inaudible) and Marcedes Myran (inaudible) and Ashlee Shingoose (inaudible) have had a significant impact on the families and the community. And while we have had time for reflection in this nearly…it feels like four years, Madam Speaker, and we can't undo the past, it is important to stand and acknowledge how important it is to privilege dignity and privilege those things that would resolve the violence against women and girls. One of those things, Madam Speaker, is on the agenda today – the Welcoming Winnipeg initiative. We also have opportunity as the whole city does on the structure for reconciliation of the Indigenous Accord. We also have a co-development of the biodiversity plan with CIR. We have Naawi-Oodena, and the municipal services agreement. Madam Speaker, we have structures of reconciliation, we have structures that would prevent the genocide that is murdered and missing Indigenous women and girls. It is time to lean into all of these things. But I do want to acknowledge the words of the Chief just days ago. It is a new day for families that have their loved ones back. And I want to acknowledge that, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Next is Councillor Wyatt. And our final speaker, Councillor Chambers.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Miigwech to the statement by Councillor Rollins. I would just like to rise. Last night the Railers Express hockey team in Transcona tied the series up against the Charleswood Hawks. And we're going down to the best of seven. Councillor Duncan and I have a bit of an honourable competition whereby when, of course, the Transcona Railers Express wins the series, he'll be wearing the Railers Express jersey in the Council chamber at the next meeting. As well as I think the agreement was that he will be purchasing a luncheon. I will attend, of course, with him at the Dal's restaurant in Transcona. And in the unlikely event that the Charleswood Hawks should win, I will be wearing the Charleswood Hawks

jersey here in the Council chamber a month from now along with purchasing him, at a restaurant of his choice, a lunch in Charleswood. It's a great series. Last night we have had some players, unfortunately, injured. My thoughts are with Nathan Turner and his family who had a ruptured spleen at the last game of the St. James. We knocked out the St. James Junior Canucks and now we're going on to, hopefully, win the entire series. But, of course, it's good hockey. Great hockey to watch. We had a packed arena last night at the East End Arena. And I look forward to attending the next game in Charleswood to the same packed arena of fans on both sides. And all the best to the players of all the families and all the kids who are playing. They are playing with their hearts and minds. And it is a wonderful sport to watch with this kind of enthusiasm on the ice. And may the best team win, and we know which team that is. So, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Take care.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Our final speaker, Councillor Chambers, Deputy Mayor.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today to pay congratulations to the University of Manitoba's women's volleyball team who won a national championship for the first time in 11 years. And they did so on home court. Such a great feat. Coach Ken Bentley of the University of Manitoba women's volleyball team, you know, has two daughters, a daughter and a stepdaughter that are playing on the team in their final year. And I know this is, you know, tremendously exciting for him as residents of the St. Norbert and Seine River Ward. So, congratulations, again, to the women's volleyball team on winning national championship right here on their home court at the University of Manitoba 2025. National champions. So, again, congratulations.

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

## MINUTES

Councillor Chambers moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on February 27, 2025, be taken as read and confirmed.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? That's carried. Onto delegations. We've got a request to suspend the rules for additional delegations. Councillor Chambers?

**Councillor Chambers:** I provided a list to the clerks on requesting suspension of the rules to allow, I believe, it's nine people to speak.

**Madam Speaker:** 10.

**Councillor Chambers:** 10 people to speak.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, and those names are? Mr. Clerk, I believe you have it. I do have a copy here. Tracey Turner, Dr. Shelley Sweeney, Eric Reder (the Wilderness Committee), Dr. Ann Loewen, Patrick Neilan, Mireille Lamontagne, Stacey Gosman, Ken Harasym from the Council…I'm not sure what the organization is, excuse me. And Cat Gauthier.

**Councillor Chambers:** And…

**Madam Speaker:** One more?

**Councillor Chambers:** Yeah, Katharina Stiffenhofer.

**Madam Speaker:** Yes, thank you.

**Councillor Chambers:** And five-minutes each to speak.

**Madam Speaker:** Five minutes, no questions. And this is regarding PP&D Notice of Motion No. 1 on the Lemay Forest.

**Councillor Chambers:** Correct.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Point of order, Madam Speaker, I believe (inaudible) is via Zoom. In the case of Tracey Turner that will help…assist the clerks.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. So, Councillor Chambers moves the suspension of rules. Five minutes, no questions. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. First delegation, Mr. Clerk.

## DELEGATIONS

**Clerk:** First delegation is Dr. Erin Millions, Welcoming Winnipeg Committee of Community Members, in opposition to Item 1 – Executive Policy Committee – Notice of Motion (Welcoming Winnipeg Policy Review).

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. The delegation is here with us today. Dr. Erin, welcome.

**Erin Millions:** Thank you. Good morning, Mayor Gillingham, councillors. My name is Dr. Erin Millions. I'm a faculty member in the Department of History at the University of Winnipeg where I research and teach Indigenous histories. I'm also a public historian, meaning that part of my work as a historian is to translate historical research done primarily by academics to public audiences. And I have done that work through a variety of settings; through Parks Canada, through the CMHR, Canadian Geographic, the BBC and the Manitoba Indigenous Tuberculosis History Project. I have also been a member of the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee of Community Members since its founding in August 2020. The CCM is a committee of volunteers appointed based on our expertise in relation to the Welcoming Winnipeg policy and the only city committee that works by consensus. Now, over the years I have met and spoken to several of you in-person, on the phone, by e-mail in relation to recommendations made by the CCM for which I thank you for your time and your interest. Now, I had prepared a different speech today. One that responds specifically to the motion and is based on conversations that the CCM had with Mayor Gillingham in a very fruitful, productive meeting earlier this month. Those specific details are available in a written submission that you can look at. Because instead, as we contemplate the future of the Welcoming Winnipeg initiative, I want to offer a history lesson. Now, as I often do when I am teaching my students, I'm going to begin in the present. And this time I begin with four names: Marcedes Myran, Morgan Harris, Rebecca Contois and Ashlee Shingoose. And in doing so, I honour the lives of these women and the pain that their families have gone through. I also want to thank Mayor Gillingham for his comments at the press conference yesterday. My husband, Perry Bloomquist, is in the audience. He's a First Nations archeologist with a specialty in forensics and one of the team leads at the Prairie Green Landfill excavation. And Mayor Gillingham, he brought your comments to my attention. But I also want to talk about the truth part of truth and reconciliation with a reminder that it's not just reconciliation. It is truth and reconciliation. And the truth is that these four women's tragic murders are part of the missing and murdered women and girls and two-spirit epidemic in Winnipeg. And in Winnipeg specifically, part of the roots of that epidemic began with the arrival of Wolseley's troops in Red River in 1870. And following on their arrival, those troops enacted sexual assaults against First Nations and Métis women with impunity. And their cohort condoned those acts of violence against Indigenous women. Many of those same troops who enacted those sexual assaults or condoned those sexual assaults remained in Winnipeg and became the city's founding fathers after 1870, including leading businessmen, a sheriff of Manitoba, a northwest mounted police officer, members of the legislative assembly, Manitoba mayors, a Manitoba attorney general, and that is just a partial list. So, those same men who had arrived to enact violence against Indigenous peoples in retaliation against Louis Riel and his supporters stayed to establish the structures of power and authority in our province that has continued to marginalize Indigenous women, including a lack of care for their deaths. Now, in the present again, when we look at the epidemic of unhoused peopled in our city and the disproportionately high number of Indigenous people among them, that present, our present today, is a direct result of the dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their lands. And in Winnipeg specifically from the federal government's failure to act honourably in meeting the terms of the Manitoba Act of 1870 to distribute the lands promised to Métis children and in the failure to honour the commitments made in the numbered treaties. It's also the result of the specific and intended family and community disruptions that were intended by the residential school system, the day school system and the child welfare system. And I will note that so far, only one of the four residential schools that existed in Winnipeg has been commemorated. An unwelcoming Winnipeg for Indigenous peoples is rooted in these same histories. And in the erasure of the Indigenous histories of this city by those same men who arrived with Wolseley's troops, who enacted violence and who perpetuated those same structures of power and subsequent leaders who filled their roles after them. Winnipeggers have benefited from the dispossession of Indigenous peoples for at least 150 years. And for 150 years or so, the erasure of Indigenous histories from representation in Winnipeg's histories of our city is part of these same systems of racism and discrimination and colonialism that have resulted in an epidemic of missing, murdered and Indigenous women and two-spirit people and unhoused Indigenous people in our city. So, as we contemplate the Welcoming Winnipeg policy, I want to remind you that we are talking about more than just what a park is named or not named. I am speaking against the motion as presented today because we have to choose to speak for or against. And we speak specifically against the motion as presented now because we have asked the Mayor to amend his motion to more specifically represent the mandate of Welcoming Winnipeg and to allow the CCM to submit a written response to Merrel-Ann Phare's report on recommended changes to the Welcoming Winnipeg policy. The CCM does, however, agree that changes to the Welcoming Winnipeg policy are necessary. We have already recommended several amendments over the

years that have not gone forward from Council. And we hope that these changes will address specific points of friction in the policy. We also fully support Phare's recommendation that a budget line be dedicated to the Welcoming Winnipeg policy. As our Chair, Elder Dr. Albert McLeod, argues, not funding a policy is a policy in itself. Most importantly, the CCM insists that the core mandate of the Welcoming Winnipeg policy to resolve the absence of Indigenous perspective, experiences and contributions in Winnipeg's municipal heritage scape in order to make Winnipeg a more welcoming place for Indigenous peoples remain intact. In order to do this, and particularly at a moment of limited financial resources, support for truth through naming and commemoration must prioritize first Indigenous histories and secondly other Winnipeg communities whose histories are underrepresented in Winnipeg, which the CCM has supported throughout our mandate including commemorations acknowledging south Asian, Sikh, Filipino, Iranian and Francophone communities in Winnipeg. This means that communities who are used to hearing yes, whose histories are already overrepresented in Winnipeg municipal spaces because of the operation of these powers…systems of power that I've referred to are going to need to hear 'no' for a while. They are going to need to hear no, because we have a lot of catching up to do to achieve even a minimal baseline of 18% naming of parks, just parks in Winnipeg, to represent the 18% and growing population of Indigenous peoples in Winnipeg. Some of the proposed changes will move this along, but the CCM first and foremost needs Mayor and Council to be on board with and provide leadership on saying no to people who are used to hearing yes, because that is leadership in reconciliation. Thank you for your time.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Dr. Millions, there is an opportunity to ask questions. If I could ask you, Dr. Erin, to come back to the podium, please. And procedurally, no representations from the gallery, please, throughout the proceedings today.

**Erin Millions:** Sorry, I don't know what to do here.

**Madam Speaker:** Come…come to the podium, yes. Okay, just one moment. We do have another delegation, so I will ask you to be on the bench here, opposed to the gallery. Thank you. And we will call you back for questions. Next is Dr. Mary LeMaître who is also appearing in opposition to this item. We'll have five minutes on the clock. And then we will take questions concurrently for both delegations. Welcome.

**Mary LeMaître:** Hi. (Speaking multiple languages) Greetings, good morning, Mayor Gillingham and Council and my fellow citizens. My name is Dr. Mary LeMaître. I am a professor at the University of Winnipeg. I specialize in the analysis of social discourse. That is everything that is said, written and illustrated in a society at a particular point in time. And my research is on stereotypes about Indigenous peoples in Canada. So, where those stereotypes come from, how they affect our relationship, how they hold colonial structures in place and how we can change them. I am also the communications person and the vice-chair of KAIROS for this region. What's KAIROS? Think churches and the blanket exercise which some of you may have already done. And last but not least, as you know, I am a member of Welcoming Winnipeg. Here in Canada, we have a history of erasing Indigenous languages and voices and peoples and history from the common space. Some of the policies that Canada has created that have done this are the Indian Act, which puts Indigenous peoples in a separate, less-funded system. It was used to create residential schools. It was used to create the pass system and also the Peasant Farming Act. So, Indigenous peoples, although they were here before we arrived, and are still here, were made invisible by all of these policies. And so, a lot of us didn't learn any history or culture or anything about, you know, Indigenous peoples and their languages. And when we think about our history here in Canada and history of Winnipeg, for example, we usually start with when we arrive. But before we arrived, there were Indigenous peoples and they made treaties with us. They invited us into the family relationship. And they are our partners. And so, for the longest time we did not see them. It was only probably in 2010 when we had our Truth and Reconciliation Commission that people became aware of part of Indigenous history. I know I didn't know anything about residential schools before 2010. And then, in 2012, Idle No More started and so Indigenous voices, Indigenous history, Indigenous language, Indigenous culture started to become visible to us. In 2015, McLeans declared Winnipeg to be the most racist city in Winnipeg. And so, the city responded and we created the Indigenous Accord. And part of the reason that we got stuff like that done is because, I don't know if you know, but we have the most amazing Indigenous partners here…treaty partners here in Winnipeg. They create new systems, new and better and more just systems that are adopted across the country. So, if you're wondering if you are fortunate to be living in Winnipeg and to be having the treaty partners that you do, the answer is a definite yes. So, in 2015, was the closing of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. And there are three calls that are really pertinent to what you do as city councillors and to what Welcoming Winnipeg does. The first one is call to action 57 which is professional development and training for public servants so that they learn about this history and they understand why it is so important to be making changes for things that include Indigenous people and Indigenous history and make them visible for everyone, because we all are learning. And so, it is important that you as city councillors help to promote that learning environment. Can I have…

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer moves extension of two minutes.

**Mary LeMaître:** Okay, two-minutes? Thanks.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Mary LeMaître:** Okay, thanks. Okay, call to action number 79: including Indigenous representations. So, that is monuments, parks, that sort of thing. And then, call to action 92 which is including Indigenous people in decisions and employment and that sort of thing in business. So, why have they asked…by the way, go to Catholics for Truth and Reconciliation. Number 57. Please be proud our Indigenous Accord is an example of a good 57. So, why are they asking? Why are we asking? Why is a call of…are the calls to action asking us to do these things? It's because Indigenous peoples have been excluded. They have been invisible. And they should not be. They are our partners. So, we want to be walking beside each other and we want to include them. And so, that is why Welcoming Winnipeg, you know, is renaming things so that the Indigenous part of our community and of our history is visible to people. And that we are walking together in a good way as partners. Thank you very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. We now we have questions. If I could ask both the speakers to be at the podium. Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Rollins.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. And Dr. Millions and Dr. LeMaître, thank you for coming here today. Just on a personal note, I have been blessed with two children, two sons, one of them is Indigenous. And so, it means a lot to me to hear it. And thank you for your history, Dr. Millions, taking us back to the founding of this province and the history we have not heard. I just wanted to note, as well, that I arrived on Council originally back in 2002 under then the leadership of Mayor Glen Murray. Glen Murray…Mayor Murray, to his credit, brought forward what was then referred to Aboriginal Pathways. A policy which at the time advocated many things. But one of the things that it advocated for was urban First Nations in the city.

**Madam Speaker:** Question, Councillor Wyatt. Placed through the Chair. Thank you.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yeah, fair enough. And it was quite controversial at the time amongst the public. Council came together, though, voted unanimously after all the information was received and we started on that path. And I just wanted to say thank you for the work that you are doing, and Welcoming Winnipeg. I could tell you…just are you aware…I have to put it in a form of a question. Are you aware that some of us feel there is a disconnect and we want to have a better connect? And as somebody from my…are you aware of my ward, I have the last…in this term alone, we have passed a number of subdivisions. We have a whole list…I have a whole list of parks that are unnamed that I would like to bring forward to your committee. I also have a small list of parks in my ward that community members have come forward because they have done things. We lost somebody, tragically, to a car accident, young lady, they want a name. So, we were talking about five or six names, but it was probably about…I am not being…exaggerating to say there's probably around 12 to 15 or more parks, maybe even as far as 20 in these new neighbourhoods that are coming that is an opportunity for Welcoming Winnipeg. What would you suggest is the process for me to be able to follow that I could forward to you, maybe informally, even? One of the parks, for example, we had land set aside and we want to get all our schools involved, is we want to call it mother…mother…Mother Earth Nature Park. And we've done a design that's Indigenous working with landscape architects. We'd like to share it with you. What sort of…how could I…we do this…you know, we're so formal here with our processes. How could I do this informally? I'll forward it to you, what would you suggest? I need some guidance…

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you for the question.

**Erin Millions:** Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. I agree on the disconnect in the relationship building. And when we met with the Merrell-Ann Phare in the fall, and with the Mayor earlier in the year, and again with the Mayor this month, one of our key points of recommendations is that a disconnect has developed between Council and the CCM. And we need to do some relationship building to bring us back on the same team for that. I am not going to offer specific policy recommendations because that is not my forte. I am a historian. I will say that the CCM and IRD has already over the years made several recommendations to reduce the points of friction that have become a problem. And some of that is recommended in the report. So, there is opportunity. And I think what is most important is that the CCM, IRD, Mayor and Council all commit to moving forward with Welcoming Winnipeg in a way that reduces those points of friction but continues to centre that mandate of Welcoming Winnipeg. I will also note that I mentioned that we are the only city committee that works by consensus. So, asking us to register here to speak for or against doesn't reflect the nuance with which we work, right? We are also…we are an Indigenous-led committee. At minimum, 50% of our members are Indigenous. And in the past, our Indigenous members have come to speak to Council. In this instance, Mary and I, specifically, as non-Indigenous members of the Council have come to have those conversations about amendments and how we can come together to move forward. I would recommend that IRD take the lead in recommending policy changes with consultation with the CCM because that is not our specialty. We can offer advice from our perspective and our experience. I would be happy not to

have to call or e-mail you, any of you, ever again in recommendation in support of one of our recommendations. Not that I don't enjoy coming and talking to all of you, but I didn't know that's what I was signing up for when I volunteered for the CCM. So, I can offer those reflections, but I think I need to leave specific points of policy to IRD.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second…

**Mary LeMaître:** Can I add something? One of the things that has happened in Canada is that because of stereotypes and that sort of thing, is…and colonial structures, is that Indigenous peoples become peoples that we talk about instead of entering into relationship and talking to. So, just make sure if you are...you know, you've got ideas for naming the park, please get ideas from Indigenous peoples so that they can give you input, as well, so that it's actually a partnership relationship. Yeah.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question.

**Councillor Wyatt:** And it's on that note, actually, I really appreciate both of your responses. It's on that note that I would like to be able to ideally forward something informally to the committee in terms of here's…I'm putting together the various areas that have been approved in future developments, identifying…like, just for the sake now, part A, B, C, D for you to be able to look at for naming. And the name that I was mentioning on remaining of existing parks in my community which are non-Indigenous related, most of them. But there's about six of those, we're talking about 12 and up to 20 in the new neighbourhoods. And so, how would you be…best…do you think it's for that, do informally, or what would be the best…just a letter with the…maybe the attachment of all the material and come and speak to one of your meetings or something, or to explain it all if there's questions of your committee. What do you suggest in terms of that dialogue?

**Erin Millions:** So, first of all, I would love if more Councillors came to talk to us at our…at our meetings. We would love to do that sort of relationship building. However, I don't want to receive any of that, which is not to say it is not important, but this is why we have been consistently recommending that there is a specific budget line for Welcoming Winnipeg in part to support the massive amount of work that IRD has taken on without additional resources. There are points of procedure that we have recommended that we continue to work…we can continue to work on as we amend the policy to address those concerns. But also, without downloading additional work onto the committee members because we are, at the end of the day, volunteers that are providing our expertise to the City for free. And so, it is IRD who needs additional support and additional resources and a budget line for Welcoming Winnipeg to help address that with you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Final question, Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** When you say budget line, you're saying…IRD has a budget line, but you're saying a budget…there's no budget being to Welcoming Winnipeg?

**Erin Millions:** They have received no additional resources specifically to support the work of Welcoming Winnipeg or the CCM. They have been working within their existing budget to accommodate the significant increase in workload related to Welcoming Winnipeg.

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

**Councillor Rollins:** With respect to a motion, you've…I was just confirming with the Mayor. I do think there is one in the works. But I wanted to confirm with you. One, you are looking at asking for an amendment to align closely with Welcoming Winnipeg's purpose. And two, allow for a report…a response from the citizen committee opposite Merrell-Ann Phare's report. What time…usually we point to a time to allocate this. And normally we…we direct the Public Service, which is IRD. And I thought it was a bit ironic that we would be directing something to IRD that they had actually reported to Council thoughts over the years on Welcoming Winnipeg. So, I want to ask you for that timeline because you are volunteers. You have held your hand up to volunteer for the City for this specific purpose of Welcoming Winnipeg, i.e. resolving the absence of Indigenous names, placemaking. And so, if you could shape that motion for me, my first question is, what would be your timeline? And I will start with that question.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. The response.

**Erin Millions:** Thank you, Councillor Rollins. There's a couple of answers to that. So, I will speak specifically to the response to the report.

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Erin Millions:** Reconstitution of the committee of community members is currently on hold. I am not currently officially a member of the CCM because we are waiting for our terms to be renewed and new committee members to be put in place to continue that work forward. So, in part, we need that to happen. The CCM, in collaboration with IRD, could create a response to the report within 60 days. And I want to point out, it is not in opposition to the report because we agree with many of the key recommendations in the report, but we had requested to be able to read a draft and provide feedback to make sure that our key recommendations were reflected in the report. Some of them are, but some of them are not. So, it is an addition to the report as opposed to writing against the report.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you.

**Councillor Rollins:** Yes, thank you for that clarification. Are you aware that our Procedural By-law, when committee members, citizen committee members, are appointed and they are not replaced, that you, in fact, continue? Something I learned as Human Rights Chair recently when I neither appointed people in the term's stead and so had to call a bunch. Are you aware of that?

**Erin Millions:** I am not aware. Thank you for that.

**Councillor Rollins:** And so, to confirm once more, you think 60 days for a…for a collaborative draft to provide feedback with respect to the report. I could actually support a motion like that. I could support some of the basics. I, too, was looking for a budget for a long time for IRD and Welcoming Winnipeg. I wouldn't be able to support part two of the motion as presented because it contradicts the purpose of Welcoming Winnipeg and, I believe, Merrell-Ann Phare's report. So, let's see what can be done here.

**Erin Millions:** Thank you, Councillor Rollins.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer, will you move a two-minute extension? Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Last speaker, Mayor Gillingham.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, colleagues for the…

**Councillor Schreyer:** Is there an opportunity to respond to Councillor Rollins'…what was meant to be a question, I guess?

**Madam Speaker:** Do you wish to respond to that, or have you?

**Erin Millions:** I will pass, thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Said your piece. Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. I want to thank my colleagues for the extension. And I want to thank both of you. And not for your…not only for your presentation today, but for your ongoing work. And I appreciate the dialogue we have been able to have. And you know, I think, Dr. Millions, your words of the points of friction for sure are evident. And that, ultimately, is a goal that we have before us here is to move forward in a way that we can really achieve the ultimate goals of reconciliation. And I appreciate your comments today and your presentation, as well. And I guess I have two…so, just thank you to you, be it all of the community…committee members, thank you so much for all of your work. Thank you, also, to IRD. Some members are here today who do the work. I have two, I guess, questions. One, I want to thank you for assistance, too, in the motion I'm going to bring forward today. The first part of it, certainly, is specifically, actually, the words you just spoke about a restructuring of the policy to focus exclusively on resolving the absence of Indigenous experience, perspective and contributions. And so, I think that that will get us back to the point that we are trying to…really need to achieve. I…the sentiment, I absolutely echo the Chair that we as a Council need to be working in partnership with you, and you and with us so that together the collective…collectively we share a vision and a goal, really, to…really, to do that. To establish the policy that really does deal with and address the absence of Indigenous experience, perspective and contributions. My final comment or question…my question to you is this, quickly. We are calling here in this motion for a report back from our Public Service, IRD, within 120 days. Would you be willing to submit your response to Merrell-Ann Phare's report to all of Council and then also to the IRD community team so that it could be considered when they are developing the report?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

**Erin Millions:** Thanks, Mayor Gillingham. And we have had conversations about…about the…about what the mandate of the Welcoming Winnipeg needs to be. And I thank you for your listening and your response to our concerns about the

wording of the motion. Our goal is to be able to provide a written response, yes, that will move forward with the report because it is to be considered as the foundation for changes to Welcoming Winnipeg. So, my answer is yes. We can read the (inaudible) we provide that written response.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. And are you aware that if things go, if I had my way, the community of committee members would never, ever have to appear before Council again. The moment you were here, the moments you have been here, I've thought, okay, this is not working, right? Because this is not the way the structure should be set up, that you as community members would have to come and advocate for your own report. So, if it works well, you know, we get the outcome that I hope we get, you know, that…that would never have to happen again. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. That concludes questions. Thank you for your presentation today. Our next delegation is Kelly Ryback who is appearing on two items as listed on the Delegations page of our agenda. Welcome, Kelly, to the podium. There will be 10 minutes on the clock. Following that will be Diane Bousquet and then Louise May. Welcome.

**Kelly Ryback:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Mr. Mayor, fellow…and Councillors. Pleasure to be here today. The first item I would like to speak to is on the motion for the Housing Accelerator Fund. Councillor Mayes' motion, support of Wyatt, of having every ward having a public open house last discussion. I have been engaged with this item since the fall of 2023. I attended the first Zoom meeting. I attended the open house. I attended two of Councillor Mayes' sessions. And what has become apparent, number two, first is that several residents don't know the existing process and they are not sure of what this Housing Accelerator Fund with a four…up to four-plex, up to four-stories, means to their community, to their neighbourhood, to the properties adjacent or their opportunities. Secondly, that there is information that is not included in the presentations that has only come out in questions or has actually not been addressed that could only have the opportunity to be brought forward in continuous open houses. And specifically at the ward level. And I want to cite the example of when neighbourhood open houses were held for the Master Transit Plan that, again, another item that I've engaged in from the onset of the since April 2021. And through my efforts and in promoting and in providing information to the St. James community, at the St. James Civic Centre had an excellent turnout. And as a result of all that, there were changes to three roads receiving transit service that was going to be discontinued in the original Transit Master Plan. So, that is the benefit of having these neighbourhood/ward area meetings, or community committee meetings, that it is a better opportunity for the public to be engaged. And my concern since the public sessions last week, as with my concern with the communication on the Transit Master Plan, there is still information of concern. And specific to, if I can just read right off the City of Winnipeg website, "Winnipeg needs more housing so everyone can have a home they can afford." No argument. "We can create more housing options by making changes to the Winnipeg Zoning By-law and local area plans to enable development", that it just describes. That information…that statement is not accurate. Those opportunities exist today, but through a hearing process. What this is, is to improve and decrease the amount of time to have changes made. But that in of itself is an inaccurate statement, and I've presented. And to go further on the website, public information sessions. "Public information sessions happened on March 17th, 18th and 19th. Videos will be posted when available. More information sessions are being planned and updates will be posted soon." The concern of that is, it's been over a week since that. And the March 17th Zoom meeting, there was 120 attendees with over 200 questions. Many of them duplicated, as I'm sure it took place on the next Zoom meeting and then also on the open house at the Convention Centre, that why should it take a week for videos to be posted at a minimum? And at least a first sweep at the consolidated questions so we can begin, because we are just over four weeks away from question period being closed before we go into final recommendation which would lead to the June hearing. So, I would encourage that we give residents every opportunity to learn, every opportunity through…to be represented at…to Council. I don't know how many councillors took in the Zoom meetings. I don't know how many councillors took…reviewed the information or attended the open house. I knew a few did. But I think it's just…this is the biggest property change, and people are passionate about their property. I had a very good conversation with a gentleman today who we both volunteered at Agape Table. He lived on Moncton in Elmwood. And the…an infill project right beside him had…was very concerning to him. We're not here to debate the Housing Accelerator Fund, but I'm just encouraging you to approve this motion and proceed with neighbourhood, ward open houses, education systems. And if the motion were defeated, I still encourage you to independently proceed with holding information sessions and do all that you can to at least educate and give residents an opportunity to voice their concerns, opinions, support. I am prepared for the hearings. I have items that I would like to bring forward to the…for the hearings. But for that item, I ask you to support it and do it yourself…do it yourself if it isn't…if it doesn't. The other item on the 311 Continuous Improvement Plan. I have been engaged on this since October of '21. For those councillors who don't remember or who weren't in office at the time, 20 years of my career was involving call centres. 12 of those years of which I led call centre departments. And at that time, I offered 50 hours of free consulting to help with a improvement plan. My concern with this report is two-fold: number one, that continuous improvement plans should have been a live document since April 28th of 2022, when that first report came out. And that report also required two extensions. That why is it not a continuous plan that was live back then on this similar agenda? Secondly is, the report that was published and discussed at EPC last week was inconclusive. It was…it did not actually fulfill your request to providing an extensive continuous plan showing value for the money. The report presented about six paragraphs describing the 12 new hires. And the irony of

that is, that same information was provided at the January EPC meeting at the same time that the extension for said report was asked for. And this report included two things: that in March of last year, 180-day report was requested. It required two extensions. And then, on 359 days since the request for the report, you received six paragraphs of old news. Secondly, it did not go into continuous improvement plan. What we don't know as a public, as a taxpayer, maybe you as councillors, is even how 311 is led and do they have an opportunity at the HR level, at the leadership level, to improve performance so that more work can be done better. And I have phoned into 311 several times as recent as yesterday. And I would say that more than the majority…greater than the 50% of the time, those phone calls are problematic and do not go as they should. And as a person, as a subject matter expert with extensive experience in call centres and going through business transformations myself for the huge benefit of not only the customer, but the employer and the employee that I don't see evidence of a proper continuous improvement plan. Now compared to three, three and a half years ago, I don't have 50 hours to provide in free consultation as I did then, which I offered on three occasions. And if you want to go back, you can go see my PowerPoint presentations. But my concern is that even going forward, is that going to be a comprehensive enough study and plan for council to consider? What I would offer, if you want to have a roundtable discussion, private meeting, I'm prepared to do that. If you want me to take a 5,000-foot level look at how 311 operates, I could do that and provide you my insight. There could be some victories, there could be some good things that they're doing, but there could opportunities for improvement. So, I'm asking you to actually reject this report and have them go back to the drawing board and provide an actual continuous improvement plan identifying opportunities and what actions they would take to improve the service of 311 because right now, as a citizen taxpayer and as a subject matter expert, I am not convinced that we are receiving value for our money and that that department is operating efficiently and effectively as it can be. Thank you very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for Mr. Ryback's comments and his efficiency. I have been very concerned about that, regarding the City of Winnipeg's operations in general. The fact that all our fines, fees, levees, taxes, and rates go up, we reduce services. We have spent our reserves and we've…we're selling more debentures; we're going further into debt. I can't say, however, in my personal interaction with 311 of service representatives, with the 311 workers on the phone, that they individually are part of the problem of inefficiencies and part of the problem of what I just stated, which is grave. I test the system of 311 on a regular basis, Madam Speaker, using their…I know that councillors have their own way of accessing 311, but I will use it as citizen, primarily using different telephones and I will test the system because I have to. Either individually, personally, for my family or on behalf of others. I, personally, have been astounded at how well the workers, the people that take the calls, deal given their circumstances. And it gives me hope. At least the people that answer the phone give me hope on a regular basis in terms of how it is structured. That is a good question and open to debate, which is why Mr. Ryback is here. He says that sometimes the calls don't go as expected or desired. And I wanted to know, since he's been talking about this over…over years, can he give us some examples of how the call doesn't go as expected?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Ryback.

**Kelly Ryback:** Thank you…yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. One recent call because of dangerous driving conditions on Overdale Street between Ness Avenue and Portage Avenue, I phoned in to request that it be cleared because the ruts were so deep a compact car could have difficulty driving through and vehicles were sliding through the intersections. As I presented that information to the 311 operator, and I am not critical of the operators or the clerks. Keep that in mind. I am actually critical of the leadership or the processes, okay. And that call took 33 minutes. There's a problem with the process. That call should have been at most 10 minutes. It was 33 minutes. A second one, I phoned in to identify graffiti on a park bench on a…that was commemorating a very noteworthy artist from Winnipeg. 16 minutes. It was painful. I frequently call in about dogs at large in the school yard near where I live. When it goes well, it's five…it's less than five minutes. Too often, it is a 15-minute call placed on hold for no…for my point, I provided all of the information, there's no reason for that call to be placed on hold. It's a very simple call. I have been on the…on a call like that for as long as 20 minutes, when best case is less than five, okay? And there are times it does go extremely well. Yesterday I reported a buggered up stop sign in Bridgewater. The call was fantastic. The actual concern is, why was that stop sign screwed up for two months? Okay. So, that is just basic. Too often put on hold because they need support. If I am…I am critical of, actually, is the leadership. I'll give you two examples of the leadership related to this motion with 311 at EPC. Madam Speaker, in January, a second resource was added for exclusive councillors 311 services that allowed them for that service to be provided over the weekend. It was unknown, councillors weren't notified that they're an additional resource and that they could call Saturday/Sunday. Madam Speaker, Councillor Lukes asked in January, could we receive an e-mail, councillors, of the new hours of operation for the exclusive councillor 311 resource. The director said she would do that. At last week's meeting, Councillor Lukes stated the situation and expressed a request, again, for an e-mail describing the new hours of operation mail. That two months later, the initial request hadn't been done. The second concern when I talk about leadership is back in January, and Councillor Lukes asked about, it would be nice to have the call data so that when

residents phoned a ward office and spoke to an executive assistant, complaining they can't get through 311 or it is unresolved, that Councillor Lukes asked for, can we have call data so that we can explain to residents sometimes it's just busy. And if things get…look at the magnitude of work that they are doing and ask for the call data. (inaudible). And the director responded, it's not available online, of which the next day I provided Councillor Lukes with a link to the online data. So, when we have a situation where it's two extensions to provide a report that doesn't answer and is not understood. And as a…again, as a subject matter expert, I don't know if the leadership is actually leading 311. And wonderful decrease in call answer time. That is…that is done. But when you just throw resources at it, we don't know once the phone call is answered, is it effective and efficient throughout that call and followed up on. And our staff, do they have the best tools at their disposal? Is their wellbeing being addressed? And thirdly, are they working to the potential capacity that they could be capable of or is it status quo and we're not getting value for their money because it's not at a high productivity rate or correctively? We don't know that. You don't…as Council, Madam Speaker, councillors do not know that. There…it is a science to run a call centre, and I have not seen evidence that it is being followed. That the reports that, Madam Speaker, that Council has received are insufficient.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next is Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you for your ongoing interest in the Housing Accelerator Fund, and in particular the matter that's coming to us in June. Your comments…we'll be debating whether to have the additional meetings, in-person meetings, later today. My two questions, though: you had indicated the need for affordable housing. But you are aware, I assume you are aware, that the four-plex part of this debate that's coming in June, none of that is required to be affordable housing under any criteria. There's no linkage between the four-plex part of this and the other part, which we see today, of building affordable housing.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. The response…

**Kelly Ryback:** Madam Speaker, I am aware because I know in the malls and corridors where there is 21, 23 projects listed with…that have received 10 million…100…is it 10 million dollars? 10 million dollars just for one project. 50 million dollars, actually. That there are components of these units within those apartments that are deemed for affordable. As much as 70 percent reduction in market rent. Yes, I am aware that none of the affordability applies to the four-plexes, up to four-plexes. And on one project, it was actually for a six-plex. I asked the owner what the rent would be and it was 1,800 to 2,200 dollars a month. Not affordable. We are actually taking affordable homes and creating unaffordable rental units.

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

**Kelly Ryback:** Appreciate that. Thank you, Madam Council…Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** I'll call forward Diane Bousquet of Warming Souls with Soup, to be heard in support of Item 1 of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development – Notice of Motion (Expropriation and Rezoning of the Lemay Forest). Following that, we'll hear from Louise May and then we'll take questions. Welcome.

**Diane Bousquet:** Thank you, City Council, Mayor. My name is Diane Bousquet and my spirit name is Shining Flowering Thunderbird Woman. I come today to stand before you not as a voice of an individual, but the voice of my ancestors, my community and generations yet to come. I am here to speak about the Lemay Forest. A sacred space that holds the remains of 3,383 children that perished at the Asile, a home for unwed mothers. This is not just a forest. It is a burial ground. It is a ceremonial space where our people have come for years. And now, it is under threat. Our people have gathered on this land for over 40 years in the ceremonies. But this is not just about land. This is about truth and justice. For decades the Lemay Forest has been a place of healing for our people. The sweat lodges that stood there have been forced to stop since December. Silencing our ceremonies…sorry, since December.

**Madam Speaker:** Take your time.

**Diane Bousquet:** Thank you. Silencing our ceremonies that have been a long part of our spiritual and cultural survival. The very land that has embraced our ancestors has been stripped without consent, without our voices being heard and without justice that this sacred site deserves. A developer claims he has engaged in Indigenous communities, but true consultation requires more than just a meeting. It demands respect, collaboration and most importantly, consent. Instead of what we see as a familiar pattern of a company pushing ahead with their own agenda, while forcing Indigenous nations to a table under terms we did not sign. The duty to consult is not a legal loophole, it is a…under section 35 of our constitution, the rights of Indigenous people are not symbolic, it's enshrined in our law. The Canadian government and the municipalities have a duty to consult and accommodate Indigenous people whenever development affects our land, our rights and our cultural practices. But consultation is not consent. Consultation must allow for the possibility for us to

say no. Otherwise, it is not meaningful. Yet time and time again, we see developers and governments treating it, consultation, as a formality. A check box to be marked off before pushing forward with a project that has already been decided. The Lemay Forest must be protected and not exploited. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission calls to action number 6076 demands that the government work with Indigenous communities…thank you. Must work with Indigenous communities to protect and maintain burial sites of Indigenous children and our families. Yet, instead of seeing honouring of this responsibility, the developer has actively silenced Indigenous voices. Ignoring the presence of graves beyond his buffer zone and controlling access to our sweat lodges. Restricting those who have spoken out while actively selective…and selectively allowing others. Claims to support reconciliation while profiting off the erasure of Indigenous culture. Reconciliation must be on Indigenous terms. It cannot be dictated by a development…developer, a government or a corporation. Anything less than this is not reconciliation, it is colonialism wrapped in empty promises. We demand action now. We are not asking you guys for a favour, we are demanding justice. We are asking the City of Winnipeg to expropriate the Lemay Forest and protect it permanently as a sacred site. Recognize and respect Indigenous burial sites by halting all development immediately and conduct a full, non-invasive search of the area with consultation of Métis and First Nations alike. Ensure that our sweat lodges can remain active without threat of destruction, restriction or threats. City officials, you have a choice to make here. This is a test of who we are as a city, as a community and as human beings. Will you stand for truth, justice and reconciliation or will you allow another sacred site to be erased? Yesterday I listened as City officials stood up during a press conference for Search the Landfill saying the pathway to reconciliation is already there. You guys just need to stop, listen and action it. And that time is now. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** We're going to hear from our next speaker. Again, I want to remind everyone in the gallery to be respectful. No presentations are permitted from the gallery. That's the second caution today. Thank you. Next speaker, Louise May.

**Louise May:** Thank you. Good morning. I would like to thank Councillor Chambers and all of you for allowing additional presentations today on this important subject. Lemay Forest remains under immediate and epistemic threat today. It requires both a crisis intervention plan to ensure that it does not become Lemay Meadows as the property owner, his henchmen, and their lawyer have repeatedly threatened in words in the media and under oath and proven with tree-killing actions. It also requires a defined end game move that one government or another is now required to make. The City of Winnipeg can today make the correct choice and expropriate this property with the plan of making it a memorial forest. Since December 23rd, 2024, the community of people who care most about the fate of this forest have been thrown into crisis. With the first acre of trees cut, it became a race to figure out how to stop the devastation. The immediate answer came on January 8th when I was advised by my lawyer, Ian Histed, that I could take action personally and file a statement of information that I witnessed the cutting of trees in a known cemetery, which is against the law based on the provincial Cemetery Act. This led to the summons of John Wintrup and Mazyar Yahyapour personally. Currently, this case is under review by Manitoba Prosecution Services and the next court date being April 15th. The threat of their possible arrest was enough to stop the immediate cutting. In the intervening three months and with tremendous work by several historians and the strongest community lobby I have ever seen, we are now at a place where there is a mandate from the citizens of Winnipeg to save Lemay Forest. The linchpin in the argument is found in the facts. We know that the consulting company hired by the developer did not access the archives which are in cursive handwriting in French, some of it found in Quebec, to know that the total count of deceased children is 3,383. We now know that only a small number of adults, 15 in total, were exhumed and moved. These are but two of the facts. Give the historians time to speak and they will give you many other disturbing facts. There can be no doubt that the developers' applications for permits both at the City and at the Province were grossly inadequate, nonfactual and shall render these permits unbinding in a court of law. Let's not have to go there. As for the end game, this forest must become permanently preserved and that the children who are buried here are recognized for their lives lost. That their lives matter. And they help to guide a society to become a more caring and more just place. This is especially timing…timely as we see the larger regressive social wave breathing down upon us wishing to harm women and children, especially those most vulnerable. There can be no doubt that the decision to search the landfill has proven to be the ethically correct decision. The continuing…continuum spanning over 125 years of these two grave sites. The graveyard of an orphanage of children whose lives apparently didn't matter. To the Indigenous women murdered by a convicted serial killer set out like garbage. There could be no one who does not see this continuum as part of the same social failure. We have an opportunity to have this precious place of ecological perfection, with 237-year-old trees, habitat for numerous species at risk, part of a connected ecosystem of the Red and Lasalle Rivers to become the gemstone in the city of Winnipeg's crown in our collective pursuit of reconciliation through healing. It is both fair and reasonably necessary to expropriate. The current property owner knew the land was previously found undevelopable, that it is land locked, that it would require rezoning that would be difficult to achieve. He may not have known the extent of the importance of the graveyard, but he did know that there was a graveyard on the property. He may not have known that the habitat of the pileated woodpecker, a keystone species, is protected by federal law. He knows that now. He most certainly knew that the forest was home to several sweat lodges that have been healing Indigenous people for over 40 years.

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

**Louise May:** Thank you. There is no need to wait for the Municipal Board hearing as our lawyers tell us that the owner may choose to continue to fight this battle all the way to the Supreme Court. Is that a battle the City of Winnipeg wishes to undertake? I should think not. And what if the Municipal Board for some unbeknownst reason rules in favour of the developer? Would we simply roll over and acquiesce? I can say that I won't and others won't either. You all have the power to make a significant historical change today here now. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. We will take questions. If I could have the delegations back. Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you for your presentations today. They were all heartfelt presentations. I was blessed to have been raised in a family which is relative middle class, stable family. And at the age of three, my parents decided to move to a street called Almey Avenue in what I guess technically was between Transcona and East Kildonan or Elmwood. And behind there was a large forest. And I grew up…my father was a small businessman, my mother a nurse. You know, my father would say, go play on the freeway, kind of thing. There's no time for sports. But we played in the forest riding our bikes, building forts. And I can't speak to the, I guess, the grounding and the mental health and the appreciation for nature, all of the things that you have said here today. You know, the history of the site, the tragic history of the site and the burials…the burials. The fact that you have a developer who wants to cut down a forest that is a benefit to the community in terms of mental health. With benefit both to the settler history and the Indigenous history of this site combined. And there's a motion before us today moved by myself, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. Nothing would make my happier than to see that motion pass. Or nothing would make me happier than to see the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg or somebody else want to move a separate motion saying, let's just get this going. Let's somehow secure it.

**Madam Speaker:** Question, Councillor Wyatt…

**Councillor Wyatt:** Any thoughts on that in terms of process? Are you here to say that you want to see the Lemay Forest saved and work it out City Hall. Work it out. You know, expropriation, whatever the case may be, but just get the ball rolling. Let's save the Lemay Forest. Is that what you are saying here today?

**Diane Bousquet:** Yes, that's what…exactly what we are saying.

**Louise May:** I would add that we have the mechanism in front of us right now. A motion on the table with all of you present, able to vote. There will be consequences no matter what the eventual end game is. There are going to be consequences. We are already feeling those consequences personally. I can say there will be legal repercussions no matter which way we go. Let's make this a city place. Let's make this part of the city…the great thing that the City of Winnipeg is. Let's make this park be part of it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yeah, you know, and I thank you for organizing that event at the University of Winnipeg on a Saturday night, two Saturdays ago. I learned a lot. And what I found amazing was the fact that there is so much information about the Lemay Forest that I learned that night. If other members of Council didn't, nobody can be everywhere, of course, at one time. And so, I really appreciate you doing that. My question is this; you know, we often get bogged down here inside the city with regards to, okay, how are going to do this? Where is the money going to come from, right? It's always about that. And I get that. But wouldn't you say that it's very similar that where did the money come from for Assiniboine Park and Assiniboine Forest in 1905? The city fathers and mothers of that time made the decision to buy it. Everybody fault…in the next general election, everybody except one lost their seat because they…people punished them, they didn't think Assiniboine Park, Assiniboine Forest was important. But it was vision and leadership, and they found the money to buy the land. That, really, we are at another crossroads today, over 100 years later to do the exact same thing. Do you not believe that is the case? Do you share that?

**Louise May:** I mean, the answer is, yes. We make decisions all the time that require resources. And this is a moment in time where we can make a difference. So, let's do it. And let's…together let's find a way to make this happen. You can be guaranteed that you have a very strong lobby that are going to follow in on the heals of this to make sure that all of those pieces come together. And we will continue to fight with you to make this happen.

**Councillor Wyatt:** My last question. And thank you, also, for coming to the standing committee more than once now on this matter. And for members of Council who don't sit on the standing committee, or FYI, the standing committee did move that the Administration work cooperatively with the habitat folks of the Manitoba Habitat Society who actually have funding

identified up until the end of this month, federal and provincial, I believe, to make an offer on the lands. There are groups out there…I guess the question is, are there groups out there, including other levels of government, who are prepared to help the City of Winnipeg come to the table that if we are willing to create a city park here, that we can do it if the leadership is from the city, as well? We need that leadership push of the city to get us to the table there and make a priority so they hear from us that it's a priority. But they've got money on the table. Is that not correct today, what you are hearing?

**Louise May:** I very much believe that both the Province and the Federal Government, well, let's hope, will definitely be coming to the table to help participate with this. We have many of the groups that are regulars in these kinds of discussions. Both Indigenous groups, environmental groups, all coming…have come together to give their support to this. So, I think you will continue to see a strong lobby to figure out a workable plan for this.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Chambers, your question.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the delegations that spoke this morning, thank you very much. I am looking back at the report June 24th, 2024, when this was brought to Riel Community Committee. And it does say in the report that there's…the developer plans to do 2,500 units and 5,000 beds…roughly 5,000 beds with the construction of three buildings. So, this to me suggestions a full build out of the entire 22 acres. It has been suggested through…through applications that the developer has submitted that they didn't plan to build where the graves were at one point in time. But again, in looking at 5,000 beds, within 2,500 units, it suggests a full build out of the entire property. My question to you is, you know, the City of Winnipeg came back with a…with a plan to reduce that quite significantly. The information with respect to the graves that are on-site, what else is needed or necessary to confirm the graves there and the fact that the developer didn't do the due diligence necessary in the sense that they are looking at building this out, the full 22 acres, based on what they have here.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you for the question.

**Councillor Chambers:** So, the question: what else is needed in terms of, you know, to refute what the developer is planning here with respect to 2,500 units?

**Louise May:** Well, I think because the developer chose to go through with the Municipal Board hearing, that he is serious about this particular proposal. He did not take that avenue off where he could have to say, great, I will come back with, whatever, 174 unit that had been suggested, okay. And even that doesn't mean it's going to get approved. He did not go that direction. What do you do with a situation like this? We don't have a willing and reasonable counterpart to have this discussion with. So, I think the bets are all off. You know, I just think that the only course of action is expropriation. And they are not willing to sell. We know that. They don't want eight million, they don't want 10 million. They want hundreds of millions of cash (inaudible)…you know, continuous, ongoing cash revenue from a 5,000-bed unit. That is what they want.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question.

**Councillor Chambers:** Yeah, it is recognized that there is a lot of investment that would be required prior to any shovel going in the ground, you know, to recover the construction cost. So, again, would it…is it fair to say that, again, the aggressiveness of this plan is based on the fact that there would be all of the investments necessary prior to development?

**Louis May:** That's what we're led to understand. But that has been questioned by more than just yourself. I have heard that numerous times.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, appreciate your delegation today.

**Diane Bousquet:** There's just one last thing. We believe in giving gifts to people. These are not of monetary value. They were crafts made by people who came out to our art build one night. So, we're going to give this to you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Our clerk, Mr. Poitras, will talk with you at the side there. Thank you. We'll now move into additional delegations, Mr. Clerk, I believe. Yes. Okay, additional delegations. We're starting with Tracey Turner, Manitoba Historical Society. And it's on the same topic. And I just want…Tracey Turner, come forward.

**Tracey Turner:** Hello?

**Madam Speaker:** Tracey Turner is online. Okay. Welcome.

**Tracey Turner:** Thank you. Thank you for having me, Mayor Gillingham and City of Winnipeg Council. I am pleased to be here. I'm going to situate this that I feel that this is probably the most important heritage issue I have ever been involved in my career as a heritage professional. So, today I bring my knowledge as a former Parks Canada archeologist and currently as the Executive Director of the Manitoba Historical Society and as a museum curator to this important heritage issue today. In May of 2021, can you recall the discovery of the remains and unmarked graves of 215 children who were students of the Kamloops Indian residential school? It made national news. It turned our perceptions and beliefs upside down to critically…critically look at our institutions and history with fresh and tragic eyes. And rightly so. That discovery provided material evidence of one of the darkest times in Canadian history. Weeks after still a staggering 751 unmarked graves were discovered in Saskatchewan. The Cowessess First Nation said the discovery was the most significantly substantial to-date in Canada. Soon, Manitoba will be mourning the death of thousands of children that were buried in mass graves in the Lemay Forest and the Asile Ritchot cemetery. And I call upon the Mayor and City Council today to take action today. Help us get ahead of that national story and show that the City of Winnipeg is forward thinking about human rights, about dignity, about honouring history and the environment. Now, while the context of the Lemay lands is not a residential school, it is a context of an institution in the city of Winnipeg that reflects our lack of care for women, children, the poor, the disenfranchised. We must ensure that these souls are now treated with dignity and care. In March, it's Women's History Month. We can do better for all the women that suffered and all of their children that have been forgotten in the forest. The Manitoba Historical Society strongly supports that the City of Winnipeg rezone and immediately expropriate all of the privately held lands as the Lemay Forest, the Lemay lands, to create a new city of Winnipeg regional memorial park. The Lemay Forest and the Asile Ritchot cemetery in the Lemay Forest is a natural heritage and cultural site of massive significance. It was an orphanage and home for unwed mothers run by the Catholic Order of the Sisters of Misericordia from 1904 to 1948. We know children, unwed mothers, madeleines, sisters, as well as others connected to the community, were buried in a cemetery in Lemay Forest. New research by the Société Historique de Saint-Boniface has documented 16 registers that together record 3,383 deaths of children at the Asile. I repeat: 3,383 deaths. There is no evidence to support that they were exhumed or re-interred and the cemetery de-consecrated. Recent research has only confirmed the removal of only 15 named marked graves. A recent report compiled by our research team, my colleagues, identified that many errors – many – were made in the reports that the historic resources branch based their recommendations on that allowed for the permit. The historic resources branch has stated that historic burial patterns in cemeteries, bury…or sorry, that historic burial patterns in cemeteries are known to occur in and around cemetery grounds. It is possible that mothers or families whose infants have died could have privately buried their children outside the formal boundaries of the cemetery. Further, de-forestation, heavy equipment, elevation grading will alter the drainage of the site. It will impact the cemetery and the deposition of human remains in situ there. The Lemay Forest and its understory and root systems help to prevent erosion and the disturbance of the human remains. A number of these children were orphans of Indigenous backgrounds. Our recent research suggests that most of these children were of French Canadian or European descent, as well as Indigenous, Scottish, French and those of unknown heritage. From a community perspective, there has been a complete absence of consultation about this with rights holders, Indigenous groups or the Manitoba Métis Federation. And development of this site may violate UNDRIP: the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Act. This is a site of conscience.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Thank you for your presentation. We have nine additional presentations. So, we'd…

**Tracey Turner:** I just had one…one…two sentences to finish…May I conclude, please…

**Madam Speaker:** Okay…Sure. Okay, yes…

**Tracey Turner:** Thank you. This site bears witness to the abandonment of basic human rights, but it provides a powerful platform for the creation of the collective public memory. Preserving this site through expropriation is essential. It's our responsibility to foster a future where this site can serve as a beacon for human rights. The City can and must do the right thing. Preserve this forest, honouring the tragic children in the forest and memorialize this history. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Tracey, thank you for your presentation. We wish you a good day. Our next speaker is Dr. Shelley Sweeney. Following that, Eric Reder and then Dr. Ann Loewen. Is Dr. Shelley Sweeney here? Thank you. Just like to remind everyone in the gallery, there is no clapping or cheering, no presentations at all. Thank you.

**Shelley Sweeney:** Okay, so my name is Dr. Shelly Sweeney. I am a member of OURS Winnipeg which is a green space advocacy group. And I am also archivist emerita from the University of Manitoba and an adjunct professor of anthropology there. My colleague Tracey Turner has sketched out the issues with the cemetery, but I just want to go through a few details. First of all, it's interesting because a lot of records of children, for example, in other institutional contexts, were destroyed, regularly destroyed. Whereas in this case, the Sisters of Misericordia and then through Villa Rosa were very careful to maintain those records. And they took, I think, careful records and those records ended up with the Société Historique de Saint-Boniface. So, we have an unusual, unparalleled opportunity to actually find out who was…who was

admitted into the orphanage and the home for unwed mothers, as well as who died. And this is how the Société Historique de Saint-Boniface was able to figure out that 3,383 children died because there are records. There are records with names, with parentage, with, in some cases, ethnicities. And this is really an unusual situation. And one of the aspects of this tragic story that the Société was able to pin down was that there were 43 ethnicities of children that were admitted. What was the common ground? They were poor. Poor people, mostly in Winnipeg. These were mostly Winnipeg girls, pregnant girls, and young women who were too poor to afford any services. So, basically, they worked off their pregnancy, their…their laying-in at the Misericordia Hospital by working at the orphanage looking after the children. So many of the girls, women and babies came through the Misericordia Hospital. Those were…a number…a large number of those who died were then buried in Lemay Forest. We know that the sisters left in 1948. In just in 26 years, the cemetery was in total disarray. So, I want you to think that when the developer says private property with public access, what that means. It means that nobody is really responsible for memorializing and looking after that cemetery. And a big issue, of course, is that the archaeological unit found there is evidence of pit graves outside of the cemetery which means that not all of the children were buried within the grounds of the cemetery. We also know that according to past practice, other people would bring their children to be buried close to consecrated ground. So, we have an idea that there are more than just the children from the…from the Asile Ritchot that were buried there. So, while identified remains and a few others were exhumed and moved in 1974 by the Desjardins Funeral Chapel, according to archival records and testimony, the children were never moved. There is testimony from somebody who was actually there at the exhumation who said that they were unaware that there were any children there. We have records from the cathedral that states that there were only 15 bodies moved. We have records from the Sisters of Misericordia archives in Montreal that confirmed that the children were not on the list of people that were moved…the human remains that were not moved. So, the children were forgotten over time, but we know about them now. And they should never be forgotten again. They should most certainly not be lying in a cemetery on private land, but be protected in a public space, commemorated and they should be given in death the attention they did not receive in life.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you for your presentation. Our next speaker, Eric Reder, followed by Dr. Ann Loewen. Welcome.

**Eric Reder:** Thank you. Thank you. Reder, yeah. Reder was good. I already got texts from the office calling me Eric Redler and it will be years before I live that one down. I've got five quotes for you here to start this off. "Built bridges spanning ideas, cultures, identities and generations on a foundation of truth, understanding and right spaced reconciliation. Develop meaningful relationships among and between individuals and groups as a foundation of truth and reconciliation aa self-determination. Intellectual understanding and respect of rights, responsibilities, values, knowledge and protocols". Does anybody recognize that? You guys can nod your heads if you recognize that. Nobody, hey? Alright. Well, we are going to get into that in a little bit. I suggest that the...oh, I am not allowed to ask them to nod their heads?

**Madam Speaker:** That's right. This is your opportunity to…

**Councillor Rollins:** Madam Speaker, everyone's doing a good job of…in a tough issue, keeping decorum. Insulting Council, I caught it, Madam Speaker. I am not going to ask to retract it, but I will call points of order.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Rollins. This is your opportunity, Eric, to make a presentation, not ask questions to Council and certainly not insult Council. Your presentation, please.

**Eric Reder:** Alright.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Madam Speaker, I just want to make a point. Sure, Councillor Rollins point is well taken. But throughout Council, it is either implicit or explicit that there's assumptions made as to the knowledge of members of Council at all times, including all this morning, and that is fair. In this case, I do see it was a little pushy. But bear that in mind, we are here to be educated.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. We've provided that education. The presentation only, sir. No questions. And it's…definitely is a sensitive issue.

**Eric Reder:** Alright, my apologies for bringing that up.

**Madam Speaker:** Let's start over. Put the clock at five minutes, please. And let's start your presentation again, if we could.

**Eric Reder:** So, I would suggest that the issue of the Lemay Forest should be discussed in a public forum, a town hall if you will, and it should be hosted so that city councillors can be present to learn and answer questions. So, moving on to the next quote. "A greater acknowledgment and disruption of social systems of privilege and colonization that continue to concentrate political and economic power and influence is needed to achieve equity. These systems influence every

decision made whether realized or not. Left unchecked, the gap between rich and poor will grow large and perpetuate itself." That is quite apt in this situation because we have folks with money bullying and harassing individuals, communities, community organizations and elected power on the Lemay Forest issue. Going on to my third quote. "We need to protect and respect the land through the City's responsibility to ensure that life sustaining ecosystems continue to provide clean air, clean water, biodiversity, local food systems, natural habitats, ecological restoration, carbon sequestration, cooling of urban heat island effects, opportunities for Indigenous land-based practices." Opportunities for Indigenous land-based practices – I repeat the quote. "And improved mental and physical health." Going onto quote four. "Provide opportunities for heritage education, truth telling, reconciliation through the commemoration, conservation and stewardship of both tangible and intangible heritage resources including Indigenous land-based practices and artifacts, public names, places and art, museums, artifacts and archived information." Fifth quote, "Develop an Indigenous lens which recognizes, respects and advances multiple and diverse First Nations, Inuit and Métis rights, knowledge and perspectives. Apply the lens throughout municipal leadership and governance processes, policies, programs and practices to be inclusive and eliminate elements that knowingly or unknowingly enable the exclusion of Indigenous peoples." Those five quotes came from OurWinnipeg Plan. That is the directive that these councillors have to make decisions on the land, as I understand it, and in this city. This is the fourth time that I have been presenting in the last 80 days since I started this work on the Lemay Forest. I have been working on lands and waters for 19 years in the province, and this is easily the most important site that I have spoken about. The truth of what the Lemay Forest is has become apparent in the last 80 days. This is what I said to the media yesterday when I delivered 1,000 letters asking to protect the Lemay to both Mayor Gillingham and also, to Premier Wab Kinew's office. The Lemay Forest is powerful and compelling. From massive 237-year-old trees to habitat for protected species, to Métis history with Louis Riel, to sacred Indigenous lodges operating continuously on this site for more than 25 years. To the trafficking of impregnated residential schoolgirls, to what may be the largest mass gravesite in the country with unmarked burials of 3,383 children. The Lemay Forest is unlike any other place in the city and is irreplaceable. So, my question is, where is the leadership? The leadership on this issue…the leadership…the leadership on this issue is the women sitting up in the gallery. Those are your leaders on this issue. This is a issue of rematriation and those are the leaders that we have to listen to. Diane came and presented first. She didn't come here to talk about Indigenous values. She had to come here and talk about the colonial processes that are affecting her. And we don't ask the oppressed to talk to the oppressor…to those…we don't ask the oppressed to teach about oppression. That is wrong. It's unfortunate that Diane had to do that. You need to show the courage to be the leaders on this issue. This is your place. Three months ago, we could say that people didn't understand this issue, but that is not the case now. We need you to lead, to follow your own policies and to save the Lemay Forest. That's all I have.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Eric. Thank you for your presentation. Next is Dr. Ann Loewen, followed by Patrick Neilan.

**Ann Loewen:** Good morning, Madam Speaker and Councillors, Mayor Gillingham and all present. Fellow citizens, thank you for this opportunity and thank you for allowing us to have these extra delegations. My name is Dr. Ann Loewen. I work in Morris and in Winnipeg. I have been a GP in rural Manitoba and before that in Newfoundland for 35 years. I live in St. Norbert and I was very fortunate to grow up enjoying the forests there. Thank you for this opportunity to express my favour for rezoning the land as a park known as Lemay Forest that is open to the public. There are great health implications for cities in relation to their public. It's known as the built environment and I will help you understand a bit more about that and I would be happy to help you further that understanding, if you wish, later. There's urgent needed need to preserve and protect land for many reasons known as Lemay Forest directly related to the health of the citizens of Winnipeg. Heat related deaths are increasing rapidly. In British Columbia's 2021 heat dome, 600 people died in their…mostly in their homes of heatstroke in 30-days. That is 20 people a day. Imagine if 20 people a day died of cold exposure in Winnipeg. The urban heat island effect is well-documented and trees are essential infrastructure to mitigate this. The City must protect its citizens from this threat. Lemay Forest is especially prone to flooding. It is 12 feet lower than Pembina Highway and surrounded by an enormous primary dike which further impedes water drainage. Even with thousands of trees and other vegetation to absorb the water, adjacent lots have lost their basements to overland flooding in recent years and sewer back up during heavy rainfalls. Removal of this vegetation and paving the land would make this problem worse. And this damage has great personal impact from grieving to financial hardship to indoor mold. And the City must, again, protect its citizens. Free access to natural spaces is essential to mental, spiritual and physical health. In the pandemic, people flocked to green spaces where the trees and other natural forms grew in abundance for relief from anxiety and disappointment, for a chance to be safely in the company of others, to learn and understand and be at peace with the life forms of a forest. Physicians can even prescribe nature now to their patients for this reason, through PaRx, Walk with a Doc and other programs. Our Indigenous fellow citizens use the land for sweat lodges, an important part of spiritual expression, healing, recovery and maintenance of recovery. The City must provide its population with ready access to natural spaces for everyone's health. Lemay Forest is a jewel of healthful living in our midst. Why would we destroy it? We are now currently in a time of great grieving. We grieve the losses of the pandemic, the devastation of the opioid crisis, of climate change harms. There is fear and divisiveness accelerated by social media and isolation. The losses of the 3,383 children of the Asile Ritchot orphanage cemetery represent additional harm that our society also grieves. That of separating children from their mothers, the primary attachment and object of their love in early life. Those 3,383 children

did not only die of infectious disease and lack of advanced medical care. They died of neglect because there was no one to love them. Babies and young children will whither if they do not achieve immediate constant, secure and loving attachment to a single individual. This was well documented among orphans after the world wars in Europe. Canada ignored this lesson and we continue…and continued the separation of infants and children from their mothers through the 20th century. We know so well now the tragic outcomes of not just orphanages, but also forced and coerced adoptions, residential schools, the '60s scoop and what passes for child protection. Our ranks are replete with these survivors. Many of them are homeless on the streets of Winnipeg. They also populate our emergency rooms and our clinics; I can tell you that for a fact. The Asile Ritchot cemetery grounds and surrounding woods represent a place of both historical and current societal sadness and grieving. At the same time, it's a place of regeneration and abundant life. A place that deserves stewardship and recognition. To preserve this space gives all of us an opportunity to grow, gain knowledge and express our empathy. The City of Winnipeg provide us a way to take those losses and let them be transformative in their power.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Dr. Loewen. Our next speaker is Patrick Neilan, followed by Mireille Lamontagne. Welcome.

**Patrick Neilan:** Hello. It's the first time I have been in here. And yeah, if no one told you guys that they love you, I love every single one of you and appreciate everybody here. My whole thing is to save Lemay Forest for many, many reasons, especially for the healing aspects of it. It helped many, many people in the last couple of years. These are places that we need to preserve and help and save not only for the culture, but for the way of life. Just like the fire, here you can see the circle and that's the same premise. You would have the grandfathers around and you'd have the fire in the middle and you'll have a council around it that would speak. And they would all discuss things before they make decisions. This is very similar to what is there. Fire has a way to gather people together for very, very many purposes, just like here. You are gathered here and you have an opportunity to help us. And we need your help. We cannot do it alone. Each single one of you has the power right now to save that forest. Not only for the eagles, not only for the bears that are there, not only for the endangered woodpeckers, but also for the sweats that help so, so many. I have ran into so many people that got their names there. Once you get your names, your spirit names, you are 10 feet taller. Helps you stay sober. There are many people that are struggling out there with addictions and mental illness. And ceremonies is what helps them. We need more of these ceremonial places. I understand that we need housing, as well, but we also need a place where people can go and heal and that's where they go and heal. Another example would be search the landfill. Very important. That was brought up today. And I appreciate you guys bringing up those names. I worked very hard on that and many of us did. Especially at Lemay Forest, there's many of us that worked on that when nobody believed that we could hear the spirits calling us for help. We went and helped and now here the spirits are asking you guys to help, as well. I will leave that with you, other than, don't worry about consequences, always do the right thing. And that's why we did what we did. Peace and respect to all. Hope you all have an awesome, awesome day. Miigwech. Miigwech.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Patrick. Thank you. Our next speaker, Mireille, followed by Stacey Goslin…Gosman. I also propose to Council that we finish the delegations and then recess for the lunch. Thank you.

**Mireille Lamontagne:** Thank you for having me today. I'm going to speak from my heart. I am an anthropologist, archeologist and cultural resource management specialist who has worked in pretty much every museum in Winnipeg. And I have spent 30 years trying to preserve heritage in this community only to see it destroyed left, right and centre. Literally every site of conscience related to Indigenous heritage, Métis heritage, Franco-Manitoban heritage, is under threat and at risk of being lost in this city. I have been here many times over the last 30 years and this is one of those places that is just so incredibly special that it requires special consideration. It is not the time and place to erase the past. But what I'm hoping is that people have learned from the past and don't make the same mistake again. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mireille. Our next speaker, Stacey Gosman, followed by Ken Harasym.

**Stacey Gosman:** Good morning and thank you for allowing us all to speak today. My name is Stacey Gosman. I am a resident of Winnipeg currently living in St. Norbert. But I've also lived in Charleswood, St. Vital and Waverley Heights. In fact, I lived in a house on Cadboro Road that is now just an empty lot right beside Bison Run School. And that was wild to me when I drove past there a few months ago. I am here today to ask you to be visionaries. To imagine Winnipeg in 10 years where the Lemay Forest has been protected for memorialization and ecological sustainability. For the very reasons emphasized in your climate policies, in your commitment for reconciliation and, frankly, to keep Winnipeg the interesting and lovable city we know it to be. This past summer Winnipeg celebrated the 150th birthday with many events, one being in St. Norbert. It was a day about community, neighbours gathering, honouring our shared histories and environment and re-enforcing our responsibility to protect it. I listened to President Chartrand speak about St. Norbert's role in Manitoba's birth. Elder North Wind Bear on the healing significance of the Lemay Forest and the Singing Wolf singers reflecting on their Métis history and their connection to the forest. I heard Mr. Mayotte highlight the area's historical worth and representatives from all three levels of government stressing the importance of building a city we can be proud of. We celebrated Indigenous People's Day while sweat lodges in Lemay Forest face destruction. We planted a ceremonial tree

while standing beside an established forest with 18,000 mature trees on the chopping block. Since the summer, we've learned much more about the Asile Ritchot cemetery. I am still in shock to know I have walked near the cemetery for years without knowing the history that laid just below the surface. The cemetery should not be privately owned, a feature of a housing complex. Have you ever been to a sold-out show at the Burton Cummings Theater? Most of us can think back and remember what it is like to be part of that crowded theatre of 1,600 people. Now imagine every single person at the Burt just didn't make it home. Every single person. Now double it. That is how many children did not leave the Asile. Winnipeg needs densification, but not at the cost of losing something this unique or building over a cemetery. High density housing should be built where it makes sense; centralized around the core and along rapid transit lines that can utilize public and active transportation with a sustainable public works and environmental footprint. Winnipeg also needs nature in place, in pockets, in walkable neighbourhoods like the Harte Trail, Bois-des-Esprits and Kildonan Park. Residents from all socioeconomic backgrounds need green spaces near their homes for health and mental wellbeing. We should never have to drive to a park. I urge you to consider the significance of Lemay Forest not just as a piece of land, but as a symbol of your commitment to preserving our environment, our history and our city's wellbeing. Don't lose this opportunity to align your actions with the values celebrated during the 150 birthday. Elder North Wind Bear said something very powerful that day. We got to get stuff done now. By my count, this marks 14th time Lemay Forest has appeared on a Council agenda. 14 times dedicate…you've dedicated your valuable time to this discussion. As elected officials you've thoroughly examined the issues presented and made decisive choices based on your due diligence. It's time to put an end to the cycle and let your decisions stand once and for all. Be the City Council that has the vision and courage to stand up now and make the next Assiniboine Forest. Let's not let Lemay Forest become a story of what we failed to protect. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you for your presentation. Next Ken Harasym, followed by Cat Gauthier. Welcome.

**Ken Harasym:** Good morning, Mayor, City Council. The Council of Canadians Winnipeg Chapter urges you to approve the expropriation of Lemay Forest in recognition of its deep historical and cultural significance. The forest is home to the abandoned Asile Ritchot cemetery where, as we have heard, 3,383 children tragically died between 1904 and 1948. Many of them buried in unmarked graves. Preserving this entire forest out of respect for these graves is of moral imperative. I urge you to consider the lessons we have learned from the tragic ongoing struggles surrounding the search for the remains of missing and murdered Indigenous women, particularly the controversy involving the Prairie Green Landfill. In that case, the previous provincial government under Premier Heather Stefanson, would not commit to funding the search for the remains of Indigenous women who we now know were buried in that landfill. Their hesitation was criticized as a failure to act swiftly and with the respect and care that those families deserved. Similarly, we now face a critical moment where the City of Winnipeg has an opportunity to make a choice. Will we take action to honour the graves of these orphan children, or will we repeat the mistakes of neglect and inaction that have plagued Indigenous families for years? The failure to act in a timely and respectful manner when it comes to the land where these children are buried could be seen as a continuation of a historical indifference shown to marginalized communities. Furthermore, the Lemay Forest has long served as an important site for First Nations and Métis ceremonies, and it is essential that this tradition continues. The cultural and spiritual importance of this land cannot be understated. And its preservation ensures that future generations can honour these practices. As citizens concerned with corporate greed and the increasing influence of developers, we must support the efforts to protect spaces like the Lemay Forest. It is a clear example of how we can stand against the forces that prioritize profit over the wellbeing of our communities and our shared heritage. In a time when corporate interests threaten the preservation of our natural and cultural landmarks, it is crucial that we take action to protect these public spaces like Lemay Forest for the people of Winnipeg. By supporting the expropriation of this land, we have the chance to correct past wrongs and send a strong message that the City is committed to justice, remembrance and healing. I encourage you to consider how this decision reflects our values and how it can help us move forward with integrity, learning from our past mistakes. For these reasons, we urge the City of Winnipeg to immediately expropriate all private lands held known as the Lemay Forest, to work to designate Lemay Forest as a heritage site and to take the necessary steps to ensure it becomes a protected public park. I thank you for your time.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you for your presentation today. Next, Cat Gauthier. And our last presenter, Katharina. Katharina.

**Cat Gauthier:** Good morning. Thank you for having me and allowing for so many of our delegations. I and many others have been working on Save Lemay Forest for five years now. I want to say thank you for everyone in the gallery. I know most of them have had to take time off work, take vacation days to be here, rearrange their schedule for elder care or childcare. Someone has actually chosen to be here today on their birthday. I am going to make this really short in order to avoid being repetitive. First of all, there is very little support for the development of this land. There is an incredible amount of support for saving Lemay Forest, and it's growing and far-reaching as people learn and grow and grieve with us. More research needs to be done on the Asile Ritchot cemetery at the Société Historique de Saint-Boniface. And funds have been secured to continue the remaining research, digitization and reporting of the 16 registers of the Asile. The City and the Province have the power and legal and moral responsibility to designate Lemay Forest a heritage site. You have the power today to protect Lemay Forest. I believe in vision and big picture thinking. And I believe you can be leaders for

a sustainable livable city that values protecting nature and biodiversity, heritage, culture and trying to do truth and reconciliation right. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Chambers moves motion to move past 12:00. Continue with presentations. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Welcome to you.

**Katharina Stiffenhofer:** Thank you for making time and space to listen to our presentations. My name is Katharina Stiffenhofer. I'm a documentary filmmaker with a special interest in social justice and environmental justice. Please note my strong support to motion Item No. 1 – Expropriation and Rezoning of Lemay Forest. The Lemay Forest is irreplaceable in its rich, historical, cultural, ecological value. This 22.5-acre riparian forest and green space needs to receive heritage status and be rezoned and preserved as a public heritage park in perpetuity. I am part of an increasing number of individuals and organizations opposing any further destruction of the forest for development. Manitoba Historical Society, Heritage Winnipeg and Manitoba Archaeological Society are calling for a complete stoppage and moratorium on any incursion, damage, deforestation, alteration of the grounds of the Lemay Forest in its heritage area immediately. Recent research by a respected archivist, Shelley Sweeney, about the 60 percent child mortality at the Asile Ritchot orphanage between 1904 and 1948 revealed the death of 3,383 of its 7,365 admitted children. Further research about these children's burials is needed and ongoing. Children's and some of their mothers remains are buried in the former Asile Ritchot cemetery inside of the Lemay Forest and beyond the cemetery in the forest. This fact alone should convince members of Council that this land should never be developed and absolutely needs to be acquired by any legal means possible and rezoned as a protected public site to remember these forgotten children who mainly died because of poverty and inadequate care. These children were of all nationalities, but many also were of Métis and Indigenous heritage. The Manitoba Metis Federation has formerly called on the City of Winnipeg to acquire and rezone this land in acknowledgement of the profound, historical and cultural connection between the Lemay Forest land and the Red River Métis. MMF further support a national urban park framework to honour this lands historical and cultural significance. The owner's applications for rezoning and subdivision have already been rejected four times by various levels of City of Winnipeg decision makers because the applications contravene existing city by-laws. This treed property is not suitable for development because it is land locked in a floodplain and un-serviced. Housing should be built on properties that are more suitable and do not require the removal of mature healthy trees. It is my understanding that the City assessed value of this property is 1.7 million. Recently, the owner was offered a purchase price of 5.25 million by the Manitoba Habitat Conservancy which was rejected claiming an inflated value of 8 million. The developer then proceeded to clear-cut one acre of trees without having any permits to build. An action that does not represent acting in good faith, in my opinion. The acquisition of this green space needs to be part of City of Winnipeg's Climate Action Plan and Climate Resiliency Strategy. It takes a minimum of 20 to 30 years for trees to mature. We no longer have this luxury of time in this accelerating climate crisis. Our actions and policies need to reflect the reality of this increasing public health crisis. Indigenous communities have been performing sweat lodge healing ceremonies in the privacy of this forest for over 30 years. These sacred grounds must not be disturbed any further. And ongoing acts as to these much-needed healing ceremonies need to be guaranteed as a gesture of reconciliation. I have provided a link to a trailer to my documentary film which shows the keeper of one of the sweat lodges, Terrence Bruce, talking about the importance of the sweat lodge ceremony. I was invited to participate in one of the sweat lodge ceremonies. And part of these sweat lodge ceremonies were three Indigenous women who told their stories. May I continue?

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Rollins moves two-minute extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Katharina Stiffenhofer:** Thank you. And these women's stories were all about inter-generational trauma and hurt. And they talked about the importance of these sweat ceremonies to their health and to their continuation onto staying sober. And I have followed this Lemay Forest story for more than a year now. And I would like to urge Council to make the story have a happy ending. I respectfully urge the members of Council to support Motion No. 1 to expropriate and rezone Lemay Forest and to declare it a memorial forest. And to please guarantee continued access for these so important healing ceremonies. Thank you very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you for your presentation. That concludes delegations. We will now take a recess and reconvene at 1:40 p.m. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of**
**Winnipeg City Council of**
**March 27, 2025, at 1:51 p.m.**

**Madam Speaker:** Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of March 27th, 2025. We are on reports of the Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor, the report dated March 18th.

**REPORT OF THE**
**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE**
**DATED MARCH 18, 2025**

**Mayor Gillingham:** Okay. One second, Madam Speaker. Okay. Thank you very much. I move then…actually, I would like to introduce the report and move adoption of the consent…consent agenda Items 1 to 14. Yes, 1 to 14. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. No. 8 has been pulled. French Language Services. No. 2 – Mill Rates for the Education Support Levy. And that is all. Councillor Mayes pulled 2. Councillor Wyatt?

**Councillor Wyatt:** 1, 5, 6, (inaudible).

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, 1, 5, 6…Okay, I will call the question on the remaining. Items 3 and 4, 7, 9, 11 and 12. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Mr. Clerk.

**Item 1 – Approval of Business Improvement Zone Levies – 2025**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes, Madam Speaker, I just want to rise and just speak to this briefly just to thank my Transcona Business Improvement Zone for the hard work that they continue to do. The business zone recently conducted a search. We required a new ED. I believe that is going to be announced shortly to all members of the BIZ zone. And I want to thank all of the members of the BIZ zone. They do immeasurable work for our community. One of the big projects that I get involved with every year is the Transcona community cleanup, whereby, we get all the students from various schools throughout our community, we raise enough funds to give every child a t-shirt, a community cleanup t-shirt, that's bright in colour so that nobody…to try to increase their safety when they're out there cleaning up the streets. It usually happens over the course of about a week. Where you see literally hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of student children from all over the community cleaning the streets in the community. This had its genesis in…a number of years back, Take Pride Winnipeg does this, what is the dirtiest area of the city? And of course, one year, unfortunately, it was Transcona. Of course, the headline was not trash…Transcona, it was a different slogan. I won't say. And I kind of hit the roof. And we kind of…we turned it around. Working with Take Pride Winnipeg and started this annual cleanup which has lasted till this day. There was, I think, during the pandemic we didn't have it, but we've brought it…managed to bring it back. And it really is an amazing thing to do. As well, the Transcona BIZ does wonderful things. They do the programming in the Transcona Centennial Square. We've had the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra, we have yoga in the square, we have farmers market in the square, we have a Canada Day celebration in the square where I…even I cut a Canada Day cake with Brian Bowman at one point, and look forward to having the mayor there…Gillingham to…Mayor Gillingham to cut the Canada Day cake. It's just a wonderful place. And it really has become the focus. The BIZ has recently opened new offices on Day Street. Bigger, better offices. And I want to say that we have slowly…instead of growing our tax levy, as you know, the BIZ is…receive a revenue based on the levy, the BIZ levy. The BIZ levy is a percentage on top of the ARV: the actual rental value of the business, which is the calculation done determining…based on the business tax. And for the business tax. And so, we have managed to maintain our levy, relatively speaking, and grow the zone. In other words, grow the rolls of the zone. And with the expansion of Park City Commons, that area joined the BIZ, which exponentially added value. When I first arrived on Council, I want to say that the overall BIZ levy collected by the BIZ was around 100, maybe 100 and a quarter thousand dollars a year, now it stands at 432,714 dollars projected into 2025 here. I just want to say that we have expanded the zone. It was funny, one business in the area, quite well-known business, but he didn't want to really know…presence known. It had something to do with a substance other than alcohol was being created in the zone, grown. And our officials didn't know that it was there. I had to send the Assessment Department out a couple times to try to track them down. We finally actually got them on the rolls. And you know, they contribute now to the zone. I would like to add something that maybe we don't look at now in light of trade war going on, but that the railway, for some reason, CNR, does not pay business tax. I'm not too sure why. There's some sort of old exemption there. Why the railway has…doesn't pay business tax, but their main competitors, who, by the way, is not CP. The main competitor, if you ask the railway who

their main competitor is, it's the trucking industry. If you ask the trucking industry who their main competitor is, it's the railway. You know, the trucking industry has to pay business tax, but the railway doesn't. And I get it, it's a historic reason for some…they pulled…back in the day, when they were a Crown Corporation, they were able to say, we are Federal Crown Corporation, and we should not have to pay business tax. Well, last time I checked, they are not a Federal Crown Corporation anymore. And so, I really think the time has come for us to revisit that. And that would bring revenue. I know the Mayor is always looking for revenue to come to the table. That would definitely bring revenue to the table. And maybe, as I mentioned, maybe not at this point in time with this economic uncertainty before us with the trade war going on, unfortunately, between Canada and the United States, it's time to do that. Anyway, I just wanted to say, the BIZ has been doing amazing work. Continues to do great work in the community. And is a centre point for many residents in the community with all the programming that they do. They put out a quarterly, we call it the BIZ Bullet. It goes not only to Transcona, but it goes beyond into Oakbank, Springfield, into East Kildonan-Elmwood. It's really a way to advertise the businesses. It has a directory of all our businesses in there. It showcases different businesses at every BIZ Bullet. And it's really exciting. It's something positive and we have really managed to build the BIZ organization up over the years in such a way. We have our own storefront revitalization program. We'll give matching grants to businesses that want to enhance their storefront. I just think it's wonderful. And so, I want to thank them. I'm happy to be able to approve the levy here today. And I wanted to stand it down because I don't talk about this that often. And it's been a while since I have. And I felt it was important to be able to stand it down now and to speak about it, especially in light of our new executive director coming online very shortly in the middle of April. We are really excited about that. And I just want to thank all the volunteers who sit on the board of directors of the business improvement zone. The last time that we had the AGM, we were in a council meeting here on our planning hearing that went all way till…that one went till 11:00. What, that was the 1:00 in the morning one. And so, I couldn't attend. I gave some printed words that were read. But I just want to thank the BIZ's board of directors, the president, secretary, treasurer. I want to thank Martin Pasiecka, as well. Martin is an amazing guy with the Planning Department of the City. He is an amazing liaison to us. He's always there at all our board meetings answering questions as a resource for the BIZ. Liaising back to the City. If we didn't have Martin, I don't know what we could do at times. He has been immeasurable. His institutional knowledge of being able to get things done is just tremendous. So, I want to thank him and the Planning Department for that support. And with this, I would just like to close and…on those remarks. Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know it's going to be a long day. This an opportunity now that once again I am inspired by Councillor Wyatt to say a few words in terms of the BIZ. I just want to say, it's been my first few months as Council rep to a business improvement zone. I want to thank Councillor Eadie for recommending me to Council to be…in this…for this year, Council's representative to the North End BIZ. I literally live half a block from that North End BIZ catchment. And lived part of my life on a day-to-day, week-to-week basis in the area. It's been a…truly a pleasure to have monthly meetings with some excellent members of the business community in the North End. Salt of the earth people that have truly, in their own way, the best interests of our community in mind. I do want to thank right now Keith and Anthony Horne, Tom Krupa, Astrid Lichti, Carla (inaudible) doing an excellent job of representing the North End businesses in challenging times. Also as well, Martin Pasiecka. I do want to state that it gives me that experience, less in the case that there is a BIZ on my side of the Red River. There is constant, vigilant work…works to form a BIZ along Henderson Highway with members of the business community and members of the GNA: the Glenelm Neighbourhood Association, as well as the Chalmers Neighbourhood Resource Committee, to form a BIZ. It's an ongoing…ongoing challenge. And I do want to state that in lieu of a BIZ in the area, it has been just the community organizations in the area have sort of taken up that slack and sort of the challenge to work with them over time on issues that would be BIZ issues. But nonetheless, I want to thank some of the local organizations: Ma Mawi, Chalmers Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation, Glenelm Neighbourhood Association, for being there for the community and dealing with these issues. Happens to be that just yesterday I had a meeting with Peter Ginakes of the Pony Corral on Nairn Avenue in East-Elmwood, in my ward, and the…their brand-new neighbour, Fat Guys Auto Parts, Doug Wilson. They are going to put on one heck of a Canada Day celebration in East Elmwood, and it is my pleasure to work with them. And not only are they excellent neighbourhood businesses to, you know, bring some pride to East Elmwood. Happens to be as well that on record, Peter Ginakes just said yesterday, when asked, he's in to creating a BIZ on Nairn Avenue. For the record, Madam Speaker, these are good things and I just want to give that positive report. And especially my enthusiasm now that Councillor Eadie has offered me the opportunity to be a Council representative to the North End BIZ. Thank you. Miigwech.

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

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. You can call the question, Madam Speaker.

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

**Item 2 – 2025 Mill Rates for the Education Support Levy and Special Levy**

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Property owners in Winnipeg are impacted by the changes that school divisions make to education taxes. And of course, we know…we know well that under the provincial legislation, under the Public Schools Act, the City of Winnipeg, our Council, is required to fix and impose an education support levy. And it also requires us, the provincial legislation does, to send out the tax bills. And though our staff makes very clear on the property tax bill which portion is municipal taxes and which portion is education taxes, still - councillors will know this, because your office, my Office of the Mayor, gets the calls or our 311 staff, the City of Winnipeg staff, gets the calls when there is confusion or sometimes people don't…they don't separate, they just read the bottom number and then they have questions. And so, the changes that school divisions are making this year to education tax levels combined with the province's changes, will have an impact one way or the other on many, many property owners. And so, appreciate the report that our staff did bring forward to try to kind of clarify what really is…you know, are the changes that school divisions are making with their submission now of property tax changes. So, with that, I'm looking forward to hearing my councillor colleagues on this one.

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

**Councillor Mayes:** Noting that we likely are in for a long day, I will try not go on for too long, but it's important to talk about this. We…there has been some unfortunate comments, I think, in the media over the past week about, you know, cities trying to make sure people know these shocking increases are coming from the school divisions. 16 percent here and then there…they should be expressing it this way, not as a mill rate increase. Look, we've made some progress in the years I have been here. I will take a little of the credit, but a number of other people deserve some credit too. We have made progress in our dealings with the school boards. Former Mayor Bowman created a position for School Board Liaison which was something I pushed for and I'm glad he did that. I think we should do more of that. We have done a lot of good partnership work with the school divisions. On running tracks alone, we've done Seven Oaks, we've done River East, we've done…we've done projects with the Winnipeg School Division at Grant Park and we've done three with LRSD. We've been doing…and that's just on one item alone. We have been doing some good work with the school divisions. They have expanding enrollments. They have expanding needs. We didn't make it easy for them when we took them all the way to the courts in terms of whether certain items should be exempt from property taxes. So, which Councillor Rollins made clear as Trustee and as Councillor here, she thought the City's position was wrong and I agreed with her and the courts agreed with that, as well. So, the point…look, we know the increases are going up. We know we have to implement this. People can see it on their property tax bill. Our taxes are going up 5.95 percent. Plus, there's a garbage fee that's the equivalent of an eight percent property tax increase. That's not very hard math. That's up around 14 percent. And that's if you are in the middle income. If you are in a lower income and you're getting that fee, the equivalent of what you pay in taxes and fees is up over 14 percent. So, maybe we shouldn't be too righteous about faulting the Louis Riel School Division or others about whatever increases they are proposing. Additionally, I would think if the trustees from Winnipeg Division were here, they would be saying, yeah, we are trying to put in less user fee on the parents. We are actually moving away from that. So, we're going to have to do more on property taxes because that seems more equitable. What do you want from us? So, I would hope we have a little bit more of the partnership and cooperation philosophy rather than trying to claim, oh look, their tax increases are higher than ours. Look, we…it's…there are pressures everywhere. That is why their…our taxes are going up, that's why their taxes are going up. The one item we should come back to someday, and it's not really on us to resolve it, but we have this inequity of school play structures that are out there. Province won't fund them at a new school. The Province won't fund them at old schools. Randomly, the City has funded them at certain schools. School divisions are taking different approaches to this. DSFM has actually taken a very good approach which was, we'll put in some money if you can find matching money. So, that's well done by DSFM. So, we've got to work out something on this problem of the school play structures, but that's not for today. But for today, I just wanted to get up and say thank you for the people who are trustees, thank you for the work you are doing. And yeah, there are property tax increases here. Sure there are, but they are straightforward. We're going to vote for them for today and hopefully we can keep the progress that we have made. Well, hopefully we can continue with the progress that we've made with the school divisions.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Browaty, followed by Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Wow. All I can say here is wow. These percentage increases, I'm quite certain, are the highest that I have seen in my 18 years here on City Council. We're talking between 10 and 18 percent for school divisions across...no, it's…again, it's 10 to 18 percent more per school division that they are taking in. This is a reassessment year, as well. Some people will see extra impacts because of that, plus a big change in the way the education tax credit is coming forward. Yeah, half the people are going to be further ahead getting this flat

1,500-dollar credit. But there's some fairly average homes now, and especially depending on the school division, where the new scheme where you get…sorry, yeah, the new scheme, which is a flat 1,500 dollars, versus the old scheme, which was 50 percent plus 350 dollars. This is going to put a really big spotlight on the fact that the mill rates are pretty radically different in different parts of the city of Winnipeg. In Pembina Trails where the mill rate is around 10.8 percent, the value of the house before the change negatively impacts you is pretty high. Your house value…well, it has to be close to half a million dollars. In Seven Oaks School Division, Madam Speaker, a lot of the residents that we both represent, you are into the mid 300,000s where you the new scheme, you are worse off. But the important thing to remember is, the City of Winnipeg, we're the ones who are collecting it. When you see your deduction for your TIPP payment on your…on your bank statement, doesn't say Seven Oaks School Division. Doesn't say Pembina Trails. It says City of Winnipeg TIPP payment. We're the ones who are going to be collecting it. And there's some pretty average homes in different neighbourhoods of the city and it varies by neighbourhood, because of the radically different mill rates we see in the city of Winnipeg, how this is going to impact people. So, the whole combination, yes, 5.95 percent, one of the larger increases we've seen in a very long time here at the City of Winnipeg. But the school division increases are typically double or more. Plus, the changes to the education tax credit. There's some fairly average homes now that are going to see 1,000 dollars more per year. I've been running lots of examples; 200 dollars to the City of Winnipeg, 800 dollars more in education taxes because of this change. My own house, it's about 500 dollars more for the year, about a hundred…about a hundred dollars of it to the school divisions. Why is mine lower than the average? Because my assessment went up less than the average. We were I think around 6 or 7 percent as opposed to the average city-wide of about 9.5 percent. So, when people get their bills the first week of May, you're all going to be getting a lot of phone calls. Some people are going to be further ahead. But about a quarter of people are going to be hit pretty hard. Winnipeg School Division, homes in River Heights, are going to be hit pretty darn hard. Fort Rouge, River Heights, but yes, so again, these are big increases. There's a lot of moving things this particular year that are impacting things differently. And I encourage you all to stay on top of it. And make sure that, you know, your MLAs recognize that they should be taking most of the blame for the changes for most people. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. First thing I want to do is clear up something. The new waste management fee, if we hadn't had to recover last year's four percent tax equivalent to…the 28.2 is equivalent to four percent. We are collecting that now because there was…there was no money collected. So, yeah, you could say that this waste management fee is an eight percent increase. But ultimately what it is, is it's equivalent to a four percent property tax increase, Madam Speaker. Because the cost is 28.2. And one percent increase is equivalent to seven million or thereabouts. Anyway, so I am only going to speak to this. I hear this debate and a number of us have been school board trustees. And Brian will always stand up and speak appropriately because, you know, they have a mission which is to graduate our kids so that they can have success in their lives in the future as well as socialize and be good participants in society. So, it's all about the assessment base in school divisions. So, I notice that, you know, you want to target and say, well, the Winnipeg School Division, you know, they say it's a five percent increase. And then, well, there was an increase…a big increase in the assessed values of properties, that actually derives more money to increase the school division budget. And I will point out that the Pembina Trails School Division didn't have to raise their special levy because the assessed value in Pembina Trails, it's always been much easier there because the assessed values are way larger than in any other part of the city except for, what might come close, is a portion of North Kildonan. So, ultimately, if you look at the Evergreen School Division, which has…has the wealthiest capability of raising money, they have a huge assessment in Evergreen, which is Gimli, which has this huge corporate property taxpayer who produces Canadian liquor. And everybody should buy it if they drink. But I digress. I want to talk about…in the past, so people don't like the special levy. I'm…you know, I'm a senior citizen now, why should I have to pay any education tax? All that kind of…we have all that kind of situation to talk about. But it is about the continuing good future of this city. Couple things you could do to reduce the problem, maybe Pembina Trails and all the school divisions who are doing special levy in the city of Winnipeg boundaries, maybe they should get together as school divisions. What is their need to provide the education for our kids? And then, what they could do is, it would be one education levy against the total assessed value within the city of Winnipeg so it would be fair. So, you couldn't say, well, this school division, look how much they are jacking it up. Because, really, there's a discrepancy just in the assessed values. And I would also point out that where the bigger growth, Seven Oaks School Division, Madam Speaker, is benefiting from the second fastest growing part of the city. Whereas, of course, Pembina…Pembina Trails, I think that it pretty well covers almost all of Waverley West where there is a huge increase of new assessment that helps pay for the schooling that our kids need. And so, that's one idea. In the past, when…before I got onto City Council, the Manitoba Association of School Board Superintendents came up with a plan. And they…actually, the current deputy minister was at the crux of that. And pointed out that you could get rid of the special levy if you combined all the programs that the province is putting out related to schools. And if you mixed it all, you could have got rid of the special levy. But there was no impetus from the provincial government to follow that track. So, we can debate this all we want. But ultimately, if we are going to property taxes for education levy, it is the most efficient way to use the one system that sends out that property tax bill to all of our homeowners. And just, that's…that in itself keeps costs down. It keeps

bureaucracy down. And that is a good thing, Madam Speaker. So, I will leave it at that. I, of course, am supporting these levies. And you know, people can interpret things the way they want and spin it whatever way, Madam Speaker, but again, I will just conclude, this is about educating our kids, our grandkids, so that they and all of us will have a really good future.

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

**Councillor Wyatt:** I just want a couple of things on the record. I vote against this, typically, every year. And that is that, first of all, I want to say, to everything Councillor Mayes said, absolutely correct in terms of the hard work and the spirit of the trustees. I think they all have the best interest of our divisions at heart and the education of our young people. But I also want to recognize what Councillor Browaty has said, and that is, we have some of the highest increases we have ever seen in a long time coming right across the city. I think it's 15.6 percent or 15.9 percent in the River East-Transcona School Division alone. And I guess what is frustrating about all of this is that it was the municipalities that lobbied the province to reduce education taxes off the property tax bills. We had success with that with regards to Premier Pallister who came in and said, we are going to remove a good chunk of your education taxes off the property tax bill. Come the election of Wab Kinew. Wab Kinew, Premier Kinew, confirms it with a cap of 1,500 dollars a household. We created the tax room that we wanted to create, members of Council, that we as an association, as part of the AMM, lobbied hard on the Province of Manitoba. Part of the reasons, though, was we did this was that we could backfill part of that dividend. Not take all of it. Not take all of it. But to say to the residents of Winnipeg, look, we have these outstanding issues that we've got to fund. We've got to build Arlington Bridge. We've got to get Chief Peguis done. We've got to do this; we've got to do that. We need money to do this. Here is a plan for the next 10 years. We've got to bring property taxes up to this amount. We will probably take about 50 percent of the dividend over 10 or 15 years, but we're not going to do it all at once. We're not going to hit you with a 15 percent hit all at once. But to cap it, at least…at least you'll have 750 dollars still in your pocket at the end of it all. What the irony now is, of course, the school division is going to eat all that up at the rate they are going at. And we will have none of the dividend that we lobbied so hard for all of those years to establish coming back to us unless we, I hate to say this, like the dog in the yard. You know, we mark our territory, so to speak. And it really comes down to that, Madam Speaker. We have to do this. And communicate to the citizens. Look at, yes, we are going with this in terms of property tax increase. But this percent is dedicated to setting up a reserve fund for a new strategic infrastructure. This is dedicated to setting up a reserve fund to fix our existing bridges or to build rapid transit or whatever. Open, transparent, be frank, put it in the bill. Let everybody see. And that this is our plan. We all…the multi-year budget for that reason, Council, we have the multi-year budget for that reason that we should have a long-term plan. Not only on spending and controlling that spending, but on taxation, so that we can tell citizens this is where we need to go. The school division is doing it. They're doing it. They're not hesitating. They're not blinking an eye. I mean, I'm getting calls like Councillor Browaty is and others. I'm encouraging them to go down to the board office. I mean, they would be coming to us if we were proposing a 16 percent in tax increase. They'd be coming down here. Go down to the school board, speak your mind. That's democracy, right. That is where you need to go. And probably call your MLA. But you know, and I have lots of sympathy for the trustees. And the reason I do is because I know that 95 percent, maybe that is high, but the lion's share of their budget is wages. Is wages. School trustee's wages. Payroll. And they are somewhat limited in that. And not only that, they are limited by the fact that they don't have…teachers don't have the right to strike. It's arbitration. It goes to arbitration for its decisions. They are limited based on what arbitrators decide. Arbitrators tend to look at the past. The past has been pretty aggressive on some fronts in terms of those increases. I mean, you could make the argument of right to strike. Right to strike is a fundamental foundation of the rights of labour. You could send you to some public sector unions, we won't give you the right to strike. Oh no, I don't want that. You know, I will keep arbitration. So, ultimately, Madam Speaker, and by the way, I have family, I have cousins who are teachers. I…you know, and they come to me. I mean, what is interesting, is one cousin I won't…he came to me and, you know, anti…we don't want that bill Pallister is bringing in. But privately, there's a lot of things I like in that bill. You know, in terms of benchmarking, having standardized testing, trying to get our kids…We have the lowest public education results across the board almost in every subject in this country right now. Like the Mississippi of the north when it comes to our public education right now. Which is why people when they're scrapping and saving, working class people put their kids in a private school. That shouldn't be. We should have the best public education. The private schools should be the one trying to get the best teachers. We should already have them. Instead, it is the other way around. Anyway, Madam Speaker, per my views, I'm going to vote against, as I always do. I know we have to go to vote…all vote against it, it will apparently go to some sort of, I don't know, electoral prison or something like this. But anyway, I am sure some of you would like me…like to see me there. And I'm sure you wouldn't want to be issuing bail. But anyway, those are my comments, Madam Speaker. Thank you very much. It's going to be a long day.

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

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thanks, Madam Speaker. I will be very brief. It's just, listening to Councillor Browaty and giving his explanation, he mentioned about the difference in mill rate. And I got scared. What are they talking about? I don't want to put words in his mouth, but if I'm not…if I understand him correctly, he's not talking about the…the City of Winnipeg's mill

rate, and that is consistent throughout the city. It's our assessments that give property taxes, make the difference in terms of the difference in property taxes throughout the city, whatever house, what neighbourhood. It's mill rate times assessment equals property taxes. When he said the difference in mill rate, I believe he was mentioning the difference in the school division's mill rates, which are notably different from one school division to another and that's where we've got a difference in…in school tax assessment. And I just wanted to make that clarification. I know…I am pretty sure that is what he meant. I think he nodded. That's what he meant. Because we all deserve to understand sort of the mill rate and property taxes. And if there's going to be any difference in mill rate, rest assured, the City of Winnipeg is not doing separate mill rates across the city. That's the school divisions, which is their prerogative. Thank you. Miigwech.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor. The Mayor's opportunity to close. Thank you.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues for their comments on the record. I want to thank our staff, again, for this report. And I am looking right now at schedule B. I appreciate this report. I think the…it's fair to say, the average person – and this is not a condescending comment, because it's just the reality. The average person doesn't totally understand mill rate or how mill rate is calculated. In fact, if I put a pen in front of 16 of us and said, okay, calculate the mill rate. How does it worked out? We would probably, you know, go to Google, one or two of us, say, just want to make sure I'm doing this right. Because it's complicated. Less complicated, but still, not everyone understands the impact of a property tax change, either increase or decrease. Because, as Councillor Browaty pointed out today, it's an assessment year. The assessment is a factor in the equation that changes everything. But what everybody does understand is how many dollars more or how many dollars less per year am I going to have to pay as a property owner. That is the language pretty much everybody gets and can understand. Am I paying more dollars or fewer dollars this…this year? And so, I do appreciate that our staff, through the report and schedule A and B, especially B, takes a sample home, values it and then per school division, gives the percentage increase and then the dollar increase on that sample home. So, I want to recognize the work that our staff has done. And I think this is really important work. And I think that all of us elected officials at every level of government should be using, you know, these kind of examples. And we do that annually in our budget. We always talk about a sample home with the property tax increase and the dollar amount difference on that sample home that it will make. So, when school divisions talk about mill rate changes and use that (inaudible), seem to use that as their lead communication, I think this work from our staff helps to clarify and put into more understandable language what the average Winnipegger can comprehend. I will say this, I too appreciate anyone who puts their name on a ballot, we do, and gets elected; whether it's at a federal level, provincial level, municipal level or school rate…pardon me, a school division. I do appreciate that work. I was surprised to hear that at least one school division, maybe it's more, maybe it's common practice, I don't know; the day they voted on their school budget and their property tax and education tax increase budget, they opened their meeting, they went in-camera to do…make their decision and then came out of camera, adopted their budgets with its corresponding increases in-camera. I find that surprising. Maybe it is common practice at school divisions, but it did surprise me. But once again, I do appreciate the work our staff has done. And we are compelled under provincial legislation to bring this forward, to vote on this, to fix and impose the education support levy and fix and impose the special levy. And so, that is what we are doing today. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. With that, I will call the question on Item 2. All in favour? Contrary? I called the vote. All in favour, please rise.

**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, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

**Nays**

Councillor Wyatt.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Item 2 passes. Next item, Mr. Clerk. Item 5.

**Item 5 – Winnipeg Police Service Headquarters Litigation**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I want to thank our CFO and her team who have been working with our external auditors, KPMG, getting this to this point. And so, I will wait to hear from my colleagues on this one.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. First speaker on this? This was stood down by Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes, I just want to thank the Mayor and EPC for pursuing this matter. Recently I had a gentleman, a constituent, come by the ward office to say, you know, what is going on with this payment? Where is it at? And so, I was very happy to see this. And I will be informing him of the actions undertaken by the Executive Policy Committee to continue to, hopefully, pursue this matter pertaining to the need to collect funds that are still outstanding. I'm hoping that we can secure the said funds sooner rather than later. But any kind of information that the Mayor or the Administration can give as updates on this as the matter goes forward, it would be useful. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. Yes, Madam Speaker, in anticipation of maybe a future question in question period, I have no other information but that that is before me today and…before us today. I want to thank my colleagues. I assume it will be a unanimous vote or really close to that. Let's keep in mind this, is the work that we are trying to do here is to recover for the people of Winnipeg at least a portion, right, an amount, that will refund the people of Winnipeg. So I, too, would like to see, like all of us would like to see, that settlement completed sooner rather than later. But what we have before us here is this…is this report that says that we can now book these amounts accordingly. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Call the question on Item 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, next item.

**Item 6 – Municipal Canada Community-Building Fund – Annual Indexing Rate of Construction Inflation**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. First speaker on this item, Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. I want to thank Councillor Wyatt for partnering with me on this and for really bringing this forward. We do need to ask the Federal Government when they are bringing or sending the Municipal Canada Community Building Fund funds to municipalities that they keep in mind, that the costs go up every year. There is a percentage increase. Whether it's consumer price index or current construction inflation. And so, that's important. That's reflected in this motion that we will, therefore, take this to AMM. I thank Councillor Browaty for his work as our representative on AMM and FCM, as well, to ask those two bodies to continue to, you know, kind of lobby the Federal Government to make sure that an inflationary amount is built into the annual gas tax…I'll keep calling it a gas tax, the annual gas tax funding amounts. So, that's what this motion is. I want to thank Councillor Wyatt for his partnership.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I just want to rise, as well, and thank the mayor for taking the lead on this motion and for moving the motion that was proposed originally as amending another report last month. And thank him for this opportunity. I actually had the motion blown up and it's on my wall downstairs, outside of my office door. And to…I think it's very important, the motion, that we're hopefully going to vote on and adopt today. I would be interested in acquiring information through, I guess…through to you, Madam Speaker, and Councillor Browaty, who is our representative of the FCM. That the first convention up, I believe, is the FCM convention, which is in June in Ottawa. And that, in light, if we pass it here today, that this would be considered by their resolutions committee and then be considered on the floor of the convention in Ottawa. And if that is the case, which I'm assuming it would be, unless for some reason, which I doubt, but it may be that policy already exists with the FCM pertaining to this. I don't think it does. That would be the only reason they would disallow it or if it was not municipally related, which it is. And so, at that point, the sooner we have that information the better. I would like to extend through my office to the Mayor's office that I would be happy to coordinate any kind of effort on the floor of the convention to educate and lobby delegates to secure the support of the resolution when it comes to the vote. I would be very happy to work with the Mayor's office and his staff and my staff to do that. And just so that we could push it over the top and get it approved on the floor of convention, as policy. As was mentioned in the last Council meeting, we…we were the ones that…Mayor Norrie was the mayor who moved the gas tax policy to become FCM policy to lobby the federal government that it finally became actual public policy. And it would be nice to see if the same thing could be done here in the future pertaining to this request by our mayor today in terms of development of public policy federally. And so, those are my comments, Madam Speaker. And again, thank you to the Mayor for moving it. Appreciate it very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, I want to thank the Councillor. I was smirking a little bit, if this is what is…if this motion is adorning his office walls, we may need to take him to an art gallery or to get him a poster of Mark Schiefele...

**Madam Speaker:** It's outside his wall, so for all of us.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Oh, exactly. Or maybe, you know, the ubiquitous standard dogs playing poker photo or something. But nonetheless, I will take…yeah, glad to talk to the Councillor a little further about working together on the floor of AMM or FCM to do some lobbying work. So, thank you. I want to thank everyone for their participation and support of this.

**Madam Speaker:** Very good. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, the question on Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk, Item 8.

**Item 8 – French Language Services Five-Year By-law Update**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Merci, Madam Speaker. And I will turn it to, I think, Councillor Allard, my colleague, has some comments on this. And so, I will look forward to hearing from him and others.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** ***French Spoken (2:35 to 2:39):***

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

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Last week we had the flag raising here to celebrate the Moi de la Francophonie, Franco-Manitoban community. One member of the community very publicly thanked me for my efforts. And if you have been here long enough, you know take the praise even when you don't entirely deserve it. So, I'm happy to take the praise, but it would be unfair to Councillor Allard not to thank him and salute the efforts he's put forward over the years. This report indicates we have made good progress. Our gestionnaire, Nicole Young, has done a lot to promote French language services in the city. But I want to thank Councillor Allard. And now, a few words in French, from me which is…would be say. ***French Spoken (2:40 to 2:41):***

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

**Councillor Schreyer:** ***French Spoken (2:41 to 2:44):***

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next speaker? Mr. Mayor to close.

**Mayor Gillingham:** ***French Spoken (2:44 to 2:45):***

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Carried. I know a word or two. Mr. Clerk.

**Item 10 – Annual Report on Housing Accelerator Fund Initiatives**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Touché, Madam Speaker, for knowing a word or two. I'm going to wait to…I may have some comments to conclude this, but I'm going to wait to hear from my colleagues on this first. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Speakers on this item? Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes, Madam Speaker, I just want to step it down. I think there's good parts to the report, bad parts to the report. I am concerned still about the rapid zoning changes being proposed in local area plans. And I know we are about to have a discussion on that pertaining to open houses coming up that we are requesting. I see a motion on the matter pertaining to request. I know there was one at the Convention Centre recently. I am looking forward to hopefully seeing these meetings happen prior to us dealing with this, which is coming up shortly. And it's something which, you know, zoning is one of those things, Madam Speaker, that what I have learned is there is a multiple of ways of not how to do zoning. And there's really a very narrow window on the ideal way to do zoning. But one of the few things that I have

learned is that the more you consult, the more you are genuinely seen as having a real dialogue with residents, not an artificial one, not an imposed one, not something coming from above. That you don't necessarily always have to go with the plan. Sometimes it is good to go without a plan and to get feedback and saying, this is where we need to go in terms of densification. However, we really don't know how. We would like to get your thoughts. Rather than coming in and imposing from above. Automatically that creates resistance and distrust. And so, I have some very real concerns about that as well. I just have concerns about the overall process, to be honest with you, Madam Speaker. That the HAF, I think, was tainted by a federal government which really had no reason to sit in a position of moral authority and say that they could tell us how to dictate our zoning in light of the fact, and I say that, Madam Speaker, in light of the fact, at the very minimum, they are late to the game when it comes to funding affordable housing. For a federal government that in 2018 or '19, I want to say it was, voted that housing is a right. That housing, affordable housing and quality, dignified affordable housing is a right. That that's a right. And then you wait a few years later, five years later, then you roll out a program with strings attached. As if they want a message that we are the tough guys on the block and we're going to get this done and get you affordable housing because we are beating up the municipalities of this country. For a pittance of money, by the way. When you look at the big picture of money that affordable housing actually requires to build. One-time money, as well, on a problem that has been going on for decades and is sustainably underfunded, is the best way to put it. I have real concern that we have kind of emasculated or undermined ourselves in terms of our ability as a municipality to say to the citizens of Winnipeg, you are in control of your land use. You are the residents. You are the local decision makers. We are an extension of that through a representative democracy. But here we have this entity coming in from the outside and interfering into that very democratic process that has been aligned under the powers, under the charter of the actual planning and City Charters and acts. While giving those…bestowing those powers onto us to be able to decide what type of land use is appropriate on a parcel of land or not. And all of a sudden, the federal government can say to us, we must do this, we must do that. If we don't, we will not get our level of funding. That to me, Madam Speaker, is fundamentally flawed in terms of a local democracy. And I don't think in light of the fact that we are in a major trade war right now with the United States and that seems to be the big issue of the day. And consuming the debate in terms of the federal election is unfortunate because the housing issue unto itself deserves its own federal election alone in terms of what is happening out there. I mean, only in Canada can we have a country where we have a relatively low population per density in terms of our acreage and size of our country, where we have successfully managed to drive up the price of land to make it hard for many in the middle class, definitely in the lower middle class, to be able to afford a piece of turf to call their own. Fundamental to what I think is the Canadian dream. And for the federal government to come in and say, thou shalt do this and thou shalt do this at the eleventh hour of a dying government, five years after they declared that housing is a right. And then to take away rights that belong to the citizens pertaining to their zoning and how they want their neighbourhoods to develop and how they want their neighbourhoods to look. Not to mention all the other challenges we face in this city with regards to our transportation, our infrastructure and everything else and how we're actually going to get that done in terms of the underground sewers and the pipes that actually need the services density. You know, oh no, we will put that aside. We'll look at that later. But you know…you know, the CSOs will look at that later. You know, Madam Speaker, this is where I really have some misgivings under the HAF. I love the fact that money is flowing. I love the fact that there are…projects are getting selected. That we're getting things happening. I think it's terrific. The Transcona project, Transcona Boulevard, five million dollars approved. Wonderful. It makes it a little bit more affordable. Not a lot when you look at the amount of units, but it does bring that number down. If they get it a top-up there from the Province of Manitoba, that will make it truly affordable, probably. So, and tomorrow we have our Winnipeg Housing board of director's meeting, FYI, Chairman Duncan (inaudible). You know, the…we need to…we really need, Madam Speaker, to push back on this file. The Housing Accelerator Fund initiatives, you know, annual report, it's now here in the middle of a federal election. And to make this an issue during the federal election. You know, the citizens of Winnipeg, never mind the rest of the country, have a right to know what the Federal Government's been doing. And the nerve that we've been threatened by, in terms of the Premier, or potentially Premier…Prime Minister Poilievre, what he…a Prime Minister Poilievre would do, like, you know. You know, you want to make housing affordable? Do what other western democracies do. Israel, France, Italy, Germany; they actually step up. They actually fund them. They actually go to municipalities. They build them. They actually buy the land and build it. The don't dictate to the municipalities thou shalt do this. But that is what this government has done here in Canada, demeaning local government in the process. Which, by the way, is far more democratic than the house of commons ever has been or ever will be. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Once again, and I really wish it wasn't the case in a way. My bad. Why would I even think that? Because it's disproportionate. Why is it, once again, Councillor Wyatt makes an excellent speech for something that is really important and he makes some points that I haven't heard before or he puts them into a perspective. That is true. And yet, why is he the one that said it? Why haven't I heard it somewhere before said like that? I hear kind of said like that here and there because people kind of get it. And he kind of nailed it again. People's frustration, people's fears, people's curiosities, people's misunderstandings. They don't understand. Why is it being done this way? Why isn't it being done this way in other countries? Why is he giving examples of when they kind of do the opposite? They don't de-regulate, they

actually take responsibility for their words by putting their own money where their mouth is kind of thing. Not taking the taxpayers money and de-regulating and saying, well, we are not going to take responsibility, but we will tax the very people that are having the hardest time. And then, put it over to, one could argue abetting inflation. I mean, let's face it. When…let's face it. I mean, I've talked about this in the chamber before. Let's not pretend this isn't a very important issue. Of course, it is a very important issue. Because it's actually related, obviously, to construction inflation. Why would I be talking about it for 10 years if it wasn't important? So, why are…why are we so…are we surprised it comes to this point in our society where it's harder to buy a house? It's not just due to construction inflation, but it's due to, well, the nature of the markets. He mentioned things that I think we better take heed of. In that, in other countries, they just don't tax you while they are de-regulating and say other people are going to take responsibility for it. And well, we will see if it becomes more affordable. We'll see in five years if these houses really were more affordable. They build it themselves. And guess what happens? Guess what happens when they do that? You actually have a greater accountability to the taxpayers money, and voila, you get less inflation for the most part. Isn't that amazing? You get less inflation. Not what we are told in this country. But that's not how we do it. And once again, he has to say something that the rest of us weren't, thus, yet again, inspire me to make some comments. At least to say thank you. Why can't I hear that 15 times in this circle? What is wrong with that? What's wrong with saying what he just said? So, he mentioned how the conditions under which we are told to de-regulate the democratic process here in Winnipeg and in other municipalities where the federal government by-passed the provincial governments of which the municipalities and cities are charters of. By-pass them, went directly to them. Divide and conquer. And said, if you want this money, you're going to compete for…against each other, you cities, not you provinces that actually talk to each other in a highly recognized organized basis. But with the cities saying, if you don't do it that way, that municipality is going to get the money. Am I exaggerating? No, that's exactly what's been said. And so, you know, the Liberal governing party here is a rather a big tent party. So, maybe the left hand or the red…the right hand are kind of far apart from each other and one hand doesn't always know what the other hand is doing. Well, that can happen, you know, in a big tent political party and governing party over time. And therefore, we have heard and I have heard here that even though the federal ministers from another province have said, these are the conditions you need to abide by, by reducing your democratic consultation…consultant process through the Council, through the councillors, you are in a better position to get the money. Meanwhile, the local Members of Parliament from Manitoba are saying, no, there…that is not true. But we have never seen them in the same room talk it out. So, there you go. And so, we've got this dichotomy of what it is, the conditions under which we are getting this funding. And why we have done more in one year, in less than one year, to change the property, planning and development strategy of this city for a permanent…for a very temporary…temporary era of a few hundred million dollars. How many hundreds of millions? Are we? Are We? Sorry? 60 million? Yeah, 60 million dollars, we have done the greatest change in the change of the role of the democratic consultation of our city when it comes to development. I think in the history of the…the history of the city, in the 150 years. Something like that for 60 million dollars, it's something for historians to look at and marvel in terms of the impact of this one temporary era on what's…could look…be a very long era. Because people now will say, well, you're going to change…you're going to change the rules and then change them again back? That is not fair. So, you're changing the rules in the middle of the game. Meanwhile we are told to change the rules to get money in the first place. But the money is temporary. But therefore, are changing of the rules is meant to be permanent? Anyway. At least Evan Duncan in this chamber says, you know, when asked how long will the change last? They'll last until they last is essentially what he said. It's on record, on video. They last until they last. We will be dealing with this in five years from now. Well, it's a good point. We don't know how long they are going to last. That is the question we've got to deal with. We're asking to make…we're asking to make major changes to how we run the city when it comes to development and planning for the sake of very temporary era of investment. And yet, why should we expect those changes to be permanent or even last a decade? Is the deeply affordable aspect of this development really going to last a long time? Well, I don't think so. So, again, judge me again. Watch my predictions again. I have been here 10 years. I've been talking about this for 10 years. You can watch what's been said 10 years ago. I can be judged right now. You can judge me right now. My concerns about cost increases, inflation, construction inflation, infrastructure inflation, relative inflation. And I never said it was just construction, I said it's going to hit on things like food because it already had been. We have been using false statistics when it came to food. Food inflation was already happening. You get to a certain point, and then it's sort of…it just becomes more noticeable, more painful. More people…more people are suffering. It becomes more evident. Food inflation was already happening 10 years ago, we just had ways of masking it when it came to the statistics. And there was people…I should be able to explain that better right now. But unfortunately, there are people that have explained it to me explain it much better. Things are getting worse. And what scares me is to think that we can blame it on a tariff war with the United States. It was already happening. And these 25 percent tariffs is worth about three years of inflation anyway. So, when we're talking about…talk about these tariffs every single day in the newspaper, why don't we talk about three years what standard inflation has done to the costs of things to Canadians. It's about the same thing and we don't. So, we are missing out on the communication. At least we had Councillor Wyatt to give us a bit of a lesson in terms of what they do in other countries to deal with unaffordable housing. Whereas we abet on affordable housing by throwing money at it which allows the costs to go up because there's no market responsibility to keep costs down. Because we'll just say, well, we'll tax the people that are suffering the most; the middle class, lower middle class, who's had their taxes go up the most. Let them pay for the subsidy. That is who we are. That is where we are at, Madam Speaker. Thank you. Miigwech.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Warmed up for my later speech about the four-plexes by talking briefly about the Housing Accelerator Fund here. What does this report tell us? It tells us a couple of things. Number one, as of December, we had almost met the target for what is defined as missing middle housing which is basically housing of two to four units. We have since surpassed that as Councillor Gilroy accurately pointed out at the last Council meeting. Mr. Mahé's reports now coming monthly at EPC confirm that. We have…the City now has generated 1124…1,124 units of missing middle. Our target was less than that. Our target was 1,026. We are 10 percent over the target 13 months into a 36-month exercise. So, when we are here in June, please nobody say we have to do these four-plexes to meet our missing middle. We are already over the target and we haven't done the four-plex stuff yet. We haven't even passed it. We haven't done any of it. So, that is not a valid reason to go forward with an expanded version. We will have some version on the four-plex debate when we come back here in June. And thanks to the clerks, we are now set…good to go for a lovely week from June 2nd to 8th here on that item. So, the missing middle is no longer missing. That's been…we are already over the target. So, that should not be part of the debate in June. Ironically, where we are well behind is on single family detached. That is right in the report. Ironic in that you might say, well, then why would we rezone all these areas that are for single family if that's where we are way behind on our target? Should we be doing that? Maybe Mr. Ryback had a point earlier about trying to maintain affordable single-family homes, but we will come to that, perhaps, if we need to in June. So, the missing middle no longer missing. We are already over the target. Second point; if you go through the report, couple conclusions that are pretty obvious. Number one, all of the concerns about affordability, building affordable housing, that is valid. Director Boris, to her credit, got up here at the malls and corridors and said, we don't have a…we don't really have a housing crisis, we have an affordable housing crisis in the city. Affordable rental housing crisis. All of that work, none of that has to do with the four-plex stuff. All of that work, they are all listed here, good projects. You have Winnipeg, Southern Chiefs, all sorts of other projects receiving funding. Good work by Mr. Mahé, Ms. Finnigan, getting the money out the door or supposed to be going out the door to these projects. So, the affordability argument, that has nothing to do with what we are going to be debating in June. So, let's not conflate the two. What we're doing is debating in June is a federal imposition saying you have to do four as of right. It's not our own staff who came up with that. That was not what was proposed. That is a pure…as Councillor Wyatt has said, that is a pure federal imposition. Thirdly, as you can tell from this, that is city-wide. It's not near the core. It's not in the…in the mature neighbourhoods. We had all that debate around infill guidelines. We have to get more people in certain parts of the city. Their population used to be higher. We have to focus on that. All of that has been abandoned. All the Federal Government said is four as of right. We are amending 21 local area plans. These include Precinct K and J, which are like a sea of mud mostly now. There's no…this isn't infill. This isn't infill in the mature communities. That's what the infill guidelines talked about in '21. So, this is just four as of right, everywhere across the city; Sage Creek, Waverley West, Court Avenue up in your part of the city, parts of Transcona, that's what's coming in June. That's clear from this report. It's just four as of right across the whole city. So, it's not really about affordability, it's also, and Councillor Browaty is to be commended for pointing this out, it's not about the infrastructure part of this. We had that vote. There is money coming on the infrastructure. That is good, but it's all targeted. Look at those maps that we got. None of that relates to four-plexes. None of it relates to probably where they are going. It's targeted to where we should be trying to densify, along the corridors. So, the report is thorough as far as it goes, reporting on some of the progress that has been made. Where we are behind, though, is certainly not the missing middle. Ironically, where we're behind is units by rapid transit and single-family detached. So, we will have to decide, I guess, in June how we wish to proceed with that. But it's useful to lay out what it is that's coming before us and we will have this talk, perhaps, in more detail in a few minutes about the need for more public consultation. But let's not start conflating housing needs and housing. Let's just be honest here. What is…what the federal government is demanding, and you can say…I was told, oh, you're jeopardizing 250 million. And my view is, oh, let's round it up to 300. If you're going to accuse me of that, let's just go even higher. Look, there's some money that has not yet been confirmed that rides on four as of right. The devil is in the details. That's what we're going to spend a week sorting out. Should the lot be 60? Should it be 65? Should it be less? Is it different for side-by-side? Is duplex versus up and down? All of this we'll have to sort out. Mr. Veich is earning his pay, I certainly have to say, answering all sorts of questions on this. And Mr. Kostiuk. Some good work there. So, that debate is coming and I'll go into more discussion of why we need some more public input. But this report is thorough in so far as it goes, but let's just be honest; that debate in June, that's not about affordability. That's not about making better use of infrastructure. It's certainly not about missing middle. We have…we have…it's been found, it's no longer missing. We are already over the target for those units 13 months into a 36-month project. Some people have said here, well, why are you worried, we'll never have to build any of these. No, no developer is ever going to actually build it. Well, let me conclude with two things: maybe don't say I am the one who is jeopardizing the housing if your answer is, but you should approve the four-plexes because no one is going to build them anyway. That just doesn't…you know, pick a lane. That doesn't hang together. And the report does say we're projecting 6,000 more units of missing middle in the next 10 years. So, we seem to be doing well with our current set of rules; promoting missing middle and our current staff. So, let's just remember that as we go forward with the debate. And there's some more things that this debate is not about, but I will come to that when we…when we discuss the motion that Councillor Wyatt and I put forward.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next speaker, Mr. Mayor to close.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I do want to take just a moment to acknowledge the work of our staff. I know, you know, not everyone is in 100 percent agreement with some of the steps we've been taking. But I think we can all agree that our staff has been working extremely hard on this initiative and the initiatives around it. And we do see in this report it talks about several of the initiatives. In fact, that there are eight listed there. I want to draw our attention. I know, you know, the time is going, but I do want to draw your attention to the land enhancement office and the work that they are doing. I campaigned on identifying available City land that we collected…collectively could find ways to develop, to get housing developed in a time when we need housing. We talked consistently about the fact that in three years we have grown by 71,000 people. The pressure on needing more housing is not just a Toronto or a Vancouver matter, it's a City of Winnipeg matter, as well. Our vacancy rate remains stubbornly below two percent because there's not enough units available. So, with the surplus land that we have available to us, we as a Council can, and we have, and I credit everyone who supported it, make a…are able to make a decision to put that land into circulation, make it available through partnerships with the private sector and non-profits to get housing units built. Our land enhancement office has been doing that work and doing great work. And just this week, they issued out…they issued expressions of interest inviting developers to partner with the City of Winnipeg to get housing built. And so, I want to thank them for that. Councillor Mayes did reference Appendix 2 which lists 23 different projects that we have funded through the Housing Accelerator Fund to get housing units built. We did a lot of approvals in the last several months; the goal, the hope this year, certainly, is in 2025 construction season, we would see a lot of shovels breaking ground, hammers, you know, putting up frames for housing. Concrete poured, drywall going up so that we can get units built. So, the only way that is possible is if our staff does the hard work they've done, not only in the Planning Department, but also in other departments as well to get the approvals accomplished so that these developments can get…can get approved. It's a good report and there's more to come. And my final comment is, and it's something I've stated on the floor of Council before. I think Councillor Wyatt referenced it. The current federal Liberal government, the current Conservative opposition, the leaders, at least in the past recent months, have said similar things. Somewhat different, but similar things about housing, is that they are requiring cities and municipalities to get housing built and get it built faster. So, it's…right now, unless there is some massive change in the federal campaign where one or both of those parties changes their policy, there will be pressure on cities and municipalities to get housing built. And this is one of the tools we are using to get that done. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, I'll call the question on Item 10. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt noted in opposition. Item 13, Mr. Clerk.

**Item 13 – Permit Dashboard**

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

**Mayor Gillingham:** I introduce the item.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. This was stepped down by Councillor Wyatt…Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you…That's correct. I look forward to the submission you brought forward by the Executive Policy Committee. Madam Speaker, there is definitely a need. I had a really good discussion…a very good discussion with the Chair of the standing committee recently about this very matter. And I hope that we can continue to have that dialogue so as to develop the standards that we want to bring into effect pertaining to, not just…I think our conversation more involved applications and development applications, but it's no different when it comes to permits in many ways. It has the direct impact on the ability for businesses to be able to pull to make their activity happen in a timely manner. One of the most challenging parts, I think, of this process has been two-fold. One, with the legislation that the Province brought down requiring us to meet certain timeframes. There's been a lot of debate around this chamber what is deemed a complete application? That's when the clock starts ticking based on the legislation. And that has caused, I know, some concern in the development industry and building industry. And also, just in terms of the permitting process itself. I don't point any fingers at the department. I think it's also a function of their resources or lack thereof. So, I just wanted to put these facts on the record. I think we are all supposed to be on the same team. And I think the staff do an amazing job with the resources they have. I do believe, though, that we could probably do much more if we had everybody back in the office and not necessarily working from home, but that's just my own personal opinion. But anyway, I have hammered on that issue over and over again. But anyway, Madam Speaker, those are my comments. Thank you very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie, you are next.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Chairperson…Councillor Duncan for bringing this forth. I think it's very important. My office gets many calls. I know that…I know that zoning and permits and the staff there work

hard at trying to accomplish really assisting and accomplishing the goals of the developers and builders out there. And it can be difficult in dealing with permits and such when you are trying to develop and build in, for example, in my ward in certain areas, it can be quite difficult. And I think that having this dashboard and working towards this so that we know how things are going. We really need to know, Madam Speaker, how we can support our staff who are trying to get things done following all of the standards and rules that we do have when it comes to building and building code and so on and so forth, and development can be very difficult. So, really, we need this done. And again, thanks to the Chairperson of Property and Development that this is going to move forward. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next speaker. Or Councillor Duncan first. Thank you.

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you very much. I will be very brief in my comments here. Some feedback that I did get just around the ability of the department to do this type of work when it comes to development permits and building permits under the restrictions that they currently have with staffing levels. I have heard this in my two years involved in the budget process, in my two years sitting on the Standing Policy Committee for Property and Development, and now, as the Chair. And this reflects hearing that loud and clear. However, we need the support of this data. And to several councillors around the table who say we need more transparency, we need all of this upfront. I agree wholehearted with…wholeheartedly with them. So, let's do this, Madam Speaker. Let's show where the department is right now with their resources. When it comes to timing on delivering for developments. We can do that by having a fully transparent process that is available to the public. And then, around this table, we can have a fully informed discussion on exactly what the needs are of the department. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Duncan. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you very much. I'm going to take you back in time. Back to…back to when I was on the Chair, 2016, I think it was. Whatever, 2026. Whatever it was, it was a long time ago. But in that horrible, really difficult time, we did a comprehensive fee review. And it said, quite clearly there, and that was in 2016 with the last comprehensive fee review and then they did another one, I guess it would have been four…2024 or 20…yeah, somewhere around there. Well, whatever it is. Doesn't really matter. But it's eight years. Eight years since we've done our last comprehensive fee review. And it's actually kind of ironic when we talk about that because one of the first recommendations of the last comprehensive fee review was, don't wait eight years again. It really messes things up. It's kind of like assessments, don't do it…wait so long. Okay, so we went through that system and we increased permits fees for some areas. And we based it upon, and this is a Council motion which I think we have now lost, obviously after the last budget, I'm pretty sure we have, is that permits need to be cost neutral. They're not…we're not here to fund developers on the permits. We have to work on it that we…whatever the cost is, is borne by the developer, it's not borne by the City. Again, we can…and then, discussion is, what is borne by...what is the cost? Well, we had a group that was set up, and now they are gone I found out. I was quite shocked by that. The industry players together with our City staff who would monitor permits on a regular basis. I asked our new Director about where is that group? What happened to that group? Had no idea it even existed. Again, why that doesn't exist, I don't know. So, we have this opportunity or we had the opportunity. We still may have the opportunity before the next federal election because I have seen some of the housing talk about this last round being pretty draconian. Some of the promises these…both the main federal parties are saying they're going to do for housing is even more. What my fear is right now, and I have heard some people talk about it again, is okay, we're going to use public dollars, taxpayers' dollars, because we want to fund permits for developers because developers will generate new tax revenue that will trickle down…trickle down economics, again; will trickle down to all of us and we'll be blessed and happy. Again, if that is a change to what it is, and I've kind of battled this on the budget, as well. I thought, why we'd left…they're getting less permits, but we're giving them more money. I didn't understand that logic at all. Maybe we should increase in permits, maybe we should review it. Should review the permit schedules. I don't think the atmosphere is here for that. We don't want to any way get in the way of developers being able to decrease housing price, which…or profits, depends where they put their savings. But we are going down this path. So, I am raising today my really big scare that with the limited money we have, our parks are falling apart, we can't afford anything, what we're going to do under the guise of, you know, making sure we have more housing, we are going to continue to take this budget short…this shortfall staffing. Even though they have less permits to do now and they're going to have a lot less permits going forward, because all the public hearings for the missing middle are gone, theoretically, proposed gone. We're going to have the same amount of staff but we're going to actually increase the staff. Well, if you have less work maybe the staffing level should go down. That may be…maybe a little bit more…a way to do this. But again, every time I mention that, especially to the department, it is like I just said the most evil thing in the planet. How can you possibly say that? We're so understaffed. Well, again, there's something disconnect going on here then. Then the fees need to increase. That may be another option. But none of that is going to probably happen. What I believe will happen is just based on my experience of the last two years, is we're going to dig deep somehow under the guise of affordable housing, which it won't be affordable housing. None of…let's face it. These projects, besides the beautiful projects that we do have by giving our land away. The Mayor is actually correct. Wonderful projects. Some of them were a little bit more controversial than others. But it's really…that was

beautiful. Do I think any more affordable housing is coming our way? No. Not really, because there's no more funding for that kind of project. And affordable, real affordable housing, really requires funding from the levels of government. So, I do…I am very pleased that we did that first portion, but now we're going forward with the next section and the next budget, and I raise up today that we need to have a comprehensive fee review. We need to do this sooner than later before the new parties come in and will say stuff like, no more guidelines. You can't even tell them to plant a tree. You can't even tell them to do anything. You just got to say, our land is your land, build what you want up to a four-plex, that's it. But if you want to say, you know what, we have design guidelines, hey, you need to have at least two façade styles. Gone. Permit fees. You can't raise permit fees. Gone. Development charges, and we had a little opportunity, that is gone. So, we're going to be stuck in this thing where we're going to actually be having to, in this case, unless we look…seriously look at what role the P&D department is doing and what is happening there. But we can't just take the lazy approach and say, well, we just got to take some public dollars and just give it to them. We don't have that money. These are for-profit businesses. This is what they do. They are there to make money. Developers aren't…they are there to build houses, sure, because it makes them money. And that is a business. I'm okay…you know what, who doesn't make any money? That little pocket park. There's no money. And that is where the city's (inaudible). That's where the city lies. We lie on the stuff, that no one else is funding because no one else will, but we know they're really critically important. But if it's a for-profit business, we should not be funding them. And that's why I get up today to raise a red flag on this one for the next budget cycle. The fact that we do have a comprehensive fee review, it's already eight years behind schedule. Probably there's some discussion to have. We don't have a committee that's working on this with industry at all. Very terrifying. And what is going to…I see happening coming down the pipe is like, oh my gosh, good thing there's two million dollars this year out of the public purse to pay for permits. It will be even higher. Even though the permit levels, as we can see, and with the Housing Accelerator Fund and all as of right stuff is coming in, those permits are going to drop. Because…and so, they…we should have the staffing to do the proper work. So, I raise this more as a concern. Maybe to bring some awareness of what is happening. But I also have to say, I have had some really good conversations with Councillor Duncan. Sometimes when I've brought this up it's like, oh, you even can't touch that. You can't touch that. Reducing staffing levels? That's a ridiculous…Councillor Duncan didn't do that. He said, well, I don't know about that, but let me go look into it. I really appreciated that. Talked about some of the history when I was there. I know that some of the developers will say, you charge us too much because we shouldn't have to pay for custodial fees for the Fort Garry Place. Well, then I go, who's…well, you weren't here. And again, it's like a tiff. You know, if it wasn't for you, why would we give you the money? If it wasn't for you needing that work, we need to clean that building somehow. So, you have to pay your proportional value. So, I am not sure whether we'll ever do a comprehensive fee review. I think Councillor Duncan is taking a few steps now that…putting us on a path. But I think by the time we get the path settled, it'll be too late. Because, again, to Councillor Wyatt's comments, the Federal Government's going to interfere with us to be able to do that. And again, what happens in the end? The public will have to pay for it. The public meaning our taxpayers who are already stretched to the limit. We should not be paying private business…for private business to do work. They should pay, it should be cost neutral. Don't want to gouge them, but we shouldn't be…we should be looking at this again. Again, but yeah, I do appreciate what…the comments I've had with Councillor Duncan. I do appreciate this (inaudible) report. But again, that's when I started researching a bit and I just want to bring that back up to the public.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next speaker will be Mr. Mayor to close.

**Mayor Gillingham:** I want to thank my colleagues for their comments and for their focus on this. Thank Councillor Duncan for bringing this forward. We always do need to, you know, kind of baselines and dashboards. I appreciate the dashboards we do have already. Where we can enhance, kind of, our baseline and our data and our stats in any…in any department, and certainly on permits, it's important. So, thank you, Madam Speaker, I invite you to call the question.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All in favour of Item 13? Contrary? That is carried. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

**Item 14 – Implementation of Audit Recommendations Report – 2024 Quarter 4**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce.

**Mayor Gillingham:** I will wait to hear from my colleagues. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Speakers? Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes, Madam Speaker. I rise just to point out just a thought for members of EPC, Mayor's office, that, you know, it's one area that you could consider beefing up in terms of funding. I know there's lots of areas, right? You're getting…you're always getting…but one area that actually would create potential dividends for you, maybe more in the long run than short term, but maybe even in the short-term basis is the audit department. I have always felt that it was under-utilized in the past. And you know, I've met with auditors in the past, and they say, well, we've got so many requests

and it's only so many hours and so many auditors. And the other part of that is possibly to enhance the scope of the office, i.e. to underline issues of best practice in the industry, whatever that industry may be or department within the city. What are the best practices? Not just from the…you know, looking at the narrow fiscal financial arrangement, but rather, what processes are better used and what processes are being used in other departments? Now, that relays…raises the potential head of the idea of an operational audit. And I remember when I was Chair of Finance and we proposed an operational audit on police and on Public Works. They had a heart attack. Oh my god, operational audit. And you know, but the sky didn't fall and we actually came up with various recommendations. Some of them we adopted, some we didn't. There was a strong push back from the Winnipeg public…Police Service at the time, I recall, on some of those recommendations. However, having said that, it was something that I think served us well. And so, I look at this thinking that maybe there is a way to…out of all the different departments and of all the different asks we get for more funding, this is something that maybe that should be taken…considered in terms of the resources to do a review of what resources they have and where they could actually take their office to if they had, you know, a 10 percent bump or a 20 percent bump. What would that actually mean in the scope of their work in a given year? And then you look at all the requests and all the outstanding audits that we have done that we haven't…probably should be following up in, this 20 years (inaudible). All the issues that are coming on the floor that's before us today. We just had a debate on the permits. I mean, that is something that, really, the auditor could be wading into in terms of recommending in best practices, streamlining, how to make sure the permits system works. And to start bringing audits…more audits forward, but also in a faster nature and maybe look at how those reports are being submitted to Council in a manner which is legible, understandable to the layperson whether they be on this floor or elsewhere. Because often auditors, and I get it, that is their field, they're experts in their field, but we want to have very clear recommendations with clear benchmarks and when they're going to be achieved. And the follow-up by the departments in a timely manner that that backend piece often is being struggled with, missed. And it seems if…when I follow the audit reports, and I follow all of them, they kind of drag on and on and one. Well, we're getting this one done, we're getting this…and there's…there's always a couple ones that I've seen hanging there that never seem to get addressed for some reason in a timely manner. And I think that's the closure that they need to have the ability to do. And, indeed, the hammer to come down and say, you know, what's going on here. And maybe the issue of maybe the…give some more freedom to the department…to the auditor to be able to issue…you know, have their own press conference, issue their standalone reports. It's no different than any auditor in town. I mean, it's kind of a thought, well, we don't want to have that coming down, but that is accountability. That is not a bad thing. It's not a bad thing. So, you know, there things that I think we could be doing here to really look at this office to be an assistant considering the pressures that we have on us financially. And these are just some thoughts that I just want to leave with Executive Policy and the Mayor. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. I will call the question on this item, Item 14. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Now move on to Notice of Motion, the one that's…was from last month, from Mayor Gillingham and Councillor Eadie. We have Motion 1, and I believe that's going to be withdrawn and replaced?

## EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
## NOTICE OF MOTION

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes. Motion 1, that's right.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Okay, so amending Motion 1 will be withdrawn with the concurrence of the seconder, Councillor Eadie. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. So, we have the notice of motion, we have amending Motion 8 that is moved by Councillor Rollins and seconded by the Mayor.

### Notice of Motion 1 – Welcoming Winnipeg Policy Review.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to introduce.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't take a long time to introduce this. We have a Welcome Winnipeg policy. It's a Council policy, that was adopted in 2020, in the last term of Council. The intent, I think, was and remains good and right. It is an opportunity for a really…reconciliation, at its heart, is what we really…what this Welcome Winnipeg policy is all about. It…credit needs to go to the Indigenous Relations Division and all the work that they have done in the past five-years. Also, to the committee of community members who have done a lot of work in the last five years. I will summarize it this way, and this is my perspective, you know, and in talking to others, Council members and members of IRD and committee of community members. Somewhere along the way, it…don't know that it's gotten off-track, but it ultimately is resulting too often in places…in friction. It is a misunderstanding. And it's become something, I think, nobody really intended it to be. So, this is an opportunity we have, to I think, bring things back on track to get very much united, if

possible, where Council understands the work of Welcome Winnipeg and IRD and that all of us together can achieve goals of reconciliation. All of us can achieve, really, a desired outcome of resolving the absence of Indigenous experience, perspectives and contributions within the place naming of opportunities within our city. You know, I just would point us to a couple of highlights of, I will call it, success. And it was success that…it was only possible because Council and the committee of community members and IRD worked together. If you have been to the Bunibonibee Cree Nation plane crash site memorial in St. James on Silver Avenue. It's just…it's just a beautiful site that recognizes the 1972 plane crash where eights students, residential school students, who were either returning from or heading to…I think returning from…heading to school, residential school, died in a plane crash along with the pilot. And that memorial was really the result of a shared effort. I want to credit the Royal Canadian Aviation Museum of Western Canada for initiating that. I was there. Others were there at the ceremony where we unveiled that memorial. It was the work of the committee of community members, IRD, the Bunibonibee Cree Nation community members, the western…Royal Western Aviation Canadian Museum members. Our own, you know, councillors were there, as well. And it was…that's when it works. That's when it works when we all come together and we say, this place, this space should recognize Indigenous history, which is…which is Winnipeg history. It's all of our history. Abinojii Mikanah. I mean, that is a shining example, I think, of what can be and the result of us all working together. It's those kind of successes that we want to continue to pursue. And at the same time, not burden this committee with other work that is not related to Indigenous naming and renaming. And so, finding an avenue where we can also express that. And so, I want to thank Councillor Rollins. I'm glad to…she has an amending motion she's going to introduce in a minute. I'm seconding. I'm glad to support it. It brings some clarity to…and more definition, I think, to what Councillor Eadie and I intended with our original amending motion. So, I will be glad to support her amendment.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Rollins, the item and your amending motion.

**Motion No. 8**
**Moved by Councillor Rollins,**
**Seconded by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,**

*BE IT RESOLVED THAT Notice of Motion No. 1 under the Executive Policy Committee, titled 'Welcoming Winnipeg Policy Review', be amended as follows:*

- *Delete Recommendations 1.A.i-iv., and replace with the following:*

  *"i. A response document of Welcoming Winnipeg Committee.*

  *ii. A review of existing policies or policy amendments that assist in producing better outcomes, greater alignment and expedition of goals for the Welcoming Winnipeg process in line with the purpose resolving the absence of Indigenous experience, perspectives, and contributions.*

  *iii. A review of Committee of Community Members' terms of reference.*

  *iv. Funding implications of specific actions and policies that may require additional resources."*

- *In Recommendation 1.B., add the following words after "report's recommendations":*

  *", including those out of scope of the Welcoming Winnipeg policy such as a review of existing policies or policy amendments that may expedite naming work either inside or outside of the Welcoming Winnipeg process, "*

**Councillor Rollins:** Speaker. I want to echo the Mayor's statements on credit due to Indigenous Relations Division and the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee. I also want to thank him and Councillor Eadie for being amenable to an amendment, Madam Speaker. The Welcoming Winnipeg policy reconciling our history is really an example how we can support Call to Action No. 43, the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The Welcoming Winnipeg reconciling our history policy aligns at the municipal level with Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Like I said, Call to Action 43, and articles 15(6) of UNDRIP: the Indigenous people's having right to the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations, reflected in education and public information. And that we should take effective measures in consultation and cooperations with Indigenous peoples concerned to combat prejudice, eliminate discrimination, promote tolerance, understanding and good relations among Indigenous peoples and other segments of society. So, this policy and it is one that we must, I think, when we talk about this harken back to Mayor Bowman's era and the policies, support and effort he did in convening to advance reconciliation, including practices to revitalize Indigenous historical sites and the Bunibonibee Cree Nation site in St. James, one that I believe the St. James Council ward allocation went towards, probably in partnership. And I'm hoping, Madam Speaker, that Councillor Dobson will speak a bit about this with respect

to the ward allocation and perhaps in his capacity as the liaison to the military on behalf of Council. That is deep work, Madam Speaker, that was done and…with not only Welcoming Winnipeg, but IRD, but also, my friend Megan Sinclair and Sheila North Wilson and more. We know that there has been…that Welcoming Winnipeg was not developed as a one…one shoe or one size fits all model. It really has a policy purpose. And so, this amendment, Madam Speaker, is to realign with that purpose. Resolving the absence of Indigenous experience, perspectives and contributions in the words of Dr. Erin Millions and in the words of the policy. It's a really good one. It has been recognized. And I know that we are not braggers in Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, but this has been bragged about internationally. It has been looked at internationally. And you know, in Winnipeg, we are not Winnipeg famous. That isn't our way, Madam Speaker, as you know. We are modest creatures. But Madam Speaker, as the Human Rights Chair, I will say that this is…if we are a human rights city and we're leaning into that, it is this policy that would be a feature of our international discussions. And I do have ambitions for those discussions, Madam Speaker. So, I would like the integrity now. What the review of Merrell-Ann Phare does also show is that there are other policies that aren't Winnipeg…Winnipeg policies that also need to be considered. And so, this motion does that as well. There's a whole host of ones, whether in Community Services, in Public Works, that also are involved with naming of things. And so, this sort of reorganizes the amendment from Councillor Eadie and Councillor…and Mayor Gillingham. And it really does both things. It just reorganizes a little. But in the main, it keeps the integrity of the Welcoming Winnipeg policy. And it points to…and I want to thank Merrell-Ann Phare. I think many of us did spend some time talking to her about the naming of things. Whether within the Winnipeg policy or with other policies that we were accustomed to prior to that date. And you know, the report that she wrote does give rise to pointing at other things. So, with that, I will introduce the motion and I guess I will have some time to close.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting the amendment as presented by Councillor Rollins and it does really follow the intention of the Mayor and I. However, Madam Speaker, you are going to hear from me that maybe, well…so, you know, over the last number of years there has been a lot of difficulty related to Welcome…the Welcome Winnipeg committee doing its work, the Indigenous Relations. What happened in history, the truth, which hurts and some people don't know why the truth should hurt them today because they weren't those people who came into this country and colonized and did all those awful things to the Indigenous people of this country, well, of this land called Turtle Island, actually. There were no country boundaries. There were…there were treaties between various Indigenous nations, Madam Speaker, before we came along. So, how do you reconcile? I heard a speech today that concerned me. And I understand it, so I am not going to…I'm not criticizing a comment that I heard, you know, colonizers get used to hearing 'no'. I am okay with that. I mean…but that is really not a way to reconciliation. It is not, Madam Speaker. It's…what that…well, in a way, it is kind of like we were hurt, maybe you should feel hurt. And again, that is not a way to reconcile moving forward together in the future. And there is going to be more consideration to how this policy for Welcoming Winnipeg committee works. And Indigenous Relations is going to be involved and I think that is very important. But I think we went about this the wrong way right from the beginning in terms of coming up with Welcoming Winnipeg and naming, renaming the places, entities or whatever that we are talking about that are identifiers of this land. And we do have a land acknowledgement, Madam Speaker. What we really need to do, I think, is to empower the Welcoming Winnipeg committee to look at all of the City's owned assets where we have an ability to have an influence, Madam Speaker. Look at that and look at the history. Like, read the books, man. Like, what the orange men did to this…to the people of this area was awful. And I hate to say I am a descendent of anybody that comes from the British Isles. I have to say that, Madam Speaker. But…so what I think we need to do is we need empower the Indigenous people here in Winnipeg to look at that factual, truthful history and look at the places that they can name so that we, all Winnipeggers, no matter your race, no matter your gender, no matter your…how you see yourself, no matter your disability, whatever it is, Madam Speaker. We need for the future for the truth to be known. And so…and that is what I heard from the presenters today. And that is what I heard, actually, from the whole issue around the Lemay Forest, frankly. And I think that maybe, hopefully, as this goes forward, we have a consultant that will be working. Maybe we could look at it that way. And maybe we can look at providing a budget for them to undertake that work because I don't want to say 'no'. I can't really think of anybody off the top of my head. But I know persons with disabilities who have done great things for this city of Winnipeg in moving forward accessibility issues that should have some acknowledgment. And some of them have passed away. And they put in a lot of energy, Madam Speaker. So, I am thinking that maybe that is a better way to go. I am not the expert…I'm not an expert. I want the North Winnipeg Parkway active transportation to be renamed. It was kind of…came from the community. We moved the motion but undertaking the work. What do I know about a naming ceremony? What do I know about moving forward that project? It hasn't happened yet. And I am hoping that the Welcoming Winnipeg committee would be able to do that along with Indigenous Relations. I think that would be very helpful because I am not comfortable, Madam Speaker, doing it myself. I am not. I have no Indigenous blood in me whatsoever. Anyways, thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next speaker. Any? Councillor Rollins, do you wish to close?

**Councillor Rollins:** Call the vote…Or Mr. Mayor might (inaudible)…

**Madam Speaker:** Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. Again, want to thank my colleagues for their comments. I can't let this pass. It's a rhetorical question. Does anyone know the Inuktitut word for 'welcome'? We should. We just voted on it. And so, I want to thank…speaking of partners, I want to thank Councillor Mayes for his work. Item No. 11, we just voted on, it's a result of the work of Welcome Winnipeg initiated by our colleague from St. Vital, Councillor Mayes, and his initiative to rename the Bonaventure Park…be renamed to – I'm going to try – Tunngasugit Park, which acknowledges the Inuit community here. And it's just another example of finding opportunities to appropriately, I think, name places, rename places, and this is the kind of work we want to see continue on in the future. So, with that, Madam Speaker, I will invite you to call the question, please.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I will call the vote on amending Motion 8. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And the notice of…the main item, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next notice of motion.

**Notice of Motion 2 – Housing Accelerator Fund – Public Consultation.**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. We haver amending Motion 2 going with this, as well. Main item, Councillor Mayes. And you have also penned amending Motion 2, which was moved by yourself and seconded by Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Mayes:** So, I get 16 minutes to talk straight?

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Duncan, five.

**Motion No. 2**
**Moved by Councillor Mayes,**
**Seconded by Councillor Orlikow,**

*BE IT RESOLVED THAT Notice of Motion No. 2 under the Executive Policy Committee, titled 'Housing Accelerator Fund – Public Consultation', be amended by deleting Recommendation 1 and replacing with the following:*

*"1. That the Public Service be directed to hold in-person public consultation sessions between April 2 and May 10, 2025, to solicit feedback on the proposed zoning changes, in each of the five Community Committee areas."*

**Councillor Mayes:** What are…alright, I don't…Thank you. Thank you to the mayor for those generous comments about Tunngasugit Park. And I will try and stay in that vein about partnerships and say, we've got here the originating motion…notice of motion came last week that is in front of you on the computer screen. Hopefully that is a notice of motion to say, look, we've only got one in-person session planned for public consultation on the four-plex part of the housing accelerator. Part of the reason we delayed considering this matter from March to June, and we did that in December, as you may remember, was to get more public input. So, we've had some three online sessions. We had one in-person session. I did not attend. I didn't want people to accuse me of trying to influence anything, so I didn't attend. Some of you did. A number of members of the public did. A number of members of our staff. Thanks to Georgia Boris and James Veitch, Rob Kostiuk and others. There was no violence. There was no security crisis. So, that is positive. So, the motion was to try and have one additional meeting in each ward given the timeframe, given the energy levels of our staff, the compromise. We talked about doing four, but that would have omitted one of the community committees. So, the compromise that's been landed on is what's found in the amendment. I assume I'm talking to both, Madam Speaker. Both the originating motion and the amendment? Okay, so the motion then in front of you with the amendment is to have five. I would encourage people to vote for that. If you don't want to vote for that, then bring forward something else with some number you would like to see, because is important that we get more public input in this process. Fortunately, by the time we come to this hearing in June, federal election will have come and gone, so we'll have a better idea of what the federal position is on, A) the housing accelerator, B) the CHIF fund, which also talks about the four as of right. And C) the transit fund, which talks about four as of right. We also now, as I think the Province has finally said, yes, we are in under the CHIF for a provincial contribution of 120 million. That was sort of half announced and then bounced around during the by-election campaign. In any event, the Province says it's in as well. So, there's some enormous amount of money allegedly being put at risk if we don't do something in June. So, I think we will proceed to have some form of hearing in June. But we do have time in the interim to hear more from the public about this. It is a…it is the biggest rezoning in the city's history. One of my pieces said, estimated 150,000 properties being rezoned. Nobody has challenged that. Nobody has corrected me on that. So, I think I am probably in the ballpark on that. Now, it isn't necessarily rezoning in terms of changing it from R1-M to R1-L, but it's changing the height limits of a whole lot of properties in this city. So, people should be made aware of that. People should be given a chance to talk about it. What isn't coming, though, what isn't – and I got into this before. I mean, this fourplex debate isn't about, oh, we have to meet our missing middle housing target. We've already met it. It

isn't about affordability because that's a whole separate stream. None of these units at present are required to be affordable, none of them under this proposal. It also isn't, frankly, consistent with what we've said in the infill guidelines. And the infill guidelines ably shepherded by colleague, Councillor Gilroy. I don't think I could have gotten it through. So, luckily, she was Chair of planning at the time in 2021. Said a couple of things. Hey, we should focus on those areas where there is less population than there used to be. All of that is gone. The feds say it's across the city. Doesn't matter if it's the edge of town or not, four units everywhere. Okay. So, none of this is really about infill the same way infill guidelines were about it. Also, there was some terrific stuff in the infill guidelines about why we should have…why we should emphasize properties that have back lanes. Lots with direct access to a lane minimize points of conflict with pedestrians, reduce sidewalk interruptions, provide more on-street parking, reduce snow clearing needs, protect the boulevard street types, support pedestrian friendly design of our mature neighbourhoods. Okay. All of that is gone, right? You saw the boards. The boards say, yeah, you've got to have a little wider property if you want to do a four-plex if you don't have a back lane. And Councillor Chambers' ward, for example, would be heavily influenced by the…and you can do a three-plex if you have a certain amount of frontage. We don't care about back lanes anymore. That is not dreamed up by our staff, that they tell me, is a federal requirement. So, all of that carefully nuanced stuff we put through about you've got to have a back lane, all of that has been jettisoned. So, people should know that. People should know that when we come to debate this publicly. It is quite different than what we looked at in 2021. Three other things this isn't going to be about, and I hope nobody gets up in June and starts saying it, because I'm going to remind you of what…of this, which is, you're going to hear people say, "oh well, we've got to do this. We've got to do this four-plex stuff or the city's going to go bankrupt". And this has been said to people from Glenwood in my ward and they didn't react too well to it.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Mayes, let's focus on the consultation.

**Councillor Mayes:** Yes, I'm coming to that. It's about the four-plexes. So, what the consultation isn't about, what isn't coming, is that the city is going to go bankrupt. Because look at what is coming further down the roster here. Chief Peguis Trail, long discussion of how we need to build this horizontal infrastructure and we need to get the revenue from all the new housing in precincts A, B and C, I think it is. So, let's not say to people in some parts of this city, we have to put four-plexes in here and as a result, then we won't build horizontal infrastructure. And if we don't really change your neighbourhood, we're going bankrupt. And then say, oh, but we also have to build a lot of…well, two billion dollars-worth of horizontal infrastructure, Kenaston, Chief Peguis, and have all sorts of new suburbs. Because they will more than pay for themselves. You've got to pick a lane here. And thank you to Mr. Armbruster. He has picked a lane. He has signed off on this Chief Peguis report. It clearly says, no, we can build horizontal infrastructure. No, we can have new suburbs without it bankrupting the city. So, all of that noise we can put aside when we get there in June. This is just a federal imposition. This isn't about bankruptcy of the city. Second thing. Heard a lot of talk about, oh, it's a crisis. It's…well, the memorable line from 2023, either you're a visionary or an exclusionary. You've got to vote for this or you are an exclusionary. Well, we heard a lot of talk this morning about, well, this is different at Lemay Forest. Yeah, there's a housing crisis, but in our neighbourhood, well, the hard expression you are a visionary or exclusionary doesn't also include a category that says, or you are different. So, to our credit, we voted here a few months ago on the Lemay Forest item. And all of us said, no, let's not proceed, let's not authorize any housing there. So, clearly, we are capable of making intelligent decisions about zoning, not simply saying, you are a visionary or an exclusionary. Not simply saying there's a crisis, sorry if you don't like it. I vote for controversial stuff in your ward, but not in my ward. So, we have the intellectual capability of saying, no, it's more complicated. We don't need to do this everywhere. And that really is the devil will be in the details of what we decide in June in terms of width of lots, that kind of question. So, it's important that the public knows, I think, some of the background here. The infill guidelines really are not…well, we are abandoning some parts of that. Not due to our staff, due to the federal government imposition. Okay, let's tell people that. Let's not get up there and claim we have to do this or we're going bankrupt and we can't afford anymore horizontal infrastructure when we're debating items signed off by the Public Service saying, A) we are going to make money on this Chief Peguis extension, which I intend to vote for. And we will come to that. So, and also, let's not, please, get up there and say, well, if you vote against…you know, if you want to limit the four-plexes, you're an exclusionary. Well, I guess we're being exclusionary about Lemay Forest, too. We're not voting for the 500. Very good city report saying, no, no, the Wintrup thing is way too many units, this many units would be appropriate. It's a good report, but we as a Council said, well, we would rather not go there. Okay, but let's remember that. That's a city-wide…let's keep thinking intelligently. We can draw some lines here, or we can just get up and say, we have to build up, not out, as long as it's not in my ward. We could do that. But let's not. Let's have an intelligent debate in June. But first, let's get some public input. We need these sessions. They shouldn't be online. There's going to be one in each community committee. I have no idea where. I know Mr. Dryburgh, to his credit, and Mr. Armbruster have been looking around at possible public locations. We'll have security guards there. People still have security concerns. So, I would encourage you to vote for this compromise. I want to thank the Mayor's office for…and Mr. Dryburgh for reaching out over the past month to say, well, 15 seems a little heavy, let's go with some lesser numbers. So, I can live with five. I think that is appropriate. And we'll have a chance to hear from the public about this before we head to a hearing in June. So, I look forward to hearing the debate. And I will close in due course.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

**Councillor Rollins:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be supporting the motion for more public debate. I do think it is broad. I do agree. You know, I can't have stood here for three years to say, we're going to bring in a generational rezoning change without agreeing of the size and scope is…with Councillor Mayes on the size and scope of the rezoning. I do want to stand and disagree, though, on…with respect to the safety and security concerns, Madam Speaker. Not to and never to dissuade us from holding the engagement and public consultation and the co-development that we should be, but to really underline some of the, I think, really real issues that did happen. Not only to me when I was Chair, Madam Speaker, but I also understand and all I can speak to it, but Councillor Duncan and being confronted during the meeting by folks that I, you know, have constantly had by my side whether I want them or not, the anti-15-minute city folks. I had residents in the RBC that were concerned, Madam Speaker, not because of violence or fears per se, but more of erratic behaviour of some members within that meeting. I think my colleague did have that. So, I don't think that those have been exaggerated. And we're going to take precautions so everybody can engage with the material. But I don't believe that it's an overinflation, Madam Speaker. I just believe that it is part of what we need to do to, you know, make sure that we're doing and gathering community in a good way. But with respect to the motion, I really believe that it is important to engage in this material. It is material that, as Chair, I still have questions on, as do my residents who are proponents of 15-minute cities, but also proponents of added density that this would bring, Madam Speaker. I absolutely have residents, and I do want to talk a bit about my resident, Hugh Penn-Warden, who…who really has been really consistent being concerned about this. And I also think it's a very good time for the city to engage. And I know it's with some irony perhaps by some that it is our…you know, that is our city that is footing the bill on the engagement. When really, it is, you know, the burden that a municipality has these days to catch a financial ball from a government that has more of a tax base and more responsibilities, some may argue, on housing. I do believe it's a shared responsibility. But I know that I have been sometimes you know, the minority on Council, in particular last term, in thinking that housing was a municipal responsibility. And there is strong logic for that. But for all those reasons, Madam Speaker, because folks need a chance to engage with the material, there is a depth of engagement that they saw just really briefly on the posters that they want to engage, and they want more access to their city councillors, Madam Speaker. There were a handful of us that were there for various reasons. They absolutely wanted engagement with their councillors. So, I would encourage, Madam Speaker, that when we find out where they are in the community communities, let's also as a community committee, rent the place next door if we can. Have more sort of one-on-one time. And I'll be regrouping with my fave, City Centre, to suggest just that. I wish I had have, you know, rented a space within the RBC, Madam Speaker, just to have sort of the after party. Not only for our staff, but for that one-on-one time for the residents. They really did want some interaction with elected officials. They were missing that. That wasn't our place. That's not how we structured it. But for those of us that came, it was an occasion. I got to talk to people from St. Vital to Elmwood. Madam Speaker, I got to talk to your ward resident, Jared. And I believe I flipped you some of his casework that next…that night. So, you know, it's an opportunity to really connect with folks from across the city, and that is vital. Whether, you know, I've…I was the Chair of P and D, or I'm not now, it's still really exciting to meet your ward residents, Madam Speaker, hear some of their feedback on malls and corridors. You know, Jared didn't like it, Madam Speaker. He wanted more regional malls. I'm not going to help him with that, Madam Speaker, but I think we have enough. But you know, that…those are the types of things you hear when you get out and about. And I want to thank the Public Service, once again, for doing that; for making sure that our staff were safe, for making sure that anyone that came to the engagement were. And that even those that hold opposing viewpoints, like anti-15-minute city folks, that they also had the room and space to rack their actions safely. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Rollins. I too was there for two hours. Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you. I rise it to support the original motion as well as the amendment to the motion. I want to thank Councillor Mayes for undertaking the motion and seconding his original motion. I heard a call back when we did the...I was telling Councillor Mayes, you know, when he was coming up with a compromise. I said, no, let's stick to it because I recall back when we looked at going from the six district model down to the four district model of policing. And at the time, Mayor Murray agreed to nine meetings across the city when we were simply reducing our police districts from six to four. It was a major undertaking, and it was done across the city. More…not…more than the five community committee areas, but less than the 15 wards and the compromise was nine. It was done…well done with the Chief of Police at the time, Jack Ewatski, at the front of the room and every meeting that was held, answering questions from the audience. I attended as many as I could, seeing that I advocated for that. And you know, I just want to put some comments on the record. Number one I think is crucial, that this is going to be undertaken, that it be well advertised. That it's not just a press release, this goes on the City website. That the Property and Development Department spends a little bit of money, not much, buy some advertising on social media. If you buy some advertising on Facebook, believe it or not, it will get…it doesn't cost a lot, but you can get the message out pretty quick. And you know, just a little bit of information ahead of time to ensure that the meeting places are accessible, well lit, parking available for those who need it, that there's some thought given to that, that if necessary…it's not necessarily…if not in a school gym, that if they need a local facility like a hotel or what have you with regards to proper conference room in the area, use that. Let's make an investment here. This is a

major change that's coming forward. I would also like to add that, you know, similar to what was meant by…stated by the previous speaker, I think as much information should be supplied pertaining to what we're…what is happening, why it's happening, why the City is undertaking the process. The who, what, when, where and, why; the five Ws. To clearly outline what's going on here, what this means, what does this mean to your neighbourhood, what does it mean to you as a homeowner or a resident. I would also like to see, I think, it's not much to ask because they are, as Councillor Rollins rightly pointed out, coming out to these meetings, the 15-minute city folk. And let's be honest, I mean, when people receive a lack of information or no response to their contention, no matter what that contention is, automatically, that creates the greater conspiracy that's at heart. Let's respond to each one of their points. Each one. Like, you know, and some of them are, you know, there. Some of them are not over the top. And you know, for example, we're not building the regional roads and expanding the regional roads because we want to limit people to existing neighbourhoods. Well, let's talk about that, the funding issue with regards to our regional infrastructure in the city, the funding issues with regards to what's taking place. Let's talk about the history of where the 15-minute city concept came from, which was the Mayor of Paris who advocated originally live, work and play. Let's pull out the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The last time I checked it, and I have it on my wall in my porch where I sit and pat my shih-tzu terrier dog and have a cigarette, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is up on the wall. And it's the right to mobility. The rights to mobility, where you want to live in this country without having permission from government. The rights to freedom of association without having permission from government. If we have to restate these fundamental rights, so be it. But if we don't and if we don't address these issues head on, even though some folks may roll their eyes at them, mark my words – there could be somebody who is of that…of that mindset elected in this next general…in this Council chamber. And then let's see what we do. I really think we must respond to these concerns. I heard something fundamentally, which I thought was absolutely…it was a doctor who spoke at the Lemay Forest issue, which is coming up. But I just want to reflect on it, Madam Speaker, because it relates to this. And she said, if you think about what the public has gone through in the last five years or so with the pandemic and everything else, she says, it really hasn't been a place for people to really come together in community. We used to have...you know, people used to…more people would…we have become very secular. Less people go to churches. There's really not been a place for people to heal. There's been a lot of loss. And where are people expressing this? They are expressing it on social media, taking it out on each other on social media. Hammering away at each other. And a lot of it is related to frustration, anger, fear – fear that was pumped out during the pandemic that has not gone away. And that's still there, Madam Speaker, that concerns…that this doctor spoke eloquently about at the Lemay Forest matter at the University of Winnipeg two Saturdays ago. And so, I think we have to have some patience and compassion when we hear alternative voices and be able to address those concerns. So…and we will hear it. We will hear it in these meetings around the city, these five meetings. And I think it's foolish for us just to pretend it doesn't exist, that these voices don't exist, these concerns don't exist. Let's address it front on. The…you know, the…to the matter pertaining to the capital region of metro Winnipeg and the zoning hearing…meeting that got cancelled with the police and all that, all that's feeding into that narrative. Because nothing has been responded to in a sense to that. And they haven't got the answers that they really want to hear. Maybe not want to hear, but maybe have to be put out there as factual information about what we're...what the City is struggling with. So those are my comments. I look forward to the open houses. Again, I hope the department advertises. I…Councillors can advertise. And it's been said in the past, well, we should do that. Yeah, you can. Individual Councillors can advertise. Use your ward allowance. I might even do that to promote the meeting. But it really is the department who is leading these meetings. We're requesting it. That they need to take the lead and make these meetings publicized, well known, well advertised in advance, the informational sessions. And that it would be nice in advance of the open houses that members of Council get the material that's going to be at the open houses. Fully…not censored, not…not…you know, whatever's being presented at the open house, let's have that information well in advance as well, so we can read it, familiarize ourselves with it, so that when we're there, we're going to get questions, too. And we may have questions of the Public Service prior to the open house. It would be nice to have that. So, those are my comments, Madam Speaker. I'm hoping the Director is listening, and members of the staff, and members of EPC. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** This will sound a little odd because when I first brought up more consultation, I kind of went, why? Why…why would we have more consultations based upon what they're providing the public? I didn't understand we had one little ad in the paper. Here you go. And then, I called up the department and say, hey, I see the ad. It's kind of weak. Let's (inaudible) to do one thing that you really wanted to do, but you didn't mention as of right. That's kind of a big thing. Well, you know what it was? What we did Councillor, quote, to enable the development of. That means as of right. Don't you know that, Councillor Orlikow? I go, no, I did not. I did not know that. I guess the public should also assume that as of right is from there. Well, I go, okay, that's ridiculous. You didn't really mention anything about the four-stories. You talked about why we need to do this. Again, the proponent, you remember, is the City of Winnipeg. So, it's a little bit different than usual, and we are doing a consultation where we're trying to get feedback. I feel very strongly that they are not trying to get feedback. They are trying to get their message forward. They're…very strongly believe that this is what we need to do going forward from the bureaucratic side. As we saw when the Housing Accelerator Fund, all of a sudden had as of

right in there, that was approved by, actually some people. But again, prior, Council never had that discussion. It came through an application that went through the Housing Accelerator Fund that none of us saw, but we finally saw it after we got the Freedom of Information Act allowed us to see that report. So, it showed the bias that our department is in. And I believe, again, that's…that is not okay. It is not okay. They're supposed to be the neutral party in the middle. So again, I do believe my brain is tainted on this perception. And I don't believe it's a perception. For example, well you know what they also didn't also talk about at these things? Like Councillor Wyatts mentioned. What affects them. We spend…pretty well half of the report is talking about why we need to do this. Then it has some pictures. The pictures, there's not one picture in there of the four-storey in there. Not one. They're all different, and even the ones that are there, you got…you got lots that I know are 60, 70 feet looking exactly like a 50 foot. Oh, what's the reply to that? Well, talk to the consultant. That's all they get. I go, well, you should have at least one page with a four-storey with two bungalows beside it to show that picture. I did one on the screen, I showed to Mayes. He goes, I don't know about that. I go, yeah, it's, you know, 20 feet for a single storey and now it's, you know, double that for a four-storey. You should at least show that. Be honest about it. Don't hide it. I could go, we're not hiding it, Councillor Orlikow. I go, well, you didn't have on there. It's one of the most controversial issues. They did have as of right way down the line. I say they've missed a few other things. And as I keep researching this and I'm trying to…keeping an open mind, keeping an open mind. Remember last year, we did the rapid housing? That's one year ago. And even though I didn't like it (inaudible) as of right and some other things in there, but there's things I did like, it's almost like they want to make sure that I'm miserable. They took away all the design criteria. Never said once in the report that the design criteria stuff is gone. Nothing about the need to plant trees every 120 of linear feet. One tree…new one needs to go in. So, I asked them, what are they going to do about trees? Well, if the developer wants to keep it, we'll give them a credit. I go, what about the shrubs? Well, that's gone. Well, you didn't put that…anything in your report, anything you told the public. So again, I go back to almost the Hitchhikers Guide to the Galaxy moment where, well, you should have known to ask that question. The public doesn't know how to answer those questions. So I did say, these are the questions we should ask the public when I sent out my e-mail. Trying to be…trying to neutral. I didn't need to pump up why they need to do this. I knew when they go to the session the department would do that, for whatever reason: housing affordability, shortage, whatever they want to say. They're going to do that. We should ask about the side yards. No mention about side yards. Now I find out it's two and three. I'm not sure how you do one's two and one's three, but now they know. They should know that the side yard they maybe used to, some neighbourhoods like my neighbourhood in Fort Rouge, they are really small side yards already. But other places like south River Heights, they are very wide. No one would know to ask that question unless someone told them to ask that. And they shouldn't have to be told to ask a question. The department should be saying, what are the questions that we need to answer openly and transparently for the public. That's all they need to do. So, you know what? Now you can build a house with one type of material, a block, just a big square, and yes, you know what else is going to happen? You know, lot coverage. We talked about lot coverage. Lot coverage is moving up. Nothing is mentioned in there about that. So, you know what, you're going to have a bigger mass building on that property than before. One year ago, just one year ago we fought and got this through with a bit of a merit because they had some design guidelines in there. And now that's all wiped out. No mention of that in this report at all. No mention about the loss of the trees. There's nothing in there at all about that. There's nothing in…not even a picture about a four-storey building beside a bungalow. I don't even care if it's beside a two-storey building if you really wanted to. The most controversial one, as we all know, will be the bungalows, which take up about five of my neighbourhoods where they're going to have four-storey buildings going up in the middle. Not a picture of that. Do I say, oh, it's just a miss? I'm having trouble saying, yeah, they just missed that one because they probably didn't know four-stories beside bungalows would be an issue. I think they didn't put it in there for a reason. So again, that's why I was concerned about even doing more of this. But again, I will do my darndest to list out those questions that I think…and provide the information I've been provided by the department, even stuff about water retention. I didn't know a four-storey would have to have this whole water retention system underneath. 100…80 to 100,000 dollars add-on. Good luck affordable housing. But that's what it is. The public should know that because they are worried about combined sewer overflows. Nothing in there at all about that. Nothing…nothing. You know, yeah, garages, will they be bigger? Well yeah, if they want to put a secondary suite above them, it will be bigger. Should have mentioned something like that. If they asked us what the controversial issues are, especially in mature neighbourhoods, I would have said loss of green space. I would have said, you know, side yards, privacy. We don't even have an opportunity right now, and I tried a couple of times when we had a public hearing, and someone kept saying, you know what? They're going to do a landing…a side door that they are going to walk into, and then you know what? My living room is right there. And they go…so we say, okay, you have to have the landing on the ground. That's what we did in public hearings. Gone. That was something we do. Now, no. They even said no, we're not…we have no mechanisms to review any of these applications. They're going to come in, they do what they want. What about that person next door? What about something as simple as they are all going to be rentals. Who does the neighbour contact if they have a problem with someone, at the building? We do it with AirBnB, they have to have a little plaque to say who to contact. No, we're not going to do that either in this one. So, again, I don't believe the department has the right lens on. They're much more of an advocate like a developer is rather than the bureaucrats that we need them to be, neutral. So again, I hope they're listening as well. I actually asked them a couple of times on this. Crickets. So again, I will do my best to fill that gap in, which I shouldn't have to. Because I get…when we talk about anger, I'm getting these people who believe in infill and since I have these questions, they are really pissed off

at me. But I go, I didn't say I'm against all this infill, I have problems here and there. But again, the anger that they come out, because they think I'm out to just destroy this thing. I go, we just need to be honest. And let the public have the say. Or things that Councillor Wyatt is talking about, if people feel they're being hoodwinked, which I feel they have, because it's one year ago we voted on this and passed this. And all of a sudden, 50 percent of what we passed one year ago is gone. It's just wiped off the plate for no reason that I can figure out at all. They decided we're just going to enable developer rights even more.

**Madam Speaker:** Need more time? Yeah. Councillor Schreyer moves extension. Two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Councillor Orlikow:** So, again, I have taken the chance…I'll take a chance on this because I think we're going to have to just keep pushing the department to be much more neutral and really think about not what I want to say to you, but what do the residents need to hear. I think that's what we need to really start refocusing a bit on. Again, I understand the philosophy, I understand the ideology behind it. But this is a public service, not a developer. So, they need to step it back from talking about this is all great, everybody's going to love it and not tell the other dark side of the story, which there is. Everything has a positive and a negative. Be balanced. I just don't feel that balance is there. And I think that just by the simple fact the guidelines weren't mentioned, but the simple fact there's no four-storey building there. The simple fact that in the ads, they didn't even talked about as of right. Those things really raise some pretty hard concerns for me to think that the department is being neutral on this. They may believe they are, but in my view, as a City Councillor, in a ward that's going to be dramatically affected. I don't have any gravel back lanes. I've got 50-foot lots, 110-feet deep. Generally, that's it. We're going to be dramatically affected. So I would definitely volunteer River Heights ward to be part of this consultation. I thank them…Councillor Mayes for that. Because worst case scenario, three years down the line, someone, because they are not going to know, all of a sudden, this big building comes up and they go, where did that come from? Oh, don't you know? You should have showed at the public hearing, again, my Hitchhikers Guide to the Galaxy reference. You should have shown up two years ago and you could have had concerns then. And as people have been saying to me, we never knew about this. Oh, you didn't read the paper on that day? It was an ad in the paper. Okay. I sent it out to a couple thousand people, but how much more does a Councillor have to do to get people to be engaged in this? I don't know, but I'll keep trying because it really is the most significant zoning changes that…ever. I don't know when the…if there is a bigger time that this happened, let me know. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, being influenced and inspired by my colleagues, as they speak on the floor. Just want to add some thoughts to the comments made. One, Councillor Rollins talked about generational changes that we're dealing with. And in fact, yes, how do you interpret general changes…major changes made in a generation? I said maybe, you know, last 150 years. To be fair, our first 50 years were pretty rough-and-tumble. I mean, we were really going gangbusters. Our rate of growth, you know, for our first 40 years was a little much. Couldn't have been that well regulated. Post World War II, we really got into a groove in the city, in the western world. We had some certain advantages after World War II here in North America. We literally economically profited from World War II. Fact. And in that respect, we had…I guess, if you don't believe me, guess statistically what country had the second largest economy in 1946? Canada. How is that possible? World War II. So, we were really expanding. We were doing it properly. We were doing it well. That was the emergence of the middle class, the working class, really having a say in solidarity for taking the sacrifices during the war. And it happened and it lasted over a generation. And it truly was a golden age of democracy. Perfect? No, because we had to evolve. It was an era where we could change things. It was an era where we were evolving from the past. Was it a golden era? Yeah, because we were evolving from the past at a good rate.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Madam Speaker (inaudible), we're just trying to…like, with all due respect, we're just trying to determine whether we're going to five consultations or not. Thank you.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Yeah, Madam Speaker, I'm talking about the essence of democracy because it's just been put in question today. So, I'm talking about property and planning and development. Councillor Rollins just said a generational change. Is she ruled out of order? We're talking about generational changes or not. I sit down to ask for the answer from His Worship. For goodness sakes, we just…is this a generational change or not? Is Councillor Orlikow questioning our administration or not?

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer, thank you. So, before us…

**Councillor Schreyer:** Can I keep on track here talking about generational changes or not?

**Madam Speaker:** Yes.

**Councillor Schreyer:** So here we are. We used to have more input from…from people. We used to have 50…50 councillors. We used to have smaller councils. We used to have, actually, more input. We've just been discussing amongst my own fellow councillors what will be the role of the council once we make these changes. We'll be here allocating community funding at our community…at our community meetings. That's what we're talking about. We're talking about whether the public is being consulted. We're talking about questioning the role of the...I don't understand why I'm even being questioned here. We are devolving, Madam Speaker. So here we are, generational changes. These are huge changes we're making. They are more than generational. Did we make a change like this a generation ago? No. This is even bigger than anything I think we did in 1972 when we created this one big city. So, for goodness' sakes, Madam Speaker, if people…people have concerns right now over the role of democracy in what Councillor Orlikow just said, their own private property. So, I don't know what to say. I hope we're not out of order while voting the role of the City Council out of existence on these things while Councillor Orlikow just said that the brief consultation we had was misleading and he was extremely specific in how it was misleading. And what did I say? Did we have this happen 50 years ago? No. But let's not talk about that. Let's not compare ourselves to another generation. Let's turn our back on that. Let's turn our back on our elders in terms of the progress they made that we didn't. Oh, that's good. Madam Speaker, we're not in a golden age. Madam Speaker, we're devolving, Madam Speaker. Democracy seems to be meaning less. Am I exaggerating here? Am I missing the point? I'm really not trying to be sensational. I'm just trying to say we used to do better. What's wrong with that? We just had the…today we're talking about 150 years and more about truth and reconciliation because of the things we did wrong. But somehow when it comes to development, we're not allowed to talk about that.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer, you're speaking to the need for more consultation…that's fine. That's fine.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Yes…Yes, Madam Speaker. And we used to have more consultation, we're being specific. Councillor Orlikow was being specific. And congratulations to him about it. But I'd like to make the point that these very specific incidents, examples he used, this is not new to City Hall. It might be sort of…this is a lesson for us on how it's applied now…right now when it comes to Property, Planning and Development. Because Madam Speaker, it is the same type of communication used already at City Hall when it comes to the fact that we don't want it deal with construction inflation. Councillor Orlikow just said we need an administration that is neutral. Well, they need to be professional and they need to be objective. They don't need to be as ideological as the politicians. It's human nature for anybody to be political in ideology. Anybody. So we have to question everybody, including our administration, of course. They are only human beings just like…just like us. No more, no less. We all have to keep ourselves in check and balance. That's what democracy is supposed to do. It's supposed to be robust. We're supposed to challenge our Administration. That's literally our job. As Councillor Wyatt has once put, we stand in judgement of the operation of the Administration. That's our job. So, what Councillor Orlikow has said today, good for him. That's true. Do we apply that when it comes to our Public Works Department? When it comes to the fact that that's been the greatest rate of inflation in our budget. The main cause for why we raise taxes.

**Mayor Gillingham:** (Inaudible) with all due respect, it's…respectfully, it is, are we having five more meetings or are we having 15? This is not about…I'm good, no. it's not about construction inflation. This is way out of order.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the question…

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer, let's not veer into construction inflation. You've made your points around the consultation. So, if you want to continue on that path.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Madam Speaker, I just asked the question, then I'll ask it again because we talked about this before. Housing is based on what? Housing is construction. Why are we ask…why are we asking for subsidies from the federal government to the extent that…

**Mayor Gillingham:** Madam Speaker, the matter before us is whether we go to five more consultations or 15. That is the motion.

**Madam Speaker:** The point has been made. Councillor Schreyer, I think you're wrapping up now.

**Councillor Schreyer:** And there's more to say. But having said that, yeah, I think…I think sometimes we need to get back to basics and that good old thing about local democracy. If municipal democracy is that important, and I think when it comes to something that Councillor Rollins has called a generational change, and I think it's more than that. Therefore, I think consultation is important and the nature of that consultation, the communication on that is important. And let's be vigilant. Because my point is, if we let it happen here, it will happen in every other department. That's where we stand, Madam Speaker. That's who are the city. That's why we're having our conflict right now. But we have to ask ourselves,

why are we even doing this? It's because the costs are going up relative to people's ability to pay. Let's face it. Thank you. Miigwech .

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I will be supporting Councillor Mayes' motion to amend. And thank him for the good work that he does on this kind of thing. Madam Speaker, I heard the debate on the HAF report. And I heard some things in discussion here, Madam Speaker. So, I think we need to be clear about…like, we're going to do this consultation. There's going to be more consultation. But we all need to understand this in context. So we, the City of Winnipeg, the Mayor, standing up and saying, you know, people have a right to housing and they need to have affordable housing. And technically, really, they really need social housing. So we as a city coming out of that '22 election, we're looking for things. The federal government now, on the other hand, because we have a lot of new immigration and a lot of growth in all our cities across the country, needing an ability to do it. So, first thing we need to understand is the right to have housing is a human right. Now, the right to build four units on a property…a private property is a property right. And in this city, in this country, we have regulation on property rights. You can't just willy-nilly go ahead and do what you want to do. So, we have these two different rights, and we have a need not just for people to have housing that they can afford when they are poor and trying to rebuild their lives and come back. That's the social housing, and usually government has to subsidize that because…just because. It's a human right that a private sector, a private property, doesn't have to. So, we provide incentive for the private property owners to build, well, all of these different levels of affordability, which is okay, and then regular market, whatever that is. I think the HAF program so far is working well as intentioned. But let's be clear here. What the federal government has done is there's just a general need for housing, and they are using moral-suasion – moral-suasion – on cities that will accept the dollars that they are willing to put on the table. And as the Mayor and everybody knows, you know, we have all these other reports, increase in property tax, all these things. To avoid a lot of that, we decided to go, well, the feds got money, let's take it. I'm going to get to consulting because…actually, I'm going to get to what you were talking about, Councillor Orlikow. If you wait a moment, you will hear it.

**Councillor Orlikow:** (inaudible) back and forth.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Thank you. I was distracted because I've got another member sending me a message.

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, I'm trying to get to the point about a consultation here. Okay, Madam Speaker? We have a Public Service, who is putting a heck of a lot of work into something related to a moral-suasion approach that the federal Government of Canada has used in this province of Manitoba, along with working with...well, we can get into other things. We can…we'll be talking about. But Madam Speaker, what I'm trying to get at here is, is that this methodology of moral-suasion is causing some concerns for me in discussing about the Public Service now is charged. We have accepted that suasion, and we are moving forward. Council accepted that. We did that. Now, some people disagreed, some agreed. The Public Service is doing work and hopefully they keep an open mind as things move along. But in this consultation when we're going out to the people, let's be frank. We're going to be going out there, but the Federal Government through their suasion has done this. And we are working towards it. So, we're going to be having an applicant in June come. We're going to have hearings after these consultations. And hopefully, we can make it work. And I think it's very important. I think the community committee idea is there. But in our debate and discussion, Madam Speaker, I don't want to…you know, we're going to go to the public and there was a lot of concerns about people who are very upset, Madam Speaker, about government telling what people can and can't do with property and so on and so forth. But again, in context, we're going to go out to the communities and we're going to have a dialogue. I have a lot of concerns. It is a change that, actually, will take a generation or more to have a big influence on the way our neighbourhoods look and feel. And anyway, I'm going to leave it at that, Madam Speaker. But I just had to put these words on the table. We all need to keep it in context because it can get quite...anyway, I'm just concerned about that. And again, I'll be supporting the amendment for the consultations in the five community committee areas. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will attempt to be brief. Thank you to the mover, seconder of the motion. I plan to support this…this initiative. I do also want to mention that I have had a meeting with Public Service regarding issues that I thought were important to the St. Boniface ward. In particular, Provencher Boulevard has a planning development overlay. That planning development overlay was updated after I was elected with much discussion and consultation with the community. And I think Councillor Orlikow had made some comments about wanting some answers relating to things that are similar in the city of Winnipeg. I did also wanted to say further to one of my colleague's remarks, I do not expect the Public Service to be neutral in this, as they are the applicants. My experience, and we do have this oppositional system when it comes to zoning of for/against/for information that comes from juris prudence, as many are aware, from the Supreme Court of Canada. That being said, I don't think Public Service is in a situation where they

are…they are impartial. They are the applicants, so I would not expect them to be impartial. And so, I wanted to put that reflection on the record, relative to what I heard earlier. I do intend on supporting this. And I have had a preliminary meeting with the Public Service. I hope some of those...some of the things that we talked about are considered in terms of the planning development overlay given we have recently made those changes with the community and I'm hoping that there will be a path forward there in terms of compatibility with what the federal government is asking for and some of the dimensional requirements that were included as part of the planning development overlay update on Provencher Boulevard. There have also been some changes in the North St. Boniface Secondary Plan since I was elected in 2014. They have meant significant increases in the allowable densities in north St. Boniface. And I think, well, residents came forward, supported the plan, we have one and I'm hoping that some of those elements will be...will be integrated as part of this proposed zoning update. I'm bringing this up now because as this is a matter of public hearing, this is the forum where we can…we may not be in a public hearing right now, but this is the most appropriate forum I can think of in terms of what I perceived and what I'm hoping for in the proposed update coming forward. So, thanks for your attention.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Allard. Any further speakers? Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to start this, although, there seems to be some interesting debate around the table on this. I wanted to thank Councillor Rollins, Councillor Dobson, and yourself, Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma, for attending the open house at the RBC Convention Centre. Councillor Rollins was accurate, there were a lot of interesting perspectives on this. Some that did not think we went far enough and others that thought that people were coming to take their homes. And thus, their city and their control. So I respect everyone's opinions. I'd also like to thank Councillor Lukes for attending virtually. To my knowledge, no other councillors attended and just to…

**Madam Speaker:** I did.

**Councillor Duncan:** I said Councillor Sharma. Yeah.

**Madam Speaker:** Virtually.

**Councillor Duncan:** No, I saw you in-person. Oh, you did virtually, right.

**Madam Speaker:** As well.

**Councillor Duncan:** Yes, and Madam Speaker, just to Councillor Schreyer's, you know, points, I suppose. You know, we have had an opportunity as councillors to take part in a community committee discussion with the Public Service and the consultant. We have had an opportunity as councillors to take part in a larger discussion with the Public Service just downstairs here at City Hall. We have had opportunities to participate virtually in a town hall public forum. We've had an opportunity to participate in-person for a public forum. Councillor Schreyer has chosen not to do that. So, I understand maybe some of his confusion around this. And I'm happy to meet with him, Madam Speaker, to continue this discussion because I think it's important…that all of my Council colleagues...

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer, yes?...I want to hear Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Schreyer?

**Councillor Schreyer:** (inaudible) say point of order. That's what I do. So, point of order; is he referring to my comments or Councillor Orlikow's? I was referring to Councillor Orlikow's...

**Madam Speaker:** He's…

**Councillor Schreyer:** What points of mine was he referring to?...I mentioned Councillor Orlikow…

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Duncan…Councillor Duncan can restate. I think he's pointing out your absence at meetings.

**Councillor Duncan:** I'm just saying, Councillor Schreyer, through you Madam Speaker; Councillor Schreyer, I understand his confusion on this because some councillors have chosen to go to these opportunities that have been facilitated by the Public Service, the consultant and Council colleagues. I again extend my offer to meet with any of my colleagues, just as I have with Councillor Gilroy, just as I have with Councillor Orlikow. I have had many healthy debates with Councillor Mayes. Anybody else around the table…

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Duncan, we're talking about public consultation…

**Councillor Duncan:** And this is a piece of it. So, we go forward now to Councillor Mayes's amendment to the motion of five. I'll support that, Madam Speaker...

**Councillor Schreyer:** (inaudible) With the public or the Administration? Or members of his Council, including in this chamber? As he said, I've been absent from all these things. Or is he choosing some that I and many other members of Council will be...

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Schreyer, thank you. He's offering…offering more consultation to any councillor. Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** So, yes, again, the offer is on the table if people aren't clear. Let's continue the discussion. And we have until the first week of June when we will come forward yet again and hear many sides of the debate for several days, potentially, on end. At what point in time…here is the brilliant part of Council, Madam Speaker, that I have learned in my short time here. Council is supreme and we can change whatever we'd like. That will be the opportunity. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Point of order, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, point of order. You know, I appreciate where Councillor Duncan is coming from, but I think it would have been more helpful just to sum up on the debate as pointed out by the Mayor. And Madam Speaker, that the Chair is quick to call certain non-members of EPC to order. I would look forward to that same kind of ruling in advance with members of EPC, as well. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Next speaker is back to you, Councillor Mayes, to close.

**Councillor Mayes:** Everybody is looking forward to that week together in June. I can tell. Well, that went reasonably well I thought. Yes, good that we're…seem all to be on the same page of some of us were on zero meetings and some were on 15, now we're on five. Sounds good. Alright. So, I'm pleased with that. Four things: called up Jeff Patton, who is retiring. Congratulate him on that. And he said to me, you know, I always like your musical references because I always get your musical references because we're very close in age. So, in honour of Jeff Patton, there's an Aerosmith line, "Let the music do the talking." That's in essence what we're saying, let's have more of these meetings. Let the people look at what's being proposed, inaccurate drawings or not. They can ask questions. Let's just have more of that. Let's get out and have people...it's a big change, we should have more consultations. Seems we're all on the same page on that. Good. Number two: let's not demonize the people who might have questions or opponents. I've sat or opposed this. The Mayor at one of these sessions had a good line about you can have concerns about this and it doesn't mean you're crazy. I'm paraphrasing and he can leap to his feet if he thinks I'm not being accurate or generous, but it was a good comment. It was basically, you can have concerns about this. Come out and ask about it. So, people…we should encourage people to do that now and in June. Because I've sat here for years and had people from Glenwood come in and raise some of the same concerns we heard earlier today about trees, about green space. Just vilified. You're climate change deniers if you don't want more density on your street. You're NIMBYs. All just total vilification. And yet, I guess other people can make those same arguments. So, let's not demonize people who have questions or have opposition. There are people from OURSWinnipeg and other groups who have good points, good questions. Let's hear from them. Final things: you know, also I am pleased that we're on the same…on Chief Peguis, as well today, whenever we get to it…or tonight. All of these economic arguments. We had this fantastic scenario recently where some of the same people who insisted that we had to pack people into Glenwood, and then we wouldn't move out anymore and we'd save all this money. People could use the existing facilities. Same people – literally, same people – saying, well, we need a new school to replace the Varennes School now. It's an old school. It's from the 1950s. So now, why should new areas be the only ones getting new stuff? Well, it kind of defeats the argument, doesn't it? We're going to all…do all this four-plexes so we won't…you know, we'll save all this money, because we won't build new stuff, but we'll build new stuff because we have all these people here now. So, I mean, let's just have a straight-up debate. It's the federal government saying you can do this. If you do this, you get the money. That's really what this is. And it's trying to find the nuance of it. So, the nuance…you know, I was at lunch…at lunch I was at Parlour Coffee and I ran into somebody from my ward, from Parkville Bay, and he wanted to start in about lot widths on their streets and stuff. It's a nice little street. It's from the 1960s. People have paid their taxes. They'll want to know about this. They'll want to have a chance to consult. And there are ways around…like, we shouldn't have…on the malls and corridors, which the Mayor ran on, the malls and corridors we had respect for how wide is the street right-of-way. That should influence the height. We actually had that in the infill guidelines, to Councillor Gilroy's credit. We had stuff in there about the right-of-way. So, we haven't talked about that at all yet. But that should be part of our debate in June, I think. And so, for some of these smaller little streets, maybe they can't take as many four-plexes as some of the bigger streets. Not a revolutionary idea. Same concept we had in malls and corridors. So we will come to that in our week together starting on June 2nd. But this at least is promising. I want to thank the Mayor, who is supportive of this compromise. So, maybe it's a good start. A good way to head into the hearing in June. And to be fair to the Public Service, they have been listening on some of these points. The draft that the public is seeing is certainly reflecting some of the

concerns that we started to have at the session, as Duncan mentioned, in November/December. And I know Councillor Schreyer's had input into it. I know he's concerned about this. We all are. So hopefully, we'll have…we'll have a chance to get some public input. Maybe the Public Service will have some changes, and then we'll know the federal election results, and we look forward to a week of hearings starting June 2nd. People should start signing up. I know we'll have a lot of delegations. But it is a good promising start here that we're all landing on the same page here, I think, in saying, yeah, let's have some more public input. Thank you for your efforts on this, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. With that, I'll call the question. Yeah, on amending Motion 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. I guess we'll need a vote on the main item, as amended. There was an amending motion, Mr. Clerk, on this? Yeah, that was. Okay. Thank you. Next…yes, the item, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Thank you for that. We'll now have question period or is it by-laws? By-laws first.

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

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law No. 36/2025 be read a first time.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 36/2025.

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

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you. I move the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law No. 103/2024, By-law No. 18/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 103/2024, By-law No. 18/2025.

**Mayor Gillingham:** I move that By-law Nos. 20…pardon me, 103/2024 and 18/2025 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. Next section, Mr. Mayor.

## EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
## CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

**Mayor Gillingham:** Madam Speaker, I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 32/2025, By-law No. 34/2025. By/law No. 35/2025, By-law No. 37/2025, By-law No. 38/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 32/2025, By-law No. 34/2025. By/law No. 35/2025, By-law No. 37/2025, By-law No. 38/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that By-law Nos. 32/2025, 34/2025, 35/2025, 37/2025, and 38/2025 be read a second time.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Councillor Wyatt:** (Inaudible)…sorry, 34 and 35.

**Madam Speaker:** Noted. 34 and 35, Councillor Wyatt opposed. I don't see 36 here. Yeah, that was first reading already. So, we noted you on 34/35.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 32/2025, By-law No. 34/2025, By-law No. 35/2025, By-law No. 37/2025, By-law No. 38/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Madam Speaker, I move the rule be suspended and By-law Nos. 32/2025, 34/2025, 35/2025, 37/2025, and 38/2025 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 Wyatt, the numbers?

**Councillor Wyatt:** 35 and 25.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, that's noted. Councillor Wyatt in opposition. The rest carries. We'll now have question period for the Mayor. Councillor Gilroy.

## EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
## QUESTION PERIOD

**Councillor Gilroy:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And this might be a Councillor Lukes and Mayor question. Maybe they can work on it together. So I'm having...now that it's warming up, it's warming up and...

**Madam Speaker:** It's snowing right now.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Is it snowing?

**Madam Speaker:** Just saying.

**Councillor Gilroy:** That didn't work out well for me. (Inaudible). Thank you. So anyways, we're starting to see the encampments increase again with the warmer weather even though it's snowing today. So we're starting to see our bus shelters really impacted. Bob Christmas has been very good trying to deal with some of mine that are impacted. But I was wondering if between you, Councillor Lukes and the Province, if there could be a look at expanding Street Links, or like an organization that can really help to house the individuals that are in the shelters. I'm very concerned that this isn't going to go away fast. And so, kind of with poverty, the...sorry, the provincial plan on ending homelessness with your work on that, if you can maybe talk with the Province on that. And I guess a follow-up question with that would be if we have to remove bus...because I'm getting lots of people wanting me to remove the bus shacks and I kind of don't want to remove bus shacks because I think it's there for people that are needing to use Transit. I'm afraid of getting those bus shacks back if there are some that get removed. So my question is would I be able to somehow...can the department keep track that those things can come back so there isn't an added cost later on to the Transit service when bus shelters need to be removed? So those are my questions. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Through you, Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague Councillor Gilroy for the questions. There's two of them. Of course, I cannot answer for Councillor Lukes, but I'm confident in saying that between Councillor Lukes and myself, we can make sure that Councillor Gilroy's concerns, and they are fair concerns about the idea of removal of bus shack and whether it ever comes back or not, we can look into that and address that. And I do appreciate her raising that concern. In regards to the first matter of the number of people right now who need housing that are unhoused, unsheltered, and the Councillor is right. We as a city continue to work the Province of Manitoba. Recently, I had a meeting with Minister Smith. Jared Baker was there with me. My Chief of Staff was there as well. As colleagues will know, Tessa Blaikie Whitecloud has been hired by the Province of Manitoba to really, I'll use the word, quarterback, the work that's being done. Right now, there are just not enough housing units for all the people that need housing as we know. Incrementally the Province, I won't speak for them, but I can tell you that incrementally, they are identifying units to address these needs. One of the, you know, individuals that…or groups that's being spoken to is St. Boniface Street Links. I don't know, you know, how the relationship is going between...their involvement or not involvement. The degree to which they are involved in...in the overall plan. I don't have the latest information on that. All that to say we continue to try to make progress. It's not going fast enough. I don't think it's going fast enough for anybody. There's not enough units

available right now for...to meet all the need. We continue to be on it. If the Councillor, any Councillor, has specific locations, for example, that encampments that, you know, if you'd like to be addressed then please let's work together on that. And I know that again, if anyone has questions for Jared Baker from my office, please let us know. And he can bring people up to date as well on some of the specific encampments if he has information on that. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Okay, seeing none, we'll move on. Is it the will of Council to take a short health break at this time? Maybe 25 minutes? Okay, 15 is a little too short. You know you're going to come back in half an hour anyways. 20…about 20-25 minutes. Okay. There's been a few requests. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of**
**Winnipeg City Council of**
**March 27, 2025, at 5:38 p.m.**

**Madam Speaker:** Good evening. I'd like to reconvene the Council meeting of March 27th, 2025. We're on the Standing Policy Committee on Finance and Economic Development. Councillor Browaty, the Chair.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
**DATED MARCH 7, 2025**

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the report of March 7th, 2025, and move reports 1 and 2 as consent.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. 1 and 2. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay. We have no motions, no by-laws. Any questions for Councillor Browaty? Any questions for the Chair? Okay. Next is the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. Councillor Duncan, the Chair.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT**
**DATED MARCH 6, 2025**

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to advise that Item 2 has been laid over to the April 22nd, 2025, meeting of the Executive Policy Committee. And with that, I'd like to introduce the report and move adoption of consent agendas Item 1 and 3, 3 till…through to 14.

**Madam Speaker:** There's no debate. There's no debate, it's laid over at EPC. Okay. So, it's just for information. It is laid over. Definitely no debate, yes. Any questions…any items to be pulled? No?

**Councillor Rollins:** (Inaudible) vote in opposition to the…Item No. 12.

**Madam Speaker:** I can call the question then? Okay, so Item 6 and we'll do 12 as well. Well, we need to for the…to record in opposition.

**Councillor Duncan:** Madam Speaker, I can call to question Items 1 and 3.

**Madam Speaker:** So, you're pulling down 1?

**Councillor Duncan:** Sorry. No, I will move consent agenda Items 1, 3 through 5, 7 through 14.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. So, 6 has been pulled. Councillor Wyatt? Councillor Orlikow? 2? 2? 12. 12 – Zoning Agreement Amendment – 915 McMillan Avenue. Councillor Gilroy?

**Councillor Duncan:** Yes. Sorry, Madam Speaker. My intention was to allow for those that are in opposition to be recorded in opposition. Is that possible?

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, thanks. We'll get to that, but we're just standing down. Councillor…Item 6 was pulled down by? Councillor Wyatt. Okay. And then Councillor…Item 12 has been pulled. Okay. The rest we'll call the question on: 1, 3 through 5, 7 through 11, 13 and 14. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

**Item 6 – Extension of Time – Rezoning – Kenaston Snow Dump (Located South of 1301 Kenaston Boulevard and West of Canadian Pacific Railway Line) – DAZ 210/2022**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mr. Chair?

**Councillor Duncan:** I'll hear from my Council colleague, thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Item 6 was Councillor Wyatt?

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes. May I speak?

**Madam Speaker:** Yes.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I voted against this in the committee. This was a matter that is very similar to another matter that we actually approved in terms of dealing with a company that is…owes the City a little bit of money. And let's keep in mind that an extension of zoning, a time for zoning, is typically granted by the City, but it is not an automatic. We have in the past not granted extensions of time for zoning, including on lands zoned by the City. I know of a parcel in my ward where the City has rezoned land. When I left Council, they let it expire, even though it was zoned RMF-L. And not one person showed up in opposition to that (inaudible). But anyway, that's beside the point. The real issue here is that we have a property here, which we rezoned, at least part of a sale transaction that the City had undertaken with the very entity that we are now attempting to resolve. And I'll state the name, Caspian. They were the ones who filed for the extension of time. And frankly, I think it's up to us. I think we should not necessarily deny the extension of time, but we should be laying it over and be part of the discussion that's under way. Because frankly, I don't see any benefit to the City on one hand to be attempting to collect 20 some plus million dollars. On the other hand, we are simply granting an extension of time on a zoning on a sale of land. It may be argued they are two separate cases. Indeed, they are. But it's the same company. And I believe that there are issues that we need to take into consideration now that were not taken in consideration when this was initially done. And I think what I've said is fair and reasonable. You know, we have to accept applications. We've done that. We have to process the applications, development applications. We have to say 'yea' or 'nay' in a time of zoning of the applications. We do not necessarily need to approve an application. We can deny an application. We can also deny an extension time on a development application. I don't see anything wrong with that. In this case, if somebody wants to refer it back and have it as part of a greater discussion that's underway, wonderful. But for us to simply to go forward on this I think is shortsighted in light of the overall picture here. Those are my comments, Madam Chair. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next speaker, if any. Councillor Duncan to close.

**Councillor Duncan:** You can call the question. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt recorded in opposition. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

**Item 12 – Zoning Agreement Amendment – 915 McMillan Avenue – ZAA 10/2024**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** I'll hear from my Council colleague.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Gilroy, I believe you stood this down. Or was it Councillor Rollins? Councillor Rollins.

**Councillor Rollins:** In fact, it was all of City Centre. You know, the matter before us was a substantial change insofar as the parking was once underground and now it was going to be surfaced. Insofar as we had a large building that was going to have balconies and then there were none. It was going to have commercial on the main floor, and then there was going to be none. So, the City Centre saw substantial change, disagreed with the Public Service and unanimously voted against this item. As it had before, noted the substantial change and operating development did the opposite. I stood it down to be consistent with my vote at community committee, Madam Speaker. And I would like a recorded vote.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Thank you, Madam Chair…Madam Speaker. Yeah, again, at least the people in this case had an opportunity to come and voice their concerns even though it got overturned later on, but that is a part of the process. So, I just want to get up and say why I felt that the issue with…and maybe we have to go to all the Standing Policy Committees in the future. In the old days, when I was a young lad, we kind of respected the Community Committee's decisions. That's kind of what we did. Unless it was something just terribly scary. None of the committee members said no, we shouldn't have high-density there. None of us said that. Some of us were looking at different features. For example, what they used to have in the other picture was a stagger down. So, the neighbour…adjoining neighbour wouldn't have this, well, I'm not going to say four-storey building right beside them, but it came down to three-stories at the end. It went up closer to Stafford. They had ease…they had…they had setbacks and different facades that were quite nice, actually. Different styles. They had different windows were placed, not in this horizontal line that looks like you got it from Home Depot and just put them straight across. It had different textures, different window panes. It was something when I looked at that…Bottom line, I look at this building, I go, ugh. It's just something you try to squeeze it as much as you possibly could and then you took away any of the good features the other proposal had. And I just felt that they could do better. The developer didn't really try to do better. He decided that just, I'm going to do 400-square foot units and take the parking from the bottom to the…now we have more parking in the back. So, but there was a lot…no give by the developer. There was take. And he just removed stuff that I believe the neighbourhood really thought was something good. Some of the…like the staggered stuff, some of the setbacks and how it worked so it didn't look so blocky. It had some nice different features. It had different types of facades. Again, that's why I like design guidelines. It had some design on its residential side versus the Stafford side. It had the patios. Again, we try and activate Stafford as the Grosvenor Square it's called, right close to some Councillor's office, but I'm not going to mention her name. But you know, it's going to be a thing that would actually activate Corydon…Grosvenor Square with a little more commercial. And that's gone. So, it was very, very substantial. And bottom line, no, we're not against it. I think there was some comment, I watched a video that we are against density. Well, no. That wasn't it at all. It's just…it's just something I had felt was not in keeping the character at all through the neighbourhood. It seemed cheap in the fact that it was just so linear, boxy. It took away all the nice elements. And again, I'm just going to tell you right now, what I am very concerned about right now is all these development applications. We have another one on Grosvenor where they are just coming to say, and I was always surprised that we even told them that they have to go underground because it's Crescentwood/Fort Garry, there's a river underneath there. So, I'm not sure even how they are going to do that. So, we have other ones. So, it always felt like a little bit of a bait and switch. To get the zoning, we're going to do all this great stuff. And then you know what, a year later, we're going to come by and say, well, we can't do that, so we need to change a whole bunch of stuff. And I understand some changes, but this is substantially changing. So, the message I was trying to send to the developers, too bad. Come on. It's a beautiful neighbourhood. Try to do better. And that was it. And it wasn't about the fact we said, oh, do less units. But we understood the parking problem. But just do better. Do some more design characteristics. Make it so when I look at that building or the neighbourhood looks at that building even though it's pretty big for one corner, they will feel good about it. And not a lot of the neighbourhood feel good about it. But we voted, that's fine. So, it wasn't to stop densification. It was to say, you could do better in design. This is really lacking. Try to keep some of those features going forward. Look at your windows. Do different type of windows. Don't stagger them all in one straight line. Put them in different articulations. Do that kind of stuff. Do your…you know, treat the residential like it was before, rather than just one big industrial. And it really, to me, when you look at the pictures in the thing, it to me was a very industrial, I'd say 1970s government building. That's what it reflected to me. It didn't reflect what I believe the character of the neighbourhood, even though it's Councillor Rollins' neighbourhood…ward. If I was walking down the street and I go, could I have that one or that one? Well that one, the first one, was way better. And this one, you need to do more work. So, that's why we said it is substantial change and that's why it came forward, but you can do better. That's why we voted. I voted against it because I just believe the developer could do better. Now other councillors at P&D and EPC, they may say eh, it's close enough. That's fine. But my opinion is, he could do better and we should demand from people, the developers, don't take the cheap quick route, do the good route. Make it something that the neighbourhood could be proud of. This building that they put forward, I don't think anybody other than the developer would be very proud of it. So that's why I voted…voted to not to go forward and reject the application at committee.

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

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes, Madam Speaker, I was originally going to be supporting the recommendation, but I've read how the recommendation has been amended since it was at the standing committee on the March 6th. You know, it's that old expression, you know…you know, don't…don't do unto others unless you expect the same to be done unto you, or expect the same for their standard when it comes forward to their community committee. At our community committee, and I think Councillor Browaty is a member of it, I'm sure he is, he's on EPC, as well, insist that plan approvals come back in cooperation not just with the Director but with the community committee. And I want to say that we as a community committee have over and over again made major improvements on developments, on their elevations, on their parking plans, on their landscaping, in cooperation with those developers that this council never hears about. We don't expect you to hear about it because we feel that's part of our job. And you know, many of the developers are very appreciative of the

input we have to improve their parking arrangement. To find them efficiencies to improve their ability to offer bike parking, better landscaping, better entrance signage especially in today's day and age and with the population, which is aging. And all of these things have…are made possible thanks to that one little clause in the agreement that says that plan approval will be both the Director of Property and Development and the community committee. And I see that according to the meeting of March the 18th the Executive Policy Committee has concurred in recommendation to strike the clause…the term that the community committee out of the plan approval process, which speaks to what Councillor Orlikow was just talking about. And I think, Madam Speaker, that is problematic. I agree that the elevation should be with the community committee. We're not saying no to the application here. We overturned the decision of the community committee. Let's make it very clear. The standing committee overturned the decision of the community committee, and I had no issue with that. I read a lot of the recommend…the folks speaking out on the matter and listened to the audio. And I can tell you that I don't do it lightly when I do that. That a lot of the issues and concerns, as was mentioned by Councillor Orlikow, you know, can be addressed, I believe, at the plan approval stage. The building, the accessory parking areas, the garbage enclosure, the fencing and landscaping. So…in terms of the location and design of all the following. And keep in mind, we are restricted based on the zoning. Plan approval does not mean that you can move the building, you could change that. We can't do anything that would trigger a variance. So, it's very restricted in that sense, and but it does allow community committee to have significant input into the design, the landscaping, the parking, all of the things that I just mentioned. And I really would encourage members of the Executive Policy Committee to think twice on this one. I mean, I believe that the Councillors in this ward, in this area, in this community committee and specifically the Councillor of this ward has the best intent of her ward. I don't think...I'm not going to leave it to myself, Madam Chair, to try to now say that I know more information about her ward and that I can, you know, hold judgement in terms of what is best for the buildings and the elevation. She has a better understanding of that and rightfully so. And I wouldn't expect her to do the same in my ward either. But you know, I think that's where the co-operation needs to come in here, Madam Speaker. Otherwise, we're just creating kind of a toxic environment that doesn't create that kind of dialogue. And we know full well from having sat on many hearings in our community committees that, you know, our community committee has seen…has approved significant developments. We always try to find doors instead of walls to make things happen and we typically do. We just don't...we're denying your application. No, we'd find…even in the face of resident opposition, even in the face of resident opposition, one which we approved after many meetings, as long as we could...and they had massive public consultation, which right now as we speak is before the Municipal Board today. It was yesterday and the day before and today, before the Municipal Board. They are there now. I wanted to be able to be there but anyway, here we are. So, I support the concerns raised by the area Councillor, and by her colleague on community committee. I would hope that we could reconsider the decision of EPC. Maybe we can vote it...maybe we can vote it clause by clause and restore the ability of community committee to be able to have input into the plan approval. I think that would create more balance. That's all.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next speaker? Councillor Duncan to close.

**Councillor Duncan:** Yeah, thank you very much. When I saw this come to SPC on Property and Development, Madam Speaker, I was surprised, given the location. And the you know, to be quite frank, the area Councillor being a huge housing advocate. I did go back and watch. I saw several very, very valid points being brought up. I thought that there was a concession when it came to even the balconies not facing the neighbours, the garbage units being enclosed. You know, commercial units. I'm not sure if I heard right, but my understanding was there was still commercial units on the bottom. And that neighbourhood concerns around traffic congestion would be reduced given that there was a rollback of the parking. So, at the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, there was the condition to approve so that these 30 units, 30 new units, 30 smaller units, potentially, more affordable, given, you know, the neighbourhood isn't the cheapest in the world. So, I'm just assuming that the smaller units could be a bit more affordable. To see that these units are still built and that there is not a one-year period where nothing can be done, that we would put the condition in that the items, regarding building accessory, parking areas, garbage collection, fencing, landscaping, would all go back to community committee for their consideration and not just signed off by the Director of Planning, Property and Development. That was not the consensus around the table at EPC, and this is how this comes forward today. I would still like to see something built, but I hear what the complaints are. So, at that, we can call the question. See how she lands.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Duncan. I'll call the question on Item 12. All in favour? Contrary? Okay. All in favour, please rise.

**Clerk:** His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, just a second. I think there's some confusion so we're going to start again, okay. Mr. Clerk, Carlos? We will…so, voting in favour of this is voting for the EPC recommendation, which is approving the development?

**City Clerk:** Correct.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Okay, and the community…community committee rejected the development. I just want to make sure. So, we're voting in favour of EPC recommendation, if you rise. Amended EPC recommendation with the plan approval going to the director. Okay, all in favour, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Eadie, Lukes, Mayes, Santos, Schreyer.

**Nays**

Councillors Duncan, Gilroy, Orlikow, Rollins, Wyatt and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

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

**Madam Speaker:** The item passes. Next item? We're done with this committee. Yes, there's a notice of motion. Mr. Clerk, the notice of motion is next.

## STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
## NOTICE OF MOTION

### Notice of Motion 1 – Expropriation and Rezoning of Lemay Forest.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. And we also have an amending motion I believe with this, Mr. Clerk? Carlos? No, not that…not this one. That's a different one. Okay, thank you. This was moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Wyatt, your opportunity to speak.

**Councillor Wyatt:** (Inaudible) Madam Speaker, I think it's important for me to start off by referring to the letter that we received of March the 26th, 2025, literally yesterday, from the legal individual…the legal firm of the property owner in question here. I just want to put on the record that his legal firm also represents me on matters at times. However, Mr. Toyne is not my attorney. But I'm on the opposite side of the fence on this one with regards to Mr. Hill Sokalski Walsh. I want to specifically speak to a number of issues in the letter. Number one, we as a council have the right of establishing the right of public domain. Whether it be for a park, a playground, a road, we have the right to establish what we consider is in the public good for public domain. Number two, nobody has run. If you listen to the discussions in the standing committee, according to this letter, we have taken away all rights because we have raced off to expropriation. Nobody has done that. In fact, the standing committee, and I verified this today by having a conversation with Mr. Chappell, the head of Real Estate Division, who has already initiated discussions with the property owner to acquire the lands without expropriation as directed by the standing committee of March the 6th. So there was absolutely no rush to expropriation. And number three, that expropriation is a municipal right. That in the event we are unable to actually secure the land that we feel that it is in the right of public domain to secure these lands for the public good, the long-term public good of the city, we have the right to use expropriation. Number four, expropriation laws aren't tilted in favour of government versus the individual. They are very...if you read the Expropriation Act, they have huge powers that protect the rights of the property owner. So much so that we actually pay for their lawyer throughout the entire process. Land in The Forks took 20 years for the City to settle on. The entire time, we were paying for their lawyers on the land until we finally arrived at a number in terms of settling with that land. Now what I'm concerned…what I'm concerned about most is not what was necessarily said by Mr. Toyne, but what was not said in his letter. A lot of what you heard here today with regards to the HRIA, if you have a chance and you're…you don't have any hobbies, read the Heritage Resource Act of the Province of Manitoba. And in that act, you will see the powers outlined of a minister specifically there, the Resources Act, to be there as a tool to preserve heritage, but actually, it's even deeper than that. It's preserving heritage where we know there could be the burial of individuals. And the powers therein that the minister has are extensive. And one of the key mechanisms that the minister has available to the minister is what's called an HRIA, a Heritage Resource Impact Assessment. And you heard today, the contention that the property owner did not do a detailed HRIA, which I'm sure the Province will now look at it and consider. But the fact that that in and of itself, and the whole issue, and I had the opportunity, Madam Speaker, to go and listen to the speeches or the presentations on…two weeks ago, Saturday at the University of Winnipeg. And to hear the comments by some of the doctors and some of the professors about the extent of the people, the children and the infants, who are buried there. And the nature by which they passed. They now know that a child that who is not necessarily comforted, loved, that these children just simply died of solitude and from solitude and from not having any

typical caregiver. Typically it's a mother, but not always, to be there and to show compassion and love to them. And it's something which, you know, a number of us had to leave the room and sometimes during those…that evening because of the information given which was so powerful. And so, none of that is addressed in this letter. It's almost as if that doesn't exist that there's over 3,000 individuals buried there, many of them infants and children who should have never lost their lives. I just want to read some of the comments, Madam Speaker. And I really call on Council. You know, at the end of the day, you don't have to support the resolution, but we really need to get behind some of the efforts going on. I just want to read some of the comments here on the record. Lila Asher, "The City of Winnipeg has made a commitment, such as Winnipeg's Indigenous Accord and the Montreal Pledge for Biodiversity that ought to be…that ought to make taking action to protect Lemay Forest a natural choice." Michael Bagamery, "Just eight percent of Winnipeg's land is covered by greenspace. Intact ecosystems provide for other species and for us in numerous ways. By comparison, 68 percent of Oslo is green. 50 percent of Vienna and almost half…almost half each of Sydney, Singapore and Edinburgh. It would be far more sensible to be build on a site that is already developed, especially for repurposing one or for more buildings that have been abandoned." Jody Borle, "Establishing this as a public park or protected space would demonstrate a commitment to reconciliation, environmental stewardship, and the wellbeing of future generations." Diane Bousquet, "26 years, sweat lodges have stood here offering a space for healing, for prayer, for connection. Now those sweat lodges stand empty, silenced, erased, feared away in the name of profits." Which is actually not quite true, they are still there, thank goodness. And the sweat lodge keepers are trying to keep them going. Ariel Gordon, "Very interesting that carbon storage, sequestering avoiding surface runoff, reducing energy. The value...the annual function of Winnipeg's urban forest is 53.68 million. They are calculating the benefit of what our urban forest does for the environment. We have right now an urban canopy at 17 percent. Our urban floor strategy is to increase that to 24 percent." The goal…the national goal is 30 percent, just so you know. Lucien Gagnon, "An analysis of the admission registry reported a total of 3,383 deaths associated with the institution being the Asile Ritchot orphanage." And many of the...and we don't…and you'll see a motion before us today that will be referred to the committee. We don't know how many individuals are buried under our land, City land. Charles Feaver, "I live near the Assiniboine Forest and I visit it more than a hundred times a year." And I spoke about this earlier, the Assiniboine Forest urban park. We had a vision when we created that as a council in 1905. I'm calling for the same vision now. Nicole Desautels, "The developer and owner ignored a federal wildlife officer's request for the pleated woodpecker cavity sweep ahead of tree cutting, thus seemingly not adhering to federal species regulation. In a media interview, the developer seemingly dismissed the need to comply with the federal species law. Linda Dietrick, you know, calling on us to live up to our own…living up to the Montreal Biodiversity. Marianne Clipsham, "Careful and rigorous examination to gain a better understanding of how many children or other people are buried, where they are buried, how they have lived, is our duty to preserve history and advance reconciliation." And I want to read from somebody who I think spoke very well that evening, Erna Buffie, who really gave a powerful presentation, which I know the Mayor has talked many times about how the forestry issue, how we all campaigned on that in the election and how we all have that common ground. What I didn't know, which I thought was interesting, is that in 2024, urban forestry planted a record 17,000 trees. If the estimated 19,000 mature trees in the Lemay Forest are clear-cut, it will not only cancel out all those gains, it will also rob the city of substantial benefits those mature trees provide. Benefits that, which newly planted trees, will not produce for at least another decade, another decade. It will literally wipe out all the gains that we just did this year and will not have any kind of gain for another decade based on wiping out this forest. And finally, she also goes on about the Council adopted Parks Strategy and Centre Plan indicate the dire need for more green space in the city. "The City has committed to adding a thousand acres of parkland to its inventory, expropriating the 22 acres of Lemay Forest would mark an important first step towards meeting this target". Let's hope, Madam Speaker, that this is not the symbolic forest, which…the symbolic tree that was cut back in the…you know, when the women of Wolseley circled around and stopped the tree cutting of the elms or the demolition of the former City Hall, which sparked the heritage movement of the city. Let's move forward, Madam Speaker. I hope that if this doesn't go forward, members of EPC will at least move something similar.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie moved…

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, I rise…move to suspend the rules to go past 6:00 p.m.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** Yeah, Madam Speaker, I would move to lay this matter over to the next month…next meeting of Council, if I may. We have the other item regarding Lemay Forest that outlines options for the Public Service to potentially pursue in regards to working with Manitoba Habitat Conservancy, as well as the property owner. I would like to give that opportunity for the Public Service to work with all the stakeholders to see if there is an alternative to potentially make this work so that we could save this forest. If not, we can entertain this next month as well, but I would like to provide that opportunity on the City side of things. On the Provincial side of things, we now have the Municipal Board adjourned to deliver a ruling, which is scheduled mid-April. That would time quite nicely, should they meet their deadline, with Council's next meeting. I think if it's the will of Council here today to provide this layover, we could have a lot more answers, and we

could have not just us, but the potential, the land…the current landowner, developer could have some more ideas of what they would like to do moving forward.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, your opportunity to speak to that. Rebut.

**Councillor Wyatt:** In light of the comments made by the Chair, I think his points are reasonable. I appreciate the fact that I confirmed in conversation today with Mr. Chappell that they've just had an opportunity now to begin that discussion. I understand that just happened literally yesterday or today. And I give the benefit of the doubt to the Administration. They have a lot on their plate. We only dealt with this on March the 6th. I can appreciate the fact that the residents want us to do this right away in light of the fact that we have, you know, something from Friday the 13th with regards to the chainsaw out there. You know, and let's...I'm hoping…I just would want to say, I will support the Councillor's request, but I will say this, Madam Speaker, if I may. I am appealing via here in this chamber to the property owner in good faith, don't take this as any kind of misunderstanding that they…you can go out and start cutting trees again because that will simply irate the public and show total bad faith in the process that we now are initiating, which is to begin the discussions to attempt to secure the property. So, I would hope that that property owner hears this message loud and clear and does not jeopardize. And I want to thank Councillor Chambers, as well, the ward councillor, for all his work on this matter. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. I'll call the question on the layover of this item to the next Council meeting. All in favour, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillors Gilroy and Orlikow.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. The layover passes to the next meeting of Council on this item. Next, we'll get into the one motion we have. Motion 5: moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It's regarding the Lemay Forest. It will be an automatic referral to the standing committee. By-laws, Councillor Duncan, our Chair.

## STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
## MOTIONS

**Motion No. 5**
**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,**
**Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,**

*WHEREAS the requirement to conduct a Heritage Resource Impact Assessment (HRIA) has occurred on privately owned lands in and around the area known as the Lemay Forest;*

*AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg owns extensive lands in and around the Lemay Forest;*

*AND WHEREAS it has been identified by the experts in their field that 3000+ individuals, including infants and children, are buried in and around the grounds of the former Asile Ritchot Orphanage, including the grounds of the Lemay Forest.*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Service, in coordination and cooperation with the Province of Manitoba, specifically officials of the Department of Heritage, conduct a Heritage Resource Impact Assessment on all City-owned lands in and around the grounds known as the Lemay Forest and that of the Asile Ritchot Orphanage.*

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

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you again, Madam Speaker. I'll move that the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law No. 56/2024, By-law No. 122/2024, By-law No. 133/2024, By-law No, 17/2025, By-law No. 20/2025, By-law No. 21/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 56/2024, By-law No. 122/2024, By-law No. 133/2024, By-law No. 17/2025, By-law No. 20/2025, By-law No. 21/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Pardon me, not yet. Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you. I'd like to move that By-law Nos. 56/2024, 122/2024, 133/2024, 17/2025, 20/2025, 21/2025 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

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

**Councillor Duncan:** Madam Speaker, I'd like to move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 28/2025, By-law No. 29/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 28/2025, By-law No. 29/2025.

**Councillor Duncan:** I'd like to move that those By-law Nos. 28/2025 and 29/2025, be read a second time.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 28/2025, By-law No. 29/2025.

**Councillor Duncan:** And I'll move that the rules be suspended and By-law Nos. 28/2025 and 29/2025 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. Moving into question period under this committee. Councillor Wyatt, first question for Councillor Duncan.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT**
**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes. Councillor Duncan and maybe this is a question for you to take to the Public Service, but in light of the recent discussion regarding the Lemay Forest, is it possible that a clear communication in light of the...also the letter from Hill Sokalski Walsh be sent by the Public Service just to inform them of the decision today, delay the expropriate matter. Number one, delay the expropriation matter over. Number two, delay it over for the very reason that we instructed on March the 6th, enter negotiations, because I understand that there has been discussions in the media today where the property owners representative was pretending that there was no discussions and the City had not reached out, to make, it very clear that we have, that we are in the process of wanting to have productive discussions for the securing of that land. But number three, in the event of those discussions not moving forward productively, i.e., the City being able to secure the land, that the motion pertaining to expropriation, which is the City right, to still go forward. Whether that goes under your signature or that of the CAO, I think it's just simply to reflect the decision of the Council Chamber and to give the mood of the Council Chamber that we are giving the benefit of the doubt to the property owner in good will and good faith to do the right thing, but failing that, we do have rights that we will not walk away from when it comes to establishing

the right of public domain. Is that something that you'd be prepared to take forward to the CAO that he will then circulate to all members of the Council?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** Yes, absolutely. I will turn to the CAO and ask that this be communicated clearly to the Department, and that dialogue continues with the Department and the stakeholders at the Lemay site.

**Councillor Wyatt:** And just specifically, I think we have to follow up with something in writing because they sent us all an individual letter, to all members of the Council, Mr. Toyne. I think we...it's incumbent upon the City, just simply to reflect the decisions that have taken place here, boom, boom, boom. Six, we're negotiating. Three, we laid it over to allow further negotiating. Four, or three, that we can come back and expropriation is still on the table if things do not move forward on number one and two. Simply reflecting the decision to CAO to supply that.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** I apologize. I don't know the process on ongoing matters and the CAO providing updates to, in this case, a landowner. But it's all public record here. If the CAO chooses to provide a written response, I'm not sure what his motive will be at this point in time. But, I mean this is all public record and if he chooses to share it with them, I would be more than happy to support that.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Final question, Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** And it should be noted just for the record, Madam Speaker, that it does not appear that the CAO was copied on this or written to, it was just members of Council and the Mayor. Was he copied on it? Okay. Well, you know, I'm just taking it from who they formally wrote to, and maybe it's something that the Mayor's Office maybe should consider just to kind of give them a...just to state some of the facts for the record that are missing in this letter. Thank you.

**Councillor Duncan:** Yes.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. In regards to comments made in this chamber, just earlier before break, I wish to make the point in my preamble that in the last four months, I've held four forums and public consultation with members of Administration in my ward. In the last four months, I've held four. It didn't occur to me that people that...Councillors that didn't do that are confused. Madam Speaker, over time, I visit...I went to public consultations in half the wards, maybe as well as being a City Councillor. I've been the only other City Councillor there. Didn't occur to me that other Councillors were confused because they didn't attend other Councilors' public consultations like I did. In the last few months, Madam Speaker, I just visited public consultations. We have...by hosted by Markus Chambers...

**Madam Speaker:** …Thank you, Councillor Schreyer…

**Councillor Schreyer:** …And Janice Lukes…

**Madam Speaker:** Your question on that?

**Councillor Schreyer:** Sure, Madam Speaker. Specifically, I visited the public consultation by Councillor Mayes. We also talked specifically about Property, Planning and Development issues. It did...I was the only other Councillor there. It didn't occur to me that other Councillors were not there. Madam Speaker, there is a time when we don't always...I go to seminars here where other councillors don't show up. It doesn't occur to me that other councillors are confused. And Madam Speaker...

**Madam Speaker:** The question, Councillor Schreyer. You've made your point...

**Councillor Schreyer:** I just heard by the Chair of Property, Planning and Development that he understands my confusion that I didn't attend a public consultation where I think three councillors did attend. Good for them. But he understands my confusion. I'm just wanting to know, I was referring to Councillor Orlikow's points. I'm not here to sensationalize, but I wish to ask again so there's no misunderstanding here. Councillor Orlikow was talking about how he felt it was mis...can be misinterpreted, prone to confusion, that it's when the Administration talked to...spoke that they talked to as of right. They use the terminology "to enable the development of". And...

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, the question for the Chair though?

**Councillor Schreyer:** Yes.

**Madam Speaker:** Let's get to it…

**Councillor Schreyer:** Can the Chair of Public...Planning, Property and Development understand that there can be confusion by people when the Administration says they did have a consultation, they did mention that they are consulting on as of right even though they use the terminology, according to Councillor Orlikow "to enable the development of"…

**Madam Speaker:** Got it. Thank you…

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thus, can understand my confusion about that…

**Madam Speaker:** Thanks for the question.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Duncan.

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you, Madam Chair. My offer is extended again to any of my council colleagues to attend any form of public consultation, including Councillor Schreyer. I was not aware of your public forums in your community. Thank you for doing that. I would encourage anyone who does these public forums to get as much information as possible from the Public Service to get as much information as possible that they have been provided over several occasions in briefings, in meetings or at the public forums. In fact, should you like to listen to any of the virtual meetings, they are available to any of the Council members now. I think they are actually available to the public as they have been posted. So, lots of opportunity here. I look forward to heading out to Elmwood-East Kildonan to join Councillor Schreyer at his next town hall.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question…

**Councillor Schreyer:** But it was referring to understanding my confusion, not the other councillors that didn't attend the public consultations. I don't know what to say about this. I'm not sure why I've been singled out kind of thing. But having said, I thank Councillor Duncan for the continued opportunity to work together, to cooperate, to learn together.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further question?

**Councillor Schreyer:** Yeah, I guess are the other councillors that didn't attend the last one, are they confused? I don't know what to say about that. I don't know what I did not...

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Duncan, your opportunity to clarify.

**Councillor Duncan:** Sure. I would, you know, just to the confusion point, when a Councillor stands up and talks about the golden oldies or whatever it was at the time that was being discussed around the council chambers, that leads me to believe that they don't know what's going on. And I take responsibility as the Chair of that committee to ensure that everyone around this council chamber is informed...

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Duncan:** And I'm happy to do it. Thank you very much.

**Councillor Orlikow:** I'm citing decorum. The Chair impinged the motives of other councillors…

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Okay…

**Councillor Orlikow:** Impugn. Impugn, sorry. So, let's get this down a bit.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Yes, let's take it down a notch. It's the opportunity to clarify. Play nice. Councillor Duncan, do you have anything to add to Councillor Schreyer for his being singled out?

**Councillor Schreyer:** (Inaudible)

**Councillor Duncan:** Again, I'm happy to provide clarity on anything...for any of the councillors. I'll do my best. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Madam Speaker, I'm not the only one to talk.

**Councillor Duncan:** Can we get his mic?

**Councillor Schreyer:** Councillor Orlikow...just I was referring to Councillor Orlikow's remarks. He did talk about how we're taking away the power, how it's changing. And I'm referring to historically...

**Madam Speaker:** Any question?

**Councillor Schreyer:** Why it is a change. How it is a change? That's all I did, Madam Speaker. Is that recognized?

**Madam Speaker:** You're going to take this conversation off-line. Okay, I think we're done with this.

**Councillor Duncan:** I'd be happy to take the conversation off-line. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Play nice. Thank you. Okay, next question? No, you know what? Both, please. Okay, let's hash it out later. Thank you, new speaker of the house there, in the corner. Alright, any other questions for our Chair? Seeing none, let's move to the Standing Policy Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment.

## REPORT OF THE STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT DATED MARCH 10, 2025

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to introduce the SPC on Water, Waste and Environment's report of March 10th and move adoption of consent Items on 1, 2, 4 and 5. There's an amendment to 3 on the table.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, amendment to 3. 1 and 2. Councillor Mayes? They have been pulled. Okay, good. So, call the question on 4 and 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Mr. Clerk.

### Item 1 – Request for Budget Revision for the NEWPCC Upgrade: Nutrient Removal Facilities Project

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie to open the discussion.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, this report No. 1, is…you know, it's closely related to report Item 2. In terms of report Item 1, there was an amendment to the capital appeal for a…to allocate 10.894 million dollars towards the procurement process for the project three nutrient removal at the North End Pollution Control Centre. And that was a recommendation that came out of the Mayor and I and working with the…with Water and Waste. We had to figure out how not to move forward with cash payments for the project three, as it was moving along, and we needed some time to work with other levels of government to figure out how we can figure afford to pay this...pay for the project three in a…in a…well, in an affordable way for the water bill payers, who pay the sewer rates, as well as the water rates. And procurement, though, has to start because we have a date our licenser, which is the Province of Manitoba's department, that we have to complete the whole North End project…Pollution Control Centre project by, well, I think it's 2030. There is some work at trying to extend that. But anyway, so that's what this is. And it's a minor…well, any amount…nobody wants to see increases to their rates. Whether it's property taxes, sewer rates, water rates. The reality is we have an environment here where we have to…it costs a lot of money to build these essential City services and facilities in order for us not to injure the environment. So, it was a slight rate increase to get that money. And that's the introduction.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers, Item 1? Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Madam Speaker, I really implore. I'm not saying put the brakes on the project. I'm saying that there has to be a new lens brought to this capital project and desperately. We need to get outside help to look at what we're doing, to look at the scope of this project, and to send a message…and to revise, potentially, and find savings. And the first thing I would do to…before that, as we know, because of the Veolia contract, whatever savings we make, they're

going to get a percentage of it even if they are involved or not. The first thing I would contemplate is ending that contract which acts as a disincentive to this Council. I want the Chair to have the benefit of the doubt, Madam Speaker. No, not at all.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie, just waiting for you to hear the debate.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Sorry, Councillor Eadie. I wanted you to have the benefit of the doubt rather than not hear. Not at all, sir. Not at all. No, Madam Speaker. Actually, the Veolia contract acts as a disincentive the way I understand and read it. Whatever savings they make, even if it's not related to any work they do, they are going to have a…they're going to make a dividend on the savings. We had a similar thing when Katz…Mayor Katz did the sponsorship policy where we hired sponsorship group and I was trying to make sponsorship after the Transcona Centennial Square and found out, well, they're going to take 20 percent, they had nothing to do with the raising of the money of the Centennial Square. Somehow I was able to figure that one out. But anyway, Madam Speaker, if we can deal with Veolia and then bring in outside engineers, with fresh eyes, because what's happened here? And I saw it happen behind the scenes, Madam Speaker, with all due respect to our engineering division. I know they have our best interests at heart. When we were dealing with the organics back in 2015, around then, when in a Council seminar the engineers basically said, well, we hear the Province is going to bring down regulations on us. And I questioned them, how do you know the Province is going to bring down regulations on us? And what I learned through all of that was that our engineers talk to their engineers and their engineers talk to our engineers, and they write the regulations. And it's like you taking your car, Madam Speaker, over to a dealership and they tell you, well, you need this new thingamajig. Oh yeah, I've got to get that. You know, I don't know what it is. But you know, knowing how high-tech cars are today, right, you trust who you deal with where you take your car to get repaired. It's the same challenge we face today with this. It's so high-tech. But I'll just draw two (inaudible) here. What does this mean? Does any member of Council can tell me and explain what this means? Maximize the use of biological phosphorus removal, saving digester capacity for the continue of residential and economic development in the city and the metro region. Okay, now maybe you might (inaudible). But Madam Speaker, this is where…why are we even talking about the metro region at this point, right? We are talking about our own city. What are we building here? We have contracts for the other municipalities. But Madam Speaker, we should be looking first and foremost after ourselves and the rate payers of Winnipeg who are going to be paying these exorbitant new rates. I just want to read for the record a letter that I wrote to the editor that was never published. With some debate, at last Thursday's February Council meeting with an overwhelming majority your…our so-called fathers and mothers voted in favour of two reports that will ensure within the next decade that your annual water and waste bill shall rival the cost of your annual property taxes, municipal and school combined. In 2023, the estimated cost of the new biosolids treatment plant, only part of the upgrades to the North End Water Pollution Control Centre was 553 million but then soared to over a billion. Important to note that this plant is being designed by Provincial engineers out of the Department of Conservation and the City of Winnipeg Water and Waste engineers, who have worked together to build a plant which only exists from what I know in Washington, DC. In other words, we are building the Lamborghini version when a much cheaper version, Ford version, exists and can do exactly the same thing. This happened with zero political oversight. And that's important. With the zero (inaudible)…by either level of government of the engineering and the design questioning it, challenging it. No oversight. And that cost to the treatment plant upgrade, with the lion's share being the North End plant, the total budget has now surged to nearly three billion. These upgrades can find their genesis in the report of the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission of 2003 chaired by then premier…Premier Doer political appointee, Terry Duguid. Amongst the many recommendations in the report, Duguid also called for the said upgrades be subject to the funding formula of one-third municipal, one-third provincial, one-third federal. It's called…the report was called 'Better Treatment – Taking Action to Improve Water Quality in Manitoba' Clean Environment Commission report August 2003, page 60. As it stands today, the province of the Manitoba, and this might be updated, it may be a little bit off, but the province of Manitoba has only committed 277 million, the government of Canada, to 323 towards a 2.8-billion-dollar project. So, for a total of 600 million from the two levels of government. This is a massive regret, Madam Speaker, for our city to not secure this one-third, one-third, one-third. It ensures that out of the 2.8 billion in cost, which is a number that will surely grow, at what we're seeing at present manner that we're receiving these reports. Only 600 million is covered by the higher levels of government which means 2.2 million is going to be on the backs of water. And we are all saying it's so sad, but we can do something about this. Regional Minister Terry Duguid, who was then the Chair of the CEC, must take a serious look in the mirror. I know he's running in the campaign right now. He's technically…but he's still technically a minister. To ask himself why Winnipeg rate payers today are being asked to be responsible when he only called…when he called for one-third, one-third funding in his political career not that very long ago. And Premier Wab Kinew, who is a protégé of premier Gary…former Premier Gary Doer who campaigned in October of 2023 of making life more affordable for Manitobans must also be held to account on this matter. And the irony of ironies is that following all these upgrades being made, Madam Speaker, to our treatment plants, Winnipeg will continue to dump raw sewage into our rivers, as none of these upgrades will address Winnipeg's antiquated system of combined sewers, the source of our regular raw sewage discharge. Madam Speaker, we have to turn this around. This thing is out of control. We need to get outside help. We need to end the contract with Veolia without, you know…I'm sure there will be penalties, but it will be probably a lot less than if we find savings and then we've got to pay them a certain percentage. I

really implore that there be a task force. As Pierre DeSchmidt would call it, a tiger team. The former brigadier general. You know, that it be with fresh eyes, engineering and lay people to take this issue on who will ask the tough questions that need to be asked that is not happening on this file right now. And I don't blame any member of EPC or the Mayor or Councillor Eadie in any way, shape or form. This is…I'm not saying it could be them, it has to be…but they could initiate that process. So, thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to my colleague from Transcona, in terms of the supports that are needed, the Chief Construction Officer will be starting on Tuesday, April 1st. You know, it was mentioned that hiring a Chief Construction Officer will make sure that the projects our members build will get done on time and on budget. It's something that both contractors in the City of Winnipeg want to achieve. And that was a quote by Ron Hambley, President of the Winnipeg Construction Association. There are also a set of goals that the CCO are responsible for: strategic planning, infrastructure thinking, cost management, centralized oversight and reporting. This position itself, again, the person that was hired comes with 35 years experience. In conversation with my colleague here, one of the major contractors, PCL and the City, indicates that this individual, Mr. Sparrow, Tom Sparrow, is a good catch. He's managed projects from hospitals to schools to airports to data centres across BC and the Yukon, with projects valued ranging from tens of millions of dollars to billions of dollars. I think this is a good hire for the City of Winnipeg and will keep our projects on budget, on time. Time is money. And will make sure that we get the value for money in terms of the infrastructure that the City of Winnipeg is investing in. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**Councillor Mayes:** Well, once we finally got rid of Mayes and Duncan as Chair of water committee, I see some progress here for the first time on projects. Hooray. So, well done, Councillor Eadie. So, to give some credit where credit is due, we have been talking about project three which is the nutrient removal for as long as I've been here. As Councillor Wyatt says, it's from a 2003 report. So, it's the first time, to give some credit where credit is due, it's the first time we sort of put our cards on the table here and said, look, this is what this thing is now going to cost and this is an idea of how to pay for it. So, I'll speak more about the rates under number two, which I'll be supporting. And I'll support this item too. I mean, it's basically just a revised budget estimate. There's some theatricality, perhaps, in having this line up with, well, we got federal and provincial money, but we're not going to include that in the rates, but we'll get to that under the rates. There is the oddity here of saying, well, we can't fund it under debt, as if we're somehow not allowed. Well, look at the 2014, 2015, 2016 capital budgets. All of this was going to be done under the debt, the original 795 million. Why can't we do it now? We're up against our own debt ceiling, really. So, I mean, how hard would that be to change? And Councillor Eadie, to his credit, has been calling for us to do that for years. So, we really could. This whole idea that my god, the fees are going to astronomical because we have to cash flow this. No, we can do it under debt. We have to move our own debt ceiling. It's not that hard. It's under our control. Council is supreme as Councillor Duncan once said. So, the impact of this is going to come down in a less theatrical fashion. But for today, yeah, number one, it's good. We're sort of biting the bullet and saying, well, I guess…I guess we're going ahead on this project number three. It will be extremely expensive. It should be cost shared. That issue is…we'll be able to fund this under debt if we just remove our own ceiling, but it will be a lot less debt if we get other levels of government to cost share with us. That much is obvious. So, I'm pleased to see this come forward. I'll be supporting it and more comments on the rates under number two.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Orlikow.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Yeah, I'm going to throw something out here that I've been thinking about for a while as this project just unravels completely. And one of the reports talked about what level of government is paying what portion. You know what, until those levels of governments come into their one-third, we should just stop. You know, this is crazy. We're just going to keep funding it no matter what they give us? This is crazy. I dare the province to say stop development. You can't develop anymore. I dare them to say that. You know what, I dare them not to do that, is just give us the money we need, it being 33 percent, 33 and 33. But for us, it would be boring 60-plus percent of this project on the rate payers of Winnipeg, on an environmental by-law, which is not bad, but being forced to us by the provincial government who has given us something like 16 percent so far. There's…I think…and I just want to plant in your head, there is the option of just saying forget it. We're going to wait until you guys all fund your one-third, and then we'll move forward. Yes, it may cause us some problems down the line be it by the province. We'll say, well, I guess you're not going to do your environmental licence so again, we're going to shut down development in Winnipeg. Well, most of the seats for the NDP are in Winnipeg. Good luck. They want to try that? But again, just sort of biting the bullet and say, hey, don't worry about it. You just give us 16 or 20 percent and we'll take care of the rest. That is just, to me, at this point now, the projects…and I appreciate you think the Construction Officer's going to save us. Not going to happen. This project is so complicated. Not saying that he won't do a good job, but the costs are going to keep going up. Tariffs alone are going to crush this project. So you know, maybe

I'll just say it to EPC and the Mayor, maybe it's time to say, hey, forget it. Until you guys come forward with the money, we're going to have to take a pause on this project and move forward. But again, the way it seems to be working is we keep spending more and the other levels of governments are just trickling along with a little bit of extras. They need to be…We need a commitment from both those levels of government to at least fund the project, whatever the number is, one-third/one-third. And is unfair to charge all Winnipegers for this. So I am willing to discuss it, don't say we should do it, but I want to plant the bug in some people's ears. I've talked to several councillors about it. Maybe it's time that we stand up, put our back up and say forget it. Until you guys come up to your one-third level, we're going to hold this project until we have the money in the bank rather than hoping for the future that the province and the feds will give us money. So, that's my point. That's all I'll say. I will be voting for this and probably the written report, as well. But I just want to say, in the future, if this keeps going, we don't see some kind of balancing on this, I think it's time that Council may have to decide that, okay, we're just going to pause this project even though it costs more. Not our doing. It's your doing for not helping property fund this project. So, I'll leave it at that. That's my bug for the day.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie to close.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. And thanks for the comments from all the colleagues who spoke to this. Yeah, it's a huge, complex project being demanded on the City of Winnipeg since 2003. I just want to say that it is this Mayor and this Council who have finally taken the responsibility to move forward, this environmentally important project for Lake Winnipeg and the treatment of our sewage. In closing on this, I think I need to make a…make a couple of comments. I've heard people…I just heard…or heard of the idea of removing phosphorus and other nutrients that the Netley Marsh into Lake Winnipeg, if it was fully restored, it would handle being able to take all that out and help prevent the heavy growth of algae in Lake Winnipeg. While I was at the Red River basin fund-raise…fish fundraiser last week, Madam Speaker. And we heard from a scientist engineer, who is overseeing that project. And they actually have to do a study to find out back in 1929 how much Netley Marsh, how much phosphorus and other nutrients were being held back from going into Lake Winnipeg in that marsh. So, they don't know. So, that's not a solution. And just to mention that we could…yeah, I feel the same way, maybe. They are not throwing…bringing money to help prevent the water bill payers from paying huge rates. Even with debt spread out over a longer period of time, it still has an effect on our rates. And…but if we said no to project three, stop it with the continued chemical removal of phosphorus, what will have to happen is with project two, we would have to expand the size of the digesters, right? So, that would be an added cost to project two. Which we're finally...well, I'll talk more about it on the rate report. But we are finally getting some funding to help the rate payers offset increases to rate payers over time, not…they still have to figure out all the details, Madam Speaker. But anyway, it's essential, though, that procurement starts on project three, because if we don't start the procurement process and you delay that, that means it's longer down the term. And as we know, the longer we wait, because if we would have started this thing way back, way back, and started doing…rather than debating and trying not to have nutrient removal done biologically or…then we would have been ahead, and it wouldn't have cost us as much money. That is for sure. We wouldn't be in the Trump tariff era. Afraid of that, as well. So, in closing, I hope you'll all vote for this project. We worked hard at trying to lower the impact on the sewer…the rate payers by making sure there's procurement and that there's not a large increase as a result of moving ahead with project three.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, record you in opposition. Next item, Mr. Clerk.

**Item 2 – 2025 to 2027 Revised Sewer Volume Rates**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to introduce the report. So, you already heard report one ties into what the sewer…So we revised the rate. The rate is enough to pull in 10.894 million dollars for that procurement process. What's interesting about our sewer rates though, so we have a projection of what the sewer rates will be given that we had project…I think we've already collected enough money to pay for project one. But project two is moving ahead and is…you know, it's not going to be long before we start that project. So what's happened is, the federal government did announce before the federal election that they were entering into an agreement with the province of Manitoba to share in the cost on project two, which is the biosolids expansion that we definitely need and for this…in order for this city to grow. What is it, we have five to six years left of capacity? And that could change depending on how big of a growth projects happen. But in the meantime…but you know, it was clear there is…the province has signed an agreement with the federal government. It was noted in their budget. So it looks like while the province won't be contributing the same 150 million, they are going to be providing over 100 more million dollars towards the biosolids project. So moving into the future, how that cash flow comes in. And hopefully, we get that cash as we need it to pay the contractors for doing project two. So that's the rates. I believe it was...I can't remember. I think it was about 60 cents per cubic metre of water. That's my introduction. Thanks.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Hate to keep going with all this positivism. But thank you to Councillor Eadie and the Mayor's office. This is probably the most cooperation on something I've had since July. So my thanks for that. In that there are...I'll be supporting. I'll be supporting in part because of two amendments that were added at standing committee and which were then adopted by EPC. And those are the final two recommendations you would see under the standing committee report. The one that got all the media attention was that we will ask the Public Service to advise on how we could phase out the dividend over a 10-year arc. That 10-year arc starting with the next multi-year budget, which was something Councillor Eadie and, I think, the Mayor's office preferred saying, look, we're not going to harvest all this additional money out of the dividend over the next few years. It's capped. But the phaseout should start in 2028 because the dividend does, as we all know, over 40 million a year now being taken. Use whatever verb you want, being taken from Water and Waste revenues and moved over into general revenue. This has obviously had the effect of allowing it to keep property taxes somewhat lower over the past 15 years. Then-Councillor Gillingham as Chair of Finance, to his credit, started trying to unwind this back in 2019. COVID intervened. Frankly, we needed all the revenue. So good, we will talk about how it will leave the Water and Waste revenue with Water and Waste because the province has been saying, to me, probably to others, don't blame us for this shortfall. You're the guys who took 400 million dollars out over the past 15 years. And they are completely right. So let's start doing the right thing. This is…I'd always thought, well, when we do this, it's going to come with a concomitant increase in property taxes. Or co-comitant, as my colleague would say, Increase in property taxes. We're sort of doing that, but it's not necessarily linked because this is part of the budget. Regardless, it's good. We're going to start looking at unwinding the dividend, which I think is good public policy. And then perhaps the rejoinder to some of what Councillor Wyatt was saying, is actually the more important item to me, was the number six, although it got no media attention whatsoever. Number six is, what can we do about combined sewer? I was at a meeting a while ago where the Mayor said before I could respond. What he's about to say is that we're not going to get done until the 2090s and if we keep going at this pace, which wasn't what I was about to say. So, as people here have realized, you repeat yourself often enough here, sometimes people listen and it gets through. So the CSO work, we are literally half a century behind the deadline. But we can do a lot of it with two more projects. We're doing Armstrong now in Councillor Sharma/Councillor Eadie's ward. That's…Mr. Shanks would want us to say, that's like a third of getting toward the target if you just do Armstrong. But if we do St. Boniface and Jefferson as well, then we're eating up a huge chunk of what we need to do. Maybe we won't get some of the other ones done until the 2070s. I don't know. But at least we can do something really productive, something really historic, I think, within the next 10 years or so. So the wording is, look, get those...give us a rate report that says, how do you get Armstrong and Jefferson done by the timeframe we were talking about in 2019? Shanks has said, we're actually…we can do it before that. Our latest timeline has had in getting done before. Great. So, we're not looking to get Jefferson and St. Boniface Mission District done by 2095, we're looking to get them done by maybe 2035, roughly. 2037. This will have a cost. Thus, we need our rate report wizards over there at Water and Waste to say, well, if you do X, then you can get enough money in hand to knock off these two big combined sewer districts. That would be historic. I would feel good leaving here saying, well, we've got something done on this, we didn't leave it for our grandchildren. So, the rest of the report is pretty straightforward. I mean, it's…gee, it's going to be less than we projected because we're going to get money from other levels of government, it certainly appears. I mean, why that wasn't built in, I'll leave to somebody else to figure out. But frankly, if we keep saying on all the zoning debates, you're jeopardizing all this money, then maybe we should treat it in this report the same way as the money is in hand. Seems to be two very different ways of treating federal and provincial grants. Leave that for another day. The point for today is, yeah, we need to increase the rates. This is a less draconian measure than the original report from the staff, but to me, it's worth endorsing. And thank you to Councillor Eadie and the Mayor's office for working to say, look, the Items five and six are important. One is talking about phasing out the dividend and that's good public policy, I think, and reflects some of what was started by then-Councillor Gillingham in 2019. But to me, the main thing is Item six is the first time we've really come to the plate. We've said in the past, give us a plan to get done by 2045 or 2047, not 2097. Nothing. We did increase. We accelerated on Armstrong. That was 60 million dollars. Quite proud of that. But that didn't…we had so much money in the bank, we didn't need to increase rates. Not the case anymore, unfortunately, so we're going to have to increase rates. But if we do, we can get these two big – no where near my ward – two big projects done. Jefferson, which is up just south of Armstrong, up in North Main area, and St. Boniface Mission District, which we know has all sorts of opportunities to increase development, to…all sorts of green infrastructure possibilities there with Save our Seine. Quite exciting, actually. So, very pleased to see…to see the amendments get through EPC, frankly. And pleasantly surprised, perhaps. So, some good work there by Councillor Eadie. So, I will be supporting. I don't know where the rates are going to go next year. No one does, frankly. And will depend on what we get from the other levels of government. But we…it's good to see that we'll be getting something back in the fall saying, here's the plan to phase out the dividend. And to me, even more importantly, here's a plan to do something finally, historic about our combined sewers. Because otherwise, it's what Councillor Wyatt said, we're going to be sitting here in 2095 with raw sewage still getting dumped. Well, that's probably going to happen, but at least this is some way of saying we did our part. We didn't leave this for future generations. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt, followed by Mayor Gillingham.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I'm not going to sound like a broken record so I'm just going to make it quick. Number one, fire Veolia. Number two, value engineer this project. Hire the eyes and the minds outside of the group we've had. They value engineer our libraries. They value engineer our rec facilities. Value engineer this instead and bring down the value here. And part of that is number three, to dig into the regulations brought down on us by the Province of Manitoba. I had an opportunity to speak to a former minister in a former government who said very rarely does a minister actually read the regulations. It just goes right past their desk because it's like right over here, above the head. And you know, what can you do? They're the engineers, right? But we need to bring a fresh set of eyes at those regulations. And the Mayor has quoted the regulations on the floor, and we need to really review them and consider what those regulations are doing to the bottom line of these projects. I'm speaking to the Water and Waste rates, Madam Speaker. I want to make it clear, but I'm speaking to the fact that the water rates...Water and Waste and the sewer rates before us today are directly related to the report before and vice versa as pointed out by Councillor Eadie. And I'm going to sound like a broken record if I say this. Number four, the report talks about the need to call for the province and the feds. I want to compliment the Mayor for drawing…bringing that issue out, for standing his ground on that. Let's put a line in the sand, pick a date. Pick a date when they got to be…they've got to come to the table by. And if they're not there, guess what? We've got a problem. We're not going ahead. We've got a major discord here with the government. Maybe the date is the October 3rd second anniversary of the government's election. I don't know, but pick a date and let that be your bottom line. Number five, I agree with Councillor Mayes, take on the combined sewers. If we're going to do this, let's try to get it all done at once. Number six, make Netley Marsh…if they want to question our sincerity over the sewer and water rates and the need to clean the environment and the need to clean the rivers, let's make Netley Marsh our project. Let's restore Netley Marsh, which is a fraction of the cost, a fraction, millions instead of tens of millions, and we'll remove 10-plus percent of the nutrients out the system versus this plant alone. Never mind any costs related, which is what Councillor Eadie was just referring to. And finally, Madam Speaker…and by the way, just on the combined sewers, Madam Speaker, it's been argued in the past we hear of our development applications coming forward. If any of you have development applications now all related to this, you know, we got this get out of jail clause almost by the Water and Waste Department. Well, we approve your development, but we may not approve it later on. And I've got coming to the standing committee next month, a car wash, thanks to the help of the Mayor's office. I've been trying to get this through. Who's coming forward and they've got an engineering report signed off and all the other stuff. This poor car wash on Regent Avenue who has been trying to pull a permit to build, he can't get to build. And the impression is given that it's, oh, well, there's not enough room and the capacity of the treatment plant. Well, I find out that it's actually because it goes back to pre-Unicity, the pipe was running…is running the wrong way. It's pushing it up hill because, actually, when it was the city of Transcona, it was going this way towards Plessis versus that way towards Stapon. And guess what? It doesn't go up hill. I don't want to say what, but anyway, but you know, it does after you push so much into the pipe. Now the question is, Madam Speaker, whether there will actually be backups on some of the new housing developments we've approved in Transcona, because I don't know how they got passed and the car wash doesn't. Finally, Madam Speaker, it should be put on the record as well, we just had this debate about infill, infill, infill. Our planning department right now, with the water and sewer rates (inaudible) it doesn't really address, again, combined sewers, which really we need to start talking about, if we truly believe in infill, infill, infill. Because the policy right now of the Water and Waste Department filed by our engineers with the staff, and I had an opportunity to do some digging when I was not in this chamber in the previous term. You can get copies of the correspondence sent to the minister by our staff, or the minister's staff. Is that we suppress, our policy is to suppress the infill in favour of the greenfield. Let me repeat that. We suppress the infill development in favour of the greenfield. In other words, it's funny how Sage Creek phase three, this didn't even come up as an issue. I didn't hear Qualico saying, well, geez, I can't get my phase creek…Sage Creek phase 3 through with a thousand, 2,000 new homes, you know? You know, or all…or Genstar or all the other big developers if this goes through. But the infill is the stuff that's getting shut down. Let's...we really need to get this organized. And I want to support this report because I was a…I was a…I felt very encouraged and I said it in the seminar, behind closed doors, and I'll put it on the record in terms of the Mayor taking a strong stance on the rates. But it was all null and void the next day in the headline of the paper when the next report that's coming on the agenda appeared. You know, with regards to the moving us to the solid waste utility concept. And it's like, okay, you guys, I get it. You're the same department. You're trying to make it work. You're trying to balance your book. Having said that, you know, the province is moving towards, you know, a system of industry pay in terms of garbage. Why are we rushing to create this utility when we know Broadway is coming down with regulations and fees that would potentially be coming back to us to pay for the very rates that we are increasing in report No. 3. It doesn't make any sense. I think we could buy time on that one. I know the department wants everything, but they can't have everything, right? We have to...as the Mayor said, we can't just hammer the ratepayer. We're seeing what the school divisions are doing. And I'm in favour of raising taxes. I was one of the first members of Council that called for the raising of taxes, before Jenny Gerbasi. To her credit, the following year, she did. She joined me. But the reality is…and now I just poured water all over myself. I get so excited. Anyways, the reality is, Madam Speaker, we got to cool things down, as the water just spilt, and get the matter in hand. Our issue with regards to the rates which we know the Province does not come to the table, the feds won't come to the table. We are on our own and that should not be the case. And we have to call...we have to draw that line in the sand. The report does kind of say that, but we don't have a drop-dead date. And I would encourage the Mayor to move on that. I would encourage the Mayor and EPC to think about making the Netley Creek marsh our project. That will show our

sincerity, if anything, to the other levels of government and to the people. And if we rolled in the combined sewer program to, actually, so it's not 75 years, as Councillor Mayes refers to, but we can actually address it. And we could have a comprehensive initiative here and say, this is where the rates need to go, but by the way, the federal government and the provincial government are in one-third on this project. And we have, if we can demonstrate to them, that we have done value engineering because we have fresh eyes to the table, then it actually may make it easier for us to get the one-third/one-third funding. Anyway, those are my comments. Thank you.

**Councillor Mayes:** Madam Speaker, I think I have a point or order. Just…I will be quick. That inference about Sage Creek, I've been the Councillor there, so has Councillor Allard, previously Councillor Vandal. I'm not sure who was around with phase three. But the reason why it wasn't a combined sewer issue is because it's about eight miles away from where the combined sewer system ends. So, there's no sleaziness here that somehow these guys got this through and other people couldn't get. I mean, I think the point Councillor Wyatt is trying to make is...

**Madam Speaker:** Thanks for the education, Councillor Mayes. Thank you…

**Councillor Mayes: …**Whether you have infill or suburban…

**Madam Speaker:** …Thank you…

**Councillor Mayes:** …development, you still have a billion-dollar problem with combined sewers. You still have a billion-dollar waste treatment facility. Now three billion.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Thank you for that indulgence. Mr. Mayor, you have the floor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Councillor Eadie for his leadership and previous Chairs of this committee too. Certainly, this has been a long time coming and Councillor Duncan, Councillor Mayes, and others. And I want to go back a little bit and give some credit. Even my State of the City speech, I said the previous federal, provincial governments and some Councils didn't take action. I want to give credit to previous Council under the previous Mayor who we did move along somehow to get some ISIP funding to get things going. And at a time when the current Premier of that day really wasn't moving along. So, I do know that those of us who are on Council at that time worked really, really hard, kind of felt like we were banging our heads against the wall to get some movement. We didn't get much traction, and it wasn't for effort. But now, to Councillor Eadie's point, I want to commend every member of this chamber. These are tough decisions, but we're making them. And thank you very much for your willingness to make these decisions. I just want to point out one part of this report. And I can tell you what, I hear Councillor Orlikow's frustration, for example, and don't blame him and others for that because we, in our office, are consistently, regularly in dialogue with the provincial government, federal government, saying you need…you need to do more. One, this is provincially regulated, as Councillor Wyatt pointed out, again. That's really why we're here in large part, to build the kind of plant we are called upon to build. I appreciate the special treatment, but my clock hasn't even started, and I've been talking for two minutes and it's still at eight. So, you can…thank you very much. That's great. I was going to use it all. I thought, no, I better not. I better let them know the clock...

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Duncan will get after you.

**Mayor Gillingham:** He will. So, I just want to point out that on page 10 of your report, I draw your attention to page 10 of this report. There's a chart there, and it's a chart on project two, which is the biosolids facilities, 1.035 billion dollars. It's a chart with old numbers, as it were. They were numbers that were prepared at the time…these are the numbers that the…that our department had secured. And you'll note below that chart it says, that in November 2024, the provincial government announced a plan to increase of 30 million dollars there which would increase the total provincial commitment to 197.4 million. At the time of this report, there's no funding agreement in place. Once an agreement is formalized, the additional funding will be integrated into future financial...future rate financial analysis. And so, since this report was completed, we have secured verbal agreements. There's…now, there's no signed agreement on it, but we have commitments from the provincial and federal government that increase their contributions by a total of 300 million dollars total. 166 million dollars from the federal government and 138 million dollars from the Province of Manitoba. We think the province's contribution is through the strategic infrastructure basket, but that creates challenges for another day. But as one of my staff members says, one problem at a time. What we've got, though, is we do have 300 million dollars in commitments from the federal and provincial government, an increase from them of 300 million dollars total for project two. And that gives me some hope, I'll use the word hope, as we continue to knock on the door with them and work with them on project three. Because project three at 1.5 million dollars, without a doubt, we absolutely have to have their contribution. So, the dialogue is ongoing with the provincial and federal governments related to project three. I thank them for their increased commitment today. I thank them for their increased commitment on project two. That will help. We need

their assistance on project three. We are working with the city, the provincial government, the federal government and in dialogue with the Canada infrastructure bank to find a way, and you've heard me say this before, to amortize the costs of project three out over multiple years, in fact, over generations. I have a photo on my wall, many of you have seen it. It is of the current North End sewage treatment plant. It's from about...the photo is from about 1937. We have had that plant and been using that plant, which treats now 70 percent of our waste water, we've been using it for 95 years. And so, this new plant that we're building will and should last, there would need to be some adjustments and some…some additions, but ultimately, the base of that plant should last 100 years. So, we need to be paying for it, not in a few years but over multiple years. It just makes sense because multiple generations are going to use that service that that plant provides. We have to build the plant to increase capacity for homes, businesses and jobs in the city. We need to build the plant to meet our environmental license requirement as established by the Province of Manitoba. And to do so to protect Lake Winnipeg or better protect Lake Winnipeg and our rivers as well. And of course, we need to build that plant to repair...replace, I should say, the old infrastructure that the current plant has and we're using. I'll close with this comment today. I am asking, through you, Madam Speaker, every member of this Council to make this a federal election issue. In the coming...right now and in the coming days, weeks, there are federal candidates campaigning. They want our votes. I think it's incumbent upon us to be communicating to the residents within our wards and across our city the urgency and the need for federal contribution to project three. I think every candidate from every party needs to understand the importance of this project, the urgency of this project, and the need for federal contribution and commitment. The original plan, as colleagues have said around here, back in 2002 or '03, whenever this was started, it was envisioned that this would be a one-third, one-third, one-third project. I think the number at the time, the estimated cost for the whole thing was 798 million dollars or somewhere in that neighbourhood. We're now at three billion dollars. We need the federal government to step forward. We need the provincial government to step forward, assist us with project three. Every candidate running for elected office, for federal office, needs to know this and understand this, and be willing to stand up for the people of Winnipeg and make a commitment to bring federal money to the table on project three. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Schreyer:** Won't speak too long on this one, but I truly appreciate some serious discussion on this. And one…what is the main challenge we're talking about when the consistency here is lack of funding and trying to find a…trying to find some sort of equation with the other levels of government. I don't want to say it's comical, Madam Speaker, but we haven't exactly resolved what is the equation, what percentage from this. And I'm saying 'we', I mean we as three levels of government, can't…haven't figured out yet what are our proportions. This is…this is a long time coming, and we don't...and budget-wise, we don't know what we're doing. So that is on record based on what we just heard here over the last half hour or so, Madam Speaker. So why is it a problem, Madam Speaker? Maybe we should address that too. Maybe that should be a federal issue as well. Why is this such a problem that after how many years of knowing this is coming, we don't have a…we don't have a budget, a proportion system, and yet we're not explaining why this is a problem right now. What kind of a problem was it 100 years ago? And I appreciate the Mayor brings some historical perspective because we're talking about the now, the now was created 100 years ago. Well, that's life. That's politics. That's how it works. So, I appreciate that. But it comes time sometimes that there's time for change, and right now we're flummoxed. I don't want to…you know what, fine. I don't want to use that word, I don't want to sensationalize, but we are confused, are we not? Because we do not know how we're going to pay for this, even though we've known for how many years? I'm not here to, like...it's not a pop quiz. I'm not here to be judgmental over whether we know how many years it's been, but it's been a few, eh? And the provincial government knew that too, and the federal government. So here we are, Madam Speaker, and I think it's times like this when you have to take a step back, take a look at this. Why is this happening? And if you can't explain the problem, you know, it's going to be hard to…hard to solve it. I know we're all going to take success sooner or later the levels of government…levels of government are going to pony up, we're all going to have our money, it's going to get done and say, great, success. Well, it's not that simple because what are the problems we're going to cause along the way in terms of our economy? So, we say things like this is a great investment. Oh, we've been saying that for every decade, Madam Speaker, including the last decade, every time we put in the money for capital investment, well, it's great for the investment. It's great for the economy. Madam Speaker, I'm not feeling it. Now, this has to get done sooner or later, whether it's because the provincial government is mandating now in the short term now is the time, but sooner or later you do have to get it done. Now Madam Speaker, you know, Councillor Eadie can attest to the fact that some of the...is it the water pipes or the sewage pipes under Selkirk Avenue that are the oldest in the city are the ones that last the longest. Isn't it interesting, Madam Speaker? Let's bear that in mind when we're talking about cost-benefit analysis, when we're talking about value for our tax money and whether we can attain the same values and the same efficiencies, the same reasonableness that we have been in the past. Is that not a very reasonable challenge? Isn't that a challenge we're supposed to take on every single day? I think it is. I think we have to compare ourselves to that which came before, because we have no other comparison. And when things do change, we need to understand why. I hope that's not too vague or general. I've been talking about this for years. I think that is our dilemma. And let's…let's make that an election issue every single election, including ours in a year and a half.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I just want to thank the former chairpersons and those who have worked on this, Madam Speaker. And I would also like to note that our current so-called budget boss is also being heard to say we need to bring down that dividend. So-called dividend, because I've never agreed that it's a dividend. It's a tax on a tax, Madam Speaker. Or a tax on a fee. Anyway, Madam Speaker, the seriousness of affordability for people in Winnipeg, I've received a number of, I'll call it desperate, people trying to afford to live in their homes and stay in theirs, especially seniors on fixed incomes, but there's also a lot of people who have very low incomes, and they have to pay the water bill. I always have them in mind, Madam Speaker, always. But the reality is you can't have an urban environment today of the size of Winnipeg and other cities without providing the proper treatment of our sewage, making sure our water is safe to drink, and even on the garbage, which we'll probably be discussing next...the next report. I will point out, though, so in this report we did provide what an average family of four who consumes 50 cubic metres of water would be paying extra. And it was projected out over…but the lowest increase was this year. But I will point out that I know in my household, especially when I lived on my own, Madam Speaker, to keep the bills down, I consumed less water. So, those who will be consuming less water, it won't be as much of...it's still a problem, but it won't be as much. But the large consumers of water, which is used to calculate the sewage rates, they will be picking up the biggest portion of these increases that we need to provide the facility. So, I just want to make sure that that is clear. And I thank the former Chairperson Mayes for expressing his interest in the CSO program, which is very important, Madam Speaker, to the city as well and to the water of the Red River, the water that, you know, everybody on Treaty 1 land and other treaty lands, water flowing into Lake Winnipeg. It's all very important, and we are spending lots of money to do what we need to do to care for that water. And I just…anyway, there is conversation, as the Mayor said, Madam Speaker. There is dialogue going on right now between public servants within the provincial and federal government regards to project three. And ultimately, you know, the City of Winnipeg's portion, whatever that is, 60, whatever that portion will be of project three, it is a debt situation. And please, one of the things that could help us in terms of preventing a downturn in our credit rating, because we are going to have to do that if we're moving forward with debt on project three. And we need that infrastructure, Canadian infrastructure bank with lower interest rates. We're going to need them. And so, on that federal government, the campaign that's going on right now, that Canadian infrastructure bank is so critical. To get rid of it is irresponsible and it will have a big effect, not only on Winnipeg. North Vancouver is having major problems right now with their own sewage plant in terms of cost and how to pay for it. There's other cities that have these projects, and they need to move forward. So, let's get that on the federal table. I know I'll be doing that. And anyway, I hope you all vote for this report No. 2 that has, well, we're trying to make it affordable for people to live here in their homes here in Winnipeg. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All in favour of Item 2?

**Councillor Wyatt:** Recorded vote.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay, all in favour, please rise.

**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, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

**Nays**

Councillor Wyatt.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. The item passes. Item 3, Councillor Eadie. Or first we'll have the Clerk read it out.

**Item 3 – Solid Waste Utility Financial Plan and Rate Model 2025-2027**

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thought there was an amending motion on this report, but I think somebody was going to be asking to have it stood down anyway, Madam Speaker?

**Madam Speaker:** Mm-hm.

**Councillor Eadie:** So, this is a new financing model for what will become a full utility, solid waste. We have a waste management fee that really incorporates all the costs that we had for all of our solid waste services that we...well, we really need to provide that to the city. And actually, you know, keeping up to inner-city garbage problems, you know, there's a cost to that. So, this is a new fee for Winnipeggers, and it comes in a difficult time where we had to raise our property taxes, we have to raise our sewer rates. And now we have this coming. It's all at the same time. And I have big concerns, but in the past I've supported making solid waste a... like a full utility with the waste management fee. But to be clear, I didn't foresee that everybody would be paying the same fixed rate. It was my idea that we would...and I presented this in 2011 with the waste diversion fee, that the city would have an ability to pay a fee that's related to the home that they can afford to live in. And the best thing that we as the city have is the property tax assessment value. And so, it would be less difficult for those who are families with lower income, Madam Speaker. There's anomalies in that concept, but ultimately it is more about one's ability to pay. And in some case, it will be renters who are paying the bill if the land…if the landlord has the renters paying the water bill, they are also paying the garbage bill. And others will be landlords who pay that themselves. That will increase, and yes, it's going to have an effect. There's no doubt about it. We do have a motion, thank you Councillor Rollins, to look at what that impact is for the CCPA estimated 10,000 households who will have a difficult time covering the waste management fee. We have the department who is working at some...one method of being able to deal with one's ability to pay their bill and to provide assistance, but that is in the desperate situation where somebody can't afford to pay their bill, Madam Speaker. But we do know that this will have an effect on a number of households, and maybe they are giving up purchasing food. I don't know. Every...all the prices are going up. It's crazy. We have…we have potential tariffs on American stuff coming in. It's all very difficult. But I want to point out there is...we'll talk about this. There is some advantage to the waste management fee in that there is a by-law change that's coming in regards to that waste management fee, Madam Speaker. And one of the biggest problems that I know Councillor Santos, Eadie and Gilroy have is the constant damage and stealing of people's garbage carts. Now, they've incorporated and estimated a cost, so now those...I have people who can't afford to pay the whatever it is, 90 something dollars now, to replace a cart. They won't have to do that anymore once we pass this in the by-law. It will be monitored closely, though, and we still expect everybody to use their carts the way that they were designed to be used and the way the system was designed to be used, Madam Speaker. We've also incorporated in here there's a number of business improvement zones, and we talked about the good things that our business improvement zones are trying to do in the areas in which member businesses are doing business. So, there will be besides a charitable organization with just a charitable use out of that facility. And community…City-owned community centres and arenas will continue to receive their collection services, regular collection services, free, but we've also added, upon application, a business improvement zone, like the Selkirk Avenue BIZ, will be able to get a service from the City of Winnipeg with, say, a three-cubic-metre bin. Because when they are cleaning up our streets, they are cleaning up our streets, they are doing a lot of work, the business improvement zones, to make the business environment pleasant to work in. So now, if we pass this, upon application, a business improvement zone will be able to get a bin that will be collected, I believe it's on a weekly basis, that hopefully will handle on Selkirk Avenue some days six bags of garbage coming off the street every day. Anyway, the other point...like, it is unfortunate that the…that the 2024 cost to collect the garbage, not the blue cart but the other cart, that the department wasn't able to find a source of cash to…just cash available to cover off that cost or to cover off the cost of the diversion, waste diversion, fee for multi-family was never charged, Madam Speaker. So, we need to make back that 28.2 million dollars because they borrowed money and there was no way or nowhere we could find the money. And so, those rates will come down as a result once that's paid off. Right now, it's really 162 dollar-a-year increase on the waste management fee. There's also a 100 percent…100 percent producer-pay recycling program that's coming down the pipe. Has to be negotiated between the City. We'll figure out how that works. But the fee that we're paying related to that service should end up not being in the waste management fee. It will be covered 100 percent producer-pay. So, Madam Speaker, there are good potentials for the waste management fee to come down, moving into the future. And I know that people don't...the people I'm getting email from saying they don't trust us politicians, but I take this seriously. My career as a city councillor has been about affordability and people being able to stay and live in their homes. And so, I diligently work towards that. And you have the…this report. I should say I'm anxious to hear from my colleagues. Thank you.

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

**Councillor Mayes:** I sort of hate to end the day on a…on a not a positive note, but we're not at the end of the day yet, I guess. So yeah, I'm actually not going to be voting in favour of this. There are some numbers here that are of concern. I think Councillor Eadie has inherited this situation, to be fair to Councillor Eadie. But you know, eight hours or so ago, Councillor Browaty was saying, look at these increases for these school divisions, wow. Well, this is 161 dollars a year increase, maybe 162 I think was what Ross said, so either one. The average household property tax increase on the 5.95 was 121 dollars a year. This is 161 dollars a year. This is bigger than the property tax increase if you're at the average home. If you're at a lesser-value home, this is actually even bigger for you, right? I mean, as a percentage of your current property taxes. This isn't the equivalent...I said eight percent or there, but I went and did the math exactly, it's 7.46, so

we're up over 13 percent if you combine the property tax increase and this increase. So, let's not...anyway, school divisions numbers not too different than that. So, I had hoped there would be what was discussed in the media, another plan, a ten-year phase-in, something. And the Mayor and Councillor Eadie both said, well, we couldn't make that work. Okay, but I do think it's a big adjustment to take this off the property tax and put it on a fee. It's got to be the biggest fee increase we've seen in my years here. I want to thank Councillor Gilroy for coming forward with a motion that will come to Water and Waste Committee that at least says, well, let's try and buffer some of that by putting it on the property tax instead, because that's the more progressive means of taxation, is to do it off the property taxes. And I know Councillor Eadie has been consistent over the years saying, well, we should have a fee that's on a sliding scale, but that starts to look awfully like property tax. So, people are saying to me, well, what gold-plated services are you guys adding? We're not. We're not. This isn't the compost stuff. This isn't anything. This is just delivering the current package of services, and we're not going out again to market. And maybe we'll do some of it in-house. That's a separate debate. But this is just doing the same package of stuff, but we're…but we're now going to just put it on a fee instead of on property taxes, and that to me just doesn't seem equitable. So, the numbers are...you know, frankly it's more than a 7.5 percent increase. It's an infinity percent increase if you're living in a multi-family right now because your current rate is zero and it's going to roughly 30 bucks a quarter, 120 bucks a year. So, try and do that math. What percentage increase from zero to...it is infinity, thank you. So, but I'll stay with the 7.5, because it's a big increase. And I just think there's got to be some more equitable way of doing this where we don't say to people, well, you know, hooray, our property tax increase was only 5.9, it's only 121 bucks a year, this is 160, or if you're, you know, in multi-family you've gone from zero...it's about the same. It's about a 120 dollar a year increase as well for multi-family. So, with some reluctance I'm going to vote no today. Hopefully some compromise can be worked out where we make it a little more equitable between the property tax and the fee.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Madam Speaker, this is not a new fee, this is a new tax. And it's attack on working families across the city. If this were not a new tax, if this was truly a new fee to offset the other fee called the property tax, there would be a dividend over there and a charge over here. There is none of that. This is a new tax. It's not a new fee, and it's attack on working families across this city. And let's read the report very carefully, Madam Speaker. One only has to flip forward to page 12. The recommended rate also includes nine dollars, 2.25 dollars per quarter, per dwelling unit, to fund the purchase of green carts to support the upcoming green cart program. And then they use a word…and I'm going to use this word, and I know someone's going to call me out of order, and I don't care, but they use the word total revenue requirements for the projected project 59 million. Revenue? Revenue is money coming in. This is an expense. This is weasel words that should not be tolerated. This council has greater intelligence than this, Madam Speaker. Revenue? This is a cost. In other words, the cost of the program is another 59 million, just from what they're projecting now. This program is being rolled out, this tax is being rolled out, Madam Speaker, to hit the ratepayers of Winnipeg so that all the good-doers in the city can have their green cart and say we got our green cart. Oh, yes, and by the way, a whole new fleet of vehicles are going to be going out, spewing diesel out into the atmosphere to collect your organics. Lots of sense that makes. Meanwhile, everybody is out trying to...no, it does not make sense when you can have an organic bin in your yard, and many people do. You're going to create a whole fleet of trucks to collect organics now? Madam Speaker, this whole thing is being rammed in through this council right now hoping the voters of the city will not remember in two years. They will. Especially when you start to roll out the green cart program and watch the fee, the tax, go like that. That's where this is heading. I can tell you right now, Madam Speaker...I didn't mean to go like that. Anyway, you know, the reality is we have not only a private landfill, I learned yesterday, up in the northwest, the province has now allowed for a private landfill down in the southeast in Ile des Chênes. GFL, who's got our contract, is hauling their garbage there, not on our contract, but anywhere else that they collect, they haul it to their own little deal they got in Ile des Chênes. Nobody is regulating that, nobody's coming down on the ratepayers of Winnipeg. Do our department officials know this? Yes. Have they included that detail in this report? No. The ratepayers are getting shafted, Madam Speaker, by this report. This is a program to create a tax that does not exist. All done to bring in a program that many of us question on Council. If I have to raise taxes to fix what's going on in the city today, to fix the broken streets, to fix the new infrastructure, we got another report coming up here about Chief Peguis, Kenaston, how are we paying for that? We got to remember there's one ratepayer here, Madam Speaker. We got to pick and choose what we're raising the rates on. And yes, in the ideal world, would it be nice to have organic collection? Yes, it would. But when we have a city that's infrastructure is crumbling, we can't even maintain the existing infrastructure we have, never mind build the new infrastructure that we know we have to build when our population as the Mayor points out has risen 70,000 in only three years and the traffic congestion in our neighbourhoods and our streets are worse than ever before. Madam Speaker, what are we doing here? This is outrageous. And we're just going to nonchalantly pass it? I know everybody's tired and I'm tired too and it's almost 8:00 at night, but the reality is this cannot go forward. We cannot prove this new tax. Because I know where this goes, it goes up and up and up. And they've got their empire and they want to build it, and they are. And no way of letting them...now we're going to have the...they're going to start expanding the program. If it is not a tax, show me where the net deduction is out of our property tax. Show me where the savings is to the bottom line of the ratepayers, if this is not a tax. As a fee, as you claim. You can't. Because it is an increase on top of everybody. So Madam Speaker, if you believe in fiscal responsibility, if you believe that we only

have so many things that we can fund from the ratepayers, knowing the challenges we're facing as a city, if you believe that we're not necessarily going to get a one third, one third, one third on the solid waste, but or…we're going...we're going to the province on a whole bunch...and the feds on a whole bunch of stuff. Kenaston, Chief Peguis, you know, your rec facility, my rec facility. You know, the list is long, and they're saying, hey, guys, you know…you know, there's a limit, right? And now we're hitting our ratepayers with this when we know we will need funds because they will say at some point one third, one third, wonderful, but we've done our one third and one third over here, folks. We're not doing it over there too. And by the way, you can make that difference up. Well, we can't now because we just hit the ratepayers of Winnipeg with a brand new fee, call it a tax because that's what it is. Let's call it what it is. This is an attack on working families. Attack on the hardest. And yes, I hear this...now we're hearing this noise, well, maybe we will have a subsidy program for the poorest of the poor. Well, that's great. Where does that going to lead us? Once that…once that, you know, drawbridge, once that opens and we start doing that, and we start subsidizing folks versus everybody paying into the system, which is what we've done, you know, it's just like what's happening in our transit buses today. You got rate paying transit users using it watching people walk on for free without any kind of consequences or accountability of the system. Let's be very careful what we do there. Anyways, those are my comments, Madam Speaker. I won't be supporting this.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Yeah, Madam Speaker. First of all, before I speak, we just did listen to a former Chair of the Finance Committee. And he's saying that he is a conflict in terms of terminology in this very important report regarding the words "cost" and "revenue". And he bothered to make the point that one is not the other and the wrong term is used. I want to know if we...if we can clarify this. Why would the former Chair of the Finance Committee bother saying such a thing on such an important report, which is a brand new program, which is, let's face it, pretty darn expensive.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further speakers?

**Councillor Schreyer:** No, that...that's a point of information. I'm asking...I said, before I speak, is there anything we can do about this for clarification on this issue?

**Madam Speaker:** Yeah, Councillor Schreyer, that would be your opportunity to speak, but appreciate those comments...

**Councillor Schreyer: …**Alright, but that was…that was my question. Sometimes we ask the administration...

**Madam Speaker: …**Do you want to continue? Well, it's not question time, though. It's…

**Councillor Schreyer:** No, sometimes we ask members of the administration to speak. This is a gigantic report, it's not something we can take lightly. And this is rather divisive…

**Madam Speaker:** …Do you want to ask the chair during question period perhaps?

**Councillor Schreyer:** No. Is there anybody from the Administration that represents the report that can speak at this time?

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Eadie says he will answer on close. Any further speakers?

**Councillor Schreyer:** No, if I may speak, then, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Sure, put the clock on to seven. I think it was at seven minutes, Holly. Thank you.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Fair…fair enough, Madam Speaker. You don't have to worry about that one. But having said that, yeah, this is going to be rather divisive, eh, one way or the other regardless of how we vote. When we raised the water rates and then raised them again to create what's called the dividend. You know, rather divisive. I called that a tax on the poor because considering the fact that we had reduced water consumption, it was an increase yet anyway, and they could do nothing about it, even though in the poorest neighbourhoods of the city they have reduced their water consumption, their water rates were still going up. And then the dividend of that, which we'll call a dividend, of 11 percent was put on…was put on the rates as a tax. And it was a tax based on consumption. Why do I call that a tax? It literally was because it went into general coffers, which is based on taxes. So, this is where we're at, Madam Speaker, yet again. I don't know what I can say. I guess we saw this coming. We're not surprised because we had reports that were going to forecast this. I've been forecasting this day. I've been forecasting this, saying that we're coming to a point of unsustainability. And I find it kind of unfortunate and really disconcerting, that at a point where we're having more and more time reconciling our budget on all three levels of government, that we have this conflict and lack of…lack of cohesion of what should be something that could be progressive. But given the costs involved and the cost-benefit analysis, you know, it's unfortunate.

It truly is. The least we could do is try to explain that to people why this is happening, why the costs are going up. And explain it to people every day, make it a campaign issue for us in the next city election. Not just put pressure on the federal government, put pressure on ourselves. Who are we to put pressure on another level of government when we're not explaining it to the best of our ability? This is a campaign issue for us. And passing the buck doesn't work. And I know we're not thoroughly passing the buck on this. We're acting like because this is a budgetary issue we can't do it alone, putting pressure on the others is part of the solution. Madam Speaker, that's kind of part of the problem, is that we're just asking for more money and not asking for...not explaining why, and that's sad. We're talking about inflation, like construction, like housing, like food. It is high rate of inflation. Not like everything is going up. It's not like everything is going up. It's not like everybody's wages are going up at the same time. If there's any confusion as to why I say not everything is going up is because if it was, we wouldn't have inflation. Do I need to explain that again? Okay. So not everything's going up. Prices are going up. That's the problem. Costs are going up. Not people's income. Not to the same extent. Not for the majority of people. Not for middle class people, not for working class people. That's why inflation is the problem. So, let's bear that in mind. We want to call on the federal government, make something a federal government election issue, make it a City of Winnipeg issue. Let's do that for ourselves. Let's challenge each other. That's the best we can do. Much better than just pressuring the federal government for a few months, or actually a few weeks. Thank you, miigwech.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Any further speakers? Okay, no further speakers. Councillor Eadie to close.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thanks for my colleagues to speak on this. And Madam Speaker, I just...I heard some political comments, and I have always said if this...if a government is charging you some kind of fee or whatever they are charging you, it's a tax. It is a tax, okay? So, I'm not disagreeing with...you know, you can call it a fee or whatever, it's a tax. And the way governments fund programs, guess what? It's by taxation. Fee, tax or whatever you want to call it, that's what it is, Madam Speaker. Now we could abandon it and not vote for this. Then where is the money coming from to pay the contracts for the businesses that are Miller and GFL who are collecting all this stuff? Like, so, I mean, should we just abandon solid waste services because we don't want to pay them? Then what happens? You know, the complaints we get about garbage that collects in some areas of the city, it's awful. What happens if everybody does it? How good would that be? What a great city to live in, wouldn't it be, Madam Speaker? What a great city. I don't like it, just like others don't like to charge the fee, this actually turns solid waste into what I call a full utility, which allows them, I think, in the future, to look at programs that help keep this street litter at bay, Madam Speaker. Because...well, there are...everybody pays a water bill. This is collection services on the water bill, Madam Speaker and although it's not part of the water, but. So, luckily there's no dividend tax on top of the 161 dollars, which wouldn't be 161 dollars if the collection services were paid not from debt for 2024 but just from a revenue stream cost. Yeah, it's a cost to individual people in their homes. To the city, they're bringing in revenue, that's what…that's what it is. And again, we need to have this service. The rate will come down, although moving into the future there's this curbside composting program. Now there was a report in July that a decision was made, and Council actually voted on it, to purchase the…the nine-dollar fee to purchase the green containers. Yes, Councillor Wyatt. So, when I hear former Chair of finance and so on talk about this stuff, we were on Council when we voted to bring in the waste diversion fee, Madam Speaker. And there's a lot of issues around there. Whether you support it or not, the reality is we need to deliver the services and the costs that they have built in here, reflect what they need to pay for it. And there's a misnomer, Madam Speaker. It's a different issue. The waste management fee is not paying for the Brady Road Landfill. Tipping fees, there's no tipping fees being charged to the residents, although maybe it's buried into the waste management, but the point is, is the Councillor referred to another competing landfill. But anything that's collected in this city right now from our contractors goes to the Brady Landfill. So again, it's tipping fees that pay for creating new landfill cells where we store the garbage over a long term. And again, I'll just say it again, the waste diversion related to recycling is supposed to be 100 percent producer paid, not residential paid. So, that's coming. I know it doesn't help this year. And once 2024's 28.2 million is paid off, that will come off – will come off – but nobody may not notice it because what will happen is there's a curbside composting that will be coming up, I think it's 2030, Madam Speaker. We will be discussing that a lot more in terms of how that gets implemented. It will be coming through Water, Waste and Environment at some point, probably after the next election, Madam Speaker. So, I'll leave it at that. I hope that you'll vote for this, because the reality is the garbage needs to be collected off the city streets. It needs to be taken care of and disposed of properly. Like, I couldn't imagine living in an ancient city where garbage wasn't collected. It must have been awful. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. Please vote for the report.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. All in favour?

**(unknown speakers):** Recorded vote.

**Madam Speaker:** Item 3, we'll have a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Lukes, Orlikow, Santos, Schreyer and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

**Nays**

Councillors Gilroy, Mayes, Rollins and Wyatt.

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

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Item 3 passes. Okay, now…yes, we'll get on to by-laws. Mr. Chair…Yeah, okay. We'll do the motion first…

**Councillor Eadie:** …Oh. Did the clerk introduce it…

**Madam Speaker:** …Let's do the motion first. We have Motion 7: moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by Councillor Mayes. It's regarding dedicated tax increase to solid waste utility. It's an automatic referral. Okay, and Motion 6: moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Gilroy, regarding leaf and yard waste collection. It's also an automatic referral. And now onto the by-law.

## STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
## MOTIONS

**Motion No. 6**
**Moved by Councillor Mayes,**
**Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,**

*WHEREAS in June 2024, the Standing Policy Committee on Water, Waste and Environment considered an administrative report dated June 7, 2024 regarding the cost of establishing a zone in which garbage and recycling collection services are performed by City of Winnipeg staff;*

*AND WHEREAS the report indicated that the cost of city staff providing seasonal leaf and yard waste collection in the newly established zone would be $4.2 million, which was lower than the projected cost of $6.1 million for contracted collection;*

*AND WHEREAS the Standing Committee recommended to Council that an 'in-house zone' be established consisting of approximately 1/5 of the City, focused in the downtown area, where garbage would be collected by city staff;*

*AND WHEREAS on July 18, 2024, as a result of a tie vote, Council did not adopt the recommendation due to concerns related to in-house collection;*

*AND WHEREAS new garbage, recycling and yard waste collection service contracts take effect in roughly February 2027;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:*

1. *That prior to the issuance of any new contracts for garbage and recycling collection services, the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to retain a zone in which seasonal leaf and yard waste collection services will be performed by City of Winnipeg staff, in recognition of cost savings identified in the administrative report dated June 7, 2024.*

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

**Motion No. 7**
**Moved by Councillor Gilroy,**
**Seconded by Councillor Mayes,**

*WHEREAS the Solid Waste Utility Financial Plan and Rate Model 2025-2027 outlines a new user fee for residents;*

*AND WHEREAS this user fee will be a new charge with an increase of above the rate of property tax and water and sewer rates increases;*

*AND WHEREAS large increases to the sewer and water rates are already forecast in future years;*

*AND WHEREAS there are still some unknown costs associated with the solid waste utility for an organics program;*

*AND WHEREAS a user fee is regressive and not as equitable as funding through property tax because it does not account for a person's ability to pay;*

*AND WHEREAS the municipal property tax is more equitable for residents;*

*THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following be referred to the 2026 Budget Update Process:*

*"1. That a 1% property tax increase be dedicated to the Solid Waste Utility to offset a portion of the costs of the new utility model to make it more affordable for residents."*

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT**
**CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS**

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to move the first reading of By-law 30/2025 for the solid waste utility.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 30/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** Do you want it to be recorded? Councillor Gilroy wanted it to be recorded.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay.

**Councillor Eadie:** Okay. Madam Speaker, I'd like to move a second reading of By-law 30/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt in opposition.

**Councillor Eadie:** And Gilroy.

**Madam Speaker:** And Gilroy.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 30/2025.

**Councillor Eadie:** Let's see if I can get the wording properly here, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I would like to suspend the rule and move third reading of By-law 30/2025 to be passed and signed...signed and sealed. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay. Question period now for this committee. Councillor Wyatt followed by Councillor Mayes.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT**
**QUESTION PERIOD**

**Councillor Wyatt:** I rise, Madam Speaker, because I received a call from a long-time constituent who indicated to me that he has the MyUtility app and he follows it. He has properties on it. And then, you know, he has questions related to the MyUtility app related to his properties, specifically we're...I'm talking about the water bill here. And what's frustrating is that he calls the number for Water and Waste Department or the Water Department I guess specifically or division, and it rings and rings and rings, 30 minutes or more. He doesn't get through. He waits. He tries again, doesn't get through, just to

speak to somebody to answer some questions. He's done everything that the department has said. He's got the app. You know, he does as much online as possible, and he's just found it extremely frustrating and I just wonder if Councillor Eadie could look into that. I could forward him the email. I'm protecting his identity because he's a private citizen.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Yes, Madam Speaker, I wanted to...I want to thank, first of all, the Councillor, Madam Speaker, for bringing this to Council's attention and my attention. My office has received a number of concerns related to the ability to contact people at the Water and Waste Billing and so on, because usually most of the questions are billing, and one of the...Madam Speaker, I will talk to...I'll get an answer back about what the Water and Waste is doing to improve that service because, Madam Speaker, we will also see a huge increase in calls to that number related to Report No. 3 that we just passed today, as well as related to the other rate report that we passed, so I'll get back to him with an answer as soon as I get something from the department.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you, and I feel like I should know the answer to this question, but I don't so I'm going to answer it anyway, just in case maybe Councillor Eadie knows, but...and I appreciate the response to the last question. The constituent also indicates the tenants create an account and service where there's a legal contract technically between them and the City, even though they're tenants, for the water. Why should the landlord be held liable for breach of contract by the tenant when he gives an example, Manitoba Hydro apparently does not hold the owner of the property liable and the City should implement a similar system. I'm not familiar with the Manitoba Hydro model, but I'm not sure, but maybe the Councillor is, and if not, take it under advisement. Could you advise on that?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, I can answer this to a certain degree and could ask why the water...I think it's the Water By-law or the Water and the Waste By-law, I believe, Madam Speaker. In terms of the City of Winnipeg, it is the actual property address, Madam Speaker, that...and whoever owns that house on title, whoever has title to that property, is the one that is held responsible for the bill in the end. If they can't be collected from a former tenant who wasn't paying their bills, Madam Speaker, Water and Waste has the authority under the By-law to go after the title owner of the home, and I've seen a number of issues...just dealing with one right now trying to explain how that works, Madam Speaker. In terms of Manitoba Hydro, what happens with Manitoba Hydro is, yes, it is the tenant, the individual, Madam Speaker, who is held responsible for the bill. So the thing is, if I don't pay my hydro bill and I'm living in one place and I'm skipping out because I'm not paying the bills and whatever, they are shutting off electricity or whatever they're doing, Madam Speaker, if I go to move to another place...and this is a problem for a number of people who are living homeless right now, we have a program, Madam Speaker, with the Province. We're getting people...people who are living rough or encampments and so on, a number of them were not able to pay their electricity bills when they were living somewhere. Now the problem is, if you don't pay the old bill, Madam Speaker, you can't get electricity turned on in your new home where you're living, and we've seen a number of problems. So that's the difference between Manitoba Hydro and Water. We're going after whoever owns the home, whether it was...whether it's the person who's not paying the bill or whatever, whoever has title. That's what it is, so that's how it works.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Maybe that's something we could look at. And just on that...

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next question.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Last question, Madam Speaker. You know, just on that question, for property owners who have rental properties and then they sell them, what I've heard is that the Water and Waste Department has real difficulty giving them their final bill even though, you know, they ask for the tenant, even though the tenant is not responsible, let's say the tenant's left months in advance and they're selling the property, sold the property, they got to pay off the remaining water bill in order to close on the sale, right? In order to close on the sale, you got to...on the house, you got to be able to...or the property, you got to be able to have the water bill completely paid off, supply that to the real estate lawyers so the lawyers have it. And the issue is they come back, the Water Department comes back...of the City of Winnipeg and says, well, we need the name of the tenants. Why do you need the name of the tenants when...it really should be tracking the property if it's really ultimately the property and the property owner who is responsible for the outstanding water bill if the tenants are long gone. But the Water Department is unable to give that information presently, they're unable to cue it up actually, and I know somebody who actually had to go all the way almost to, basically to the Director to get this information, which is really ridiculous, which needs to be able to be queued up in the system based on the property. They shouldn't be asking who are the former names of the tenants so many months ago. Anyway...

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Yes.

**Councillor Eadie:** Actually, my office happens to be dealing with an issue of where there was a landlord who sold the home to an individual who bought it to live in as their own home, and as I'm sure the Councillor knows, Madam Speaker, the owner of the property should record...the vendor should record what the water meter states on the possession...the possession date as well as the new owner should be recording that. And what really does need to happen quickly, Madam Speaker, is when I...the new owner call in my numbers, there's a new person paying the bill and there's a new title owner to that home. I'm responsible for that bill, and so there's some difficulty, yes, within the Water Department. We should be able...I should be as a new homeowner, should be able to establish when I submit the new water meter reading and give my bill that Water and Waste should...because you got to prove that you have title to that home, right? That you have the ability to take over the water, paying the water in the building, and you should be able to get...the new owner should be able to get a report what's outstanding from the previous owner, the landlord whose tenant might have skipped out and didn't pay the water bill. But you're supposed to work all that stuff out as, Madam Speaker, I'm sure the Councillor also knows because very involved in related to real estate. The two lawyers on the transaction, the real property transaction, they are supposed to straighten out any outstanding bills. The vendor who has a net proceeds coming should be paying for all costs related up until possession date, and then the new owner is responsible for all the costs after possession date, so that's a long answer, Madam Speaker, but I personally think, and I'll be inquiring myself with the department, if there isn't some way that we can deal with this because the other problem is you have to prove...there's this whole privacy thing that goes on which if there's a new homeowner I think you should be able to find out what's going to be...you're hit with. Anyway, long answer, probably not the right answer, but that's it.

**Madam Speaker:** Good. Thank you. Any further speakers? Questions? Councillor Mayes, yes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you. Speaking of the meeting from last July that Councillor Eadie referenced, there was a matter there that bothered me then, it continues to bother me, and that was it came out of the Strategic Priorities Action Plan, Item 5.4 or something, I think Councillor Gilroy, Councillor Eadie, Councillor Rollins had all spoken to when we developed that plan, and the idea of the plan was sort of, well the majority wants this in the plan so we're putting it in the plan. So, 5.4 was consolidate departmental responsibilities for garbage collection to one city department. Then in July, that was voted down, and instead we simply said, well, let's get a report back in 360 days on operational changes, increased budget and consolidated administration of garbage collection requests. And also said that Public Service proceed with operational changes to improve abandoned waste collection within the current administrative structure. I don't need an answer today. I wonder if Councillor Eadie, perhaps by the next meeting or the next meeting of the Standing Policy Committee, can...this was a big issue for some people when we had that strategic plan developed, and then by July of '24, the decision of the collective here was let's do...no, let's just not do that. So, can Councillor Eadie get back to us at some point? What actually is being done? I think this was maybe Councillor Santos, but certainly Councillor Rollins, Councillor Gilroy and yourself, this was a big item, and I kind of feel like it fell off the table. And I'll take some of the responsibility for that. But it was in the strategic priorities which meant a majority of us wanted it in that document. Now people can dissent here and there on these items. That was always the understanding, but when a majority then dissents, something doesn't make it a priority anymore. So, if you could get back to us on what is being done with the operational changes to improve abandoned waste collection and this 360-day report, if that's still on track.

**Councillor Eadie:** Madam Speaker, one component I can speak to. First of all, I was not very happy that we couldn't consolidate the collection of garbage because of the silos that exist within this City of Winnipeg, and that's a real problem that we hope will be solved with a new CAO maybe. But that aside, there have been improvements to the abandoned waste pick-up on the public right-of-ways, like back lanes, and even on front streets in that the problematic back lanes do have...it's I think like a biweekly sweep, certain ones that they know are always bad, Madam Speaker, so they do that, but one of the problems is when there's needles involved, and this is not the abandoned...this is not the abandoned bulk waste on a victim's property, because they're victims, those properties where people come by and they dump...people dump their abandoned...they abandon it on people's private property. What this program does is it comes along, but the needles that are associated with it on the public right-of-way need to be cleaned up. Now, the Manager of Solid Waste who works...doing a great job actually, I think, works at it. And it's my understanding that there's a...well, Calgary, when we were in Calgary at FCM, the City of Calgary uses this special equipment, and they actually go around cleaning up the streets. They are actually cleaning up the streets. That's why it looks so beautiful and clean when we were in Calgary, Madam Speaker. Because we had City employees there using this equipment. Now it's my understanding that our contractor who do the sweeps down these back lanes to get the troublesome back lanes to do the sweeps, it's my understanding that they are implementing the use of that said equipment and so that the neighbourhood, concerned people won't have to get out there to pick up the needles, they will be able to use this equipment which keeps the workers safe. So, on the other part, I will endeavour to get back to the Councillor on that 360-day strategy.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, and that concludes question period for this committee. Okay, moving on. Standing Policy Committee on Community Services. Councillor Santos, the report dated March 5th.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES**
**DATED MARCH 5, 2025**

**Councillor Santos:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 and 2.

**Madam Speaker:** Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Okay, we have no by-laws. We'll get right into question period. Any questions for Councillor Santos? No? Okay. Next is Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes.

**REPORT OF THE**
**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS**
**DATED MARCH 4, 2025**

**Councillor Lukes:** Thank you very much. I would like to bring forward...I'll pull Item No. 1 and bring forward No. 2 and No. 3 and No. 4 for consent agenda.

**Madam Speaker:** So, you're pulling…pulling 1? Okay, pulling 1. Councillor Mayes?

**Councillor Mayes:** Pull 2.

**Madam Speaker:** 2, okay. That's it. Okay. I'll call the question. Yeah, call the question on 3 and 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Councillor Lukes:** Okay, Item No. 1 is...

**Madam Speaker:** Oh, just…We'll have the clerk read out the item first, thank you.

**Item 1 – Primary Transit Network Service Implementation Plan Revision**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes, the Chair.

**Councillor Lukes:** Perfect. So, I wanted to speak to this just so everyone is aware of what's going on again with our transit, our new transit network, that's going to be implemented. So, I'm going to make the analogy to you know how we have like...we go from a class four to a class three to a class two on a project? Well, with the Transit Master Plan, they've done further refinement to it, and now what they're doing is they're adding more on-demand, on-request service. So initially we have four, they were going to have eight, but now there's 12. And I really encourage you...and I sent an email to all of you. I really encourage you to look at where the on-request areas are in your ward. I encourage you to call up Kevin Sturgeon and speak to him to really understand how on-request works, because it doesn't work the same in everyone's ward. The concept is to have it provide evening services and weekend services. So, people will call Transit and the bus will come and pick them up at their house, or the closest stop to their house. So, this is…this is evolving. I think Councillor Allard has had it and Councillor Mayes has had it for...we did a pilot for I think it was two years now. It's probably two years we've been doing this, and... a year? Yeah, so it's very good. The one challenge that you will probably hear when it's implemented is, wow, why is there a bus going down that street? I've never seen a bus going down that street before. But that is a representative of the on-demand service, so…or on-request service. So, I just really want to encourage you to look at it. I want to encourage you to have your EAs sit down and go through how to route out maps. Now, Councillor…Councillor Gilroy asked me a question earlier this evening, and I looked it up here. So just so you know, the schedules are going to be released at the end of April, the new route schedules, okay? People will be able to explore trip connections using Navigo, the Winnipeg Transit app, or the green transit app. So, they can…they can plan out their trips. They can use their trips, okay, or they can…they can figure out how to use these new routes. So, lots is happening. I really encourage you...because what's going to happen is if you don't...if you're not really on it and you're not really clear, you're going to be calling 311 or you're going to be calling the department. They're going to be in overload because this is a

big...the biggest change we've done in transit. So, I just super encourage you to get your EAs and get your head wrapped around all of this before. Okay. That's all I wanted to say…

**Madam Speaker:** …Thank you. Any further speakers on Item 1? Speakers on Item 1? Councillor Wyatt. He's eating. Water. Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yeah, supper. Chocolate bar. Anyway, so I raised a lot of concerns when this came forward. I was the only member of Council to vote against the plan. I still have very serious concerns. I wish I didn't. I know we are trying to accomplish a lot. If I could just…I know we're trying to accomplish a lot here in a short period of time. I know the staff are being pushed in a short period of time with the minimal resources. I know we're trying to accomplish a lot with the same transit resources by not adding on new routes, so to speak. We are adding this on-demand, but that's kind of making up for the areas that are falling short based on the previous level of service. My concern here, Madam Speaker, is that to the councillor's point, that because of the poor public consultation that was done in terms of the advertising, and I think as was spoken about earlier about what was said by Councillor Orlikow who spoke I think quite eloquently pertaining to the matter of the HAF and the zoning changes being...you know…you know, state in the advertising what this is actually about. You know? It's...don't try to say...you know, the simplest thing could have been...I mean, the Transit Department did not even run ads, like paid ads, other than on their buses and on a press release, but they didn't run anything on social media, and they didn't say what it really is: your route is changing. Look at this. No, that was not done. Changes to transit service at the end of, you know...and you know, the residents are looking, well, okay, we don't know. We see this every year. You know, they change the routes every year a little bit. I think Winnipeggers are going to be...are going to get...you think the calls coming in are going to be just to the Transit Department, I don't think so. And I think we're going to see something here, especially in the middle of winter. Maybe not at the end of June, but in the middle of winter when folks are having to wait for the first time in their life to do a transfer because they have a route now that they've got to take a transfer because we did a hub and spoke system without really putting…increasing the size of the fleet to actually make it work properly. We're going to hear about it, and rightfully so. And I realize that only six percent or whatever of commuters are transit users, but guess what? They have spouses. They have families. They have friends, and they will be talking, saying what the heck have these guys done? I hope I'm wrong, but I'll tell you what didn't give me any peace of mind was just last week I got to watch a contractor hired by the Transit Department put up the new signs on the on-demand service in my area. And I... I'm not too sure if this is vertical or if this is vertical, because the signs are all over the map. I've never seen such a terrible job done by a contracting service of the Transit Department. No pride. The signs still look like that. And I'm thinking to myself, if this is how we're rolling this out, if this is a sign of things to come, as simple as a little sign, literally. I mean, I hate to say this, but somebody who does not have any mechanical skills would have been able to do a better job because they actually tied it to a post. And this was a contracting firm, not our staff, okay, because I double-checked the truck as I went by. Not impressed, Madam Speaker. All over the community that I live in, which is going to be on-demand. It wasn't just my sign at the corner, it was everywhere. And to me, how it's rolled out and how it's done, the pride in that ownership speaks volumes and that doesn't speak volumes to me. So, I'm very concerned. I'm not going to be supporting this. I'm consistent on that. I realize. But remember, it's a consent agenda. I voted for 95 percent of the items on the agenda today, even though I vote against five percent because that's what we stand down. So, I just want to remind that of Council, too. Thank you very much.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. Any further speakers? Councillor Lukes to close.

**Councillor Lukes:** Sure. So yes, you are correct. Signs are being installed all around the city on bus stops saying either your stop is moving or it won't be here anymore or it will be here. I've not seen any crooked ones. I've been watching them. So, I gladly request you send some photos to me and to the department. But also, to the point that every time I've got that opportunity, and I've seen it in print, I've seen it in the media, we are virtually...we are saying virtually every transit stop is going to change. And this is going to be happening in the summer. The real uptake will be in the fall. But look, I'm living proof. Five years now, four years, we've had this routing system in the southwest Winnipeg. People love it. Like, granted, it did come in the pandemic, that's when the switch was made. So, there was lots of, you know, drama around that timeframe in life, but people love it. They love it. There were the two issues, right? Oh, we don't want to transfer and get off the bus and transfer. And the other two issues were, oh, there's a bus down my street, I don't like it. And oh, I love the bus down the street. So, you know, so those are the big three questions or concerns, but I'm four years in and people love it. Actually, they love it too much. Transit is saying that they've had more uptake than they anticipated. So, you know, that's a whole other can of worms and problems. But yeah, it's a fundamental change. We all know how people embrace change. And hopefully we can talk them all through it. And the end result...cities all over the world have done this. So, I really, really want to commend the department for the work they are doing. They are working incredibly hard on this. And I'm 100 percent supportive of what they're doing, and I hope all of Council is too. For sure there will be some challenges, like any time there's change. But I'm very optimistic because I've lived it for four years, and it's great. We love it. And we've made tweaks and changes and they haven't cost a penny. So, it's very good, but it is change. So, with that, thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Let's call the vote on that one, Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Wyatt noted in opposition. Item 2, Mr. Clerk.

**Item 2 – Council Update for the Preliminary Design Study**
**Chief Peguis Trail Extension West – Main Street to Brookside Boulevard**

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** Sure, so this report is asking that the Public Service proceed with an independent value-for-money assessment for evaluating business case and alternative project delivery methods, and to report back by December '25…2025. So, you know, we'll hear everyone's comments on it. I'm very supportive of this project. Do I think it's going to happen any time soon in the near future? No, probably not. We've got a lot of other big issues like…that were pointed out earlier, that we're working with the other levels of government on. But I think it's very important that we plan this out. The province now is also planning out their connection to Centreport. The world is really changing, and what even more so is, in my opinion, supporting that we proceed with this project is our ability to move goods east and west. We're not really going north and south anymore. There's a lot of issues with north and south. I don't think I need to get into it. But this is an east-west connection to our economic engine, which is Centreport, for the province of Manitoba. I reflect back on 2008-2009 when I was writing grants. I could not keep up writing grants fast enough with the amount of funding that was falling out from the federal government to support the economy with shovel-ready projects. Do I think this will happen with what's happening now? Possibly. I think we're seeing some indication provincially and federally that funding is flowing. I think this is a huge priority for the city from a much bigger picture. I had a really great interview with a reporter from the Uniter, a student reporter from the U of W, who wanted to sort of pin me on one angle, but I presented another. He did a really fair report. But I think we have to really look at this from a much bigger picture. I used the analogy of looking at the floodway from a bigger picture. You know, we can use the analogy of looking at Assiniboine Park from a bigger picture. Sometimes...and I'm guilty of this. I was reflecting today when the Lemay crowd was here, how passionately I would come forward about active transportation in my little world and not really seeing the bigger world of transportation. But we are here to see and speak to and look at a much bigger picture. And this is what this project is all about. Will it happen in the next five years? Who knows, right? It won't happen without federal and provincial support, for sure, but I do think we need to be ready for this, especially because of the connections into Centreport and even more so with what's going on in the world and our east-west trade corridors. So, with that, that's my introduction.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. In July I spoke against and voted against the widening of Kenaston. That didn't seem to do me much good or win me any favours. This is a different project, I would say, in a couple of senses. For one, we don't have the farcical pretense that the combined sewer bill will be zero on this one, as we did with Kenaston. Numbers presented at committee that were later completely withdrawn. So, we're not near the CSO district here, so good. None of that controversy. Number two, at the time that we were debating Kenaston, I had been told, yeah, we're moving the priority on St. Mary's Road, which had always been short-term, always, in all these different reports. Oh, we're moving that to 2050. In fact, I got rebuked like I was an eight-year-old boy by some political staff saying, well, you never raised this until this term of office. Yeah, because it had never been moved to 2050 before this term of office. But since then, to the credit of the staff, some of whom we just saw the other day on the Transportation Master Plan; no, the priority to consider doing something on St. Mary's, whether it's bike route or opposite lane or transit cutaways, something, the stuff that was recommended in 2005 would be great. Something. That's been moved to a more realistic priority, 2024 to 2033. So, great. So, that particular concern of mine that a project that had been important and recognized as important in my area had suddenly been shunted 30 years later in order to stuff in some stuff that had been in the platform. No, we resolved that. Thank you to the staff. So, St. Mary's Road study going ahead. Good. So, what does that leave us with today? This. It's interesting, I remember Mr. O'Leary before he became Deputy Minister of Education, when he was major domo out there at Seven Oaks School Division coming in and saying, well, we actually favoured this at the school division. Didn't think much about the Kenaston one. But it made me think, well, different people are seeing these two projects differently. So, from my perspective I think this is a more worthwhile project. And also, I think I may have misunderstood where exactly we were in the budget cycle on Kenaston and where we are on this one as well, which is we're not committing to it. We're getting more study done. I still think the Kenaston one had some interesting cost-benefit numbers put forward, completely inconsistent with everything we've said about our plan to reduce emissions. But you know, we didn't ask for the Climate Action Committee to take a look at this one. We didn't ask them to take a look at Kenaston, so I guess that's just how we…how we roll now. But I will be voting for this one and partly due to what I mentioned earlier. And I see Mr. Armbruster there, so I'm glad he's still here. Which is if you look at the cost-benefit, we've got...now this is going to enable growth and development in precincts A, B and D. I said C earlier, understandably. Precincts A, B and D; once fully developed, these precincts will add 731 million dollars in GDP to the economy and provide long-term tax revenue, et cetera, et cetera. I'm going to keep banging on that if I have to because I am pretty sure I know what's coming at the June hearing, which will

be how the suburbs are killing us and we can't afford it and if we just do these four-plexes, well, then we can avoid all this horizontal infrastructure. We can avoid all this horizontal infrastructure. What the hell do you think this is? This is like a 900-million-dollar piece of horizontal infrastructure that we're justifying because it will develop more suburbs: precinct A, B and D. So, the Public Service has signed off. You don't get to write dissenting reports if you're the Public Service. You don't get to come here in June and say, well, we dissent. We have a minority report on that one. No, this is the Public Service direction, which is we're going ahead with big, big, billion-dollar almost public horizontal roadways. We're still building this and we can afford to do it. And we justify it because it's going to have net benefit because it's going to develop more suburbs out in the northwest. I don't know if that will prove to be right or not. We seem to have swung wildly back and forth over the last three administrations on these costing reports. Pity George Chartier isn't here to talk to us a bit about that, but luckily for him, he's…enviously, he's retired, but George was sort of the expert on this stuff. But this is what Mr. Armbruster and the Public Service has signed off on, right? These precincts will add 731 million dollars, so let's do this 900-million-dollar roadway. Okay, okay. I mean, fine, but when we get people coming here, including possibly our staff, saying in June how, well, we're going to go bankrupt if we don't do this. No, no. We've already said we're not going bankrupt because of anything. We've got a billion-dollar water and sewer plant phase two. We got a billion-dollar water and sewer plant phase three. We got a billion-dollar plus CSO project. None of them, it doesn't matter if you live in precinct A or the middle of downtown, all those costs are the same. So, our big financial challenges are not more play structures because we're building in Sage Creek. Our main financial challenges here are not, hey, we have to build new community centres. Well, we're fixing up the old ones. Mr. Dryburgh has said quite eloquently, look, we're spending over 100 million dollars a year repaving old roads. That's a huge capital cost that it's just there. It's one of our major capital costs. It's not going to get better if we just, you know, have more people living in four-plexes in 1960s suburbs and start tearing them down. So, fine for today. I won't belabour the point. Perhaps I already have, but I won't belabour the point further. But the point is, thank you to the public administration. They've issued a report. They've signed off. This is…this is what they're saying. This horizontal infrastructure of 900 million dollars is fine. We support it. It has benefit because it will unlock, a term I never liked, but it will unlock the benefits of precincts A, B and D. Okay, let's just remember that when we get here in June and we're told, oh, no, no, no, the suburbs, no, no, your 1960s suburbs are what...you know, Garden City, parts of my ward, parts of Councillor Orlikow's ward, Eadie, Councillor Schreyer's. Like, let's just try to be consistent here and Public Service has weighed-in now. Great. I'm not going to listen to dissent and minority reports from other parts of the Public Service. This…you're telling me to vote for this, I'm going to vote for this, but don't come and tell me, oh, now we've reconsidered and we're not going to do horizontal infrastructure. Like, this is…this is the position. It's a professional...it's supposed to be a professional public service. This is the position. Okay. Horizontal infrastructure more than pays for itself. Fine, but let's remember that when we come to that debate in June. Really what we're debating in June is federal government's money on the line. The devil's in the details of where we want to allow this development. But what we're not debating is bankruptcy imminent unless we do four-plexes or, oh, my god, tax cuts are coming because we're going to do four-plexes and we're going to save all this money. Don't tell people in my ward we're going to save all this money, you're just going to have to crowd in some more. We're not going to build anymore new roads. It's a 900-million-dollar project. We are going to build more roads. We're going to expand existing roads. So, let's not pretend otherwise. So, let's have an honest, straightforward debate in June. Thank you to Mr. Armbruster for this report. Signing off, the Public Service has made its position clear. There's benefit to this. They are just justifying a 900-million-dollar project. Fine. Let's remember that's the Public Service position.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Mayor Gillingham and then Councillor Orlikow.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think Councillor Lukes…I appreciate the way she articulated this, but indeed this project is very important. Certainly, in the provincial government's...in the campaign, the last provincial election, the current provincial government, then candidates, certainly expressed an interest and support for the Chief Peguis Trail extension. Madam Speaker, I know this project is important to you and the communities in the northwest part of Winnipeg. Councillor Browaty has spoken about it as well, as has Councillor Eadie, because this would certainly have an impact on the traffic flows within their respective communities. But I really do want to emphasize the fact that this project is needed in the long term for the city of Winnipeg when it comes to our economic development, our economic capacity, the movement of goods in and out of Centreport. And the movement of people, employees in and out of Centreport, also very, very important. Centreport, of course, now is developing a rail park. The airport is there. That's the…that's the key to that site is the trimodal possibilities and potential of all things that are created. And in a time right now when we need to be…obviously we're forced now, as Councillor Lukes said, to look at new markets and new ways of moving with Canada's economy and certainly Manitoba, Winnipeg's economy, east and west and to, perhaps, other markets outside of the...other than the US. Being investor-ready and having the ability to move goods through trade routes is really, really critical. And so, this project, ultimately when it's done, will open up…open up more growth and growth opportunities for both residential and employment lands as well. As Councillor Lukes said, what we're voting on here today is an independent value-for-money assessment, evaluating the business case and alternative project delivery methods, asking our staff to go ahead and begin that work so that we can have a better understanding so we can…once we get those numbers, take that information to the next steps, which will be, hopefully, another Council decision or set of decisions when the time comes.

But I look at a project like this. Yes, it's big. Yes, it's expensive, but I've said it on the floor of council before, I'll say it again. I often try to ask myself this. I challenge all of us to ask ourself this, this question is: what decision do Winnipeggers 20, 30 years from now need us to make today? Then let's make that decision and I hope we'll do that today. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Orlikow, then Councillor Gilroy.

**Councillor Orlikow:** Okay. Thank you, and I appreciate everybody's really tired and hungry probably. So, I got to first thank Matt Dryburgh who is our Deputy CAO. We've had some discussions on this and I probably could dive down a little bit deeper in discussions with him, but I did see the numbers, and they left me wanting. For example, it talked about a three percent inflation rate on this project. That's just ridiculous. It's in the last…last ten…five, ten years, whatever it was, it's been a 14…100 percent increase. So, 14 percent increase in the…per year. So, I don't really...really don't feel comfortable with that number. The other one I was saying, okay, so sprawl pays for sprawl. Now we got a new statement here. That's a change of pace. How does that work? Well, it was quite clear that nothing outside...there's costing available in here, which again, I tell Councillor Sharma, Speaker Sharma, that, yeah, you should vote for this because there's a massive number outside the area that we have to do. So, it's like a billion dollars or something that needs to be done to pay for the services at this new three...these new developments are going to need. And they will be going somewhere, but they will be regional. Well, that's crazy because we don't have…that number is not even in here. That's a secondary number that's not even in here. I'm going, okay, so what about when they step off the property? Because…are they paying for the roads? Are they paying for the sewer plant that we're trying to deal with it? No. All the money that's getting generated here based upon this report needs to stay within the area for 75 years. And all three levels of governments have to commit to the same thing. That's ludicrous. That will never happen. So, again, there's some numbers in here. Again, a little of this, a little of that. You know, I'm not an expert, but when I left reading this report, I did it quite thoroughly because I thought…it really said sprawl pays for sprawl. Well, I left after I had a conversation, I should have had more conversations with Mr. Dryburgh. But at this point it doesn't pay for itself. Not at all. So, those 75 years where none of those taxes are going anywhere else but that area, that means everybody else for the 35 years have to pay to develop this property. We're not getting any money back on that. Maybe some taxes, but no, for 75 years, River Heights-Fort Garry Ward and inner-city wards will be paying for our sprawl. That's what I see. What about…I know we hate this comment about the impact fee stuff, but what about the Arlington Bridge? Are they going to contribute to the Arlington Bridge when we redevelop it? No, they're not. So, again, it's how you work these numbers through. So, I wasn't left with a very strong level of confidence. But then I got back to my…well, my heels a bit and said, okay, it's time to be parochial a bit here too. There's 500,000 dollars, it's next step for this project. Well, don't spend this 500,000 dollars right now. Spend that 500,000 dollars on Kenaston. We can't be doing two major massive projects or even pretend that we're going to be able to do this. I understand it's a long-term vision document that we're going to put on there, and it will be another big project we're going to have a shelf ready. I call it shelf…not shovel ready, shelf ready, to put that project on the shelf and then in 30 years or 25 years, we'll dust that off and we'll bring it back down and all the numbers are going to change. So again, I'm not confident in the report that says this will provide value for money in the long term. I understand trade. We don't do trade. That's not...the province wants to do trade. They do jobs. They get all the tax revenue from this. And again, I do appreciate the report, how it does say, hey, province, here's the benefits for you. That's important. I agree that's not bad at all. But again, to say that this is a benefit to the city, yes, jobs are needed to create employment, that creates…people have the money to buy houses. Got it. But again, what about East St. Paul, West St. Paul and those areas? Kind of concerned about that. So again, I just don't...A) I don't feel comfortable with the numbers that were provided. B) this money could be better spent on just allocating it to Kenaston. And three, let's focus on one big project at a time rather than just spreading our wings everywhere. We got rec centres that we aren't doing. So, instead of just keep adding billions and billions of dollars into our list of shelf projects, as I call it, we have no money for any of this stuff. Let's just say, okay, this one we're not going to go forward right now. Fine. You want to talk about it in 20 years? Fine. But right now is not the time to start taking that 500,000 dollars when, really, Kenaston is a major project that needs to be done. If the government wants to come and says, we'll provide all the funding, or 80 percent of the funding, because property taxes and that, great, because we want jobs and we want to do Centreport. Fine. But again, we know that's not going to happen. So, I think this project is a little expensive. It does require an enormous amount of other costs that are not in here because it's the off-site costs. It retains all the taxes within that area. That means other areas you have to pay for everything else. So, I just don't find an equitable solution that they said here. The numbers seems to be really devised to make sure that this project looks good. And not saying it's not needed, but I also know what's needed as well. We need to get Kenaston done. We need other roads to get done. We need other...St. Mary's. We need other projects to get done. So, let's just stop doing these big project ideas. Maybe it's a campaign pledge. Maybe we got tired of it all, we just want to get it through and put it on the shelf and say, look, we have a plan somewhere. Again, no. It's time to step back on these big idea projects. We need to really focus on the basics of what's already falling apart at this time. So, I understand. I'm not begrudging people who are going to vote for this. If I was Councillor Sharma or anybody in the north, I would be voting for this because it pledges us, almost, to say we have to find millions and millions of dollars to do the rec centre and to do all...the portion…it says, proportionally they took a part of that for these three precincts, but that's not going to cover the costs. They have to still find a huge amount of other numbers from other areas, again, existing taxpayers, to pay for this stuff. So, I'm not convinced that...and I'm

happy now to carry on conversations with Councillor…with Mr. Dryburgh that I left my report that this will not be cost effective for us at this time. So, let's just pause on this. Let's focus on the big project we had with Kenaston. And let's just say, okay, we got this...we're this far with this project. Let's not spend another 500,000 dollars at this time. Let's just hold on that and reallocate that money to other projects. That's my opinion, but I do want to thank...it was one of the better reports I've seen from the department. I just didn't really agree with all the numbers. But that's about it. But it was a good report, and at the end of the day I am being a little parochial. I just wanted to maybe have everybody...the government all of a sudden changes and says we want to do roads, roads, roads. Well, let's just focus on one project and not to say, well, they may pick Chief Peguis over Kenaston. I don't want that. I want them to have only one project on the boards, which is Kenaston. So, I'm not willing to split that by, and so I want them to focus on that problem. But again, that's why we have Council as a whole. I'll do my little parochial moment. Other people may not. That's fine. But again, Kenaston is my number one project because it's really creating havoc in the River Heights-Fort Garry Ward right now. Really creating havoc. And it's going to get…if anybody's driven Kenaston in a long time, don't. Don't go down Kenaston. Don't go down Centennial. Don't go down Lindsay. Don't whip through my neighbourhood if you haven't…doing already. But again, they are because they have the blockage on Kenaston. So, I would prefer that we focus on one big project at a time. And I'm hoping it won't take this vision of 45 years to even get the thing done. I'm hoping that one project, the government, if they do come out with funding for roads, that we can actually say this is our shovel-ready project, which is Kenaston, not you pick either Kenaston or Chief Peguis. That's why I'm voting against it.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Next is Councillor Gilroy, followed by Councillor Browaty and then Wyatt and Eadie.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pretty frustrated that this is actually here. In the meeting that we had with the master transportation plan, the staff did say that this isn't even a priority for the city at this time. When the…I did raise the question about our transportation needs and how our transportation is growing within our trucking industry. They said that we have…what we have now would take us for the long run for quite a while before we would have to look at the Chief Peguis Trail. And at the same time, Madam Speaker, we have a bridge that is closed. We have a bridge going into Councillor Schreyer's area, which I was taking the other day, and into Councillor Wyatt's area, that can be closed at any time now. And yet, we're still funding projects that we have…where we are looking at funding projects another project that we're going to have to look for funding at, a debt ceiling that's high, and within inner-city communities, we are dying. Our roads are crumbling. So it really is frustrating when I'm in a meeting with our department heads that are telling us this isn't even a priority for them and that Chief Peguis as it is now can deal with the traffic that we have now, can deal with the growth of our trucking industry, and that isn't required when we have so many other demands, Madam Speaker. So much things that we have to pay for in terms of infrastructure. And you know what, I get mad when the inner-city is forgotten, and at the same time we're always looking at improving those roads. Madam Speaker, wasn't that long ago we extended Chief Peguis. It still looks like a brand new road. And now we're going to look at expanding it when we don't even have the money to pay for things that we do need to build, like the Louise Bridge, Madam Speaker. That is closed...going to be closing for some renovations. It's not too far along the Arlington Bridge, and that is a major connection into Transcona. That's not my ward, but it is going to be a major impact if that Louise Bridge closes on how we get people in and around to Transcona, Madam Speaker. So I just think that...I think...I don't know if I agree on the priorities in terms of Kenaston, but what I do think that I agree with Councillor Orlikow on is we got to step back, look at how much money we actually have, and look at fixing the problems that we have right in front of us before starting new projects that our own departments don't feel is a need, Madam Speaker. Yes, it's nice to have, but it's not a need when we have crumbling infrastructure like the Louise Bridge that could be closing any day now. So, I really raise this because this is going to cost money to even do the study. So, even though we're not doing that, we're still spending money on doing this study. And we're sending a message out to the rest of the…rest of the city is that we're not caring about the infrastructure projects that are falling down right now and we're not funding them or not making them a priority. So, I won't be supporting this, Madam Speaker. When many of you were in that room when we had that discussion that this was not a priority for the city at this time, and that the expansion wouldn't be required for several, several years to come. And the Mayor mentioned, what do I want to do…what do I want to be known for in 2030? I want to be known for having a brand new connection over to Transcona with a new bridge, a fixed bridge for the Arlington Bridge, and fixed roads within our city. And you know, Madam Speaker, we might even one-up, pave some of Charleswood's streets. Like, pave our back lanes, you know? Like, I just feel like we have priorities that we're not fixing. We have many streets within my community that I get very little streets for renewal, and there's potholes all over them, Madam Speaker. We've got potholes all over our streets. We've got other things that we need to deal with, and we're not dealing with them. And the more we put on to the agenda in terms of these big massive projects that we have no funding for, we don't have funding for a water treatment plant, we're going to have to ask for funding for that, like, let's slow down, Madam Speaker. And let's really look at what we need to do. Like, fix our house from the core and not put on a new…a brand new build onto our house. Let's fix the house. Let's fix the bones of the house before we go and we add on a new structure to our house, Madam Speaker. So that's what I…that's where I stand. You know what, like, we should be very concerned. I was going over that Louise Bridge and, like, I know that it's going to be under construction. I don't know what's going to happen if we can't have access to Councillor Schreyer's and Councillor Wyatt's area. Yeah. So, it could happen. So…so, anyways, that's my...that's how I feel, Madam Speaker. Thank you...

**Madam Speaker:** …Thank you. Councillor Browaty followed by Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Speaker. I know it's late but it's important for me to put some comments here on the record. Winnipeg is growing. I go to different parts of the city and I'm shocked to see new community after new community. Transcona is now connected to Winnipeg. It's filled in, Transcona west. I was here when we did the Transcona west secondary plan exercise. We're not building suburbs like we used to. They're not 50-foot lots with huge…huge lots. These are now multi-family predominantly. Town houses, you name it. Northwest Winnipeg, Madam Speaker, your area, it's filling in. Sometimes we do things in this city a little bit backwards. Should we have built some of these new residential developments up north McPhillips and the northwest quadrant before Chief Peguis was there? Maybe not. Part of the reason I think that we're seeing some challenges with these numbers is because we let development happen and we let all the stress of all this new development go on to existing roads. Leila, Partridge, they are getting spanked. You build…you build Chief Peguis trail, you can take all that north-south traffic and spread it out. Maybe we don't need an Arlington Bridge for another 10, 20 years. You build Chief Peguis trail, you build that capacity to get the traffic over to Keewatin, to Route 90, to get it over to the Lagimodiere Boulevard. It opens opportunities. 845,000 people. I've lived in Winnipeg my entire life. For the longest time we were stagnant. You asked me how big was Winnipeg, six and a quarter. Six and quarter; that was my answer for forever. It's 845, closing in on 850,000 people right now, Madam Speaker. We need to prepare for growth. We're building recreational amenities in southwest Winnipeg. Why? Because it's a new community the size of Brandon and it had nothing. It had nothing. It's bigger than Brandon. We need to invest in the strategic infrastructure, whether it's roads, whether it's recreation. We are a growing city. This isn't for residential development, this is for trade. This is a major trade corridor. Do you want semi-trailers going down Leila and Partridge 24 hours a day? Of course you don't. That's ridiculous. We used to have it on Springfield Road until the last segment was built. It was a 24-hour truck route going down a residential street. So again, we are growing up. We are filling in. Older communities, with higher density developments. We're blowing up our transit network. Again, I'm consistent in supporting both density in existing neighbourhoods as well as new. We're growing up and we are growing out. We are building new communities. Not everybody wants to live, you know, in a concrete jungle downtown, and that's a fair decision for people to make. People can want to live in residential neighbourhoods with big parks, big yards, and privacy. Those are both valid options. People should have that choice. It's a choice, and people should have it. So again, I support blowing up our transit network to create a new system that's, you know, going to be revolutionary for everything we've known for 30 years in the city. So again, I don't love this whole value for money piece of this exercise. Because, again, I think a lot of the value is for the residents that we…that have recently built in these new neighbourhoods. I don't think these numbers are properly capturing the benefit, and the taxes for that matter, that these new residents are paying. So again, I very much support moving forward with Chief Peguis Trail. We have some I think willing participants, perhaps with the province. Maybe even in the federal government after this election when perhaps, you know, some of the priorities change a little bit. So again, I encourage you to vote for this. I encourage you to vote for a strong, growing Winnipeg. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Browaty. Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** This is why we don't have five-minute debates. We're actually having a great discussion here on some very important issues. Madam Speaker, when are we going to start thinking like a city? When are we going to start thinking post-Unicity? We've been post-Unicity for 50 plus years, but yet, we don't think like that. We don't operate like that. We don't govern ourselves. I remember one time one director of Public Works told me that a certain councillor, he had to pave a regional street in his ward whether it needed it or not. His name will go unsaid. He was once in this chamber. And I can tell you, it was just because a certain councillor had a certain amount of pull, enough power to get that done, whether it needed it or not. And I am hearing this confrontation between the downtown, the inner-city and the old neighbourhoods and the suburbs, and yet, to what I could see in the world, every successful city seems to have a combination of freeways, I call them green freeways. I think there's a way for us to build moving away from the carbon exhaust engine, towards the one that we're going to be seeing in the future which is the electric engine, to build the roads that we need. But why…even now we're talking about this one road, meanwhile the entire city; go on Lagimodiere, go on Abinojii Mikanah, go on Kenaston, go…you know, just see the congestion that exists. Go on Plessis Road and see the congestion because we don't have Edward Schreyer Parkway north or south. And I went to…since one year now, we have been operating a residents advisory group led with the developers area and the Planning Department. And I want to give a lot of credit to the Planning Department. And I've been chairing…and we've been doing…writing a plan for South Transcona. 10,000 plus new homes coming on and parks and everything else. And when I told them I came back from a transportation master plan and Dugald Road was in 2050, they fell out of their chairs. You know, like, we have to start looking at an integrative model here, Madam Speaker. And this is where we're getting lost. Not only when it comes to the infrastructure of roads but LRT. Every city over 700,000 starts planning LRT. You figure out how…you plan the vision and you figure out how you're going to fund it. And yes, part of it will be property taxes. And yes, there are new revenues sources that I pointed out to the Mayor and the Mayor's office, more than once, I'm not going to say it again, that we could be tapping into if we showed the initiative and the entrepreneurial drive like a business person does to find where there's new revenue that are not even on the books today. That are there if we wanted them to be there to pay for all of this. Never mind the thousand

acres of park space that we need. Never mind the fact that we got to build the rec facilities that were referred to earlier, East of the Red. By the way, we will be watching on the east side of the river. A really good point Councillor Cindy Gilroy pointed out, Louise Bridge, Arlington Bridge, the existing infrastructure. I pointed out to the Mayor after last term election how we could renew our existing infrastructure. We have two funds, 200 million a year coming in. We could borrow against it. We could…in the 10 and 15 years fix every broken-down main street and sidewalk in this city if we wanted to. It's a question if we wanted to change our debt strategy, but we actually have the funding source and to pay the principal and interest. We'd have to drive up the industry. We'd have to drive up the amount of contractors. We'd have to drive…but it sounds like it's happening when it comes to Chief Peguis. And I love Councillor Lukes, I got to know her so well when I was the Standing Committee of Public Works. And you know, but I…but I can also read through things now because I was on the committee with her. And when I…we are going to see this road built. We're going to see probably a…I am guessing a P3 model and shovels in the ground prior to the next general election and so should it be. And what is wrong with that? Call it a spade a spade. Maybe we're kind of pushing up. We don't want to say it right now, so don't put it out there. We'll deal with it in (inaudible). But let's just say what is coming. Let's be honest. And why aren't we doing the same thing with William Clement Parkway? You know, or Lagimodiere which is now…Councillor Browaty is wondering about a bridge that's going to…why aren't we doing it…going to six lanes there…six lanes and tapping into the fact that we have a whole green economy coming and a green industry with regards to alternative fuel sources. Madam Speaker, I would remind the folks, also, not just in the suburbs but in the inner-city, that right now the truck traffic in this city goes right through the middle of it if they want to. Provencher was taken off the books as a truck route, but you know what, go down onto Marion, see how they like it, where it was all dumped onto, okay. And all that goes there because we have not finished the inter-road truck system and we continue to build these roads that are…like, Kenaston's plan is a disaster, in my opinion. You've got more traffic lights than ever before on it. We're widening it, but you got more lights than ever before and residents are going to say, what the heck did these guys do? They added another lane in either direction, but we've got more lights. Madam Speaker, we've got to start looking out of the box. We've got to start thinking big. We've got to see where we can take the city. The Mayor has rightly said, we have grown the city by 70,000 in the last three years, if we continue that rate of growth, can you imagine where we need to go? And could you imagine if we don't have the courage to go there? That if we can't come together. And I agree with Councillor Gilroy when she says renewing existing neighbourhoods. If we can't look after our existing infrastructure, you are right, we should be doing an addition on the side of the house. But at the same time, we do actually have the resources to do it now. We just haven't had the political will to do it. That's a…there's a big difference there. We actually have the fund because we had the courage since 2013 to 2014 to set aside those funds and not touch them. Maybe it was the two-thirds vote of Council that was put in place, so we don't raid it. But you know, the local street renewal, regional street renewal, we have the funds. The CSO program, which we talked about it at…can you imagine we roll this all in came forward with a vision of one city, the first time since 1972? That I know of. It's never been done. Never been done in this city. We stand so divided, and we pit each other against each other. Well, it's now my turn for my project. You know? Let's stand united. Let's stand united. But as long as we're divided, we will be divided. And we will continue to flounder as we struggle. We'll go running from Chief Peguis and then it will be Councillor Mayes, or whoever the councillor is now. 10 years down the road with St. Vital, my goodness, Abinojii Mikanah is a disaster. You know? Or you know, we will be hearing about the needs for inner-city rec because we didn't build the East of the Red rec plex in (inaudible) in the inner-city where there's a need just as great there as it is out in the suburbs for kids who have nowhere to go. Or older neighbourhoods like the Transcona aquatic park, which we should be building first in St. Boniface before shutting everything down. But, anyway, that's what is called vision. That's where we can go. And I've always said that don't be scared of the costs right away. Just paint the vision and see what we can do. But the minute that we throw the numbers in, we automatically retract and the vision just disappears. But you don't see…I'll tell you what, you take Calgary's basket of problems, we'll look at Calgary. Calgary is working. The city works and the province is stepping up on their addiction and mental health issues, thank god, they're doing it there. I wish we could do more like they're doing here…to do it here. But if we could…could you imagine that we could…I would take their basket of problems in a heartbeat and trade them ours tomorrow. But they're actually…they're investing…yeah, they got oil. But you know what, we've got a lot of resources in this province too that we have not tapped, right? And hydroelectricity is the new oil. It's the new oil, folks. And our future is positive we just have to believe in ourselves to build the city as one, not divide it constantly. Inner-city versus suburb, that suburb versus this one, I'm tired of that. I have heard it here for nearly 20 years. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm voting for this report. I did at the Public Works Committee, and I will do that. Madam Speaker, first thing that I want to talk about is, so in my mind, I'm looking at all of these big projects that are going to cost us lots of money as the city. We do need to take care of what exists and make sure that it works. So when I'm looking at all of these big major projects, so we have…well, our number one thing that we're dealing with now that means that we won't be able to deal with a lot of the other big projects like Chief Peguis or Kenaston widening and replacement of the St. James Bridge, or you know, we need to…actually, so in terms of priority of my mind, we have NEWPCC, all three projects. That's number one for this city. There's a project called replace the Arlington Bridge, Madam Speaker. It doesn't exist in my head. That's number two. It's gone. It's not there. If you want to talk about the movement

of motor vehicle traffic…and you know, the local trade that happens through the smaller trucks, through this city, they could really use the Arlington Bridge, a new replaced one. To say that, oh, it may may not be needed in 20 years, that blows my mind, Madam Speaker, because where's the four, five or six billion dollars to move CPKC out of Winnipeg? Like, you're talking all these money and all this stuff. Like, that's not the reality. Let's get with it. So, we need to do that. And the Louise Bridge is being repaired and that's very important. And there are other ways to get from get from Elm…get from the west side to the east side; to Elmwood, to Transcona. And so, while the Louise Bridge is closed, there will be movement. Although, it's going to cause traffic flow issues more than likely. But Madam Speaker, then there's in my…to me, Arlington Bridge, Chief Peguis trail, that is needed. I think that that is something that's more needed than the widening of Kenaston. You have an existing road that people are using every day, trade is using it every day. It's being used everyday. You know, I look at…I don't pronounce it very good but thank you. You know, William Clement, back…I have been around and I have been watching since the '90s, so have other…some of the other councillors around here, Madam Speaker. Mr. William Clement was very instrumental in making sure that that happened before a whole bunch of other projects happened in this city. And ultimately though, any of these projects that get done it's the taxpayers who are paying for it, Madam Speaker. And I find it very interesting that we could dialogue about not going to the taxpayers for, like, say Plessis underpass where you have a lot of traffic back in the day. It was an important project. There's no doubt about it. Got share in it. Taxpayers paid for a portion of it, Madam Speaker. Well, the taxpayers paid for all of it because other levels came in and put money into it. Yeah, sure, okay, Madam Speaker. We talk about the taxpayer paying. Even on a P3, that is debt, Madam Speaker – debt. That is debt. So, if you want to go and borrow, what, four-billion-dollars and issue a bunch of…four-billion-dollars worth of debentures, the interest that you're going to pay on that because we have bond rating agencies and you've got to sell that into the private market, Madam Speaker, and what, you're going to pay 15 percent on all of that debt? And remember, again, it is debt. A P3 is debt. Now so I've talked about that and I think these projects are there and I have this priority that I'm thinking of. Now, let's talk about Chief Peguis Trail. So, it's supposed to connect this up with Centreport Way. Centreport Way, Madam Speaker. Well, guess what? The Province had money for Centreport and they built a brand new road, diverting you around Headingley, through over into Centrepoint. Province had money because…why did they do it? It was important to trade and for the Province they're the ones making the dough, right? They're the ones bringing in all the majority of the revenue. That's what happens. When we have property taxes come on, quite often what we do is we fold it in to prevent…prevent having to raise property taxes for inflation purposes. So, things are done differently too at our level, Madam Speaker. So, when I look at this project, again, we're doing all of the work on this. And maybe this, you know, I can't remember in the report, it talks about, you know, like what value it has for traffic flow in the residential areas. And Madam Speaker, we do have a serious traffic flow problem on Leila and Partridge. And the residents that live all along there, it's very difficult. And so, there is that component to it. But you know, the major reason we need that is to finish off what I call the inner rectangle: Lag, Chief Peguis, Kenaston/Century/King Edward, slash, slash. And then we have…Councillor Allard, what is…Thank you for the pronunciation. We have…we have that. That's the inner rectangle. It's there, get rid of the traffic lights. But all I want to say, though, is ultimately, that needs to happen. So, I'm going to…

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you.

**Councillor Eadie:** Shut up now and sit down.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you, Councillor Eadie. Councillor Lukes to close on the item.

**Councillor Lukes:** Okay, alright. Yeah, well I did want to point two things out to our colleague, Councillor Gilroy, through you, Madam Chair, is that this past July, or July 2024, so, yeah, past July, we voted to support the Louise Bridge rehabilitation project. So that, and we set aside, I believe, it was a 34 million plus…40? 40 million. So, we set that aside. So that's happening. And just recently we also set aside funding to disassemble, to take apart, the Louise Bridge and to continue doing detailed design. So, I don't know, like, we are progressing with those two bridges. So, I think that is a positive thing. And I'm sorry, Arlington Bridge. Arlington. Arlington. Take it apart. Good catch, no one noticed. No one is listening to me. Anyways, okay thank you. This is…this is a…I'm going to be supporting this project for many of the reasons…big picture reasons that we've heard.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. All in favour of Item 2? Contrary? Okay. That's carried. Who wants to be recorded in opposition? Two. Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Allard. Two recorded. Okay three, Councillor Orlikow. Okay, thank you. Moving on, Councillor Lukes, by-laws…Really? Councillor Lukes.

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

**Councillor Lukes:** Okay. I'd like to move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 31/2025 and 33/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 31/2025, By-law No. 33/2025.

**Madam Speaker:** Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** I'd like to move that By-law Nos. 31/2025 and 33/2025 be read a second time.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

**Clerk:** By-law No. 31/2025, By-law No. 33/2025.

**Councillor Lukes:** I'd like to move that the rules be suspended and By-law Nos. 31/2025 and 33/2025 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

**Madam Speaker:** All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Questions under this committee. Questions for Councillor Lukes. Councillor Wyatt.

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

**Councillor Wyatt:** Madam Speaker, I rise...we had an opportunity to attend a seminar on the transportation master plan. Concerned that we are unrolling a master plan that does not have any origin destinates study as the original one did which was one million dollars at that time and that would be quite a bit more today. The bigger part of the question or concern I have is the fact that we have projects that were previously projected that actually would be underway by now, based on the old transportation master plan, that are being pushed back even another 25 years, and that…What's frustrating about it then we're seeing changes in the trucking roadmaps and everything else when we had roads that were on our size city, like we have a rush hour on our northeast side of the city in both directions just like the university in south Winnipeg. And our industries, our trucks are all heading you know one side of the city, they come over the other side, they're supplying goods and services and we want to avoid them which is why I'm supportive of Chief Peguis, finishing that leg which is why I think we've got to do other legs, but you know, could we not take another run at this plan because the numbers that came back were concerning just in terms of the overall strategy, the timing and got a feeling of underwhelming was the message. And I was really hoping for something more and you know sometimes it's okay to say, you know what, this isn't quite right and maybe we need to reconsider and just give it more time and more effort. Any thoughts on that?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Question, Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** That was my question…

**Madam Speaker:** …Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** As I understand the question, you want to reconsider it and send it back or something to that effect? Well, you know what? The transportation master plan, I was very involved in the first...well, not the first, but the rendition prior to this one. And the transportation master plans and, you know, quoting Mr. Patman, is they are a living, breathing document. And as our city grows and changes transportation plans morph to the changes, right? So, it's been five years in the works. There...you know, in the middle of the pandemic, I think that it will come to the public in May. There hasn't been many changes at all since what is currently posted on the website. And, again, you know, a lot of it resolves around funding that currently we don't have a lot of for new expansions. I encourage you to really go through it and read it. And if you've got comments or changes, now is the time before it comes forward.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Second question.

**Councillor Wyatt:** You know, where I was going with this is that, yeah, we have challenges with the funding and I think that's what seems to always drive our transit transportation master plan is the overall funding and our transit master plan or lack thereof. And, you know, I go back to the time when I had an opportunity to meet with a former Deputy Mayor prior to the strong mayor model, probably back in the 70s and 80s when they actually sat with members of the cabinet once a

month, and actually worked together with the other level of government. Let's be honest, that other arm is like doing any plan, it's like having one arm tied behind your back if you don't have the Province...

**Madam Speaker:** …Question, Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** My question is this: Could we not take a...pull back and sit down with the other level of government who just as concerned about the economic growth and development of this Province as we are along with the City, and say, look, we have these challenges, this is what we're facing. You have these challenges and we now have a massive trade war. We need to get industry moving. We're possibly heading for a massive recession, okay, hitting next year with the fact that the auto sector just got hit. You know, my question is this. Can we not spit...pivot and go back and make this a plan that we could be truly proud of even if it means going back to the drawing board, just get the other level of government involved?

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes...

**Councillor Lukes:** Well, actually the other level of government was involved. They were very actively involved in the creation of this, sitting in many of the meetings and one of the reasons that it's only coming forward now is because they wanted to do a final go over it and review it. I think one of the biggest challenges we have in the transportation master plan is we just don't have freeways. We just don't have freeways. So, we...we are...we are working within a network that we have to move goods and we have to move people. We have to have multimodal, we have to have transit, and it is challenging without freeways. I think that's one of the biggest problems. But we are working with the Province and we...we have seen, I would say just from a couple of experiences I've had recently with the potential, the Province was looking at the expansion of Abinojii Mikanah further to the west through the RM of Macdonald and the twinning of McGillivray. There's been actually...I'm actually amazed at the dialogue that's been occurring back and forth connecting from outside of the city, from the municipality in. So, I'm not comfortable sending it back. I think it's fine and we can make tweaks and changes as we go.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Final question...

**Councillor Wyatt:** (Inaudible) heard what the staff said that there's staff to staff dialogue. I appreciate that. But we really need to take it up a notch in terms of minister dialogue, which we're not having. And it doesn't surprise me the RM of Macdonald wants to see a road, that doesn't surprise me at all. But anyway, you know, could we not consider that, yeah, great staff to staff conversation, but political arm which really is the arm that really needs to be brought in here and has really not been brought in from what I'm hearing could be done and we're losing an opportunity here. And then they come back and we throw numbers at them. We need this and we need this. Well it would have been nice if we had them in at the start because after that they're part of it. Just a thought.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Councillor Lukes.

**Councillor Lukes:** Yeah, that we can take that back. I mean really if you think about it, we're a city and a province of only one point, what are we 1.8 million people? So, there's huge opportunities for dialogue. And I think more than ever that the two levels of government are actually having dialogue, more than I've seen in my time around here. So, thank you for your feedback.

**Madam Speaker:** Thank you. Any further questions? Any further questions for Councillor Lukes? Councillor Wyatt does. And in the meantime, I'd like to call our deputy speaker up to take the chair and we'll continue with the question period. Councillor Orlikow, first time taking the chair. Thank you.

**Councillor Lukes:** Don't break the chair. Don't break the chair.

**Councillor Eadie:** All right. Look at that guy. Look at that guy.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay, so we're done with that one. We are moving on to the Governance. I think I need my mic up. Councillor Wyatt, go ahead.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you. I'll give you a chance there to get a word. So I'll ask: In the last provincial election, I had the opportunity, Madam Speaker, through you, and maybe this is a question that the Chair of Public Works might want to defer to the Mayor's Office and that's fair enough. But I took the opportunity of meeting with the members of the incoming government prior to the provincial civic election to discuss with them the needs on the northeast side of the city, specifically with recreation and the East of the Red Plex, which translated to during the provincial election campaign of the...at that

time, the opposition NDP to become government NDP, where they announced their commitment to the East of the Red Plex as a one third funding partner along with the southwest Red Plex. Is there the...is there work underway from the EPC level and the Mayor's Office or specifically EPC level, when it comes to the same initiative with the federal...potential change in the party membership or party government coming forward? Or even not that, but is there any discussion underway? We've managed to secure the intergovernmental relations is a relatively matter of the EPC in the Mayor's Office. I feel we push hard and got that provincial commitment for the East of the Red Plex. Do we see that happening with the federal one? It's something that we're watching very closely considering the context.

**Councillor Eadie:** Point of order. He's talking about East of the Red Recplex which is a Community Services project.

**Deputy Speaker:** (Inaudible) Point of order is sustained. I agree with that. It needs to be on Public Works. So, fair enough. Any further questions? Seeing none, we'll move forward. Do I do this part? So, we're on…I think I do. Yeah, so we're on the report of the Governance Committee of Council dated March 11th, 2023. Councillor Sharma.

## REPORT OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL DATED MARCH 11, 2025

**Councillor Sharma:** Okay, yes. So, I'll move…

**Deputy Speaker:** I'm not sure if this is the one or two?

**Councillor Sharma:** Well, I will move 1. 2 does have amending motions with it…

**Deputy Speaker:** Amending motion?...Okay.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I'd like to stand down 1.

**Deputy Speaker:** 1 and 2 are stand…are stood down. (Inaudible) No. 1, go ahead.

### Item 1 – Re-appointment of the Integrity Commissioner

**Deputy Speaker:** Alright, I think, Councillor Wyatt, you stood this down.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I don't wish to speak to it…

**Councillor Sharma:** I need to…

**Councillor Wyatt:** Oh, you get to vote today.

**Councillor Sharma:** You don't want to speak to it?

**Councillor Wyatt:** I don't wish to speak, Madam…I'm so sorry...

**Deputy Speaker:** I'm sorry, Councillor Wyatt, I'm new and green on this one. It's Councillor Sharma that gets to start.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. Yes, absolutely.

**Councillor Sharma:** You don't want to speak to it, though?

**Councillor Wyatt:** No, I don't want to.

**Councillor Sharma:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm going to put some comments on the record about this report before us. Council appointed Ms. Sherri Walsh as the city's first Integrity Commissioner in 2017 for a two-year term with the option of reappointment of up to five additional two-year terms. Ms. Walsh will complete her fourth term as integrity commissioner this year on March 31st, and the Governance Committee is recommending, as you see in the report, that she appointed…be reappointed for a fourth term expiring two years from now, March 31st. Since the establishment of her position, Ms. Walsh has made significant contributions to strengthening the ethical leadership for Council, including the creation and implementation of the Council Code of Conduct which established guidelines on ethical behaviour, conflict

of interest, management and expectations for public accountability. When complaints do arise, Ms. Walsh provides investigative services ensuring that they are addressed fairly. Mr. Deputy Speaker, her advisory bulletins, annual reports foster an increased level of accountability and transparency and ensure that the public is informed about how ethical issues are handled within City Hall. The education and training of Council members has also been a priority with regular workshops that ensure the members of Council fully understand their ethical responsibilities. These accomplishments are not just procedural milestones, they have had real and lasting impact on the way our city is governed and helped foster a culture of accountability. The work of the Integrity Commissioner is ongoing and as challenges in governance evolves, so too must our commitment to ethical leadership. By continuing to support this role, we uphold the fundamental values of honesty, fairness and accountability; values that define a strong and trustworthy government. With that, I reconfirm the committee's support and appreciation for the work of the Integrity Commissioner. I would like…and would urge all of Council to support the reappointment of Ms. Walsh as the City of Winnipeg's Integrity Commissioner for an additional two-year term. Thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** Any further comments? Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Thank you. I circulated a piece of correspondence to all members of Council earlier today. I don't wish to speak to it. It's self-explanatory. And I'll be registering my vote in light of that correspondence to the negative.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Anybody else? Seeing none, call the question. All in favour? Opposed? Record in opposition? Yeah, done.

**Item 2 – City of Winnipeg Governance Review – Governance Committee Recommendations**

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. There's two amending motions. Items 4…3 and 4, just for your information. And Councillor Sharma will introduce as we go forward.

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

*BE IT RESOLVED that Item 2 of the Report of the Governance Committee of Council dated March 11, 2025, be amended by adding the following new Recommendation 9, and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:*

*9. That the Public Service be directed to report back to Council, through the Governance Committee, within 90 days with the following:*

*A. A comprehensive list of all committees, boards or positions where the Mayor appoints, designates or nominates a Member of Council, excluding any appointment authority granted by the City of Winnipeg Charter.*

*B. A listing of any by-laws, Council decisions or committee terms of reference that require amendments in order to transfer the appointment authority from the Mayor to Council.*

**Motion No. 4**
**Moved by Councillor Duncan,**
**Seconded by Councillor Browaty,**

*BE IT RESOLVED THAT that Item 2 of the Report of the Governance Committee of Council dated March 11, 2025, be amended by as follows:*

- *Delete Recommendation 2 in its entirety and replace with the following:*

  *"2. That the Province of Manitoba be requested to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to allow the City to set its own committee structure and composition."*

- *Add the following new Recommendation 6.D.:*

  *"D. to set a total speaking time limit for Members of Council at Council as follows:*

  *i. On any motion, the mover shall be entitled to speak for ten minutes and any other member of*

*Council shall be entitled to speak for five minutes, provided that Council may on motion, without debate, permit a member to speak for a further period not exceeding two minutes in addition to the regular time allowed. On closing debate, the mover of a motion shall be given eight minutes to close."*

**Councillor Sharma:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Good governance is the foundation of a transparent, efficient and accountable government. One that serves its people…people effectively and adapts to changing needs. As we continue to evolve as a city, we must ensure our governance framework remains responsive and aligned with best practices. This means identifying inefficiencies, addressing concerns and finding ways to enhance decision making. A well-structured system fosters collaboration among the elected officials and streamlines processes. Most importantly, it builds public trust in the decisions we make. To this end, the City of Winnipeg engaged MMP to conduct a comprehensive review of our governance framework. Their analysis compared our practices to other Canadian cities and provided 15 recommendations for…for implementation. While the review found that our governance structure aligns with other jurisdictions, it highlighted areas where we may want to look at improving. The Governance Committee undertook a thorough review of each recommendation consulting with departments and assessing financial and operational impacts. As a result, six recommendations have already been implemented through Council and administrative initiatives. These include enhancing Council resources, strengthening the Engage Winnipeg Policy to centre equity and public engagement, increasing public access to Council and committee meeting information through a new decision-making information system, and improving strategic planning to set clear Council priorities for our city's future. I want to thank the City Clerk's Department. They led us through a process that took quite a bit of time as we all know, getting feedback from this Council, the Council prior. We had many members of our administration come and present to the Governance Committee; Director Hazel Borys came to present, Felicia Wiltshire, Marc Pittet, and many others. I want to thank the committee that has worked on this report. And it's comprised not just of four councillors, but many more than that, and all of you, really, because we had sessions together last year as well. So, today we present a report that addresses all 15 recommendations, including those already implemented and those still under consideration. One key issue is ensuring the Mayor's appointment authority promotes consensus building and broader Council engagement. You see what's in the report today and then there's different viewpoints we see with the amending motions that have been brought forward. The committee also supports MMP's recommendation to ensure all wards are represented on EPC over time in order to provide a balanced perspective in decision making. Another critical recommendation is streamlining the report flow to Council. While reducing multi committee reviews may seem like an efficient gain, we must be cautious. Committee discussions provide a necessary level of oversight and allow for detailed interaction with the Public Service. Without this step, complex issues requiring clarification may delay decision making as questions of the Public Service is not permitted at Council meetings. MMP also calls for the documentation of politically directed changes to administrative reports. Although the Mayor has introduced a practice to document these changes, the Governance Committee believes that that practice should be formalized in the organizational by-law to enhance further transparency. Regarding development applications, MMP recommended transitioning public hearings to a third-party body, such as a Planning Commission. We are not doing this at this time. We do have upcoming zoning by-law reviews in 2027, and we believe it's prudent to maintain the current process until those reviews are complete. MMP called for the orientation of the Indigenous Advisory Council to provide advice to Council as a whole. The Governance Committee believes that it is vital that Council as a whole engage in meaningful dialogue with Indigenous communities as it provides a platform for Indigenous voices to be heard in the decision-making process. Accordingly, the committee is recommending that the Indigenous Relations Division be encouraged to facilitate annual meetings between Indigenous elders and Council to discuss pertinent issues. Transparency and accountability are the foundations of public trust in our democratic process. Documenting councillors' attendance at Council meetings is a key part of that. The public deserves to know that their elected representatives are actively participating in the decision-making process. To strengthen this accountability, the committee is recommending an amendment to the procedure by-law to formalize the process for granting leaves of absence and to ensure that meeting minutes record when a councillor arrives after a meeting has started or leaves before it is adjourned. These changes will reinforce the integrity of our governance and the trust placed in us by the people we serve. As noted in the MMP report, of the nine cities reviewed in this process, Winnipeg is the only city that allows delegations to speak for 10 minutes to an agenda on an item…to an item on an agenda. As noted in the MMP report, Winnipeg stands out as the only city among the nine reviewed that allows…sorry, delegations to speak for 10 minutes, I just said that. We recently saw the impact of this firsthand during the public hearings that we held on the residential development on malls and corridors. Council implemented a five-minute rule, presentations did become more clear and focused. While this…while we keep this in mind, the committee is recommending an amendment to the procedure by-law to establish…so the committee is recommending that we establish the five-minute rule for delegations going forward. Now, I do note that there is a similar amendment that is being called for on the floor of Council here. I would like to hear what others have to say, but I'm not sure that this is a way to go for debate on the Council floor. Today, it's been a long meeting, but that's what we're here for – to debate tough issues and things that take a lot of discussion at times. In today's meeting, there was one councillor, it was you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that had an extension for your speaking time on one particular issue. Other than that, there were a lot of Council members here today that – and I took time to note this – that used up to seven or eight minutes to speak. I'm here to listen

to each of you. And I hope we're all here to do the same. But I'm willing to listen to that debate. I'm quite surprised that it did come forward at this time. It's something, in my opinion, that requires a little bit more thought and perhaps that's something that the Governance Committee can look at, at a later time. Finally, the Governance Committee is proposing a significant change to the composition of the Audit Committee that was brought forward by Councillor Allard. A review of five Canadian cities which include an audit committee in their governance structure, found that all committees had similar mandates and ranged in size of five to nine members. So, that's something you see in the report. These recommended changes, all of them that the Governance Committee has brought forward, are designed to make our governance framework more transparent, efficient and accountable to the public. They reflect our commitment to continuous improvement and responsible decision making. I will leave it at that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'd like to hear what the members in the Chamber have to say.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. We'll now move in…I'll have Councillor Gilroy speak to her amending motion and the other amending motion and the motion in general.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. It's different saying it. Yes, I just want to talk a little bit about…just so we need to be clear. I talk about everything? So I have…okay. Okay. Okay. Perfect. Thanks. Yeah, okay. So, what I brought forward is, I know there was at one time we did…we did really feel like a push to change the strong mayor model, and I really don't want this to become about the Mayor that is here now. I don't feel that that's appropriate. So, I'm really just talking about the system…the system overall. The Mayor has done a good job trying to include everybody. I just want to really talk about the system and why I think we should change it. Because a lot of the stuff that we talked about today, I feel kind of comes from the strong mayor model system that a lot of cities don't have. And I actually feel that when we did implement it a long time ago, is when we started to see some of the levels of defunding and decay. And some of the real things that we see today, I think that has happened since that's been implemented. And then we've seen other cities that don't have it that has really flourished at the same time in terms of what they've been able to do. Because I feel like it's a more collaborative approach to…to, you know, building a city together, being city builders together. So, I guess at the end of the day, I want to…first of all, I want to thank the Governance Committee and you, Councillor Sharma. I know that they worked very hard. I was part of that process. And of course, the Clerks. There was a lot of meetings and they worked extremely hard. So, you should be very proud of the government…governance team, because I was in some of those meetings, they were long and hard. A lot of great discussion. And staff did amazing job, you know, keeping up with us, in our wanting to change everything. So, I really wanted to highlight that. So, I wanted to thank them for the work. I just…I guess I have no faith moving forward that the Province is really going to make any changes. We've been through this before. This really isn't going to happen. It's not really their…you know, they're not going to want to get in the midst of this. So, I am looking at what we can control, right? We can't control what the Province has allowed us to do, even though I do want to say that the Mayor can decide on making things fairer. That would be up to them, up to that person; he, she or they could decide to allow more councillors to…more standing policy committees to be appointed. However, this is a system that we're in. And, you know, I don't begrudge a Mayor for wanting to have more power. I think that if you were in that position, any one of us would probably want that as well. So having said that, I talked with the Clerks and there are a number of appointments that the Mayor has. And so, quite frankly, under what we're doing right now with keeping it as this standing policy five, and your acting Deputy Mayor and Deputy Mayor that would have to be part of the standing policy committee, really isn't changing it. Like, it's really not. So, but what we could do is really look at the different…the different things the Mayor would have to appoint people to. And those are things that, you know, does have influence. It comes with a budget or it might come with travel, and those are things that are added influence to having that person in a position and having a vote. So, it's just to be transparent. To be, I think, good governance, to have a balance, to have more cooperation, we should be looking at this. So, of course, this is just asking the Public Service to come back with those…to those so we can see them. Some of them might be more difficult because there might be by-laws and stuff involved in that, but we would allow at least to see that. We all don't even probably know about all of the things that the Mayor can appoint or not appoint, right? So, it would be helpful for us to take a look at that and really decide to make those changes here. And that is something that is within our control. So, that's what I wanted to point out. And I just…I did want to thank Councillor Duncan and Councillor Browaty for their motion. You know, I'm not going to support the five minutes. I really feel that we as a Council, this is our job to sit here to debate this. Some of us when we're not on EPC, we do need to get a little more…a bit more stuff out on the floor of Council. So, I feel like it is stifling us when you're not in an EPC role. So, I would encourage you to maybe…that probably wasn't really thought about. Sometimes it's painful to sit here for hours on end like we are today, listening to us talk. And some of us do ramble on. But that is up to the Speakers to handle. And I think it's something that we should make sure that we're doing is allowing people to speak in Council. So, I am in support of the original governance review, but I'm hoping that they will add in here that we would look at what the Mayor can appoint and really come back and have another discussion on this at a later date on if we want to look at changing this. Thank you, Madam Speaker…Oh, Mister.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Anybody else speaking on this matter? Oh, yes, sorry. Councillor Duncan, on your amending motion and the other amending motion and the motion in general. Go ahead.

**Councillor Duncan:** Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In regards to the first amendment here that I moved and was seconded by Councillor Browaty, regarding deleting the clause essentially about limiting the appointment of up to five members of Council as Chair for standing committee of council. One of which, wrap your heads around this, would have to be appointed as Deputy Mayor and the other would have to be appointed as Acting Deputy Mayor. So, essentially what this says is, there's going to be five people, aside from the Mayor, that have all of the responsibility of standing policy committees and at EPC and as the deputy or acting. So, I look at this as a growing city now, we have growing budgets, we have growing populations, we have growing needs I would say that it should be the opposite. There should be more standing policy committees. There should be more participation of Council. In a perfect world, perhaps we would see all Council members have a standing policy committee. I know some might scoff at that to think, whoa, how would we ever control that? I mean, I could start breaking down these committees. I look at Councillor Lukes' committee, for instance, she has Transit, she has Public Works, she has Parking Authority. I mean, where does it end? Where does the oversight of the bureaucracy say, we've seen enough of that? I have heard people here today argue they don't have enough information. Well, guess what? If we had more SPCs, if we had more Council involvement, then people would be more prepared and more in the know. So, to limit that, to shrink that down to less and less and less, I don't think is a great idea. Therefore, my motion would call for the deletion of that. Again, I understand, I didn't live it, but I understand under past administration, past mayors, you know, there was a limitation of information available. I do not feel like this is the case right now. As one of the members of EPC and a chair of standing policy committee, you want some information, let me know, I'll give it to you. Might not have been the case in the past, the argument is always you never know what is going to happen in the future. I would say, let's not shrink things, let's grow things. Let's put more responsibility around this table. That's my look on it. Hence, the amendment. To the second, the reduction in total speaking time, I've had the opportunity to sit and listen to several great debates. I've also had the opportunity to sit and listen to several storytelling times around the table here. I mean, at the end of the day, there are practices in place that I don't know how long they've been in place, but we have to evolve here. We have…you know, the hour of 10:00 is coming. I would assume that there…I could click on YouTube right now and see just how many people are watching. I would assume…36. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I would assume that the fact that we have gone on for 12.5 hours might have something to do with that. I would assume that, you know, as we have evolved along in the past let's say 10 years, look back to 2015. Average length of Council was four hours and 32 minutes. This past year, we can all give ourselves a pat on the back, we accomplished a new standard of an average Council meeting taking seven hours and 56 minutes. Why would you ever reduce the time? I would say to stay focused. I would also say to get with the times. Other jurisdictions, let's run through them: 1.2 million population in Edmonton; two minutes for introduction of motion, five minutes to speak on that motion. Calgary; 1.8 million people, there's 15 councillors there. They are representing approximately 300,000…300,000 people in Calgary each. They have five minutes to introduce. Ottawa; one million people, five minutes. Brampton; 800,000, this is equivalent to us, five minutes to introduce and debate. And then five minutes for any other second speaker. Vancouver gets it done with 11 members of council, serving three million people, in five minutes. And you cannot tell me that there is less work to do out on the west coast than there is in Winnipeg. I mean, it's time that we look at ourselves and say, first off, this amendment speaks to a five-minute time limit with a two-minute extensions. Some jurisdictions don't even have that opportunity. It's seven minutes. Let's try it, let's see how it goes. I think I would agree with Speaker Sharma, Mr. Deputy Speaker, clear and focused. That is the goal. Clear and focused for our delegations and clear and focused for us around this table. Thank you, Mr. Deputy.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you. We'll move on to our list, I have Councillor Dobson, Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Mayes, in order. Councillor Eadie? Well, you guys have got to tell me you want to speak, okay. So, now I've got Councillor Eadie to the…let's go through the list right now. Councillor Eadie, Councillor Chambers, Councillor Lukes. Anyone else at this point? You could just put your hands up later. Mayor. Okay. Okay, well that's a good list to start.

**Councillor Dobson:** Okay, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you very much. The motion and specifically the new recommendations on Item No. 2 actually hit home with me. It has changed how I look at the EPC structure and the standing committees. In my view, shrinking the number of standing committees may not always have the desired effect. Locking in the EPC positions to five and restricting the Deputy Mayor and Acting Deputy Mayor to those positions would give far too much responsibility and power to those Councillors. Not to mention may cause those five Councillors to be overworked and that's not right. We need the ability to adjust the size and number of committees to better reflect the actual workload. What the city needs right now is more oversight on the departments and that means more councillors directly involved. And if that means having more committees, or more EPC chairs, then so be it. I want what is best for this city. Thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** Moving onto Councillor Wyatt.

**Councillor Wyatt:** I don't know what to say about all this. Five minutes – I really am…I am speechless. The way I read it, the Mayor's appointment authority be limited to the appointment of up to five members of Council as Chairperson of the standing committees of Council, one of which shall be the Deputy. So, the way I read this is that we are confirming the decision to contract the size of EPC, which actually makes it more elitist in my mind. I'm hearing that we're going to go

and expand more standing committees. My take on that is, actually, we're going to contract when it's actually…when it actually hits…rubber hits the road. The other part of this what I find interesting is one of the newest members of Council complaining about how late the meetings have been going. He just got here. You know, with all due respect. I think that is the nature of debate, Mr. Speaker. We have to have the patience to listen to our colleagues. If you don't like the length of the meeting, we could have two Council meetings a month. I could point out a lot of councils that meet twice a month. And by the way, Vancouver is 500,000 people. You're talking about the metro. And all the other cities he referred, other than the two in Ontario, do not have strong mayor models. Which is why I actually implemented this motion which actually generated this process in the first place back in 2017. Moved by myself, seconded by Councillor Eadie to have a governance review because we knew the strong mayor model was broken. And we knew we had to look at things from a different perspective when it came to public policy development. And I want to thank Councillor Sharma for doing the best she could and with all the energy she threw in. She did an amazing job. But I'm really concerned. I think that 90 percent of the report is solid. It's a good report. The one part where I'm concerned is with the mayors…But you know, I could let that one…like, I hear where the Mayor is coming from. The concerns I'm seeing now with these last-minute changes limiting the amount of speaking…I would say refer it back. Somebody refers it back, let's look at it. Let's do a…Councillor Sharma has led a process very collaboratively and I would like to keep in the spirit of that. With these changes coming forward, they're great ideas to look at, but let's do it in a proper context. That's just my thought. We have waited this long, what's going to be…and it's 10:00 at night. Just my thought. I spoke to it, so I can't refer it.

**Deputy Speaker:** That's exactly what I was checking on. I didn't know if you were actually putting a motion to refer. Remember, to move a motion to refer, you can't do that after you start speaking. So, just FYI for the future or if anybody else considering that.

**Councillor Mayes:** So, if I move to refer and it's rejected, I can then speak?

**Deputy Speaker:** If you just…a motion to refer, you can just do…you can put that…you can put that down right now.

**Councillor Mayes:** Yeah, I'll move to…can I give rationale for that?

**Deputy Speaker:** You have three minutes.

**Councillor Mayes:** Alright. So, we have a number of items compound. I do want to support, you know, recommendation two, the recommendation part of this motion, but I don't really want to support the other thing about limiting to five minutes. We've got a bunch of compounded motions here in front of us at 10:00 at night. Also, I'm at a loss as to how shorter meetings with less public input satisfies the criteria of having more public accessibility and more accessibility for disadvantaged groups. Someone is going to have to explain how we'll cut your speaking time in half, there, that increases your…that increases your accessibility to Council meetings. It defies common sense, frankly. The goal here, if we want to have super short meetings, let's, you know, meet once a year. Like, surely the idea of shorter meetings equals more democracy doesn't really hang together too well. I mean, when I was a school trustee, we met at least twice a month. So, we could do that if people are so concerned. So, anyway, I do think referring it back maybe we can clear up some of this. I do not know why EPC didn't do some of this, frankly. You've got this pretty high stakes thing about five EPC members or six EPC members that wasn't done at EPC. So, now we have this double-edged motion from two members of EPC. So, frankly, given the hour and given all of these different competing motions and the different…so, apparently, I will have…if I come in delegation, I can speak for five minutes now at a committee and yet, we're rebuked for not asking enough questions when we…before we come here. We're supposed to go to committees and ask questions, but we'll cut your time in half. Also, public hearings, you are supposed to have, what, the developer come in and explain in five-minutes? Or are we giving developers some carte blanche to speak as long as they want and they'll bring six or eight people from their firm in and then they'll consolidate time? I mean, we're making some pretty serious changes to public hearing format here, as well. We did have a unique 16-person public hearing. I can't even remember if we had five-minutes on the malls and corridors. Perhaps we did and perhaps we will have to again when we get to the week in hell in June. But regardless, that is kind of an exception to people want to come and to talk about licensing their cat or something, I don't think that we need to give them half the amount of time that we do now. So, I'll move to refer. I have no great desire to keep working on this anymore than we have to, but this complicated motions here. Like, I'm supporting part of this, but then I have to vote against the whole thing because I don't think Council members should have only five minutes. But in the future, I am supposed to ask more questions, but I'll have less time to do it. So, I mean, I will move to refer and if that fails, I'll speak to it.

**Deputy Speaker:** So, the motion on the floor right now is to refer this back to Governance. All in support? No, there's no debate. What? Okay, sorry, I am learning on the fly. Councillor Sharma gets three minutes to rebut.

**Councillor Sharma:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There seems to be quite a bit of interest of folks wanting to speak. I saw the speaker's list you were putting together. This is a very important report that's come to Council. It's the last report on the agenda today. Again, lots of interest of folks that want to speak to it. Let's not shirk our responsibilities, I would support sending this back to the Governance Committee for 60 days. I think there was a 90-day clause in here. 60 or 90. Up to…up to 90, maybe we can say that, and we can bring it back in 60. I would support that.

**Deputy Speaker:** I'll get right back to you, Ross. Councillor Eadie, sorry. 60 days. Okay. The referral would become…if it is passed, it would be 60 days we would come back. But Councillor Eadie, you had a question?

**Councillor Eadie:** I don't believe I get to debate it but…

**Deputy Speaker:** No.

**Councillor Eadie:** I just, for…I couldn't quite hear, Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma. She said she's in support of referral?

**Deputy Speaker:** That is correct.

**Councillor Eadie:** Okay, alright, thank you. Recorded vote.

**Councillor Sharma:** Yeah, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to say, Councillor Eadie couldn't hear me. Yes, I do support it going back if that is the will of Council. And we had a very collaborative meeting last year. Saying that we had a collaborative meeting, so sending it back would allow us to look at some of these things together.

**Deputy Speaker:** All in favour of the referral, please stand.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

Councillors Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Rollins, Schreyer, Wyatt, Sharma and Deputy Speaker Councillor Orlikow.

**Nays**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes and Santos.

**City Clerk:** The vote Mr. Deputy Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 8. The vote to refer is lost.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay, the voting to refer has been lost. It's a tie. Councillor Mayes, you are up.

**Councillor Mayes:** Okay. I don't think I've seen that before where the mover and the…the mover wants to refer it back. But alright, so we play it out. I would support the Gilroy/Rollins motion. I would support deleting the recommendation two in its entirety and replacing it with the following, the business about the size of EPC. EPC traditionally has had one more member. The Mayor ran on having one fewer member. He has always been, frankly, had the legal ability to appoint someone else if he wanted to. They don't have to chair a committee. I was on EPC not chairing a committee. Various other people in this room probably the same. So, but then we have to start parsing out the votes, because I don't support the next bit of business about how, you know, we should be limited to five minutes because in Burnaby they'd speak for 18 seconds or in Burlington they speak for 93 seconds and it's got 500,000 people. I don't know. I mean, is that really the problem? Do we have a lot of people at the door saying, you know what really alienates me? It's not the tax increases or the potholes, it's…you guys allow 10 people…10 minutes for people to speak. So, we have this whole thing about how we're going to increase accessibility of Council and more democracy and more…but the first step to do that is to slash in half the amount of time people can speak. Slash in half our ability to speak when we come to committee. But also, make sure we're rebuked if we get up at Council because we haven't asked enough question at the lower-level committees. So, I mean, tell me how that's going to work. I guess you can come in and rush through your five-minute presentation and get maybe five more minutes. Anyway, I guess the goal here is to shorten everything up as much as we can and then we'll claim that is more democratic or something. I am glad that Councillor Duncan can get information. I'm glad you can. I have been here over 13 years, I had to file an FOI request because I was told that the feds have to sign off on you getting anything under half. It was complete bullshit, if you'll pardon the language. I'll retract that. It was complete nonsense because it didn't say so in the report. And luckily within two days, three days, I got a report from Mr. Armbruster and somebody else who understands the law saying, yeah, you can have the report. It's 51 pages, there you go. It's

completely…nothing controversial about it, frankly. It was a good report. So, I'm glad other people are having access…no problems with access to information. That's terrific. Maybe that isn't the case for everybody here though. So, I don't think there's a conscious effort here to make things less democratic. But really, as our big…is our big impediment…like, we're…let's get the stopwatch out and average time of meetings. Fine, let's have a shorter lunch break then. Let's…we have shortened up the pregame announcements to the credit of the Speaker, because those used to go on for about an hour before the meeting started. So, at least we can…she cut me off today, to her credit, actually. I could have gone on longer. So, I mean, there are some improvements we could make in process, certainly, but really, like, the point of this is to speak as quickly and get out of the door as quickly as possible? I remember saying once in here it's been a long day and it was like 4:00 in the afternoon. We had Tom Brodbeck denouncing me at length. Well, how would you know what a long day is, you people? Like, the point here is not to have the quickest meeting possible. I mean, I really don't understand how that's more democratic. Surely the point here is not to discourage people from coming because you only have five minutes. Does that really come up a lot at the door? Does that really, like, galvanize the public? Like, they're upset that we give them…what seems to be the reverse, actually, we've seen publicity saying, why are you cutting the times for the public to speak? So, no, I don't agree with the second part of the Duncan/Browaty motion, I do agree with the first part. So, I guess we'll have to break that out since we're not referring it out. So, and on the item as a whole; I mean, yes, certainly I would like to see a planning commission but there's some general talk…discussion of that in here. But I do think that we need to seriously look at the way we have dealt with planning matters. But I guess we'll probably have fewer appeals now that we're moving to an as of right regime for virtually all zoning issues, so be it. The…the…I mean, there are some positive things in here, certainly. And I don't know how this will play out with terms of mayoral appointments. I don't really know. We will see how that works out. But I have to say, the idea that our main problem here is not billion-dollar capital projects. Our main problem is not potholes or reconciliation or any…our main problem is we're letting people talk too much. Just seems to me almost…almost comical, frankly. So, let's have these meetings. If Councillor Schreyer wants to talk, he can talk. If I want to talk, I can talk. If somebody thinks that is story time, I don't really give a good…I really don't care. I'll say, people elect me, if they want to un-elect me, they can un-elect me. They can un-elect Councillor Schreyer for all we know. But we have the right to speak to these items. Some of them are quite, you know, these are historic items, some of the things we deal with. They're over a billion dollars, some of the things we deal with. So, no, I don't think that we should be cutting back time so we can maybe beat, you know, Vancouver and average length of meetings. Get the stop watch out. Like, really, that's…that's democracy? You know, like I find this sort of hard to quite comprehend, frankly. So, yeah, let's…I'm prepared to sit here for long meetings. If others aren't, well, I guess, you know, they can always leave. So, I will support the Gilroy motion with Rollins. And I guess we'll have to start parsing out different parts. I assume we're not voting clause by clause on the entire thing. Most of it is fine with me, I just don't want to cut back the amount of time that councillors can speak to items or that the public can speak to items. And by saying people at public hearings and delegation are limited to five minutes, that is us too and that's developers who are coming in with massive projects. Yeah, you got five minutes. I don't think that makes for good decision making. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Acting Speaker.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Moving onto the list and we'll just pass over Councillor Eadie because that's the kind of guy I am. No, we will get back to him when he returns to the chamber. But Councillor Chambers, you are up.

**Councillor Chambers:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise today in support of this motion, the amending motion by Councillors Duncan and Browaty. The five-minute…reducing the five-minute…or reducing the speaking time down to five minutes, I think really pushes individuals to be focused. Yeah, forces people to be focused in terms of the topic of discussion. Back in 2016, I went back to university to take public sector management. And the difference between my time in the '80s when I went to university and the time when I went to…in 2016 back to university, was when doing papers, you know, back in the '80s it was a struggle to put words on a page. But then, in 2016, when I went back to university and wrote papers, it…like, pages and pages of information came through. It's about life experience, I believe, or what I added that…that to. One of the exercises was relating a specific message but only with a certain amount of words; 2,000 words. And getting your point across within that 2,000 words. And I believe that's the intent of what we have here is to get people to focus on their topic, or points of discussion and relay that to this council. Much like us as councillors when we speak on different items. And, again, we have the added of getting that information, whether it's through our Public Service or whether it's reviewing the report online once it's released and posted. So, we have the opportunity to really dissect our statements and make sure that the salient points are coming through. And that's why I'm supporting this motion. With respect to the restructuring or allowing Council to structure its council with EPC and the appointments, we have to acknowledge the fact that the roles of DM and ADM, and I'm not bringing this up because I'm in that role, but we have to recognize the fact that it doesn't end at a 9:00 to 5:00 type of role. We're often asked, even as mayor, as deputy mayor, as acting deputy mayor and even as councillors to attend different events, whether it's after our work hours in the evenings, or on the weekends. So, we have to recognize that there's a lot more work to these roles than it is just 9:00 to 5:00, coming in, receiving information, sitting in council sessions, sitting in committee meetings, or sitting on boards that we're appointed to. There is a lot more to it. So, having it consolidated to five people I think is too much for that…for those individuals to take on that much responsibility as Councillor Duncan…or Councillor Dobson alluded to earlier during his…his talking

points. So, again, I'm supportive of the motion to reduce to five minutes. I'm also supportive of the motion that allows us to structure our own committees. But I would just draw caution to consolidating it down too small and having too much burden of responsibility for one individual. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Yes, sir?

**Councillor Mayes:** Request for clarification. The total speaking time for delegations and public hearing representation. So, that would mean when the administration speaks here in June, public hearing, public hearing, when they're speaking here at the public hearing starting June 2nd, they would have five minutes for the presentation? Okay. Thank you. On rezoning 150,000 properties, okay. Five-minute presentation. Thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** Go ahead.

**Councillor Duncan:** Point of information, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may.

**Deputy Speaker:** By all means, go ahead.

**Councillor Mayes:** It's already set to five minutes. We voted on that.

**Deputy Speaker:** Again, I'm not going to enter in too much debate. No. The applicant.

**Councillor Mayes:** (Inaudible)**…**for the position. Five minutes. Very good.

**Deputy Speaker:** The applicant only gets five minutes which would be…yeah. Okay. Councillor Eadie, are you ready to go? We skipped you over, but just…but we can come back to you if you are not ready yet.

**Councillor Eadie:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I would just like to say, you're sounding really good in that chair. Thank you. No, really. Alright. Where to begin? Five-minute…anyway. Councillor Wyatt mentioned today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and you were here, you moved a motion in 2017. It's gone through a lot of work from the Public Service, MMP, all of this work was done. It was supported by, I think, Councillor Lukes as well, was very supportive of trying to look at changing governance and how that all works, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And there's not going to be any perfection here, okay? None. There's no achieving a unanimous decision here on the governance model. And I want to thank Madam Speaker, Councillor Sharma. She's been overseeing this and paying a lot of attention to it, along with Mr. Clerk, and the support there. And it's not perfect what's being proposed in the main report, but I'm willing to live with it because, you know, I was here when there was five EPC chairpersons. And Councillor Swandel never had a problem being the Deputy Mayor and the Chair of Finance, I believe it is, because the stand…SPC on Finance, while it has economic development now on that, that's a role that…it's a lot of work. But it's also one that does allow for being the Deputy Speaker or Assistant Deputy Speaker. You could say it's elitist or whatever you want to say. You can say there's a strong mayor model. And when the mayor speaks to this, he's going to explain to us what a real…a mayor who has real power. We don't know who is the mayors into the future, but I can say while I've disagreed with our current mayor on many fronts for many times, but there is an attempt to work with all Council members. Whether you think it is or not, I know it's a sincere attempt to try to do that. And so, I think anybody who…and actually, Councillor Duncan's motion to talk about letting Council decide a number of these things through 16 members of Council vote. Some are saying that the Mayor always has, like, more…too much power. But the thing is, who knows what it looks like after the next election. The Mayor could get elected and maybe there…maybe there's a bunch of people who say, well, Mayor, you know, maybe I don't want to be a Chairperson unless you change things. That could happen. Every one of us members of Council has an ability to vote, you know, a certain way. You know, you might…some people might decide that, well, you know, you shouldn't be on EPC. Well, the thing is, we as members of Council, we have an independent source of backing in each of our wards. Okay? We are elected there. Yes, the Mayor is elected over the whole city. But if I'm campaigning on a bunch of issues that isn't necessarily in agreement with whoever becomes the Mayor, I should maintain my independence. You try to work with each other to serve the citizens of Winnipeg, which we all do. We all have a sincere want to serve Winnipeggers to the best of our ability as governance or governors over the corporation called the City of Winnipeg. I don't want to limit the amount of time to speak. I think that our speaker and deputy speaker have an ability and people should listen because they're in the authority position to make decisions as to whether or not you are on debate or not. And I was concerned about today's discussion debate, question period, whatever it is. There's a certain structure and how it's supposed to work and we should follow it. It's not a place for a back and forth debate between two councillors who may or may not agree with each other. And, anyway, so I'm just going to conclude and say, I'm not voting for either one of the amendments to the report. I'm going to respect all the work that…like, how many years? How many years? You know, it's not the best, but it's what was worked on with…actually, you know, two different councils. And, yeah, I'll leave it at that. I'm just voting for the main report as Speaker Sharma has presented as the city councillor at the moment. Thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Moving on, I have Councillor Lukes and then in the batter's box, Mr. Mayor.

**Councillor Lukes:** Okay. Thank you very much. I want to thank Councillor Wyatt and Eadie who, according to my records, it was 2018…2018, that brought forward a motion to have the City conduct a governance review. In the motion, they cited the years of the previous governance reviews; 1976, 1986, 1997. So, in 2019, the City embarked on the process. In 2019. And now today, 28 years after the last governance review was held, we have before us a report. I want to thank chief Clerk Gameiro who has been the lead on this file organizing the many, many meetings of the Governance Committee with various presenters. So professional. Keeping everyone in line as we work through the process to update policies and procedures on how we should govern. And to Councillor Sharma for chairing many, many, many lively meetings. And as Councillor Sharma noted, we have made many significant changes. I'm not going to go through them. Now, I have said a lot about the need for a governance review. I have lobbied hard to see it happen. I have written pages on it. Made many videos on it. And really been passionate about updating the model we have. My inspiration to work so hard on governance came primarily from the very, very weak leadership of the former Mayor. And the lack of understanding and comprehension on how teams work. And the inability not to be able to work with all members of a Council, whether you agreed with them or not. And also, what motivated me was the abuse of the intent of the Charter with the creation of EPC plus two, which was used to eliminate the need to even speak to some councillors. But we've moved on from that, thank goodness. I am pleased to say we've done some very good changes to better the decision-making process at City Hall and improve transparency, access and accountability for residents. I will say, I would like to have seen the implementation of a planning commission sooner than later, but that discussion will come at some point. I have now been elected for three terms and currently a total of about almost 11 years. I have seen a lot and experienced a lot of different political styles from the 15 councillors or more over the years. And I have observed the focus and the priorities of councillors and how they focus locally, and how they focus city-wide. And I have observed and I have been involved in great leadership initiatives and admittedly some unnecessary initiatives. I have worked on many issues that have required significant compromises. And also, been involved on many initiatives where no compromises occurred. I have also been on EPC, removed from EPC, back on EPC. And now I've come to the conclusion, like Councillor Eadie, that, really, no one particular model is perfect. I have looked at other cities with different models. I have reviewed them in the report. I have watched other council meetings. I have spoken with councillors from other cities. And what I have concluded under any model that what really is important is to have a strong leader who is able to work with all councillors. That plays a huge role in good governance. It is very important for the citizens of Winnipeg to elect a mayor who has the insight and wisdom to understand that every single councillor brings value to a discussion. The value of leadership cannot be understated. One person, a councillor or a mayor, cannot make changes that are needed. But a mayor with strong leadership skills and strong ethical principles and values who acts in a way that are considered right, fair and just is key to working with councillors in the governance and leadership of our city. Again, I want to thank all the councillors who worked so hard on the governance review. I am done with it, this is it. It was an incredible experience being so involved on what I always thought was such a dry and uninspiring issue. I will not be supporting Motion No. 4. Oh no, wait a minute here. I won't be supporting Motion No. 3 and I will be supporting Motion No. 4. Thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Moving on our list, just if anybody hasn't put their hand up yet, which I don't think many haven't, I have Mr. Mayor next, Councillor Browaty, Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Allard. Go ahead, Mr. Mayor.

**Mayor Gillingham:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And if I may say, I think we all agree you're doing a good job. So, thank you very much for stepping in. I want to, first of all, address the overall report and express through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my appreciation to Councillor Sharma for her leadership in this governance review. The Governance Committee has had several meetings over many, many months, years even, to deal with this review. So, it's been a very comprehensive look. Not easy by any stretch of the imagination. So, I do want to commend the councillor and thank Councillor Sharma again. And I will be supporting…there's so much in here that…that I do support. In fact, I will support all of it, even the change, you know, to the Audit Committee. The idea of requiring the political direction to amend administrative reports to really…to be, in essence, codified. We've…as Councillor Sharma indicated, that is a practice that I adopted and we do now on a…when this…when it's…when any change is made, we record it, it ends up recorded in the final report. So, I want to thank everyone for their work. As to Council, I will start with a Motion No. 4 and thank Councillor Duncan and Browaty for this motion. I want to just spend some time commenting on it. Quite frankly, and I think Councillor, you know, Lukes mentioned this, one of the reasons I think that 2A has come forward is because of a past practice of establishing…a mayor establishing a voting bloc. Let's call it what it was. A mayor, six EPC members, that's seven. Add a Deputy Mayor and Acting Deputy Member outside of EPC, bloc them up, you've got nine. It's a practice that has been used. I committed to not using that practice. I don't use that practice. I will not use that practice. And I hope, you know, speaking frankly that if…as I look at it, if…right now, I'm…as the mayor at this point, not the problem. Then I would certainly support Councillor Duncan's motion to establish really that the City Council can set its own committee structure and composition and that could be dealt with at another time. We do have a form of strong mayor model here. It is certainly not…it's not what Ontario strong mayor model is, for example, where there, and I'm not asking for this, the strong mayor model is the mayor drafts the budget. Has veto power over council votes. Can hire and fire the CAO, statutory officers and

department directors. Can create and reorganize the structure of the municipality. Can propose by-laws directly to Council and only requires one-third vote to pass them. So, that's…that's the strong mayor structure in Ontario. So, what we have here is a form of but it's certainly not that nor am I asking for that. You have…when we look at the fact that we're 28 months now into this term. In that 28-months, over half of the members of Council have served on EPC. Eight members of Council have served on EPC. 11 out of 15 members of Council have been on the Budget Working Group. It's by no means perfect, but I do try hard and will continue to try hard to work with every member of Council, because I do value the contributions and input of every member of Council. When I look at the structure of EPC and the work…the structure we have around here, I really, sincerely don't see it through a power lens. I really do see it through an effectiveness and responsibility lens. And a while ago I was having a discussion with my staff member as they were going over the calendar invitations and requests for the mayor to attend things. And you all know this because you're all very busy as councillors. You have more requests to attend events than you could ever get to, I know this. One of my staff members said, well, for every one event we say yes to, we have to say no to five because you just can't be there. So, I do…please keep this in mind. When I am looking at spreading the responsibility of work around and opportunity around, as mayor, I'm just telling you straight up, this is how I'm doing it, is that when I look at the members of EPC, whomever they are, they're first Council members representing the 50,000 people in their ward, taking all the calls, all the emails. Then, on top of that, and a lot of you have been committee Chairs or Speaker, you know the workload with being a committee chair add on top of that. And then to say, oh, by the way, would you go represent the city at 40 or 50 events a year, please, as an Acting Deputy Mayor or Deputy Mayor? You've got…Councillor Chambers says more than that. So, it's a concentration of responsibility and concentration of workload. And add to that, I think, too, when we look at what Councillor Duncan has said, we don't know what the future holds with the growth of our city. And so, I think to codify into the Charter saying it can only be five members, I think would be...I think it would be shortsighted on our part. So, I do appreciate this amendment here and will be supporting that. I won't speak at length about the second part, which is to limit councillors, you know, and mayors speaking time to five minutes. I do support that. I know not everyone agrees that, and that's…I respect that. It's…I don't see more words as synonymous with more democracy. I've referred to this before, the Gettysburg address, one of the most influential, memorable speeches, effective speeches in all of history, 272 words, two minutes to deliver. I really think...ironically, I've taken more time than I usually do, but I really think we as members of this body can say what we need to say effectively in five minutes and a two-minute extension. That's my view. I think we do a service, actually, to the residents of our community as well. So, with that, I'll be supporting the main item with amendment number four. I won't support three. I think…I think people can get that information from Clerks. I don't know that we need a 90-day report back. So, thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Moving on to Councillor Browaty.

**Councillor Browaty:** Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I won't take a lot of time here today. I just want to thank, again, the Speaker, the Clerk's Department, the Governance Committee for their work on this over the years. I mean, it's been different governance committees and everything that's been involved in this. Just in relation to...in regards to Motion No. 4, I agree, I don't think we need to necessarily have the Province take on additional powers that dictate what we can and can't do here at 510 Main. And on the item of speaking time, I'm guilty sometimes of rambling on too much. I really don't think we need to...I really don't think we need to have ten minutes. If you can't...if you can't…99 percent of the time, if you can't get your point across in five minutes, you're not going to get it across in an hour. I really don't think it's a good use of our time to allow everybody to speak for that long. I think there's a lot of good reasons. I mean, again, whether we have one or two Council meetings a month, maybe at some point we'll need to consider that. Going until 10 o'clock at night or 10:30 at night isn't necessarily a good, healthy way to have our debates and have our meetings. But also, just in terms of the media cycle, having discussions here at 10:30 at night, it's kind of hard to get attention to some of the important issues we're discussing moving our city forward. I can tell you, back when our Council meetings were done, you know, before lunch, everything that was discussed during that Council meeting could be in the next day's paper or on the 6:00 o'clock news, for that matter. By rambling on as long as we are sometimes, it's not good, conducive to have both members of the public and the media engaged with what we're doing here at City Hall. So, just another comment as to why, you know, again, I seconded the motion here from Councillor Duncan. With that said, I'm going to sit down. Thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Councillor Schreyer.

**Councillor Schreyer:** (Inaudible) I didn't bring it up, so, you know, the Lincoln's brief speech. That's because the guy before him spoke for an hour or something like that. So, yeah, that was a good idea. Having said that, the Lincoln-Douglas debates were known for being very long, very articulate, rather substantial. He talked a lot. So, I'm not sure in terms of the relevance of that here because I have to vote on policies minute by minute here, and I'm really influenced by the people in this circle. I'm extremely grateful to the words that I've heard in this council chamber that I weren't going to...that I wasn't…(inaudible) wasn't going to happen offline. And I wasn't going to get it in an offline behind closed doors seminar with the administration. Sometimes I'm dependent on the people in this room to condense it down to whatever time they need within eight minutes or so to explain something to me. And I have been extremely grateful to a few of the councillors

over the years that I've been here. Extremely. And they didn't do it in five minutes. And it happens every single Council meeting. I am very grateful because I'm going to get the information in this room and nowhere else. And that's our responsibility. So, they were doing they're job. I've been inspired. I've been educated in this room. They did their jobs. What I don't need is story time when we're condensing it down to glib platitudes where we just rationalize our position that we've already created, that we've already decided on before we get here. I don't need slogans. I do not need a rationalization of one's position. If someone's going to explain…bother explaining why they are voting somewhere, some…some…whatever position they have, let them bring it out. Let them explain and develop their thought process. And by the way, when that happens, usually when it comes to politics, it didn't happen just from the here and now. What a chaotic point of view to have. It didn't just happen now or six weeks ago, whatever. It took time for things to evolve to this point in which we can develop some sort of pattern of how things are evolving. That's how things work. It's not just my perspective. That's literally how it works. And if you doubt that, why did Mayor Gillingham bother to talk about 100 years ago when they built, you know, our…our…our sewage treatment plant in the first place? Because everything we do, everything we're talking about, everything we're dealing with happened in the past unless we're creating it for the future. I don't need to hear from His Worship. I don't need to hear from His Worship that the reason for construction inflation is, in his words here, was COVID labour costs and other factors. I don't need to hear that. I need to hear what the other factors are. And I need to hear what he means by "labour costs". And if he needs to develop that in a few minutes, extra minutes, I'm sitting here with bated breath. Because I tell you, that will influence my thoughts. I don't need to hear from a fellow councillor that all inflation rates are going up. Oh, everything is going up. It's not true. So, when we talk about it, I need that councillor to say what things are going up and what things aren't. And if it takes more than an extra three minutes, I'm all ears. It's music to my ears because that is literally seriously responsible communication. That's our job to do. So, I need my fellow councillors to explain themselves because they actually mean something to me. I actually…don't actually make up my opinions on how I'm going to vote until I hear my fellow councillors. And I know I'm not the only one. I am influenced by the speeches, and I sure hope everybody else is too. And sometimes it just happens to be you can't do it in five minutes. And that's just life. You go to a class, you take a class in anything, you think you're going to learn it all in five minutes? No, you're going to take 45 minutes every single day, six hours a day for years. And they don't even...aren't making decisions like we are as city councillors. So, it's pretty important, at least for the record. It's not just merely for the record to say a few words to rationalize your position. I really expect us to explain ourselves, and not just everything happened in the last six months. Oh, no, I have been extremely grateful for Brian Mayes over time for giving us a chronology of how things have happened, how we arrived there. But you know what? Sometimes it's even longer than that. And that's a fact. So, we have that responsibility. And by the way, we do have a strong mayor model in this city, and it does impact the dynamic of communication here at City Hall and amongst the Council members. And on that basis, bear that in mind in terms of how many...what councillors have...how many…how many minutes they speak. We're a little different. So, just bear that in mind. If you want to have this model, bear in mind, we have this model. It's not wrong that maybe it comes with people that have a little extra obligation to explain themselves at the time before we vote. It really means a lot to me, and I don't think it's just me. Excuse me if we get bored. I don't know what to say. You know, we might have a different perspective of how we think and how we arrive at our conclusions, but I stand by everything I say. And I'm going to say it again, when we are educated to be this, that…this, that…the specialists that we rely on, how many hours do they spend in university or whatever trade it is before? And I don't think we talk about in terms of a glib five minutes. It's pretty substantial. You might not like the substance, but there's a difference between giving a…giving an explanation over time to show things evolve, to show where we're at, and that...there's a difference between that and telling stories. Anecdotes are told here whether it's a longer one or a short one. But I guarantee you…What can I tell you? I stand by my words and I stand by how I come by my position. And sometimes in that process, I'm literally quoting my fellow councillors. And excuse me if that takes time. Thank you, miigwech. And as for the other things, Madam...Mr. Deputy Speaker; you know, I'm kind of ambivalent about these whole…these other things a little…you know…you know, ambivalence. I mean, I'm on both sides of this thing in a sense that…in the sense that I don't really care whether we...I'm not really certain that we should be restricting…restricting the number of councilmembers, eh? So, there you go. Point being told, might as well tell you that as well, since I'm here. Thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** I'm not seeing a new amending motion that miigwech means we're done speaking, but we're going to carry on. The last on the list is Councillor Allard.

**Councillor Allard:** Thank you. En français. It looks like…It looks like our interpreter is away for her evening. Go figure. Maybe if we had had five-minute speeches…Yeah. So, well, thanks, everyone, for your attention. It's late, so I will attempt to get my speech done in five minutes, if that is possible for me, given…given all the speeches that have happened. So, it's Councillor…Councillor Chambers was speaking about how loquacious Councillor Chambers had become over time, and how at first the words were few and I've had the same experience where I...you know, at first when I started public speaking I really didn't know how to say things in more than a sentence, and then you get experience and then the challenge is trying to keep that compressed. So, I did share that experience. And I have been doing some…some course work informally. I did Confessions of a Public Speaker on Audible. Recommend it. It stated that don't speak more than ten minutes. You lose your audience, even within the ten minutes. In that book, they say to use things like silence to get

people's attention, for example. So, I think I did get some people's attention with that silence. But I think you can get your point across in five minutes. I think if members of the public have five minutes, I think five minutes is okay for councillors. We can always suspend the rules. As Councillor Duncan said, Council is supreme. I do...well, I want to thank the Mayor for his support of the idea of an audit committee. I think that's positive for transparency and accountability, having a separate committee with two members that are not a part of Executive Policy Committee to sit on the audit committee, putting a bit of distance from the executive and the audit function. So, if this report passes, I hope it does, that would be one of the many changes being recommended. I want to thank all the members of the…of the Governance Committee. I, like Councillor Lukes, have been on EPC, off of EPC. And well, governance was the one committee where I got to meet with a group of councillors, and I really appreciated the opportunity to do that at that time. I think Councillor Lukes and I got to know each other a little bit better on that committee and well, work on...well, on...have healthy debates on what we wanted to move forward. And a lot of this report is...well, it's the work of the committee that you see today. So, I do hope…I do hope we don't throw the baby out with the bath water today. So, I will…I will not be supporting the Motion 3, and the reason for that is that I believe, as I've stated before, that a smaller executive actually means more power to the…to the presiding officer. And if you take a metaphor, think of a council of 15 and getting…getting unanimity with 15 people versus one, two or three, or five or seven. I think the bigger the number gets the harder it is to get your agenda through. So, you know, baking that into the charter I don't think is a good idea. So, I don't think we should...you know, as somebody stated before we...the current…the current mayor…today's mayor excluded from the conversation, future mayors I think would be more powerful if this were baked into the Charter, to have a smaller executive. So, I don't think that's a good thing. And the other thing is that we...you know, this...for the next motion, limiting speaking time, I'm already…I'm already through the five minutes. So, I think I could have gotten a speech done in five minutes. But given that...well, that I'm used to 10 and I have 10, I'm getting into…into the time, and I think I could have gotten it done sooner. So, I will support Motion 4, removing the...removing the baking in the smaller executive into the Charter, or asking the Province to do so, and I think five minutes is ample time to get your point across as a city councillor. I did have a few notes. By the way, Confessions of a Public Speaker says to practise your speech because when you're speaking and you're not sure what you want to say, you have to factor in the compounding effects of all the people that are watching you and multiply that by the number of people that are listening, so in this case at least 15. So, 15 you know, times 10, that's 150 minutes of time every time I make a ten-minute speech, so thank you for that. Thank you for that opportunity. Congratulations, Councillor Lukes. This was your thing. And if it passes, then you...well, you got your way. And I think that's it. I think I've made it clear where I stand on the two motions, and I hope…I hope that this report passes. I think there's a lot of good reforms to it that a committee of five, six councillors were able to agree on with a couple of changes with the amending motions. So, I'll be supporting what I said I would. Thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** Councillor Allard, remember, as you see on the clock, it's eight minutes you get to speak, so you were doing fine.

**Councillor Allard:** Oh, yeah.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay, that's it. Anybody else wishing to speak before we figure out the vote thing? Because I'm hearing a lot of different things. Councillor...I mean, Speaker Sharma, Councillor Sharma, as your title is right now in that seat, she gets to speak. And then we go backwards, right. And then, so it will be…first it will be…order, first it will be to close with Councillor Duncan and then it will Councillor Gilroy and then to close it will be Councillor Sharma. Go ahead. You got...I'm kidding.

**Councillor Duncan:** Appreciate all the different thoughts around the table here, primarily focused around the reduction of speaking time to five minutes with a two-minute extension. And for those counting at home, that's seven minutes down from ten minutes. At the end of the day, this is not about shortening meetings. This is about being more efficient, especially in our jobs as representing the public, speaking for the public, but being efficient in what we're saying to the public. I mean, if you have folks watching at home, that's great. I'm sure they are cheering everybody on, but the general public is not watching. Everybody's tuned out. There's 850,000 people that live in our city. We might be under 30 people now watching this live. You know, the argument of, well, people go back and watch. I mean, I even…I even looked up what's the most-watched Council meeting since…I can only put it on myself, since I was elected in 2022, 931 views on one single Council meeting. That's...that could be mom and dad watching ten times. 93 times. So, at the end of the day, when it comes to the, you know, the people presenting, you know, it was brought up about in our public hearing for the HAF, if the applicant, you know, they are limited to five, but let's be serious around this table, then you can ask as many questions as you want. There are no restrictions on that. Question after question after question. We've seen it happen. It still is going to happen. Again, coming back to efficiency, getting to the point, I feel this is a reasonable motion. I respect that folks disagree around this table, but this is not limiting democracy. I look at it the opposite way. This is encouraging people to be involved but not just for the five minutes that they are standing there or listening to their friend, hopefully this becomes something and somebody pointed out about media as well where, holy smokes, you got to watch Council. There's a lot that goes on and it doesn't take up 11 hours...sorry, 13 hours of your day now. Again, I know this is a change. Change is hard. We talked

about a lot of change today, but this is something that hopefully will make people get to the point. That will make people think about what they're going to say before, because to Councillor Chambers' point, in most other places in the world where you have to speak or write something, there are limitations. And the argument about this is too much of a limitation, we already have a limitation of 10 minutes. This is seven minutes. We can do this. We're the professionals in this. A lot of you have been sitting around this table for an extended period of time. I hope to be as well-versed in as much as you are some day. I promise I will keep it to seven minutes.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Four minutes and 59 seconds.

**Councillor Mayes:** I just wanted to make sure. So…

**Deputy Speaker:** Point of what?

**Councillor Mayes:** Point of…so, endless questions are...the only people who really have any limit on the time then will be the councillors because delegations, the administration can speak...

**Deputy Speaker:** Yeah, no, it's...

**Councillor Mayes:** I'm asking for clarity for the comment he just made, which was endless questions can come forward and people can speak as long as they want. The practical impact is the only people then who are limited would be us. I'm asking...if you're going to get up and say that...

**Deputy Speaker:** That's not a point of order. He made his comments as is. So, I've just been informed, it's not a point of order, so we're going to move on. Anyone else before we go? Hey? Okay, Councillor…Councillor Gilroy, go ahead.

**Councillor Gilroy:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to just talk about what I heard to close up here. First of all, there isn't a generation of councillors that don't complain about the strong mayor model. And we can pat ourselves on the back, but what we have here is not changing a damn thing. It's basically what we got now. So, my motion was really trying to look at, because the Mayor, and not talking about this Mayor. Let's put yourself...putting the person around here the most that you disagree with. Make them Mayor, if you want, to really think about this, but they have other things that they can appoint, like the Chair of the Police Board, like NASCO, like the Human Rights Committee. There is lots of different discretions that the Mayor has. This is looking at those discretions, and let's have a dialogue on that to see if Council can appoint some. So, we're not changing the strong mayor model, we still have it. So, like, just so you're clear. And on another point, I really want Councillor Dobson to really hear this because this is really important. The motion that Councillor...that our Chair, it's a late night, that Councillor Sharma has put forward is really, actually, just limiting the mayor. We can have as many standing policy committees we want. As a council, we can say we want a standing policy committee on building and, you know what? What this is doing is limiting it so that maybe now Council actually appoints the Chair. So, they might say, Councillor Dobson, we think you're chair…you should be the chair. So, this is just limiting it. We could have way more standing policy committees if we really want to. But it's important that we limit how much the mayor can appoint. That is what makes inclusive, equity, and us trying to work collaboratively. So, councillor, what this is saying is that we can still have other standing policy committees as council, but we…we can appoint as council, like we do at the beginning of the year at November, when we decide on who sits on what committees. So that's really important you understand that, because it's been…made it sound like we're...like we can...we're going to expand EPC. But if you expand EPC and the mayor has the power to appoint, that's not limiting his powers, it's actually increasing his powers. So, I think that that's really important to understand. So, we're really not changing anything. It's status quo, really, from what we have now. I mean, I really think that that needs to be clear. So, I really hope that you do support…at least support the motion to have us go back, have the administration come back with a list of appointments that the mayor has for us to review, then that would make a change in the power dynamic on Council. And I think that that's a true change. Right now, it's status quo. Let's make real change. We have an opportunity to do this. Generations after generations, councillors have stood here complaining about the strong mayor model. We are here. We could actually make a change. Let's do it. Like, if you really want more collaboration on Council, if you really want other councillors to be part of the debate, then show the leadership that we'll do this at Council and we'll be able to...we'll have those discussions at Council and it won't be just the mayor appointing or it won't be just the mayor deciding on the standing policy committee chairs if we do decide to expand it. Because I heard, Mr. Chair, that there was thoughts of maybe expanding it. And I've heard rumblings that we do have larger workloads. Well, we might have larger workloads. Let's expand EPC. But for heaven's sake, let's make sure that councillors are appointing those members of those standing policy committee and not the mayor because that would make it more powerful. So, we think we have less say now, imagine if we had greater powers under the strong mayor model. So, after all the fights over all these years about the strong mayor model, we basically have the status quo. So, that's a little frustrating to hear. So, I am hoping that if you really want to make a change, because we all know that we can't make the change on our own, you will support my motion looking at the appointments as well. And I'm hoping to see that because

that is what's going to make the real change. So, I'm hoping that you support that. I do want to thank the Governance Committee because I do think they went and did a lot of great work. Councillor Sharma, thank you very much. So, I hope that you support my motion. I'm not a favour...I'm not…I'm not going to be supporting Councillor Browaty and Councillor Duncan's, even though he had…almost had me for a second there with the time limits. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. Close debate will be Councillor Sharma.

**Councillor Sharma:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy speaker. I did lay out the report when I introduced the item. A lot's been said around the council chamber. Appreciate all the dialogue, especially at this hour, but it shouldn't prevent us from diving into any report, regardless of the hour. I heard some comments around how many people watch or don't watch Council. It's not just about the livestream, it's about Hansard, okay. Going back, looking at Hansard, it is done. It's there for a reason. And what folks put on the public record around this chamber matters. It matters a lot. I really appreciate the Mayor's comments today on the public record that will go on livestream, that will be in Hansard that he's not looking to have a voting bloc that we have previously seen on this City Council that many of us did not like. He stated that very clearly on the public record today. I think changes that we want to see can be accomplished by the statements that the Province of Manitoba be requested to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to allow the City to set its own committee structure and composition. That gives a lot of flexibility to do…to do things differently, even differently than we have right now. The mayor reduced the number of EPC members when he came into office. I don't see that changing any time soon, but the statement that I read out gives us the flexibility to create what we're looking for. So that would go to the Province. I am willing to support that. I am not going to be supporting the five-minute limit on speaking time. It wasn't even contemplated in the report. It's not part of the governance review, in my opinion. It's something we can look at at a future date. I do intently listen. As the Speaker, I do not have the luxury to be scrolling through my e-mail or going to my office at my pleasure. I intently sit there and listen. I've been listening for 15 years as a member of this chamber. That's what we're here to do. When a member of Council's communicating, they often communicate in different ways to get their point across. I respect that. So, I will not be…not be supporting the five-minute limit that's being proposed. Councillor Mayes had a point that he was trying to make, and it's a correct point. During delegations we ask questions. When there's speaking time, there's no point…there's no opportunity to ask Councillor Allard, Councillor Browaty, or anyone in this chamber, to clarify what they're saying. A lot of people went over five minutes today, by the way, and those same members that were looking to maybe try to support that item, the five-minute decrease. You went over five minutes today. So, as I said, lots been…a lot has been said today on this particular topic. A ton of work went into it. I want to thank our Clerks once again; Mr. Gameiro, Mr. Poitras, and your team, for all the work that went into it. Councillor Lukes, you've been a big champion of the governance review, and I think all of us have been on board to see this report through. So, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with that, let's vote on the items before us. Thank you…I'm making the request to vote for Motion 4 and break it down into the two clauses that we see before us.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Further, if I may, Mr. Deputy Speaker, further to the request made by Councillor Sharma to be consistent, I think we do the same with the Rollins/Gilroy motion. As well I would suggest that we do the same with the Governance Committee recommendations on page 2 and 3, i.e., break it down between 1 and where you have it broken down in subsection 6A, B, C, that the votes be separate.

**Deputy Speaker:** Councillor Wyatt, just been informed; no, you can do the numbers, but you can't do the subsections. So, you can't do 2A, 2B, it's just 2. So, you can do that 1, 2, 3, 4.

**Councillor Wyatt:** (inaudible) through to 8.

**Deputy Speaker:** One through to eight.

**Councillor Wyatt:** Fine.

**Deputy Speaker:** And the amending Motion 3 is just 1, 9. And then…and Item No. 4, there are two separate ones there, so those can be broken into two pieces and voted on separately. So that's the way we're going to do it, I've been told. We're first going to start with Item No. 4, amending Motion 4. Then we're going to...and it's been broken...so we're going to do it recommendation No. 1 in there is delete recommendation 2 in its entirety to replace with the following. You all have it in front of you. I don't think I have to read…read it out. So that's vote number one. So, all in favour? Sorry, go ahead Councillor…Councillor Mayes has a question.

**Councillor Mayes:** Okay, are we on Item 4, then? Sorry. Okay, and…

**Deputy Speaker:** Amending Motion No. 4, we're going to vote on each clause separately, as been requested, and then we'll go on to an option…amending number…Motion 3, which is just one. And then, there's…and then, we'll go on to the

final overall recommendation, and we'll do them separately, that's been requested. Well, nine, really, but up to ten. Okay? So, a lot of votes coming up, right? Sure. Yeah.

**Councillor Eadie:** Someone called for on this one, but can we please have a recorded vote on all this stuff?

**Deputy Speaker:** Recorded vote has been requested on all matters? So we're going to be here soon. No problem. Just a loss of…okay. So, we're going to be starting on…just so it's very clear, we're starting on Motion No. 4. We'll read it. The first one is the clauses for regarding number two in the...go ahead.

**Clerk:** Delete recommendation two in its entirety and replace with the following: 2) that the Province of Manitoba be requested to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to allow the City to set its own committee structure and composition.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay. There will be a recorded…recorded vote requested on this, on all the items. So, those in favour, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins, Santos, Sharma.

**Nays**

Councillors Eadie, Gilroy, Schreyer, Wyatt and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Orlikow.

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

**Deputy Speaker:** Fair enough. So that one…that amendment will pass. Number 2D, go ahead.

**Clerk:** Add the following new recommendation 6D. D) to set a total speaking time limit for members of Council at Council as follows: i) on any motion, the mover shall be entitled to speak for ten minutes and any other member of Council shall be entitled to speak for five minutes provided that Council may on motion without debate permit a member to speak for a further period not exceeding two minutes in addition to the regular time allowed. On closing debate, the mover of a motion shall be given eight minutes to close.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay. All in support, rise. Rise, people, rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes, Santos.

**Nays**

Councillors Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Rollins, Schreyer, Wyatt, Sharma and Mr. Deputy Speak Councillor Orlikow.

**City Clerk:** The vote Deputy Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 8.

**Deputy Speaker:** So, the motion fails. Moving on to...the clause…sorry, the clause D fails. Moving on to amending Motion No. 3, item number 9.

**Clerk:** That Item 2 of the report of the Governance Committee of Council dated March 11th, 2025, be amended by adding the following new recommendation 9 and renumbering the remaining recommendation accordingly. 9) that the Public Service be directed to report back to Council through the Governance Committee within 90 days with the following: A) a comprehensive list of all committees, boards or positions where the mayor appoints, designates or nominates a member of Council, excluding any appointment authority granted by the City of Winnipeg Charter. B) a listing of any by-laws, Council decisions or committee terms of reference that require amendments in order to transfer the appointment authority from the mayor to Council.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay, recorded vote has been called. All in favour, please rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

Councillors Eadie, Gilroy, Mayes, Rollins, Schreyer, Wyatt, Sharma and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Orlikow.

**Nays**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes and Santos.

**City Clerk:** The vote Deputy Speaker, Yeas 8, Nays 8.

**Deputy Speaker:** It appears that we have more work to do to get this too. So, amending Motion 3 fails. Clause A, 9...what? No, amending Motion 3. Yeah, come on. Break. I'm with you. Okay, so that one, so we got these two. We're going to move on now to the main motion. The request to do it line by line, but this will be, I guess we have the one that's amended then? Which would...right? Which would be 2A. So, we're not going to do that again? That's over? Okay, thank you. So number...as amended.

**City Clerk:** So, Motion 4 was to delete recommendation 2 in its entirety, part one of Motion 4. And replace with the following: that the Province be requested to amend the City of Winnipeg Charter to allow the City to set its own committee structure and composition. No, that actually passed.

**Deputy Speaker:** That passed.

**City Clerk:** So, number two of the item has already been voted on.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay. But we're not going to be…we're not going to be voting on that one. No, we don't. Okay, the ruling of the Chair is we're not voting on two, we've already done it. Thank you very much. Let's move on. I am moving on. Number two has been amended already. We voted on it. Let's move on. We've got to do…we'll start number one, go ahead…Well, again, unless someone wants to pull off that, I'm happy not to do clause-by-clause, but it's a…oh, I appreciate you.

**Councillor Eadie:** Just want to speak to the item that we already voted on, clause two. We vote on a report, why do we then vote on something that was amended on a report? Because we already voted for it, so why would we...so the point...

**Deputy Speaker:** We aren't voting on it.

**Councillor Eadie:** The point I'm trying to make is, like, like we do it when other reports are amended. Like, I don't get it…Maybe it's just because it's clause-by-clause?

**City Clerk:** We're voting clause-by-clause, Councillor. That's why.

**Councillor Eadie:** Alright. Okay.

**Deputy Speaker:** We got it enough? Don't have to like it, but you got it? Okay. Moving on. Oh, please.

**Councillor Schreyer:** They'd be cited before we vote?

**Deputy Speaker:** Yes.

**Councillor Schreyer:** Okay, thank you.

**Deputy Speaker:** So, we'll do number…and we're…we can allow our clerk to be able to do that. We'll do number one first. Go ahead.

**Clerk:** Recommendation 1) that the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to consult with the applicable area councillor prior to any report involving service cuts or land use matters within their ward being submitted to committee with the

exception of matters that are subject of a public hearing and that confirmation of the consultation be included in the report, similar to the existing process on certain real estate matters.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay. Recorded vote, everybody. Recorded vote. So, all in favour? Okay.

**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, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt, Sharma and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Orlikow.

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

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay, we're moving on now to number three.

**Clerk:** Recommendation 3) that when making appointments to the Executive Policy Committee, the mayor consider having all wards represented over time.

**Deputy Speaker:** Okay. All in support?

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins, Santos, Wyatt, Sharma and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Orlikow.

**Nays**

Councillors Duncan and Schreyer.

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

**Councillor Eadie:** They agreed with each other! Kumbaya.

**Deputy Speaker:** Alright, moving on. Go ahead.

**Clerk:** Recommendation 4) that prior to the consideration of the establishment of a planning commission, the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to Council one year after the completion of the Winnipeg Zoning By-law re-writes with an analysis on changes which impact the development application public hearing process.

**Deputy Speaker:** Thank you very much. All in favour, up.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins, Santos, Sharma and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Orlikow.

**Nays**

Councillors Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Schreyer and Wyatt.

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

**Deputy Speaker:** Item number five.

**Clerk:** Recommendation 5) that the Indigenous Relations Division be encouraged to facilitate annual discussions between Indigenous elders and Council regarding pertinent issues.

**Deputy Speaker:** All in support, rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillor Duncan.

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

**Deputy Speaker:** So passes. Moving on to number six.

**Clerk:** Recommendation 6) that the Procedure By-law no. 50/2007, be amended: A) to formalize the process for the granting of leaves of absence for members of Council at Council and committee meetings to include the following reasons: i) personal matter, ii) city business. B) i) to require that when members of Council arrive at Council and committee meetings after the start of the meeting, the time in which they enter the meeting be recorded in the minutes. ii) to require members of Council to advise Council or committee if they will be leaving the meeting prior to adjournment and the time in which they leave be recorded in the minutes. C) to set a total speaking time limit for delegations and public hearing representations at Council and committee meetings to five minutes regardless of the number of items addressed, plus extensions of time as may be granted up to a maximum of a total of five additional minutes.

**Deputy Speaker:** Alright, all in support, rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Gilroy, Lukes, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Orlikow.

**Nays**

Councillors Eadie, Mayes.

**Deputy Speaker:** Well, I had that in my book. There's a procedure by-law on that one. So, there is…with Council's indulgence, Councillor Sharma missed a vote. So, could you just record her vote now? Yeah, so just yea or nay. Okay.

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

**Deputy Speaker:** Moving on to number seven.

**Clerk:** Recommendation 7) that the city Organizational By-law 7100/91 be amended as follows: A) to require that any political direction to amend administrative reports after they have been submitted to the mayor's office be documented in the subject report. B) to transfer the jurisdiction of all audit matters currently delegated to the Executive Policy Committee to a new audit committee compromised of the following members to be appointed by Council annually at the organizational meeting of Council beginning in November 2025: i) the mayor, chairperson, ii) two councillors who do not sit on the Executive Policy Committee, iii) one citizen member with a professional designation in law, iv) one citizen member with a professional designation in accounting.

**Deputy Speaker:** Alright. All in favour, rise.

**A RECORDED VOTE** was taken the result being as follows:

**Yeas**

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

**Nays**

Councillor Duncan.

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

**Deputy Speaker:** Motion passes. Number seven…number eight.

**Clerk:** Recommendation 8: that prior to November 2025, the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to report back to Council through the Governance Committee with recommendations for appointing citizen members to the audit committee and the reporting relationship between the audit committee and Council.

**Deputy Speaker:** Alright, all in support, rise. This is number eight…(Inaudible)…Okay, so number eight, all in…rising. We all did. Go ahead. Thank you.

**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, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt, Sharma and Mr. Deputy Speaker Councillor Orlikow.

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

**Deputy Speaker:** This one seems to...are we voting on...we did…well…huh? Nine and 10 are functional ones, but...nine and 10, they're okay? We'll do nine and 10 together. All in…all in support? Aye. How many nays do I see? One nay? Two nays? So that I don't need to do recorded vote. Thank you. Moving on…no, that's actually…my notes say that's for Councillor Schreyer. No, I'm kidding. So, congratulations, everybody. Good meeting today, I gather. Lots of heavy lifting. So, congratulations to you all. And listening to me, congratulations for that. So that does conclude our agenda today. Oh, yeah, and there's no question period because it's my first time, so go away. No, I guess there has to allow question period. And seeing no questions, thank you very much. That is proper protocol. So, huh? No. Well, there seems to be a lot of people. So moved by Councillor Schreyer and by Councillor Chambers and whoever else to move to adjourn. All in favour? Opposed? Seeing none, roll call. Hang on, everybody. We got roll call.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**Council adjourned at 11:20 p.m.**