

These motions from 2023 regarding the **Housing Service and CMHC Housing Accelerator Fund Application** provide further evidence of the long-standing procedural rift between the rural block and the urban/municipal majority. They specifically highlight early attempts by rural directors to narrow the scope of regional services or divert them into committees where they hold more direct control.

Strategic Efforts to Fragment the Service

The records reveal a clear attempt by the rural directors to prevent the establishment of a truly regional housing service:

- **The B, C, & D Limitation:** Directors Vonesch and Whalley initially moved to establish a housing service **restricted only to Electoral Areas B, C, and D (SRD 654/23)**. This motion was **defeated** by a nearly unanimous board, with only Directors Lott and Whalley supporting the narrow scope.
- **Referral to EASC:** Following that defeat, Directors Mawhinney and Whalley attempted to refer the entire matter to the **Electoral Areas Services Committee (EASC) (SRD 655/23)**. This mirrors their strategy seen in the Strathcona Gardens dispute, where they tried to move regional business into a forum where rural directors exert more influence Conversation History. This attempt was also **defeated**, supported only by Mawhinney and Whalley.

Final Opposition to the Regional Model

When the Board ultimately voted to proceed with the establishment of a **Regional Housing Service (SRD 656/23)**, it was carried despite the opposition of **Directors Vonesch and Whalley**.

This is a significant data point for the 2026 election cycle because:

- **Contradicting the "Collaborative" Narrative:** While Director Vonesch later claimed during his 2026 non-confidence hearing that he is "on everyone's team" and usually agrees with the board's voting record, this 2023 record shows him **actively opposing the creation of a regional housing service** intended to secure federal funding.
- **Whalley's Consistent Hardline:** Director Whalley's "No" vote on the final service establishment is consistent with his isolation on later housing bylaws (Bylaws 512 & 515), where he stood alone in opposing the \$10 million borrowing authority

Connection to Campaign Vulnerabilities

For the 2026 campaign, these motions provide "ammunition" for the following narratives:

1. **The "Hostage-Taking" Pattern:** As noted in our conversation history, the rural block has a history of using **procedural friction**—such as trying to shunt items to the EASC—to slow down or block the urban majority's agenda.
2. **Risking Federal Funding:** By opposing the establishment of the service, Whalley and Vonesch were effectively voting against the administrative framework required to apply for the **CMHC Housing Accelerator Fund**. Opponents can frame this as the rural block being willing to **sacrifice regional grant opportunities** to maintain their procedural protests.

In summary, this 2023 record establishes that the rural block's resistance to regionalized infrastructure and services began well before the current \$122 million recreation complex dispute, forming a **multi-year pattern of opposing regional integration** in favor of localized or committee-level control.