



Second Session – Forty-Third Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**Standing Committee**  
**on**  
**Legislative Affairs**

*Chairperson*  
*Carla Compton*  
*Constituency of Tuxedo*



Vol. LXXIX No. 5 - 6 p.m., Tuesday, April 22, 2025

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Forty-Third Legislature**

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ASAGWARA, Uzoma, Hon.	Union Station	NDP
BALCAEN, Wayne	Brandon West	PC
BEREZA, Jeff	Portage la Prairie	PC
BLASHKO, Tyler	Lagimodière	NDP
BRAR, Diljeet	Burrows	NDP
BUSHIE, Ian, Hon.	Keewatinook	NDP
BYRAM, Jodie	Agassiz	PC
CABLE, Renée, Hon.	Southdale	NDP
CHEN, Jennifer	Fort Richmond	NDP
COMPTON, Carla	Tuxedo	NDP
COOK, Kathleen	Roblin	PC
CORBETT, Shannon	Transcona	NDP
CROSS, Billie	Seine River	NDP
DELA CRUZ, Jelynn	Radisson	NDP
DEVGAN, JD	McPhillips	NDP
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GUENTER, Josh	Borderland	PC
HIEBERT, Carrie	Morden-Winkler	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake-Gimli	PC
KENNEDY, Nellie, Hon.	Assiniboia	NDP
KHAN, Obby	Fort Whyte	PC
KINEW, Wab, Hon.	Fort Rouge	NDP
KING, Trevor	Lakeside	PC
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Dauphin	NDP
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Tyndall Park	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas-Kameesak	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom, Hon.	Flin Flon	NDP
LOISELLE, Robert	St. Boniface	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Malaya, Hon.	Notre Dame	NDP
MOROZ, Mike, Hon.	River Heights	NDP
MOSES, Jamie, Hon.	St. Vital	NDP
MOYES, Mike, Hon.	Riel	NDP
NARTH, Konrad	La Vérendrye	PC
NAYLOR, Lisa, Hon.	Wolseley	NDP
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
OXENHAM, Logan	Kirkfield Park	NDP
PANKRATZ, David	Waverley	NDP
PERCHOTTE, Richard	Selkirk	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Turtle Mountain	PC
REDHEAD, Eric	Thompson	NDP
SALA, Adrien, Hon.	St. James	NDP
SANDHU, Mintu, Hon.	The Maples	NDP
SCHMIDT, Tracy, Hon.	Rossmere	NDP
SCHOTT, Rachelle	Kildonan-River East	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield-Ritchot	PC
SIMARD, Glen, Hon.	Brandon East	NDP
SMITH, Bernadette, Hon.	Point Douglas	NDP
STONE, Lauren	Midland	PC
WASYLIW, Mark	Fort Garry	Ind.
WHARTON, Jeff	Red River North	PC
WIEBE, Matt, Hon.	Concordia	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rick	Swan River	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	Spruce Woods	

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS**

**Tuesday, April 22, 2025**

**TIME – 6 p.m.**

**LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba**

**CHAIRPERSON – MLA Carla Compton (Tuxedo)**

**VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Diljeet Brar (Burrows)**

**ATTENDANCE – 6      QUORUM – 4**

*Members of the committee present:*

*Hon. Min. Moroz, Hon. Min. Sala*

*Mr. Brar, MLA Compton, Mr. King, Mrs. Stone*

*Substitutions:*

*Hon. Min. Simard for Hon. Min. Sala at 7:41 p.m.*

**APPEARING:**

*Hon. Glen Simard, MLA for Brandon East*

**PUBLIC PRESENTERS:**

*Bill 4 – The Planning Amendment Act*

*Duane Nicol, City of Selkirk*

*Bill 3 – The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment  
and Planning Amendment Act*

*Dan Diachun, private citizen*

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:**

*Bill 3 – The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment  
and Planning Amendment Act*

*Kathy Valentino, Association of Manitoba  
Municipalities*

*Lanny McInnes, Urban Development Institute of  
Manitoba*

*Luanne Diachun, private citizen*

*Bill 4 – The Planning Amendment Act*

*Kathy Valentino, Association of Manitoba  
Municipalities*

*Lanny McInnes, Urban Development Institute of  
Manitoba*

**MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

*Bill 3 – The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment  
and Planning Amendment Act*

*Bill 4 – The Planning Amendment Act*

*Bill 14 – The Insurance Amendment Act*

*Bill 15 – The Real Estate Services Amendment Act*

*Bill 27 – The Income Tax Amendment Act*

*Bill 28 – The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act*

*Bill 37 – The Manitoba Financial Services Authority  
Act and Amendments to Various Other Acts.*

\* \* \*

**Clerk Assistant (Ms. Katerina Tefft):** Good evening. Will the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs please come to order.

Before the committee can proceed with the business before it, it must elect a Chairperson.

Are there any nominations?

**Hon. Adrien Sala (Minister of Finance):** I'd like to nominate MLA Compton for Chair and MLA Brar for Vice-Chair.

**Clerk Assistant:** So first, we'll do the Chairperson election. MLA Compton has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, MLA Compton, will you please take the Chair.

**The Chairperson:** Our next item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson.

Are there any nominations?

**MLA Sala:** Propose MLA Brar for Vice-Chair

**The Chairperson:** MLA Brar has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, MLA Brar is elected Vice-Chairperson.

So this meeting has been called to order to consider the following bills: Bill 3, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act;

Bill 4, The Planning Amendment Act; Bill 14, The Insurance Amendment Act; Bill 15, The Real Estate Services Amendment Act; Bill 27, The Income Tax Amendment Act; Bill 28, The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act; Bill 37, The Manitoba Financial Services Authority Act and Amendments to Various Other Acts.

And I would like to inform all in attendance of the provisions in our rules regarding the hour of adjournment. A standing committee meeting to consider a bill must not sit past midnight to hear public presentations or to consider clause by clause of a bill except by unanimous consent of the committee.

Written submissions: Written submissions from the following persons have been received and distributed to committee members: Kathy Valentino, Association of Manitoba Municipalities, on Bill 3; Larry [phonetic] McInnes, Urban Development Institute of Manitoba, on Bill 3; Luanne Diachun, private citizen, on Bill 3; Kathy Valentino, Association of Manitoba Municipalities, on Bill 4; Larry [phonetic] McInnes, Urban Development Institute of Manitoba, on Bill 4.

Does the committee agree to have these documents appear in the Hansard transcript of this meeting? [Agreed]

Public presentation guidelines: Prior to proceeding with public presentations, I would like to advise members of the public regarding the process for speaking in a committee. In accordance with our rules, a time limit of 10 minutes has been allotted for the presentations, with another five minutes allowed for questions from committee members. Questions shall not exceed 45 seconds in length, with no time limit for the answers.

Questions may be addressed to presenters in the following rotation: first, the minister sponsoring the bill or another member of their caucus; second, a member of the official opposition; and third, an independent member.

If a presenter is not in attendance when their name is called, they will be dropped to the bottom of the list. If the presenter is not in attendance when their name is called a second time, they will be removed from the presenters' list.

The proceedings of our meetings are recorded in order to provide a verbatim transcript. Each time someone wishes to speak, whether it be an MLA or a presenter, I first have to say the person's name. This is the signal for the Hansard recorder to turn the mics on and off.

\* (18:10)

On order of presentations: On the topic of determining the order of public presentations, I will also note that we have an out-of-town presenter in attendance, marked with an asterisk on the list. With these considerations in mind, then, in what order does the committee wish to hear the presentations?

**MLA Sala:** If I could just—[interjection]

**The Chairperson:** Oh. Do I—[interjection] I'm good? Okay.

**An Honourable Member:** Am I good?

**The Chairperson:** Is—[interjection] Minister Sala.

**MLA Sala:** I was just going to recommend that we allow any out-of-town presenters who are here to go up first.

**The Chairperson:** So the recommendation is that we allow the out-of-town presenters to go first.

And we're all in agreeance? [Agreed]

Okay. Thank you for your patience, and we will now proceed with the public presentation.

#### **Bill 4—The Planning Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** So our out-of-town presenter is Mr. Duane Nicol from the City of Selkirk. Mr. Duane Nicol, please proceed.

**Duane Nicol (City of Selkirk):** Good evening. My name is Duane Nicol and I'm the chief administrative officer for the City of Selkirk. I'm here as the appointed spokesperson for the municipal corporation, and I'm representing the council's expressed interest on Bill 4.

Throughout our presentation tonight, I will refer to the Capital Planning Region, which is the legal title of the organization that most know as the Winnipeg Metro Region.

To begin, the council of the City of Selkirk wishes to express its deep appreciation to Premier Kinew and the Manitoba government for the introduction of Bill 4, the appropriately nicknamed freedom bill, and the spirit of respect and co-operation that it represents.

You'll note I've handed out—or asked to hand out a copy of the various acts that I'll be—or clauses of The Planning Act that I'll be referring to.

As committee members may know, Selkirk was not consulted on its inclusion into the Capital Planning Region. In fact, there was absolutely no

economic or social data used to determine the boundaries of the region. They were created on a political whim and without any—without the explicit consent of any of the municipalities.

Selkirk has previously made repeated requests to be removed from the Capital Planning Region to various ministers who occupied the municipal affairs and municipal relations ministries, including presenting during the committee stage of bill 37.

Selkirk council has previously passed a resolution requesting to be removed from the Capital Planning Region and is now looking forward to exercising its right under Bill 4 to formally request removal from the region.

The City of Selkirk is in full support of Bill 4. We support the government's intention to give municipal governments the ability to opt out of the region. To us, Bill 4 is a clear and practical signal that this government sees municipalities as a mature order of government.

It is in this spirit the City of Selkirk would like to propose an amendment to Bill 4, to strengthen this demonstration of respect and to more fully fulfill the spirit in which the freedom bill was announced. Specifically, we'd propose that a clause be added to Bill 4 to remove clauses 8(2) and 8(3) from the Manitoba Planning Act.

Clause 8(2) sets out the list of municipalities to be included within the boundaries of the Capital Planning Region; and clause 8(3) then says that, notwithstanding the previous clause, the minister may change that list by simple regulation.

We believe that Bill 4 should be amended to remove these clauses from The Planning Act, which were introduced by the previous government's bill 37, because they are inconsistent with the clauses of the—of other clauses in The Planning Act, and they work to counter the purpose and spirit of Bill 4.

First of all, clause 8(2) is not necessary, because clause 9(1) of The Planning Act already provides the tool for the minister to establish planning regions via regulation, and it is in with—in those regulations that the included municipalities could be identified.

The Capital Planning Region already has a regulation, so the list of included municipalities could easily be added to that existing regulation.

The listing of included municipalities for the Capital Planning Region is an oddity. It stands out as being out of step with the practices set out by the rest

of the legislation, which provides for the creation of planning regions, planning districts and planning commissions, but does not specifically create any other entities like it does for the Capital Planning Region.

We would suggest that it is not usual nor does it seem to be good practice to establish a system that permits a regulation to overrule or overwrite the legislation to which it is subordinate. Typically, regulations are used to expand upon, refine the details of or elaborate on legislation, not to negate it.

As it currently stands, and how it would stand if Bill 4 is not amended, The Planning Act would create two—or it creates two tiers of planning regions: the Capital Planning Region and every other region that may be created in the future. There does not seem to be a benefit or value to this overly complicated structure, so one naturally wonders why bill 37 was structured in this way in the first place.

We believe this unnecessary structure reflects the original coercive spirit of bill 37, which was to railroad municipalities into the region regardless of the will of their elected councils and without the requirement for consultation, as prescribed for the creation of other regions in clause 9(2)(b).

Where the 18 municipalities—while the 18 municipalities were forced into the Capital Planning Region, bill 37 treats all other municipalities with more respect by requiring the minister to consult prior to the creation of a new region.

Furthermore, under this structure, the Capital Planning Region was not subject to the conditions required of future regions prior to formation. In short, clause 8(2) was created to avoid scrutiny.

Clauses 8(2) and 8(3) are artifacts of the previous approach to municipal government and is contrary to the spirit of Bill 4, which is about recognizing the autonomy and agency of local governments and creating true opportunities for collaboration rather than a system of coercive control.

The City of Selkirk believes that by keeping our name as an included municipality in the legislation, we believe that this seems to be inconsistent with the Premier's (Mr. Kinew) and the minister's—Minister Simard's acknowledgment of our desire to leave and the permission that Bill 4 represents.

It is a spectre. The proverbial sword of Damocles hanging over this—over Selkirk's head, threatening that one day a future government will revert to the legislation, overriding the City's expressed will. Leaving Selkirk's

name in the legislation seems to imply, however unintentionally, that one day Selkirk will eventually be annexed into the Capital Planning Region, which reduces the impact of Bill 4.

We believe that leaving it in does not reflect the clear and unequivocal message from Premier Kinew, which is, and I quote: We're going to bring freedom back to the equation. We think it's an important step to return that power to locally elected democratic officials instead of trying to centralize everything like the previous government.

Leaving the list of municipalities in The Planning Act makes Bill 4 seem less like the freedom bill and potentially more like the temporary reprieve bill.

In closing, we hope that this recommendation is taken in the supportive and collaborative spirit in which it is intended. We are in full support of Bill 4 and we see our recommendation—recommended change to the bill as an improvement that exemplifies and reinforces the government's message that membership in the Capital Planning Region is truly voluntary and it is up to the democratically elected councils to decide on participation for themselves.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our position on Bill 4. I look forward to any questions that you may have.

**The Chairperson:** So thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter? You have first choice, Minister, if you have any questions.

**An Honourable Member:** No, I—

**The Chairperson:** Sorry. Sorry. Minister Sala or Minister Simard? *[interjection]* Minister Simard.

**Hon. Glen Simard (Minister of Municipal and Northern Relations):** I want to thank you for coming here today, Duane. I know that we've discussed at length your suggestions to the bill. I thank you for coming and putting your feelings and position on the record.

\* (18:20)

Would you recognize that we are unable to—well, if we were to leave as is and the City of Selkirk were to make its opt-out, that we could change this in regulation, or rather, perhaps the City of Selkirk, between now and the opting-out phase of Bill 4, may choose to change their position. *[interjection]*

**The Chairperson:** Excuse me sir, sorry. I have to acknowledge you first.

**D. Nicol:** Thank you. Sorry about that.

Sorry, Minister, just for clarity, is the question do we recognize that under Bill 4, as it exists now, the City would be able to make the formal request to be excluded from the Planning Region through regulation?

**An Honourable Member:** Correct.

**D. Nicol:** We do understand that and we do appreciate that. Again, we are in full support of Bill 4, and our proposal is simply to reinforce the—what clearly is the spirit of this bill, which is to make it truly voluntary. We—the only amendment that we're proposing is that, by removing the list out of the legislation, we don't have a piece of regulation that negates a portion of the legislation.

We have this—we're changing the act now, and it seems to me—seems to the city—that it would make more sense to remove all the names of the listed municipalities and just include those in the regulation. So then it's by regulation that you're including or not including municipalities.

**Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside):** Question to Mr. Nicol. Thanks for that clarification on the minister's question there.

So my question is that you have—if the names for the—our municipalities are removed, that's what you'd like to see for fear of future chance of it being put back in there, where you're forced that—back into capital region. Is that what I'm hearing from you, Duane?

**D. Nicol:** I learn.

Mr. King, absolutely. Our concern is that we've been very clear that we don't want to be part of the Capital Planning Region. Other municipalities do want to be part, and we respect their right to be part—to participate. We just think it's more consistent with the legislation everywhere else for planning commissions, planning division—districts, planning—other planning regions—there are no names in the legislation.

So this is a very unique structure, and what we're suggesting is it probably seems more appropriate to be consistent with the rest of the legislation: remove the names and then include that in a regulation so that the minister can add or subtract as the legislation envisions for other regions.

Our concern is that, if it's left in, there seems to be this assumption that at some point in the future the City of Selkirk will want to participate, and that might

be true: councils change; governments change, but it would seem to be a more appropriate way of doing that through regulation as opposed to just the assumption, which is what the legislation would communicate.

**The Chairperson:** Now, I don't see an independent member present.

Are there any further questions?

**Mr. King:** I'm just curious now. So what is your thoughts on regional planning, then? I guess your thoughts, Mr. Nicol, are that Selkirk is—would do fine on their own, doing their own regional planning and still work with neighbouring municipalities, or do you feel that the City of Selkirk is okay on their own, doing their own planning Is that what I'm hearing?

**D. Nicol:** Maybe I don't learn as well as I think I do.

The—for clarity, we have no concern with the concept of regional planning. It was how this was done originally that we have some concern with. We also have concern—so, as I said earlier, there was no social or economic research that was done. The best data that we have is under the—census Canada has the metropolitan—

**The Chairperson:** Excuse me, Mr. Nicol. The five minutes have finished. I just want to check if there's leave for him to complete his answer. *[Agreed]*

Okay. So you can finish your answer, Mr. Nicol.

**D. Nicol:** Thank you.

So we are not in the census metropolitan area. City of Selkirk is not within the city of Winnipeg census metropolitan area. The province recognized us as a region unto ourselves because of all the Interlake regional planning offices that are located in Selkirk. We have strong connections with St. Andrews and St. Clements, we have good regional relationships there and we work with those municipalities.

Our—more Winnipeggers come to—drive to Selkirk to work than the other way around; we're not a bedroom community. In fact, we're the—out of the 18 municipalities included, Selkirk is the only one other than Winnipeg that doesn't have the majority of their population leaving their municipality for work. We import 30 per cent of our population every day for work. We're our own region, our own commuter shed.

So we believe that a more articulate look at this would find that Selkirk doesn't belong in that region, but maybe there is another opportunity for a region outside of that.

So the other important point that I want to emphasize, which wasn't in this, is that this change would not make—is not proposing to make any change for the Capital Planning Region at all. It can continue to function without any change whatsoever other than our request to leave. It just simply is taking the list of names out of the legislation and just putting into the regulation, which all future planning regions will have; it'll be done by regulation, not legislation.

Since we're opening up the legislation today, we thought it would be easier and better to clean it up now rather than to leave it as a second or, you know, creating a tiered system for planning regions.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Nicol.

### **Bill 3—The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** So now, we will move back to Bill 3. And I will now call on David Grant to please proceed with your presentation.

And I don't think I'm seeing him right now, so we'll just put him to the bottom of the list and we will come back. So we'll move back to Bill 4.

So I will now call on Mr. Dan Diachun, who joins us from online.

Please proceed with your presentation and please correct me if I've pronounced your name—how—on how to pronounce your name.

Thank you.

Could you please turn on your video? Mr. Diachun?

I believe we need to see you for you to do your presentation, please.

Mr. Diachun, can you turn on your mic as well, please? We still can't hear you.

**Floor Comment:** Yes, okay. Sorry.

**The Chairperson:** Okay. And I just have to re-recognize you.

Mr. Dan Diachun, go ahead. Please—pardon me. Please proceed with your presentation.

**Dan Diachun (Private Citizen):** Just—sorry. I have an iPad going because I thought there was some problem. Sorry. Okay. I'm just going to continue. Sorry.

Actually, I'm here—sorry. Lots of sorrys—Canadian.

Actually, I'm talking about Bill 3. It somehow got changed over to Bill 4. I'm talking about the City charter—change to the charter, and I'd like to speak to that.

Currently, the requirement now is 25 voters or 50 per cent of the landowners within 100 metres of real property being affected. Now the City/government—I'm not sure who initiated this change—wants to change it to 300 eligible persons. Now, I have a question: What is the definition of eligible? I could not find that. Who determines this? And how did you—how did someone come up with 300—the 300 number?

\* (18:30)

The entire rezoning process from start to the final hearing at a municipal board is slanted in favour of the City of Winnipeg and the developer. The property owner—the citizen—has very little input but they are the ones that ultimately live in that neighbourhood, not the planners, not the developers, the council members or other elected officials.

I can only relate this to a case that was just recently heard that I was involved with, with a subdivision on the corner of Dugald and Plessis. The—it went to the Municipal Board just last month on March 25, where I made a presentation in regard to that rezoning and variance. In our case, there was only 117 residential properties that are directly adjacent to the subject property, seeking—where a developer was seeking rezoning and variances on portions of the land.

In the new formula, how does one get the 300 eligible persons to sign a petition when only 117 potential residents? The EK-Transcona Community Committee ignored the recommendations of the city planner, who is a professional planner, as it relates—and I'm going to just mention block 1 and 5 of this rezoning.

The councillor ignored what the planner was saying. He went with the developer. This is, to me, it was rammed through. That's my personal opinion.

Currently, homeowners are given a whole 10 minutes to put their position forward on rezoning matters. Just recently in the Winnipeg Free Press, the City of Winnipeg now wants to cut that down to a whole big five minutes.

And this appears to be another step in stifling homeowners from their 'dematic'—democratic rights to object. This, coupled with this change to 300 eligible persons—again, I'm not sure what that means—will make it almost impossible for homeowners to visit—voice their concerns.

If this is implemented, what recourse do homeowners have if the rezoning of adjacent parcels of land has a negative effect on their property? If the City of

Winnipeg grants a rezoning variance that may impact an adjacent parcel, does that mean they have effectively expropriated the affected land? Can a property now claim under Expropriation Act? Would you like a four-to-five-storey apartment building being built behind your house? How desirable is your house now when you want to go sell it?

I am—in a recent case, 4025 Roblin Blvd., provides a guidance what a third-party—I'm going to—the Municipal Board can do to provide in a rezoning plan that was rammed through through the City of Winnipeg, with little consideration for the neighbouring property.

The proposed 10-storey apartment has now just recently been revised to now some three- and four-storey buildings that are going to be built on the parcel.

Bottom line: a development should be planned with thought and consideration, along with the meaningful input by existing residents. We are the ones that ultimately that will be living in the community. A home is one of the largest investments—and in our area, I'm going to say it's 5 hundred to 6 hundred thousand dollars per home—makes—a person makes in their life. That's the largest investment.

They just want some certainty as to what is going to be built in close proximity to them without any surprises and potential loss in value. Bottom line, what is being proposed of 300 persons is a hurdle that prevents many if not all future rezoning and variance applications just to sail-through with no opposition.

What happened to the percentage of affected properties calculation? It's all undemocratic. That's pretty much all I have.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter? Minister—no.

**Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside):** Mr. Dyson [*phonetic*—Diachun, that's the name. Thank you for your presentation and thank you for your concerns to Bill 3. Certainly have—says something from my years of experience on a municipal council that I've been looking for for a long time, but yet, at the same time, can still understand your concerns of the residents maybe not getting the opportunity.

I just—what I'm curious—my question to you would be: Have you gotten your answer as to what eligible persons are?

**D. Diachun:** No, I [*inaudible*] find it anywhere in any document that I could google it on, unless someone there knows. I'm not the one that put it forward. That's the scary part.

**The Chairperson:** I don't see an independent member.

**Hon. Glen Simard (Minister of Municipal and Northern Relations):** To answer the question about an eligible person: is someone who would be eligible if a general election were held under The Municipal Councils and School Boards Elections Act on the day the objection was made to vote in an election of members of council in the municipality or planning district that is adopting the bylaw. That would be the answer to your eligible person.

**D. Diachun:** I hear that, thank you. But that doesn't answer the 300 part. In our case, there's only 117 residents that are directly affected. How do we get 300 signatures? It makes—from what the current system is, it's 25 people or 50 per cent of the adjacent affected landowners.

That's been eliminated, so it's just straight 300. But in our case, it's impossible. So you've—someone's made it impossible. If it had gone from 25 to, say, 75, maybe, but 300? You see my dilemma. Sorry, yes.

**The Chairperson:** Thank you, Mr. Diachun.

So I do want to just remind the committee here, this is a Q-and-A time for members of the committee to ask Mr. Diachun questions on his presentation. So I just want to kind of get us back on track for that.

Are there any further questions?

**Mr. King:** Through the Chair to Mr. Diachun, I would like to ask you what type of number do you think would work as opposed to 300 or the—I mean, this is a—this is going back a long ways; the 25 signatures have been in the act, so it was definitely due for some improvement. So just curious to know what your number would be that you're thinking of, what's going on in your head.

**The Chairperson:** Mr. Diachun—or, Dishun [*phonetic*]. Please correct me if I'm not pronouncing it—

**D. Diachun:** No, no, it's correct. No, very—no, no, good.

That's a tough question, but, you know, just looking at 117 divided by 50, which is the other part of the formula that's currently on the books, you're talking, say, 60; but you jump it to, maybe triple it to 75 or max, 100. But you're talking the city of Winnipeg. Like, I said, our case, there's only 117 homes that are

directly affected. Yes, maybe we can get all of them, every household, to sign; that's 117.

I think 300's not the answer; it's got to be less. It's got to be considerably less; otherwise you're putting a hurdle. You're putting hurdles in front of us at every step. I went from, right from the get-go, from the rezoning all the way to the Municipal Board that was heard on March 25, I made a presentation. I'm here to advocate for all the citizens in our neighbourhood.

**The Chairperson:** Are there any further questions for the presenter?

I don't see any, so thank you very much, Mr. Diachun.

**D. Diachun:** Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** So our next presenter for Bill 4 is David Grant. He is also the next presenter on Bill 28 and Bill 37 and had previously been called for Bill 3. And so seeing as he's not here, we will be moving on. Right, no.

\* (18:40)

Okay, David Grant has been dropped from the list.

\* \* \*

**The Chairperson:** And hearing no further presentations, in what order would we like the consideration of these bills?

**Mr. Diljeet Brar (Burrows):** Can I propose Minister Sala's bills be dealt with first?

**The Chairperson:** So MLA Brar has proposed that Minister Sala's bills are addressed first—[*interjection*]*—*oh, in this—and it would be these bills: 14, 15, 27, 28, 37, 3 and then 4. That would be the order: Minister Sala's and then Minister Simard's.

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

#### **Bill 14—The Insurance Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** Does the minister responsible for Bill 14 have an opening statement?

**An Honourable Member:** I do.

**The Chairperson:** All right.

**Hon. Adrien Sala (Minister of Finance):** Okay. Thank you so much, Chair and folks. Happy to have a chance to speak briefly to Bill 14.

So this legislation will modernize sections of the existing act, aligning them with other Manitoba legislation and those in other jurisdictions.

The Insurance Agents' and Adjusters' Licensing Appeal Board is one of Manitoba's agencies, boards and commissions. Its mandate is to hear licensing appeals of decisions made by the Insurance Council of Manitoba, which has delegated powers of the superintendent of insurance.

The Insurance Agents' and Adjusters' Licensing Appeal Board plays a vital role in ensuring fairness and accountability within Manitoba's insurance industry, and we recognize the essential contributions that board members make to the integrity and success of our provincial insurance sector.

The board is a crucial mechanism for providing an essential check on decisions made by the Insurance Council of Manitoba, ensuring decisions are aligned with current legislation and equitable. This process is critical to protect the rights of individuals seeking to work in the insurance industry while also upholding the integrity of the insurance industry.

Under the current Insurance Act, board members are left vulnerable to legal action even when acting in good faith while fulfilling their responsibilities. In addition, the co-ordinator of appeals, a public servant, is similarly unprotected under the existing act.

Manitoba's public service—servants are a vital component of our provincial workforce. These skilled and dedicated professionals play an essential role in delivering day-to-day services that directly serve the public interest, spanning a wide range of sectors and responsibilities. Our government respects the hard work and dedication of these individuals and is committed to ensuring that they are properly protected while carrying out their duties.

Therefore the bill is being amended to add an immunity provision that will protect board members and the co-ordinator of appeals when they are acting in good faith. This provision provides statutory immunity to members of the insurance agents' and insurers' licensing appeal board.

By adding an immunity provision, we are empowering board members and the co-ordinator of appeals to carry out their important work and to make decisions in the best interest of Manitobans, knowing they are protected when acting in good faith.

This practice is already established for similar Manitoba ABC appeal commission and hearing panel members, including through The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act and the adults living with intellectual disabilities act.

We are also modernizing this act and aligning it with the current reality, whereby most communication is done electronically. The change will allow the co-ordinator of appeals to notify appellants by the revolutionary advancement of electronic mail, ensuring appellants are aware of the date, time and location for hearings of the Insurance Agents' and Adjusters' Licensing Appeal Board.

We're also making it easier for appellants to receive information and correspondence in the way that best suits their needs, with the inclusion of, quote: if the appellant has agreed in writing. End quote.

This new option ensures the use of email for notification is consensual and protects the appellant's preference by allowing them to choose their preferred communication method.

Finally, we've also introduced a provision to ensure limits are placed on the amount of funds that can be held inside accounts of universal life insurance contracts. This is a crucial step in ensuring that the insurance industry remains fair, transparent and focused on its core purpose: providing life insurance protection to Manitobans. By introducing limits on the funds that can be held inside universal life insurance contracts, we're closing a loophole that can allow hedge funds to exploit the system for tax avoidance or investment manipulation.

And on that note, I am happy to conclude my remarks.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mrs. Lauren Stone (Midland):** Yes, thank you, Chair.

And I'll make my comments brief. First and foremost, it's important to emphasize that the protection of the public is of the utmost importance. We know that the insurance industry is already a very highly regulated industry, at both the provincial and the federal levels, to ensure that insurance companies and agents and brokers are able to meet their financial obligations to customers.

This change that's been brought forward in legislation seems to affect very, very few policies which are held by institutional investors' hedge funds and very sophisticated investors; these are not everyday life insurance policies or holders of life insurance policies. Allowing for email notification of appeal hearings, essentially a housekeeping matter that brings the act up to date; and protection from liability of appeal board members when acting in good faith is an

obvious change and matches what other provinces are doing in many different areas.

It's important that, as we move forward with legislation and regulation, that any changes to insurance companies are not new taxes that are charged on top of existing policies. This continues to be one of the top concerns for Canadian business organizations and insurance companies.

So with those few remarks, I look forward to going clause by clause.

Thank you very much.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

During the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clause 4—pass; clause 5—pass; clause 6—pass; clause 7—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

#### **Bill 15—The Real Estate Services Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** And now we're on to—and now we will move on to Bill 15.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 15 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Adrien Sala (Minister of Finance):** I do.

Pleased to have an opportunity to provide some brief comments on Bill 15, The Real Estate Services Amendment Act.

The Real Estate Services Amendment Act governs the regulation—sorry, The Real Estate Services Act governs the regulation of the real estate brokerage and property management industries in Manitoba and is administered by the Manitoba Securities Commission, which is part of the Manitoba Financial Services Agency. The regulatory framework for these industries was updated when The Real Estate Services Act replaced the former real estate brokers act on January 1, 2022.

As the act is currently drafted, the Manitoba Securities Commission is impaired in its ability to perform its public interest function. The Securities Commission does not currently have the power to freeze bank accounts maintained by a person or company that is required to be registered under the act but have not registered. To put it simply, if you're a bad actor in the real estate sector and therefore you obviously haven't registered your business under the act with the Securities Commission, the government

currently has no power to stop you from behaving badly.

This makes no sense and leaves the real estate sector open to some fraud and abuse concerns. The legislation before this committee therefore fixes—proposes to fix this problem.

There's another issue in the act which we're going to fix: the current legislation does not contain timing parameters indicating how long the commission has before commencing prosecution under the act. Our government believes all people and businesses should be treated equally under the law, and therefore our amendments will impose a two-year limitation period on prosecutions.

For the benefit of people in the room tonight or those tuning in online, I should highlight that the two-year limitation was previously in place; but when legislative changes were made, this time limitation on prosecutions was removed. So we're going to fix that issue.

In summary, this is an important consumer protection—piece of consumer protection legislation. And with that, I conclude my remarks.

\* (18:50)

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mrs. Lauren Stone (Midland):** Yes, thank you. And, again, I will reiterate with this bill, it's the utmost importance to protect the public interest and current or future investors in this province.

Again, this legislation seems to predominantly focus on bad actors, those that have contravened or are about to contravene the act but are not actually registered. So it does appear to close some potential loopholes that may allow those unregistered persons to carry on activities that would have otherwise led to a freezing of assets for a registered party.

There have been numerous changes to The Real Estate Services Act over the years, going back about 10 years when this was first—act was first introduced by the former NDP government. Further loopholes were then closed by the former PC government that included: fines for misconduct; requiring written service agreements between brokerages and home buyers or sellers prior to providing services, to ensure all parties were fully informed on what service was being provided or carried out; and enhancing the

ability to take action against persons carrying on unregistered activities.

So this last point is where this legislation that's been brought forward seems to expand upon and just to close another loophole on persons engaging in unregistered activities by allowing the commission to freeze those assets. Again, protection of the public is of utmost importance.

And with that statement, I conclude my remarks.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

During the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clause 4—pass; clause 5—pass; clause 6—pass; clause 7—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

#### **Bill 27—The Income Tax Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** Next, we will move on to Bill 27.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 27 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Adrien Sala (Minister of Finance):** I do. I just want to provide some brief comments on Bill 27.

The changes included in Bill 27 will make the Cultural Industries Printing Tax Credit permanent so that it will continue to support the printing and publishing industry here in Manitoba.

The tax credit offers a refundable credit to Manitoba printers equal to 35 per cent on salary or wages paid to Manitoba employees employed in their book-printing divisions.

For years, the decision to leave industry wondering whether this credit would be maintained or eliminated created uncertainty. And in these times of uncertainty, when we're in the midst of a two-front trade war, government should be taking action to improve the investment climate as it can, here in Manitoba. We need more certainty in our economy, not less, and there are some other simplifying elements in this legislation that makes our tax statutes more clear. For the record, none of these changes will have any impact on taxpayers.

On that note, I'm pleased to conclude my brief remarks.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mrs. Lauren Stone (Midland):** Yes, thank you.

And from our side of the bench or the table, the cultural—we support the continuation of the cultural print—industries printing tax credit. We know that it supports both local cultural groups as well as Manitoba authors and publishers. And we know, especially right now, supporting our small businesses in Manitoba has become even more apparent with the ongoing economic uncertainty and current global trade environment.

So we see businesses that are printing, assembling or binding books have been able to claim that tax credit in the past, and we support the continuation of that.

And thank you for the time for those remarks.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

During consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clause 4—pass; clause 5—pass; clause 6—pass; clause 7—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

**MLA Sala:** Before getting to Bill 28, which I assume is the next bill in the order, I just wanted to have a chance to take five minutes if I could get support from the critic to just consider some of the amendments that were brought forward.

**The Chairperson:** So it has been proposed to take a five-minute break so that the minister can consult with their team to review the amendments received from the opposition.

Is this agreed? [*Agreed*]

We will recess—it's agreed, and we will recess for five minutes.

*The committee recessed at 6:56 p.m.*

*The committee resumed at 7:07 p.m.*

**The Chairperson:** Will the committee come back to order now.

#### **Bill 28—The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act**

**The Chairperson:** Okay. So we will now move on to Bill 28.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 28 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Adrien Sala (Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro):** Yes, I do. So happy to have an opportunity to provide some opening comments on Bill 28. This is a key piece of legislation that will help to implement our Affordable Energy Plan, which we released late last year.

For decades, Manitoba's abundance of clean, affordable energy has given our province a unique advantage. Our clean baseload power has driven our economy and helped to build our province. It is our natural advantage.

However, as we highlighted in our Affordable Energy Plan, one of the things that currently holds us back is the requirement to energize requests on a first-come, first-served basis with no consideration of the potential benefits to Manitobans, whether in terms of job creation or economic diversification of our provincial revenue generation.

Late last year, we committed to ending this first-come, first-served approach to allocating new energy. And as I've toured the province and spoken with business leaders and Manitobans, I've heard universally that we are taking the right approach, the one we outlined in our Affordable Energy Plan.

The legislation before this committee follows through on our commitment that we made in the Affordable Energy Plan to end the first-come, first-served approach. The regulation-making authority in this bill enables flexibility and the timely allocation of energy, in alignment with the province's economic, environmental and social priorities. As the world electrifies, we need to ensure Manitobans get the best value for our clean baseload power, and that's exactly what this legislation is designed to do.

And on that note, I'll conclude my remarks.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mrs. Lauren Stone (Midland):** I do. First, I'd like to say that Manitoba Hydro should be ensuring timely connections to the grid to grow our economy and the services that all Manitobans rely on; and for Manitoba to continue to be able to fulfill their mandate, which is

to deliver safe, reliable services at a fair price to customers.

\* (19:10)

We know that Manitoba Hydro is in a financial predicament with their growing \$25 billion of debt, \$31 billion in projected maintenance and upgrade costs and the capacity needs that they have outlined that they will require within the next five years—in addition to, we're hearing from folks across the province that there are significant delays in connecting to the grid for electricity.

This goes beyond Hydro's first-come, first-served model and lends itself to deeper challenges within the Crown corporation. However, the current legislation that's before us today lacks key details that would otherwise provide some confidence for Manitobans. We have to remember that Manitoba—Manitobans own Manitoba Hydro.

This bill lacks the definition as to what constitutes an economic priority. It lacks criteria for determining what projects do get streamlined as a priority, and it lacks an appeal mechanism if a project gets denied or gets pushed to the bottom of the list. This leaves Manitoba Hydro open to political manipulation. And through this legislation, as is currently written, the ability for the government and minister to decide who gets power and when is a concern that Manitobans should have.

So we have brought forward a few friendly amendments that hope to provide some clarity, as well as some transparency for Manitoba, but more importantly for Manitoba ratepayers. And so I look forward to going through clause by clause and hope, in the spirit of transparency and clarity for Manitoba ratepayers, that those amendments do get passed.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

So during consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass.

Shall clause 4 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Mrs. Stone:** I have an amendment.

Okay. That clause 4—I move

*THAT Clause 4 of the Bill be amended*

*(a) in the proposed subsection 49.2(6), by striking out "regulations and" and substituting "regulations, subsection (6.1) and"; and*

*(b) by adding the following after the proposed subsection 49.2(6):*

**Corporation to prioritize certain requests**

**49.2(6.1)** The corporation must provide service in response to a customer's request in priority to other requests for service if the customer requests use of the power for a residential development, hospital, school or child care centre.

***Motion presented.***

**The Chairperson:** The amendment is in order.

The floor is open for questions.

Are there any questions?

Is the committee ready for the question? Or do—sorry.

**An Honourable Member:** Just an apology. Just for clarity, so I don't have a question, but I do have a comment about the amendment.

**The Chairperson:** Okay. Minister Sala.

**MLA Sala:** So I do want to thank the critic for the proposed amendment.

I would say that it's redundant, and the reason is, is because the legislation applies to large supplies of power, five megas and over, and it would have to be one heck of a play structure at a daycare or a school or a pretty—like, I don't think it's conceivable that any of these needs would ever be above five megas.

And as it relates to residential development, Hydro treats them—this would never be a risk because I think they treat them on a lot-to-lot basis. That correct in saying—so there's never a scenario where any of these situations would not already be prioritized.

So for that reason, I would suggest that this is redundant. And I would say if, in the distant future, there was an exceptionally large new hospital that did require more than five megas, and we got to that kind

of a situation, there's already regulation making authority to ensure that they would be scoped in.

So, again, I do appreciate that this was brought forward. I would just suggest that it's redundant, because there would never be a need for this type of provision.

**Mrs. Stone:** I thank the minister for that explanation, because there appears to be a lack of clarity in what an economic priority would be for Manitoba Hydro. I felt it was important to provide some guidance when Hydro does look at the technical capabilities of a project proponent. You know, very forward-looking. Perhaps maybe there would be something in the future, certainly a residential development or a hospital I would think would come close to this, or be higher than that.

For those reasons, I think it just spells out for Manitobans and Manitoba ratepayers very clearly that, in the event that that should happen, that those be pushed to the top of the list, as those are services that Manitobans rely on and need.

**The Chairperson:** Are there any further questions?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**The Chairperson:** Is the committee ready for the question?

**An Honourable Member:** Question.

**The Chairperson:** So the question before the committee is the amendment from Mrs. Stone. Shall—and I'm not going to re-read the whole thing.

Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Voice Vote**

**The Chairperson:** All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**The Chairperson:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**The Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly defeated.

\* \* \*

**The Chairperson:** Shall clause 4 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**The Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Mrs. Stone:** I have an amendment.

I move

*THAT Clause 4 of the bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed subsection 49.2(8):*

**Ministerial direction must include explanation**

**49.2(8.1)** A direction under subsection (7) must include an explanation of why the minister considers it to be in the public interest to direct the corporation to provide service in response to a customer's request in priority to other requests for service.

***Motion presented.***

**The Chairperson:** The amendment is in order.

The floor is open for questions.

**Mrs. Stone:** Pleased to bring this amendment forward. This is in the spirit of transparency for Manitoba Hydro projects, and project proponents for grid connections. As I've mentioned before, as Manitobans and legislatures, we need to remember that Manitobans own Manitoba Hydro, and accountability and transparency are a critical component to continued confidence in what we know as the Crown jewel of our province.

It's imperative that governments do not politically interfere with the independent Crown corporation, and through this legislation as it is currently written, there are no—there is no definition as to what constitutes an economic priority, and no criteria in the legislation that outlines how and what should be prioritized or streamlined for grid connection.

\* (19:20)

So this does leave the legislation as well as Manitoba Hydro open for political manipulation. This is why that there should be a public disclosure as to what projects get prioritized, denied and the reasons for that. If this minister and this government supports transparency and accountability of Manitoba Hydro, then there should be no reason why they wouldn't support this amendment.

And with that said, I encourage support of this amendment for the spirit of transparency and accountability of Manitoba Hydro.

**MLA Sala:** Appreciate the work that went into the amendment from the critic and team. I'll just say a few

things. One thing is that I think this work that we're doing is going to ensure transparency, just by the very nature of it, in that all Manitobans and those businesses that are interested in applying for a load will have total clarity over what it is that we're looking for when it comes to, you know, new industrial load.

I think the—specifically, as it relates to the amendment, one major concern is that it would compel the minister—myself—to disclose commercially sensitive information. And why a project might be selected by definition involves an economic assessment, and that assessment involves by definition commercially sensitive data.

So I think we have to be very careful when making legislative amendments here, and I do have serious concern that bringing this in and including this as part of the change—accepting this amendment—would create serious risks and force us to disclose, again, information that would be commercially sensitive.

So with that, I conclude my remark.

**Mrs. Stone:** Thank the minister for his concerns and very aware of sensitive commercial projects through my past career.

As we've seen with other government institutions and how things are done, there is a way to publicly disclose without getting into commercially sensitive information. This is common; you know, there—a precedent is already there for government to publicly disclose what's going on in various realms without disclosing specific commercially sensitive information.

We all know that if someone is applying for a permit, that's all public: the company name or the business number. That's just the reality of how things go. The intent of this is not to disclose how much a company is spending for commercial purposes.

This is simply a transparency piece to ensure that when the minister—as is written in the legislation, the minister has given him the directive to do this—prioritizes a certain project, that—or denies or pushes a project past—that there is a brief explanation as to why that is the case, and as I've already mentioned, this is already done in other areas of government and can easily be done without disclosing commercially sensitive information of that company or project proponent.

**The Chairperson:** Are there any further questions? No.

Is the committee ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**The Chairperson:** The question before the committee is as follows:

*THAT Clause 4 of the bill be amended by adding the following after the proposed subsection 49.2(8):*

**Ministerial direction must include explanation**

**49.2(8.1)** A direction under subsection (7) must include an explanation of why the minister considers it to be in the public interest to direct the corporation to provide service in response to a customer's request in priority to other requests for service.

Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Voice Vote**

**The Chairperson:** All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**The Chairperson:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**The Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly defeated.

\* \* \*

**The Chairperson:** Shall clause 4 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Chairperson:** I hear a no.

**Mrs. Stone:** I have an amendment.

I move

*THAT Clause 4 of the Bill be amended by adding the following before the proposed subsection 49.2(9):*

**Publication of service requests**

**49.2(8.2)** The corporation must publish on its website a list of all requests for service that are awaiting the corporation's response and all those that have been denied, including the following information for each request:

- (a) the date of the request;
- (b) whether the request is made by a commercial, industrial or residential customer;
- (c) the service requested;

- (d) the municipality or locality and unorganized territory in which the service is requested;—and

- (e) whether the corporation has denied the request.

**The Chairperson:** It has been moved by Mrs. Stone

*THAT Clause 4 of the Bill be amended by adding the following before—*

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**The Chairperson:** Dispense? Dispense.

The amendment is in order.

The floor is open for questions.

**Mrs. Stone:** Thank you for the opportunity to again bring some comments forward on this amendment.

So, again, the reason for this amendment is to provide some clarity and transparency and accountability, and when and if and how projects are prioritized by the minister's directive to Manitoba Hydro.

As we've already well laid out, there are significant number of gaps in this bill that's been brought forward by the minister. The current legislation, as it is written, lacks key details that would otherwise provide some confidence for Manitobans and Manitoba ratepayers.

It lacks a definition on what constitutes an economic priority; it lacks criteria for determining what projects get streamlined as a priority; and it lacks an appeal mechanism if a project gets denied or pushed to the back of the list.

Through this legislation, as currently written, the minister has given himself sweeping powers to pick and choose winners and losers, and determining who gets electricity and when.

This raises significant concerns in what will be brought forward in regulation and how the minister does plan to pick winners and losers in interfering with Manitoba Hydro, as he looks to fast-track projects in this province.

Manitobans deserve to have transparency and accountability when it comes to Manitoba Hydro, and an area that will strengthen this bill's transparency is to include this public disclosure as it has been laid out as to the requests that had been received and when they are being approved and when they have been denied.

This, I understand, is already kind of laid out in the bill. This amendment is expanding on that slightly to ensure that there is that clarity for Manitobans and for the project proponents who are looking to find out

essentially where in the queue they will be, how long they are wait-listed for, if their project is being denied.

As we know, for project proponents, construction contracts, permitting, you know, there is a whole slew of different areas that businesses are looking for some certainty if they're going to be investing in this province. And understanding what that wait-list looks like for those Manitoba Hydro projects could help provide a little bit more certainty for those businesses that are otherwise looking to invest in our great province.

So again, if the minister and this government support transparency and accountability with Manitoba Hydro then we encourage them to support this amendment.

**MLA Sala:** I do feel just—it is important at the beginning of my comment, just because the critic reiterated, I think, a characterization of this work that does not fairly represent the intent of the bill.

This is about creating transparency and ensuring that those businesses that want to access our clean hydro electricity will have total clarity on exactly what it is that we're looking for when it comes to allocating industrial loads, and it will be centred around ensuring the best economic benefit for Manitoba. So I think that's really important just to lay out.

Again, in terms of this specific amendment, you know, I made comments regarding the last amendment about—concerns about the release or the revealing of commercially sensitive information. I would suggest that this amendment takes that issue and sort of puts it on turbo drive by, you know, forcing government to clarify where a business might want to set up in Manitoba, because it is requesting that we identify the municipality, the type of service requested. All this information creates significant competitive advantage for one business over another.

If I'm operating some—a business that wants to invest in a new technology in Manitoba, and I learn that if I come to Manitoba that the government is going to print and make public that I want to work in a specific area of the province and I'm doing X and Y, that's actually a recipe, I think, for turning investment away. And being a jurisdiction where commercial proponents may be concerned about trying to get industrial load, because they know that we would be revealing a lot of potentially very sensitive commercial information.

\* (19:30)

So, again, I do appreciate the intent and the work that was done. I would suggest, though, that doing this would not only create significant risks around the release of commercially sensitive information, but it might also have a further impact of creating less incentive for out-of-province businesses or businesses to want to invest here in Manitoba.

**The Chairperson:** Are there any further questions?

Is the committee ready for the question?

**Some Honourable Members:** Question.

**The Chairperson:** The question before the committee is as follows:

*THAT Clause 4 of the Bill be amended by adding the following before the—*

**Some Honourable Members:** Dispense.

**The Chairperson:** Dispense.

Shall the amendment pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Chairperson:** I hear a no. Or, I mean—yes. Yes, I hear a no.

### Voice Vote

**The Chairperson:** All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**The Chairperson:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**The Chairperson:** In my opinion, the Nays have it.

The amendment is accordingly defeated.

\* \* \*

**The Chairperson:** Clause 4—pass; clause 5—pass; clause 6—pass; clause 7—pass; clause 8—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

### Bill 37—The Manitoba Financial Services Authority Act and Amendments to Various Other Acts

**The Chairperson:** Moving on to Bill 37.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 37 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Adrien Sala (Minister of Finance):** I do. So happy to have an opportunity to provide brief comments on Bill 37.

This legislation will modernize the regulatory structure in Manitoba by reconstituting the Manitoba Financial Services Agency which is currently a special operating agency within the Department of Finance to a board-governed statutory corporation that would formally operate at arm's length from government.

Manitobans must contend with a financial services landscape that has never been more complicated or filled with potential risks. Manitobans now have a wide range of financial services providers from which to choose: the banks, discount brokers, mutual fund dealers, full-service brokers, as well as a growing number of fintechs providing financial services online.

These providers offer a myriad of products carrying various levels of risk. Unfortunately, some of their products that are pitched to Manitobans are fraudulent, ranging from romance scams to cryptocurrency frauds. In this environment, it is important that the financial services regulator be equipped to deal with the challenges of the modern financial services landscape.

That is why we're modernizing the structure of the Manitoba Financial Services authority.

Honourable Speaker, this legislation will bring Manitoba in line with the provinces who've taken the steps we're proposing today many years ago.

As I've shared in the House recently during second reading, British Columbia made this change of structure in 1996; Ontario in '97; Alberta, 2000; Quebec, 2002; New Brunswick, 2003; Saskatchewan, 2012.

We take consumer protection seriously and that's why we're modernizing the Manitoba Financial Services Agency and bringing it into the modern world. The agency will have statutory responsibility for administration of six financial statutes, including The Securities Act, Commodity Futures Act, The Real Estate Services Act, The Mortgage Brokers Act, The Insurance Act, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act.

It will be led by an expert board appointed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council that would oversee the regulation of securities, real estate, insurance and credit union sectors in the province in a way that is streamlined, consistent and efficient.

With that, I'll conclude my remarks.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mrs. Lauren Stone (Midland):** I'll make my comments very brief on this one.

In a nutshell, this extensive bill serves as a consolidation bill of the regulated financial sector. Over the past number of years under the former PC government, there is some consolidation that was done of various financial regulators to bring them under a single roof. At the Manitoba Securities Commission, that was in an effort to create some synergies and share resources in areas of financial, pensions, securities, regulations.

So this bill appears to be following that next logical step in consolidation with the implementation of this act. However, it is a very extensive piece of legislation and bill. It's unclear what the minister's explanation how this will better protect Manitobans and the financial sector in general. However, I look forward to having efficiency savings for Manitobans, if that is the case.

And with those brief remarks, I thank the Chairperson for that opportunity.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

During the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the Chair will call clauses in blocks that can conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause or clauses where members may have comments, questions or amendments to propose.

Is that agreed? *[Agreed]*

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clauses 3 through 6—pass; clauses 7 through 12—pass; clauses 13 through 16—pass; clause 17—pass; clauses 18 through 20—pass; clause 21—pass; clause 22—pass; clauses 23 through 25—pass; clauses 26 through 28—pass; clauses 29 and 30—pass; clauses 31 and 32—pass; clause 33—pass.

Shall clauses 35 through 38 pass?

**An Honourable Member:** Pass.

**The Chairperson:** Clauses thirty—[interjection]—oh, sorry, correction, thirty—[interjection]—oh—34?—34 through 38 pass?

**Some Honourable Members:** Pass.

**The Chairperson:** Okay. Clauses 34 through 38 are accordingly passed.

Clauses 39 through 42—pass; clauses 43 through 47—pass; clauses 48 through 51—pass; clause 52—pass; clause 53—pass; clauses 54 through 57—pass; clauses 58 through 60—pass; clauses 61 and 62—pass; clauses 63 and 64—pass; clauses 65 and 66—pass; clause 67—pass; clause 68—pass; clauses 69 and 70—pass; clause 71—pass; clause 72—pass; clauses 73 and 74—pass; clause 75—pass; clause 76—pass; clause 77—pass; clauses 78 and 79—pass; clause 80—pass; clause 81—pass; clause 82—pass; clauses 83 and 84—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

\* (19:40)

### Committee Substitution

**The Chairperson:** I would like to inform the committee that, under our rule 84(2), the following membership substitution has been made for this committee effective immediately: Honourable Mr. Simard for Honourable Minister Sala.

Thank you.

### Bill 3—The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act (Continued)

**The Chairperson:** Does the minister responsible for Bill 3 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Glen Simard (Minister of Municipal and Northern Relations):** I do. Good evening. It's my pleasure to provide opening remarks to the standing committee on Bill 3, The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act.

Bill 3 amends The City of Winnipeg Charter and The Planning Act by increasing the number of local objectors required to trigger public appeal of a zoning bylaw to the Municipal Board from 25 eligible persons to at least 300 eligible persons for a municipality or planning district with a census population of at least 6,000; increasing the number of local objectors required to trigger a public appeal of a zoning bylaw to the Municipal Board to the greater of 100 eligible persons, or 5 per cent of the census population for a municipality or planning district with a census populations of less than 6,000; repealing provisions which

require the Municipal Board to hold a hearing when objections to a zoning bylaw are received from 50 per cent of the total number of owners of property within 100 meters of the affected property.

The proposed bill is a priority for this government and these changes to The City of Winnipeg Charter and The Planning Act deliver on our government's commitment to work in collaboration with municipalities to expedite approval timelines and ensure a holistic and balanced approach to land-use-planning process.

Reducing delays to zoning—local zoning amendments will speed up development approvals and make it easier for municipalities to build new housing to address housing shortages.

There are two reasons why we have brought forward this bill. The first is to lighten the load of the Municipal Board, who has overseen many zoning appeals that overshadow the other services they can offer municipalities as they grow. This allows for a balanced approach that respects the voices of Manitobans and address many municipalities' goals of growing their communities.

We came to this understanding after countless hours of listening to mayors, reeves and many local elected officials. We're approaching this legislative change in a way that resets the relationship between the province and municipalities. We're going to do this by completing what the PCs never could do, which is by bringing people together as we work in building up Manitoba.

I look forward to consideration of this important legislation by this committee, and welcome and thank everyone participating this evening.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside):** Thank you for the opportunity to say a few brief words on Bill 3, here.

It certainly is something, I think, that's welcome by many municipalities and, of course, the Association of Manitoba Municipalities. This is a—certainly a regulation that's needed some attention for quite some time over many years that the regulation stuck at 25, there. It's been something that, in my time in municipal government, that we asked for, and so we'll welcome this change.

Having said that, we go back to our presenters' concerns of the number of names that are needed to make that—go to the Municipal Board. It's certainly concern for some of those residents in some of those areas that are—don't have that many residents within that distance. So I hope they'll address those concerns.

Other than that, I don't have a whole lot more to say other than, yes—no, it's something that's definitely going to be welcomed by our municipal governments that are looking for the opportunity to make their own decisions. They definitely deserve that autonomy; there's—nobody knows their own communities better than they do.

So having—with that, I thank you for the opportunity for a few words on Bill 3.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

During the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Clause 1—pass; clause 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clause 4—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

#### **Bill 4—The Planning Amendment Act** (Continued)

**The Chairperson:** Moving on to Bill 4, does the minister responsible for Bill 4 have an opening statement?

**Hon. Glen Simard (Minister of Municipal and Northern Relations):** I do.

Good evening. It is my pleasure to provide opening remarks to the standing committee on Bill 4, the 'blanning'—The Planning Amendment Act.

Bill 4 amends The Planning Act, give the current 18 member municipalities the ability to choose to withdraw from the Capital Planning Region. It also provides a mechanism for these and other municipalities to join the Capital Planning Region in the future.

This is a significantly different approach from the previous PC government's heavy-handed implementation to the planning of the Capital Region. The PCs failed municipalities when they took away their decision-making power over own land use, ignored their concerns with the planning process and damaged relationships with rural Manitobans.

We sat down with mayors, reeves and local leaders and had frank conversations about the experiences

they had to endure with the planning—Capital Planning Region process under the PCs.

It will reset the relationship of Manitoba's municipalities in the Capital Region. Voluntary membership means that municipalities will have a choice to sit at the table. The proposed bill is a priority for this government and reaffirms our commitment to listen to local leadership and respect the autonomy of local governments to make their own decisions for their communities, to represent the ratepayers and their constituents.

Once Bill 4 is enacted, a municipality wishing to draw—withdraw may do so by passing a council resolution and submitting it to the minister. This resolution must be submitted to the minister before the next municipal general election in October 2026, and upon receipt, a regulation to formula—formalize the withdrawal will be enacted. The bill also establishes a process for future withdrawal during the 10-year review of the adopted regional plan.

Municipalities can request to join at any time by holding a public hearing, including giving notice, and passing a council resolution requesting membership in the planning region. The resolution must be then sent to the minister. Upon receiving a resolution to join, the minister may adjust membership of the planning region by regulation.

The government of Manitoba remains committed to advancing regional planning in co-ordination. The proposed bill recognizes the importance of having willing partners working together to develop a co-ordinated and sustainable long-term vision to build infrastructure, create more jobs and invest in services that are essential to deliver a high quality of life for Manitobans.

What a regional plan might look like will be up to the municipalities who decide to participate in the Capital Planning Region. The bill provides the new board up to two years to reset the conversation and submit a regional plan by January 1, 2027, or by a later date prescribed by regulation.

A renewed Capital Planning Region board will reset and reshape the relationship going forward, with the freedom and choice being its guiding principles. We came to this understanding after countless hours of listening to mayors, reeves and many local elected officials. We're approaching this legislative change in a way that resets the relationship between the province and municipalities.

The previous PC government broke those relationships, and we're looking to reset the table. We're going to do this by completing what the opposition never could do, which is by bringing people together as we work in building up Manitoba.

\* (19:50)

By working together, Capital Regions municipalities, Indigenous partners and the Province can clearly focus on key shared priorities such as transportation improvements, water and wastewater investments, more affordable housing, and safeguarding the health of our waterways for current and future generations.

Regional planning must be flexible and adaptable to regional, as well as local needs. It must address broader, shared priorities through co-ordination and cost-sharing wherein possible.

I look forward to consideration of this important legislation by this committee, and welcome and thank everyone participating this evening.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the minister.

Does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

**Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside):** Thanks again for the opportunity to comment on Bill 4, here.

And, yes, this has been a controversial issue over the last year for sure, and I think we favour the municipalities, again, getting those opportunities to make their own decisions and their own autonomy with this Capital Region.

Having said that, we want to remember the hard work that was put into a regional plan that over the years—and thank those municipal representatives of the—put up all that work into it and now it's left them wondering where that capital plan is at, and what the future of it is, and a bit of unclarity as to what decision—how they should make their decision of opt-in and opt-out, tie it with timelines and maybe not much direction from the Province.

So I just want to leave that with the minister with some thought as to address some of those issues with those municipalities, that I as well have heard before. I know you've been in conversations with them as well, Minister, but I just wanted to make those points on the record.

And as far—and I would hope, maybe some consideration with Mr. Nicol's presentation, wondering if

maybe there's other municipalities that are feeling much like the City of Selkirk is, if they would like their names maybe stricken from this legislation as well, also.

With that, I am going to leave it there and thank you for what you're doing to give the municipalities their own autonomy and a chance to make their own decisions. At the same time, they still will need that bit of direction from the minister and the Province.

Thank you.

**The Chairperson:** We thank the member.

During the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until all other clauses have been considered in their proper order.

Also, if there is agreement from the committee, the chair will call clauses in blocks that conform to pages, with the understanding that we will stop at any particular clause, or clauses, where members may have comments, questions, or amendments to propose.

Is that agreed? [*Agreed*]

Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clauses 4 and 5—pass; clause 6—pass; clauses 7 and 8—pass; clauses 9 and 10—pass; clause 11—pass; clause 12—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

The hour being 7:54, what is the will of the committee?

**Some Honourable Members:** Adjourned.

**An Honourable Member:** Rise.

**The Chairperson:** Committee rise.

**COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 7:54 p.m.**

## WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Re: Bill 3

On behalf of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM), I am writing to provide some comments regarding Bill 3: The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act.

The AMM fully supports the proposed legislative changes to increase the current 25-objector threshold for automatically triggering Municipal Board hearings to 300 eligible persons, for a municipality or planning district with a population of at least 6,000; and the greater of 100 eligible persons or 5% of the population, for a municipality or planning district with a population of fewer than 6,000. This low and outdated threshold has long been a source of frustration for our members as it has often led to an

increase in the number of appeals, resulting in undue delays and increased costs to all parties directly impacted by local projects. These proposed changes also help restore municipal autonomy and represent a significant step toward fostering more efficient local governance while preserving the important role of community input in local development decisions.

Additionally, we believe that the proposed changes will create a more thoughtful and efficient framework for local decision-making as democratically elected Councils know their communities best. In particular, these proposed changes will enable municipal Councils to move forward more swiftly with projects that benefit the wider community, enhancing local infrastructure and economic development while at the same time mitigating the likelihood of frivolous or vexatious appeals.

In regard to costs currently being incurred by our members due to an increase in appeals, the examples provided by some municipalities to our office show that each appeal can cost \$60,000-\$100,000+ per appeal due to legal fees, personnel costs, disbursements, printing, and postage. Therefore, we support the provincial government emphasizing that 'eligible persons' means an eligible voter at an election "of members of the council of the municipality" as per the intent of existing legislation. We also believe filing fees should be established for all appeals and guidance be provided to the Municipal Board on its ability to assign costs for frivolous and vexatious appeals, including the potential for municipalities to recover costs. We understand that the Municipal Board has the existing ability to award costs back to municipalities, however, has chosen not to do so due to historical practice. Municipal funds should be used for investing in their communities and Councils should not be forced to defend themselves from appeal after appeal with no mechanism for cost recovery.

Fundamentally, we welcome Bill 3 as it maintains a space for public engagement while the proposed changes help restore municipal autonomy and strengthen local governance. As the thresholds are increased and modernized, there is a greater balance between local voices and the need for effective development, which is essential for the sustainable growth of all municipalities.

As the provincial government considers other potential changes arising from the ongoing review of Bill 37, the AMM wishes to take this opportunity to reiterate that municipal Councils are in the best position to make decisions based on their knowledge and understanding of their communities. It is their mandate as elected representatives to make decisions based on local priorities and context. The final say of land use planning decisions should not reside with a

provincially appointed, unelected body unaccountable to local communities. In several cases, the Municipal Board has essentially acted as the planning authority, undermining the authority and autonomy of local governments and democratically elected municipal officials. To address this matter, municipal Councils should be provided an opportunity to re-visit and make new decisions on land use applications, based on the findings of a modernized Municipal Board or similar body following a potential appeal. Thus, we urge the provincial government to bring forward additional legislative and regulatory changes at the earliest opportunity to make sure municipal voices are respected. Furthermore, we also stand ready to review and provide feedback on legislation that is expected to be introduced regarding municipal participation in regional planning boards.

In closing, thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments, and the AMM looks forward to continued collaboration between the provincial government and local Councils in shaping policies that reflect the unique interests of municipalities.

Respectfully and sincerely,

Kathy Valentino  
President  
Association of Manitoba Municipalities

---

Re: Bill 3

Dear Members of the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs:

On behalf of Manitoba's residential construction and land development industries, thank you for the opportunity to provide written comments to you regarding Bill 3 – The City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment and Planning Amendment Act. As you may be aware, UDI Manitoba and the Manitoba Home Builders' Association have been key stakeholders to provincial officials in the development of Bills 3 & 4. We have also been engaged with Braid Solutions as they undertake the statutory legislative review of Manitoba's planning legislation on behalf of the provincial government.

Bill 3 raises the currently threshold of 25 objectors being able to trigger an appeal of a planning decision to the Municipal Board. We have expressed specific concerns with this aspect of the planning legislation ever since its introduction. We are pleased that the provincial government is taking steps to address this. The WMR public hearing experience of last year has demonstrated that this threshold is far too low and is

unworkable. Individuals can organize via social media very quickly and essentially have a "veto" for an automatic appeal. This empowers and enables, rather than dissuades, frivolous appeals and there is no mechanism currently to prevent this.

Our recommendation is that in addition to increasing the threshold significantly, that other appeal criteria be added to ensure that appeals to the Municipal Board are legitimate and are not simply frivolous in nature. Those criteria should include:

- All appellants must have participated directly in the municipal hearings process and have expressed what it is they are specifically objecting; and
- The appeal triggered by citizens must be based on a specific aspect of planning policy not being adhered to by the municipality in its decision.

We have additional recommendations and concerns with the current Municipal Board appeal process, including the de novo nature of the Board's hearings. We have outlined these concerns in greater detail as part of our feedback to the statutory review. We are encouraged that the 25-person threshold is being addressed in Bill 3 and we hope the provincial government will act further on our detailed recommendations to address other shortcomings with the current Municipal Board appeal process as a response to the review's findings.

Sincerely,

Lanny McInnes  
Manitoba Home Builders' Association & UDI  
Manitoba

Re: Bill 3

Currently the requirement is 25 voters or 50% of the landowners within 100 metres of the real property being affected by the by-law change. Now the City/Govt wants to change that to for City of Wpg citizens to 300 Eligible persons. What is the definition of "eligible" person. Who determines this?

The entire rezoning process from the start to the final hearing at the Municipal Board is slanted in favour of the City of Wpg and the Developer. The property owner/citizen has very little input but they are the ones that ultimately live in that neighbourhood, not the planners, developers, council members and other elected officials.

We only need to look at our case that just recently was heard at the Municipal Board back on March 25, 2205.

In our case there are only 117 residential properties that are directly adjacent to the subject property seeking a rezoning & variance on portions of the land. In the new format how does one get 300 "eligible persons" to sign a petition when there is only 117 potential residences?

The East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee ignored the recommendation by the City of Winnipeg Planner as it relates to Block 1 and 5 zoning.

Currently homeowners are given a whole 10 mins to put their position forward on a rezoning matter. Just recently it was reported in the WFP that the City of Wpg now wants to cut that time limit down to 5 mins. This appears to be another step in stifling homeowners from their democratic rights to object. This coupled with this change to 300 eligible persons will make it almost impossible for homeowners to voice their concerns.

If this is implemented what recourse do individual homeowners have if the rezoning of an adjacent parcel has a negative effect on their property? If the City Wpg grants a rezoning/variance that may impact an adjacent parcel does that mean they have effectively expropriated the affected parcel? Can the homeowner now claim under the expropriations act?

Would you like a 4-5 storey apartment block being built behind your house? How desirable is your house now when you want to sell?

I an recent case at 4025 Roblin (File 22D2A-002) provides guidance what a third party (Municipal Board) can provide in a rezoning plan that was rammed through with little consideration for the neighbouring property owners. Proposed 10 storey apartments to revised plan of 3-4 storey buildings.

Bottom line a development should be planned with thought and consideration along with meaningful input by the existing residents. We are the ones that ultimately that will be living in the community. A home is one of the largest investments (\$500-\$600K) a person makes in their life and they just want some certainty as to what is going to be built in close proximity to them without any surprises and any potential loss in value.

Bottom line what is being proposed of 300 eligible person is a hurdle that prevents many if not all future rezoning/variance application to just sail through with no opposition. What happened to the percentage of the affect properties? Undemocratic.

Objection To Proposed Subdivision / Rezoning / Variance Application

Submitted to the Municipal Board of Manitoba

File Number: 24D2A-0005

Re: Plessis and Dugald DASZ 16/2024

Hearing date: March 25th, 2025

Re File: DASZ 16/2024 - Subdivision / Rezoning  
Variance – Dugald Rd & Plessis Rd

Objection Overview to the proposed development:

- Is not consistent with Plan Winnipeg and any applicable secondary plan.
- Is not consistent nor meets Complete Communities guidelines/vision. The area lacks any retail amenities, proposed size of Block 1 & 5 are out of character to neighbouring lands (majority single family).
- The proposed rezoning of a portion of the subject lands is not compatible with the surrounding properties - Block 1 (North) & Block 5 (South) - the proposed density and heights are not compatible to the surrounding properties.
- Does create a substantial adverse effect on the amenities, use, safety, privacy, and convenience on the adjacent properties and/or area, including an area separated from the property by a street or waterway.
- The proposed modification to the zoning on the subject lands may/will cause injurious affection and/or impact values to all and/or some of the adjacent properties.
- The East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee ignored the recommendation by the City of Winnipeg Planner as it relates to Block 1 and 5 zoning.
- Block 1 (North) & Block 5 (South) proposed zoning/variance does not identify the type, design or the orientation of the structures.
- The area currently has limited / inadequate public transit and no future plans for additional service are contemplated. With the higher density parcels this will lead to congestion and safety issues.
- The proposed rezoning and zoning variance is considered to be incompatible with the character, context and build form of the surrounding dwellings and established neighbourhood.
- One needs to look at the overall development at Waterside East (current) & Waterside West (Proposed) in its totality to see that the RMF-S & M

being proposed for Blocks 1 & 5 are not compatible for the area.

Mrs. Luanne Diachun

Re: Bill 4

On behalf of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM), I am writing to provide some brief comments regarding Bill 4: The Planning Amendment Act.

Since democratically elected municipal Councils know their communities best, the AMM welcomes the provincial government proposing legislative changes to enable a municipality to withdraw from the Capital Planning Region, if desired, following a clear and transparent process. For municipalities that may choose to opt-out, we would welcome further consultations regarding timing parameters to ensure participating municipalities can plan accordingly. We also understand that related amendments will apply to other planning regions that may be established in the future.

The AMM fully supports the autonomy of each municipality to make decisions that best serve their communities. At the same time, we recognize that regional collaboration plays a major role in attracting business investment and fostering sustainable economic growth. By enabling municipalities to make decisions tailored to their unique contexts, this legislation enhances their ability to serve residents effectively and contributes to building a stronger, more resilient Manitoba.

In closing, the AMM appreciates the Government of Manitoba's commitment to strengthening municipal autonomy while promoting collaborative growth opportunities across the province. We encourage the passage of Bill 4 and look forward to continued partnership in support of Manitoba's municipalities.

Respectfully and sincerely,

Kathy Valentino

President

Association of Manitoba Municipalities

Re: Bill 4

Dear Members of the Standing Committee on  
Legislative Affairs:

On behalf of Manitoba's residential construction and land development industries, thank you for the opportunity to provide written comments to you regarding Bill 4 – The Planning Amendment Act. As you may be aware, UDI Manitoba and the Manitoba Home Builders' Association have been key stakeholders to provincial officials in the development of Bills 3 & 4. We have also been engaged with Braid Solutions as they undertake the statutory legislative review of Manitoba's planning legislation on behalf of the provincial government.

Bill 4 provides the municipalities of the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region (WMR) with the ability to opt out of participating in the planning region. Our industry has been a strong advocate for improved regional planning for the WMR and we continue to believe a regional approach is key to maximizing the infrastructure investments all levels of government make in building our region. Understanding the objectives and outcomes that the provincial government is wanting to achieve via regional planning for the WMR is important information for all involved to have.

If the WMR's proposed "Plan 20-50" wasn't the answer, what is the government's proposal to address regional planning?

It should also be mentioned that there are concerns from our industry that, with the status of "Plan 2050" now in question, some WMR municipalities are looking to make changes to their own zoning bylaw to increase lot sizes. With the lack of a regional plan to reference and the challenges for industry to gather a large group in opposition, more municipalities could follow suit. Should this happen, the supply of developable land based on several factors – serviceability and economics - will only decrease within the WMR. Regional planning is important and provincial oversight and guidance is also key. We believe the Provincial government should consider undertaking a review and update of the Provincial Land Use Policies and we would welcome the opportunity to participate in that process.

We hope our recommendations and commentary will be considered and we stand ready to continue assisting the provincial government through this review process.

Sincerely,

Lanny McInnes  
Manitoba Home Builders' Association & UDI  
Manitoba

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings  
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

**<http://www.manitoba.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>**