



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS No. 38

THIRD SESSION, FORTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PRAYER AND LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

1:30 O’CLOCK P.M.

Hon. Min. SALA tabled:

Supplement to the Estimates of Expenditure 2026-2027 – Departmental Expenditure Estimates – Finance.

(Sessional Paper No. 23)

Supplement to the Estimates of Expenditure 2026-2027 – Departmental Expenditure Estimates – Public Service Commission.

(Sessional Paper No. 24)

Supplement to the Estimates of Expenditure 2026-2027 – Departmental Expenditure Estimates – Employee Pensions and Other Costs.

(Sessional Paper No. 25)

Supplement to the Estimates of Expenditure 2026-2027 – Departmental Expenditure Estimates – Enabling Appropriations, Tax Credits and Public Debt.

(Sessional Paper No. 26)

Hon. Min. CABLE tabled:

Supplement to the Estimates of Expenditure 2026-2027 – Departmental Expenditure Estimates – Advanced Education and Training.

(Sessional Paper No. 27)

Hon. Mr. SIMARD tabled:

Supplement to the Estimates of Expenditure 2026-2027 – Departmental Expenditure Estimates – Municipal and Northern Relations.

(Sessional Paper No. 28)

Hon. Min. NAYLOR, the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure, made a statement regarding today being International Day of Pink.

MLA BEREZA commented on the statement.

Pursuant to sub-rule 28(1), MLA LOISELLE and Messrs. NESBITT, PIWNIUK and WASYLIW made Member's statements.

During Oral Questions, the Speaker interjected and requested that the word "lying", spoken by the Honourable First Minister, be withdrawn.

WHEREUPON Hon. Mr. KINEW withdrew their remarks.

Also during Oral Questions, the Speaker interjected and requested that the word "lied", spoken by the Honourable First Minister, be withdrawn.

WHEREUPON Hon. Mr. KINEW withdrew their remarks.

Again during Oral Questions, the Speaker interjected and requested that the word "lied", spoken by the Honourable Minister of Education and Early Childhood Learning, be withdrawn.

WHEREUPON Hon. Min. SCHMIDT withdrew their remarks.

Following Oral Questions, the Speaker made the following ruling:

At the commencement of Private Members' Business on March 19, 2026, the Honourable Member for Waverley rose on a point of order contending that Bill 233 – The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act, was out of order as it was in violation of our Rules 66 and 67(2).

The Member explained that, after analysing Bill 233, he believes that it varies the tax bill authorized by Government by approximately \$250,000. He further stated that this could correspondingly increase taxes on residents and businesses for that amount. The Member concluded that:

It is not in order for a Member who is not a Minister of the Crown to move a motion or [a] bill that increases taxes on residents or businesses in our province. As such, it is out of order and should not be debated or voted on in this Assembly.

The Honourable Member for Roblin spoke to this point of order before I took it under advisement.

I have now considered the Members' claims regarding Bill 233 – The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act, and I have consulted with the Assembly's Law Officer in order to determine my ruling on this point.

Regarding the orderliness of Bill 233, I will first note that the Honourable Member for Waverley is correct in stating that it is out of order for a Member who is not a Minister of the Crown to move a motion or sponsor a Bill that increases tax on residents or businesses in our province. The question is, then: Would Bill 233 increase taxes?

To provide some important context, I will note that *The Municipal Assessment Act* includes provisions that provide for exemptions for taxes levied on property by municipalities. Some of these provisions provide for an exemption based on use but then limit the amount of land that is subject to exemption. Bill 233 would expand the exception for certain uses—homes for the aged or infirm, elderly persons housing, and property used to give relief or assistance to the aged—from 0.81 hectares (2 acres) to 5 hectares. Property captured by the expansion will be listed on the assessment roll of the applicable municipality as ‘exempt’ and, as such, the amendment proposed in Bill 233 relates to assessment matters under *The Municipal Assessment Act*.

I would note that, in the area of taxation, matters are dealt with under *The Public Schools Act*, *The Municipal Act*, and *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, none of which are amended by Bill 233.

As the Honourable Member for Waverley correctly noted, our Rule 67(2) states that:

No Member, who is not a Minister of the Crown shall move any amendment to a Bill or to estimates that increases any expenditure or varies a tax or a rate of tax or provides an exemption or increases an exemption from a tax or a proposed tax, but a Member who is not a Minister of the Crown may move an amendment to a Bill that decreases an expenditure or that removes or reduces an exemption from a tax or a proposed tax.

The restriction described in this provision does not apply in the case of as Bill 233, as Bill 233 is an amendment to an Act, not an amendment to a Bill or an amendment to Estimates. It is worth noting here the contrast to what is allowable in consideration of departmental Estimates in the Committee of Supply. In those proceedings, it is in order for an opposition Member to move that a Minister’s salary be reduced.

Moving past [Rule 67(2)] and turning to the procedural authorities, we note that in the fourth edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Janse and LeBlanc state in citation 18.10 that “A royal recommendation is not required [...] if the bill’s effect is to reduce taxes otherwise payable”.

Further to that point, in the article “When Bills and Amendments Require the Royal Recommendation”, on page 20 of the Winter 1997-98 edition of the *Canadian Parliamentary Review*, John Mark Keyes specifically includes provisions that provide exemptions from taxes within the list of provisions for which a Royal Recommendation is not required.

This point is consistent with Michael Lukyniuk's article "Spending Proposals: When is a Royal Recommendation Needed", on page 37 of the Spring 2010 edition of the *Canadian Parliamentary Review*, where the author notes that:

In the same [view], a bill which relieves taxation – for example, by reducing a tax rate – would not require a Ways and Means Motion or a royal recommendation since it does not involve the imposition of a tax or the withdrawal of monies from the [Consolidated Revenue Fund]. Such a bill could result in a situation where revenues in the CRF would be substantially reduced, however this fiscal imbalance does not directly relate to the prerogative of the Crown to initiate increase in taxation and spending.

Finally, we note that the consideration of Bill 233 by the House is consistent with past practices in the Manitoba Assembly, as two previous Bills with similar provisions have been introduced and considered by this House:

- Bill 216 – The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act, in the Fifth Session of the 38th Legislature; and
- Bill 200 – The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act, in the Second Session of the 42nd Legislature, which was not only considered by this House but was passed and received Royal Assent on April 15, 2020.

In summary, Bill 233 is in order because the Bills that provide for an exemption from taxation do not require a Royal Recommendation. Accordingly, I rule that the Member for Waverley does not have a point of order, and that Bill 233 – The Municipal Assessment Amendment Act, is properly before this Assembly and may proceed to Second Reading.

Thank you for your attention.

The following petitions were presented and read to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba:

Mrs. STONE – To urge the Provincial Government to remove education funding and taxation from property taxes and find a fair and equitable way to fund education in Manitoba.

MLA BEREZA – To urge the Provincial Government to support the investment and placement of an MRI machine in the Portage Regional Health Facility in Portage la Prairie, Manitoba.

Mr. EWASKO – To urge the Provincial Government to remove education funding and taxation from property taxes and find a fair and equitable way to fund education in Manitoba.

Mr. WOWCHUK – To urge the Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure to take the necessary steps to upgrade Provincial Trunk Highway 45 from Russell to Provincial Trunk Highway 10 to meet RTAC standards.

Mr. WHARTON – To urge the Provincial Government to take immediate and decisive action on bail reform to address serious deficits in enforcement by utilizing all available provincial mechanisms to strengthen warrant enforcement, increasing bail supervision, and opposing release of offenders, thus ensuring that repeat violent offenders are held accountable and that public safety is prioritized over leniency; and to lobby the Federal Government to immediately repeal provisions of the Criminal Code that allow for the continued victimization of law-abiding Manitobans while granting repeat offenders additional rights.

Mrs. ROBBINS – To urge the Provincial Government to address the conditions of Provincial Trunk Highway 34, making the necessary upgrades to RTAC standard and to resurface the road once the new bridge has been completed.

Mr. PIWNIUK – To urge the Provincial Government to support the investment and placement of an MRI machine in the Portage Regional Health Facility in Portage la Prairie, Manitoba.

Mrs. HIEBERT – To urge the Provincial Government to lobby the Federal Government to stop the expansion of medical assistance in dying to those for whom mental illness is the sole condition; and to protect Canadians struggling with mental illness by facilitating treatment, recovery, and medical assistance in living, not death.

Mr. JOHNSON – To urge the Provincial Government to address the conditions of Provincial Trunk Highway 34, making the necessary upgrades to RTAC standard and to resurface the road once the new bridge has been completed.

Mr. GUENTER – To urge the Provincial Government to lobby the Federal Government to stop the expansion of medical assistance in dying to those for whom mental illness is the sole condition; and to protect Canadians struggling with mental illness by facilitating treatment, recovery, and medical assistance in living, not death.

Mr. KING – To urge the Provincial Government to take immediate and decisive action on bail reform to address serious deficits in enforcement by utilizing all available provincial mechanisms to strengthen warrant enforcement, increasing bail supervision, and opposing release of offenders, thus ensuring that repeat violent offenders are held accountable and that public safety is prioritized over leniency; and to lobby the Federal Government to immediately repeal provisions of the Criminal Code that allow for the continued victimization of law-abiding Manitobans while granting repeat offenders additional rights.

Mr. BALCAEN – To urge the Provincial Government to take immediate and decisive action on bail reform to address serious deficits in enforcement by utilizing all available provincial mechanisms to strengthen warrant enforcement, increasing bail supervision, and opposing release of offenders, thus ensuring that repeat violent offenders are held accountable and that public safety is prioritized over leniency; and to lobby the Federal Government to immediately repeal provisions of the Criminal Code that allow for the continued victimization of law-abiding Manitobans while granting repeat offenders additional rights.

The House resumed the debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Min. SALA:

THAT this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And the proposed amendment by Mr. KHAN as follows:

THAT the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after “House” and substituting:

therefore regrets that this budget fails to adequately address the current cost-of-living crisis by:

- (a) failing to take action to mitigate the escalating cost pressures on Manitobans, while simultaneously generating hundreds of millions of dollars in new tax revenues from families already facing financial hardship; and
- (b) cancelling the indexation of the Basic Personal Amount and personal income tax brackets, thereby denying the ability of Manitobans to keep more money from their paycheques and earn more before paying income tax; and
- (c) failing to uphold its commitment not to raise taxes, as evidenced by increases to school taxes, education property taxes, and the termination of income tax indexation; and
- (d) allowing education property taxes to skyrocket to 19.5% since last year without presenting a plan to meet the growing needs of the education system or offer meaningful long-term relief for homeowners; and
- (e) abandoning 4,600 students and 500 staff by refusing to provide the necessary funding to support the transition of learners displaced by the defunding of the Manitoba Institute of Trades and Technology; and
- (f) failing to support agriculture producers, who are essential to addressing rising food prices and driving economic growth; and
- (g) failing to provide effective stewardship of Manitoba’s public utilities, thereby contributing to annual increases in Hydro rates and MPI premiums; and

- (h) failing to bring forward or execute an economic plan designed to stimulate economic growth and lessen the burdens imposed on Manitoba families and businesses by trade wars and increasing fuel prices; and
- (i) failing to take necessary measures to restore public safety in communities across Manitoba, as this budget contains no plan to address rising property crime or to advance reforms to the bail system aimed at keeping violent offenders and repeat criminals in custody; and
- (j) adopting a tax policy that places additional burdens on physicians and other critical skilled professionals, diminishing Manitoba's competitiveness in recruiting and retaining the expertise necessary for a strong health-care system and economy; and
- (k) failing to enact and enforce necessary measures to address repeat violent offenders and armed drug traffickers who continue to endanger and victimize hardworking Manitobans; and
- (l) refusing to take decisive action in response to grave safety concerns raised by staff and patients at health-care facilities, including multiple sexual assaults, resulting in three hospitals being grey-listed by nurses for the first time in the province's history; and
- (m) failing to take meaningful action to resolve the growing diagnostic and surgical caseloads, thereby forcing Manitoba families to endure unprecedented delays in accessing essential care; and
- (n) neglecting the mental-health needs of Manitobans by failing to expand access to primary mental-health services and failing to establish a single Rapid Access to Addictions Medicine clinic to support those struggling with addictions; and
- (o) failing to present a balanced budget in its first term and failing to present a credible plan to balance the Public Accounts or reduce the Province of Manitoba's deficit and debt; and
- (p) refusing to acknowledge or act on the reality that half of Manitoba families are within \$200 a month of being unable to pay their bills; and
- (q) failing to take meaningful action to address inflation and the escalating costs of groceries, fuel, and housing; and
- (r) implementing the job-killing "Manitoba Jobs Agreement", which arbitrarily selects winners and losers and overrides the choice of the 88% of Manitoba construction workers who have chosen to not be associated with a union, thereby driving up the price of schools, hospitals and other infrastructure.

As a consequence, of these and many other failings, the Provincial Government has thereby lost the trust and confidence of this House and the people of Manitoba.

Wednesday, April 8, 2026

And the debate continuing on the amendment,

And MLAs MALOWAY and LAGASSÉ, Messrs. BRAR, WASYLIW and KING and MLA DELA CRUZ having spoken,

And Mrs. HIEBERT speaking at 5:00 p.m. The debate was allowed to remain in their name.

The House then adjourned at 5:00 p.m. until 1:30 p.m. Thursday, April 9, 2026.

Hon. Tom LINDSEY,
Speaker.