



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

Chairperson
Mr. Logan Oxenham
Constituency of Kirkfield Park



Vol. LXXX No. 7 - 6 p.m., Thursday, May 7, 2026

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	Ind.
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Tyndall Park	Lib.
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
ROBBINS, Colleen	Spruce Woods	PC
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>	The Pas-Kameesak	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

Thursday, May 7, 2026

TIME – 6 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Logan Oxenham
(Kirkfield Park)

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – MLA Eric Redhead
(Thompson)

ATTENDANCE – 6 QUORUM – 4

Members of the committee present:

Hon. Min. Kennedy, Hon. Min. Simard

Messrs. Ewasko, King, Oxenham, MLA Redhead

Substitutions:

MLA Redhead for MLA Maloway

Hon. Min. Naylor for Hon. Min Simard at 7:57 p.m.

APPEARING:

Hon. Lisa Naylor, Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure

PUBLIC PRESENTERS:

Bill 33 – The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act

David Grant, Fort Richmond University Heights Neighbourhood Association

Cory Rybuck, Manitoba Egg Farmers

Tim Comack, private citizen

Bill 41 – The Promoting Inclusion in Amateur Sport Act

Glen Wintrup, private citizen

Bill 43 – The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act

David Grant, private citizen

Steven Stairs, private citizen

Dominic Lloyd, private citizen

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Bill 33 – The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act

Denys Volkov, Association of Manitoba Municipalities
Lanny McInnes, Urban Development Institute of Manitoba

Bill 43 – The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act

Denys Volkov, Association of Manitoba Municipalities

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

Bill 33 – The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act

Bill 41 – The Promoting Inclusion in Amateur Sport Act

Bill 43 – The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act

* * *

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

Committee Substitution

Clerk Assistant: I would like to inform the committee that, under rule 84(2), the following membership substitution has been made for this committee effective immediately: Mr. Redhead for MLA Maloway.

* * *

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

Are there any nominations?

Hon. Glen Simard (Minister of Municipal and Northern Relations): I nominate MLA Oxenham.

Clerk Assistant: Mr. Oxenham has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Oxenham, will you please take the Chair.

The Chairperson: Okay, our next item of business is the election of a Vice-Chairperson.

Are there any nominations?

Mr. Simard: I nominate MLA Redhead.

The Chairperson: MLA Redhead has been nominated.

Are there any other nominations?

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

This meeting has been called to considering the following bills: Bill 33, The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act; Bill 41, The Promoting Inclusion in Amateur Sport Act; Bill 43, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act.

I would like to inform all in attendance of the provisions in our rules regarding 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 for by unanimous consent of the committee.

I would also like to inform all members of the public in the gallery of the rules of decorum for standing committees. Please note that any participation from the gallery is not allowed. Examples of specific actions that are not allowed include clapping, cheering or interrupting presentations. Taking photos or videos of the meeting is also not allowed. And please set your phones to mute. I thank everyone in advance for their co-operation.

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 presentations, with another five minutes allowed for questions from committee members.

Questions shall not exceed 45 seconds in length, with no time limit for 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.

* (18:20)

The proceedings of our meeting 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 a signal for Hansard recorder to turn the mics on and off.

When-written submissions from the following persons have been received and distributed to committee members: Denys Volkov, Association of Manitoba Municipalities, on Bill 33; Lanny McInnes, Urban Development Institute of Manitoba, on Bill 33; Denys Volkov, Association of Manitoba Municipalities, on Bill 43.

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

Bill 33—The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act

The Chairperson: Okay, we are starting on Bill 33.

And I will now call on David Grant, the organization Fort Richmond University Heights Neighbourhood Association.

Mr. David Grant. Okay, Mr. Grant, please proceed with your presentation.

David Grant (Fort Richmond University Heights Neighbourhood Association): As usual, I have nothing to hand out. And I'm thankful for the opportunity to speak tonight.

Bill 33 strengthens the functions of the Municipal Board. Actions—some actions become mandatory. This is good. The bill fails to deal with what could be city arrogance at times. When a city chooses to ignore the ruling of the Municipal Board, I don't see that situation being fixed by Bill 33.

The whole concept of planning water supplies—this is a new topic—but the whole concept of planning water supplies and sewage services across the region is a very good thing, that's been hampering municipalities for a long time, and that we would have regional planning—the Capital Planning Region, I think it's now called. I think it was set up many years ago just to plan water and sewer services because, planned properly, these can be affordable for a small town, and you don't run out of capacity, as sometimes happens here in Winnipeg.

So the more recent concept of capital planning where the City is given a veto over what would normally be a municipality's decision on whether to build some more houses for its residents, the—giving the City power to say no to a community is unusual, I would say; I don't think we've seen that in the past. And it goes way beyond making sure every town has enough water and sewer—sewage capacity.

So—but this idea of the City forcing its ideas on these regional places seems very wrong. Don't want to use a forbidden term, but it seems like a globalist power grab because it's not that they have—the City has said, we don't want the small towns to grow, it's that they only want apartment towers.

And if you live in a small town in Manitoba, the reason somebody might move there to retire is not to live in a box, because we got beautiful boxes in Winnipeg for people to live in; it's because they want a backyard. And, quite often, backyards in Winnipeg are hard to find and sometimes overpriced. The amount my house is supposed to be worth is five times what I paid for it a few years ago, and it doesn't matter to me because I'm not selling, but it does seem that affordability of single-family homes is being affected by the CPR.

Now, Bill 33 doesn't deal specifically with the Capital Planning Region, but it is on the same topic. And so that's one of my concerns is that it doesn't seem just or fair for the City to prevent a town from offering housing—developing. And when—in this case, the politicians in Ottawa have used our federal tax dollars to affect the development in cities across the country.

So that's something that's—as I say, 33 doesn't deal with that, but it is an ongoing problem, I think. And that has led to a whole lot of apartment towers in Winnipeg. And I think some of the municipalities have decided that they want to have control over what they do. And they've dropped out of the CPR, so it's good that they're allowed to do that.

On the topic of unreasonable delay, I think that's one of the elements of 33. It's an ongoing problem. It turns out that's one of the most powerful tools that an unco-operative bureaucrat can apply, because not getting your permit to build sort of puts the project on hold. You've arranged your money, and now you can't build because the final permit is not—hey, you've got to cross this. There, it's that it's not going to be allowed without a reason.

So I think that's a very bad thing, and it should be dealt with in the—in Bill 33, that we should have—unreasonable delay in approval of projects should be dealt with; not necessarily forbidden, but at least a mechanism for dealing with them. Again, that's something that a developer, if he's facing a year of inactivity for what could have been done in a day, going to the Municipal Board might be a solution for that. I don't think it is at the moment.

Also, the unreasonable delay can—and has in other places—been a mechanism for demanding unlawful payments. Over the centuries, corrupt practice has been very hard to stamp out, and any time we can, with adding a sentence to a law—any time we can take away a mechanism that's been used elsewhere for corrupt practice, I think that's a really good thing.

On the last point, there are reasons that the act limits the power of City Council. Too often, the City tries to take action that tramples on what citizens believe are their rights—and businesses. Most of us are glad that the finance ministers and others in this government have been very successful in resisting City demands for money and power, and I ask that no expansion of powers in this area be granted.

And that's my comments for tonight on 33.

Thank you.

The Chairperson: Well, thank you very much for your presentation.

Do members of the committee have questions for the presenter?

Hon. Glen Simard (Minister of Municipal and Northern Relations): Thank you, Mr. Grant, for your presentation. I know that you referenced the Capital Planning Region quite a bit, but Bill 33 doesn't involve that at all.

One of the things that we're really excited about with this bill is that it puts trust and—local levels of mature government, and the Municipal Board's scope is not to relitigate what a mature level of government has done.

What are your feelings on that topic? *[interjection]*

The Chairperson: Sorry, Mr. Grant.

D. Grant: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair.

I hadn't thought much about that until a year or two ago, when the City chose unusual locations for where the next apartment tower should be. And they wanted to put it—I don't curl, but they put it on a parking lot for a curling rink. There are lots of other downtown parking lots, gravel lots that aren't in use. It could have been placed there and not fallen over when the riverbank erodes. But—so, when the City decided to ignore the business case made by the curling club, the Municipal Board here heard the matter, and that was a good thing.

They decided that when the City had said, we're going to build it there, but we'll consult.

And Municipal Board said, no you will come to an agreement acceptable to the current tenant before you start building, which seemed reasonable—that if the City's going to make arrangements for parking somewhere, that be a condition of building. So the Municipal Board made a reasonable decision on that matter, and the City said—came out at their next meeting and said—we've talked to our lawyers, and they say we can just ignore the Municipal Board.

I thought, that was—that's bordering on arrogance. And not—we need a Municipal Board, if it's going to make a good decision—to have the power to prevent the City—not just this city, but from a municipality—from just ignoring them. And I believe this bill makes the actions of the MB a little more emphatic. But that's my thought on that matter.

And I acknowledge the CPR has nothing to do with Bill 33, but Bill 33 touches on some of those things. And so if I'd been talking to you a month ago, we could have added some good stuff to Bill 33. And that's the reason I mentioned those things. As an inspiration, maybe you'll do something like that in the future. Okay.

* (18:30)

The Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Grant.

I'm going to ask the members of the official opposition if they have any questions for the presenter.

Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Grant, for your comments tonight. I know opposition kind of will support this. I know, being part of municipal government for a number of years myself, and being on the AMM board, it's something that municipal officials have been asking for years is a little bit of their own autonomy to move forward, to get around some of the bureaucracy.

So, those are my comments, but thank you for yours and thanks for coming in tonight.

D. Grant: Nothing to add, but, yes, I am aware that there are some municipalities who were very concerned with having a degree of autonomy where it doesn't hurt anybody else. And I think that's been the case, that when they've wanted that next step, or they don't want some—a power taken away from them, it's where it doesn't hurt anybody. So, thank you.

The Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Grant.

Any further questions? Okay.

Thank you for your presentation.

Okay, I will now call on Mr. Cory Rybuck from the Manitoba Egg Farmers.

Welcome, Mr. Rybuck. Please proceed with your presentation.

Cory Rybuck (Manitoba Egg Farmers): As mentioned, my name's Cory Rybuck. I'm the general manager of Manitoba Egg Farmers, which I'll refer to as MEF going forward. MEF represents 174 regulated egg and pullet farmers in the province. Our farmers produced eighty point—82.2 million dozens last year, which represents about 8 and a half per cent of national volume.

I'm here today to express MEF's appreciation and support for the proposed amendments under Bill 33, which, for supply-managed livestock commodities—poultry and dairy—in the Livestock Technical Review Committee context, will streamline approvals, reduce unnecessary provincial reviews and provide greater certainty while maintaining environmental and land use protections. We see these amendments as targeted refinements, not a fundamental redesign of the TRC process.

The 15 per cent animal unit increase to legally existing supply-managed livestock operations without a new conditional use approval, or a new livestock technical review, is significant. Manitoba's laying hen quota currently stands at just over 3 million hens, which is an increase of 36 and a half per cent since the year 2000. We're very fortunate to be experiencing annual growth, so this 15 per cent increase provision recognizes this limited incremental growth year over year in our sector.

Allowing updates to structures and operations by amending existing conditional use orders is also logical. Provided there's no increase in animal units and no change in the livestock category, triggering another provincial technical review is unnecessary. And, for context, 300 animal units in a laying context represents about 36,000 hens and 180,000 pullets. In Manitoba, the average layer farm is about 17,000 hens, so, below that 300-animal-unit threshold.

MEF also appreciates the proposed mandatory Municipal Board appeal timelines, as those will provide clarity not only to producers, but all stakeholders as well.

Thanks again for opportunity to present on behalf of Manitoba's regulated egg and pullet farmers.

The Chairperson: Well, thank you, Mr. Rybuck.

We'll turn over to questions from the committee.

We'll start with Minister Simard.

Mr. Simard: Thank you very much for that presentation, Mr. Rybuck. I appreciate you pointing out the benefits of the amendments and how they impact the supply-managed industries. I think it's a step in the right direction and happy to have your support.

So thank you for coming to speak to us today and voicing that support.

C. Rybuck: Thank you again for the opportunity.

The Chairperson: Okay, member from the—Mr. King.

Mr. King: Thank you, Mr. Rybuck, for coming in and showing your comments of support for as well. I know anybody who goes through that permitting process, the TRC, it's kind of been frustrating, so if this helps in that process somewhat, I'm sure it's going to be welcomed legislation to operations like you're dealing with, so thanks for your comments.

C. Rybuck: Yes, we certainly agree and appreciate those proposed amendments as well.

The Chairperson: Okay, well, seeing no further questions, I would just like to thank you for your presentation.

Okay, we will move on to the next presenter, Mr. Tim Comack, a private citizen.

Welcome, Mr. Comack. Please proceed with your presentation.

Tim Comack (Private Citizen): Chair, ministers, members of the committee, appreciate your time today. I just want to start out by congratulating everybody for getting to this step. I'm going to read something that I presented. I didn't have time to memorize it, so I hope you can understand—busy part of the season.

And also to let you know, kind of some background as to who I am. Not something I like to do, but I think it helps give you some context. So, first of all, thank you for taking the time to listen to our input this evening. It's important. My name is Tim Comack. I'm an executive of Waterside Development.

We're one of the largest land development companies in the province. And for the past 17 years prior, I was an executive at one of the larger home building, apartment building and land development businesses that developed land outside the city as well. So I've

got some good context and understanding of the two different frameworks you're speaking about today.

On top of that, I sit on numerous different committees. I'm a director at UDI, I'm on the land development advisory for the Province, for the City, I chair the infill committee. Hopefully, that gives you enough background to give you some understanding that I'm involved in the business. I've been doing this for a long time and I'd like to think that, between myself and my brother, we've developed thousands and thousands of housing units over the last 20-some-odd years. So we understand start-to-finish.

I want to first acknowledge the work that this government's put into this bill. I know how much work it's been. I've been involved in that work and I've seen a lot of the different back—behind the scenes things that happen to make all this work, the stakeholder engagement, et cetera. And it's important to acknowledge that, because it—this isn't—you're not here through, you know, some sort of quick and easy process. It's been long, arduous and challenging, and a lot of hard work has gone into it.

The impacts of this bill, when supported at the Municipal Board level, will be, and I want to ensure that government understands that the investment at the Municipal Board level in order to make these changes impactful is also needed.

It doesn't end today. This is kind of a second step in this process. The first step kind of started with another government. This government inherited it, but I think industry-wide and even government-wide, it's widely acknowledged the Municipal Board needs additional full-time-equivalent staff and financial investment in order to make this work really well.

There's big delays there right now, when files get referred over to there, and very often the timelines that are described in these rules, legislation; it's very hard for them to achieve it. And so they need some help and I'm here to kind of ask government to consider that side of the fence when you're looking down and making budgetary decisions.

Our entire industry would also agree that we're at a critical stage in the housing cycle where we have a very, very limited supply of land, and I think that's something that ties into this whole conversation. You can make as many legislative changes as we want, but if we don't address the other issues, we continue to have the same problems.

We also have a deeply constrained infrastructure capacity that needs investment and reinvestment all

over Winnipeg and the Capital Region. Whether it's combined sewers, lagoons, waste water treatment plants, water treatment plants, it's everywhere.

I can point down at the city of Winnipeg and tell you where all the places are that you would love to build and develop, but there's no services or no available services. I can also do the same in Headingley, where they're at a waste water treatment capacity virtual moratorium; in La Salle, where the lagoon needs to be expanded; in Springfield, where they need water; in East St. Paul, where we had to, as a company, create an alternative solution for servicing by bringing services through a joint infrastructure committee from St. Clements.

So that's a real issue and it's preventing thousands and thousands of housing units from being developed, like, as we speak, on readily developable land, land inside development plans that are ready to be developed but infrastructure is the issue. Our company leads and sometimes puts our money where our mouth is, but, in many cases, it's requiring government level funding because of the dollar amounts.

So, with that said, you have to tie this all together. It can't just be one isolated effort. And I've watched this government in action and I know this government listens. In fact, I'd argue from what I've seen in the last 20 years, this is one of the best governments at listening, and so we appreciate that. We've had a great experience with this government.

*(18:40)

I think if you did proceed with this and tie it into various other initiatives that I've mentioned, that you'd be able to actually make a meaningful impact on the housing supply in our province, which would help deal with the affordability crisis that we're in right now, and I think that's very important. We are at a point where not only do we have a limited supply of land available to us, at like a crisis state at the city of Winnipeg, nearing that state in the municipalities around Winnipeg. But if we addressed it, we could resolve it.

So, with that said, when we tie this all together and deal with these issues collaboratively, collectively and across multiple different channels, I think we can make a meaningful impact. I do think that this government needs to consider stepping in for major infrastructure investments. I know it has been, and so I'm not saying it hasn't been. But I do think this government needs to really look at how they can,

you know, polish this with some additional major government-level investment in infrastructure.

And I'm sure all the municipalities are calling, and I'm sure you have a long list. And I think it's a challenging task—I'm not trying to belittle that demand. But, with these first steps, I applaud you because that's the first step towards getting all of this right. And it's a long-term approach that has to be taken.

I want to acknowledge the robust stakeholder engagement process that was undertaken to review and analyze these development application and approval processes. We've been involved in this for many, many years. A lot of hours have gone into it, not just from the development industry, but tons of other stakeholders who deserve, like, a big pat on the back.

The problem is, is that we're sitting here trying to deal with something that is a little outdated and antiquated. I make the joke that we're taking a Model T and we're trying to turn it into a Lamborghini, and it's not exactly easy. These rules, these legislative processes started and were created, you know, hundreds—a hundred years ago, right? And we're now trying to slowly get them right. And I understand how hard that is. You can't change it all, all at once. That'll shock the system. But we have to keep working on it.

And that's my point when I speak to that, is that we're making some good steps right now, and I applaud them. But we have to continue to take steps to work on these processes, policies, procedures and the regulation and all the other things that follow to make sure that we continue to get it right.

I do want to state that these implementations make a lot of sense. So our industry has sat down and looked at the proposals that went forward from Braid, and then resulted in what was proposed and then put together by government. And I want to state that industry and private business owners like ourselves look at them and understand why these steps are the steps that are being taken, and they make sense. So we support them.

I do want to caution, again, that this can't be considered a final step in what will hopefully be the ever-evolving continuous improvement to these outdated processes. You know, they're not—it's not easy to do, and I get it. It's not going to happen overnight. The system was built over many eras, as I've mentioned, and these tweaks make the right improvements to that system considering what we're

working with. So I want to reinforce that. I know a lot of people might be asking for more or wider berth, et cetera. But the way this is being done is actually being done quite intelligently, in my opinion.

But I do want to address something that's a bit of an elephant in the room, and I think we all know about it. One thing that we haven't thought about through all this and—or, if we have thought about it, I don't think anyone knows the easy solution. But we have to deal with the digital world that we live in and the impacts of this digital world is having on the development application, development process, the development approval systems that we're in. It's a huge impact.

And so I'm hoping that, over time, as some next steps and continuous improvement, stakeholders, engagement groups, et cetera, people like myself that are willing to volunteer their hours, that we can really start to dive into how to answer this new, ever-evolving and, in some cases, problematic—but also there's opportunities—the digital world—the digital component to all this. And I mentioned Facebook, I'll mention all types of other means to get the message out and to collaborate, other ways that we can hold hearings, et cetera. There's a lot of potential opportunity to improve what we're doing—thinking digitally.

So, with that said, these steps deserve applause, and I want to be the first to say thank you and acknowledge the difficult challenges ahead. I also want to make a very, very concerted point of addressing the praise that's needed for the people behind the scenes at government that go to work every day, get assigned these tasks, these jobs, these duties, oversee these processes, and the amount of work and, probably pressure that they've been under to get all of this done. I want to be one of the people that gets up here and makes sure that we recognize that effort. It's huge. I'm involved in a lot of collaborative processes through a lot of different stakeholder engagements, through various types of government. I would suggest the Province of Manitoba, you know, the administrators, the bureaucrats, it was a best-in-class process, in my opinion, gold standard.

So, with that said, we're appreciative of what's been done. I want to flag and come back to speaking to you about the Municipal Board investment that we're asking for you to consider, some additional staff to support them, some funding to support them—

The Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Comack. Unfortunately, your time has expired.

Floor Comment: May I ask for one more minute?

The Chairperson: We will—if it's okay, we'll move on to maybe some questions from the committee, and if you could work your answer in there, would that be okay? Awesome, okay, so we'll start with some questions from the committee.

We'll go with Minister Simard.

Mr. Simard: First of all, thank you for pointing out the heavy lifting that was done by the government staff in making this a reality, through the consultation process, the implementation of those recommendations, thank you very much for that.

Your point on making investments to support the Municipal Board to be able to put these changes into immediate action are appreciated and noted. I've also taken note of your ask for increased infrastructure investment; as you know, we've been very engaged in building up that infrastructure investment and hope to make sure that they align with the processes.

And, finally, I guess my question to you is, what else do you need to finish your presentation?

The Chairperson: Minister's time has expired.

T. Comack: I just wanted to say that this process has had government's full attention. I hope it continues to get government's full attention. And I wanted to thank government and everybody involved in everything they've done to this point to get us here. And I wanted to offer my willingness to continue to help this government succeed in these initiatives. That's all.

Mr. King: Thank you, Mr. Comack, for your comments, and, I have to say, thanks for your input. It sounds like you're involved in the process, some very valuable input that you've shared with us just tonight. I mean, I've been writing everything down and the main points that you brought forward here and the actions that need to be taken.

Yes, everything's good in words, but we need action, and that's our job is to make sure that government follows through with that. And, again, I fully support this type of legislation for municipalities, so I can assure you that we'll do what we can to see that there's action on it.

Development readiness is something that really needs to—

The Chairperson: Your time's expired.

Mr. Comack.

T. Comack: Sorry, was there a question? No? Okay.

Thank you.

The Chairperson: Okay, thank you for your presentation. Thank you.

Bill 41—The Promoting Inclusion in Amateur Sport Act

The Chairperson: Okay, we are now moving on to Bill 41, The Promoting Inclusion in Amateur Sport Act.

Okay, we are going to call our first presenter. We have one presenter for this bill. I will call Dr. Glen Wintrup to the podium.

Welcome, Mr. Wintrup. You may proceed with your presentation.

Glen Wintrup (Private Citizen): Sure. Basically, I normally would just submit a written submission, but my safe sport concerns for marginalized youth in this province regarding this Bill 41, was such an extent I felt it necessary to come down here to express my concerns.

So, basically, what's being passed out is, sort of, the information in the written submission I would have just provided. I'm not going to read five pages of information out word for word, I'm just going to just kind of touch upon some of the key things, and you can ask me questions afterwards.

* (18:50)

So I'm Glen Wintrup. I have an MPA, master of public administration degree, from the University of Manitoba. For my thesis work, I did a policy research—one of the first Safe Sport policy research projects in Canada. For this project, I garnered the support of Sport Manitoba and went and met with every PSO in the province to secure athlete lists that I can send a mail-out survey to.

I had chosen to do a mail-out survey because I wanted to ensure that participants could feel comfortable that they would be anonymous when providing responses. As a consequence, I received over a 30 per cent response rate for my surveys—again, this was a mailed-out survey—which is quite high.

From that work, I was invited by Dame Celia Brackenridge, the pioneer in sexual harassment abuse in sport, to be a Ph.D. student with her in England. For her, I continued to do policy research on Safe Sport, the first policy research project in the UK, where I traveled the UK and met with various athletes, coaches, administrators and academics.

Part of my work with Celia was to assist her with her Safe Sport projects with British national sport organizations, UNICEF and the IOC. For the IOC Consensus Statement on Sexual Harassment and Abuse in Sport, my work—my policy which—work was utilized in that document that now serves a basis globally for Safe Sport policy in all countries.

After my Ph.D., I went and was employed as an assistant professor in the United States, where I taught ethics, sport policy and law. And after leaving the United States due to certain administrative changes down there, I took appointment with the BC Ministry of Public Safety as a policy analyst that wrote legislation.

Regarding Bill 41, I commend the government for wanting to make sport more inclusive, wanting to make sport be a much more positive experience, a much more safer experience for more participants, regardless of their marginalization status.

Typically, in the past, my research has found that people who are from the BIPOC community, the 2SLGBTQIA+ community, are often targeted for harassment and abuse, bullying, as well as sexual assault. So I commend the government wanting to do more, wanting to make sport more safe.

However, I have issues with this bill. I find it vague, short-sighted. It increases the risk of harm to participants in organizations that you—will be described as PSOs. And, ultimately, I think it fails to meet the spirit of The Protecting Youth in Sports Act, which seeks to—which seeks for athletes 21 years of age and under to have a safe and positive experience in sports programs delivered by prescribed PSOs.

Now, I'm not against measuring policies and legislation. In fact, I'm for it. We need to measure policies and legislation to see if they are effective, to make sure that they're doing what they're supposed to be doing. However, in the context of what we are living in right now, we have Conservative governments at the federal and provincial levels who are anti-trans. They have passed anti-trans legislation in Alberta. The federal Conservative leader supports that.

In BC, in the last election there a couple years ago, the Conservative Party ran an anti-SOGI—or sexual orientation and gender identity—platform and they almost won. There are MLAs that were elected from the Conservative Party in BC who are clearly anti-Indigenous, anti-gay and anti-trans, and they're very public about it.

We know, in the past, that when people are forced to or voluntarily self-identify, that it comes back and can be used against them to harm them. This bill is requiring athletes or participants to self-identify whether they want to or not, to a PSO. I have concerns about that.

Recently, in the Winnipeg Free Press, there was an article titled: alleges wrongful dismissal, harassment, discrimination, ex-director of lacrosse association files lawsuit. This article went on to describe the alleged work experience of an employee at that organization that was supervised, employed by volunteer board.

To date, I have not seen anything from Sport Manitoba or the government of Manitoba that expresses or gives assurances to the public that this is not a widespread issue in sport organizations, that volunteer board members are not mistreating staff. And my contention is if staff at PSOs are not safe, are not provided the resources, then we can't expect them to provide a safe environment for participants.

It greatly disturbs me that the government wants to have PSOs run by volunteer boards, who—we don't have assurances, the quality of these board members—to collect data on the marginalization of—and collect personal information from participants, with no safeguards or guarantees that this information will not be utilized in some way against those participants in the immediate time frame or in the future.

Many participants in sport go on to apply for volunteer and employment opportunities as coaches, officials, administrators. There is no guarantee that the information they provide as an athlete will not be used against them when applying for those positions. Nor is there anything in this bill that says that the PSO or the government of Manitoba or Sport Manitoba will not share that information with other jurisdictions—other governments and other jurisdictions. There's nothing in there stating that an athlete—a trans athlete who identifies as trans, as required by this law—that their information will not be supplied to an organization in Alberta where they're prohibited from participating.

Again, I have great concerns of people providing—especially youths, who may not be the ones providing the information. It could be their parents or guardians, giving personal information that is not essential for participation in sport to an organization with no safeguards on how that information is going to be protected or used—

The Chairperson: Dr. Wintrup, my apologies. Your time has expired for your presentation. I just want to thank you very much for everything you shared today.

We're going to open it up to questions from the committee.

Hon. Nellie Kennedy (Minister of Sport, Culture, Heritage and Tourism): Good evening. Thank you so much for coming in—and in person, because you had said usually you would submit a written submission. But I appreciate you coming in person to share your thoughts and share your concerns about this bill.

What I would say is that, you know, I want to assure you that the information that will be collected is certainly voluntary. We will not be forcing anyone to provide any information that they don't want to provide about themselves.

* (19:00)

It's really—this legislation is about identifying the gaps in who is and isn't participating in sport and how we can help PSOs, provincial sporting organizations, to increase participation. What I can say is that the information that is gathered will be shared with Sport Manitoba; they are the only people who will be receiving—

The Chairperson: Your time has expired, Minister. Thank you.

A question from the opposition.

Floor Comment: Could I respond to that?

The Chairperson: Oh, my—absolutely. My bad.

You can respond, Dr. Wintrup.

Thank you.

G. Wintrup: The legislation—the bill explicitly states that PSOs will be mandated to collect this information. They, in turn, will make it a requirement to collect that information for participants that register with them to meet your mandate. There is nothing in that bill that says that any group will be excluded or anything will be voluntary or there's a voluntary nature of any kind.

Thank you.

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Wintrup, thank you very much for coming and, as usual, demonstrating your democratic right here in the great province of Manitoba, to be able to come to committee and share.

I'm going to ask the committee if we can ask for leave to give you an additional two minutes to wrap up your presentation. Do you think two minutes would do it?

Floor Comment: I would only probably need about a minute.

The Chairperson: Mr. Wintrup.

G. Wintrup: My recommendation, instead of including the PSOs to collect data, that we bypass them and either Sport Manitoba or the government of Manitoba does an online survey that the general public can willingly and voluntarily participate in to collect data of quantitative and qualitative nature, so that not only do we get numbers of how many underrepresented individuals are in sport, whether they're participating with a PSO or not, but their experiences, as well as any potential barriers that, real—whether they be real or perceived by individuals, as a means for data collection and bypass the PSOs completely.

And I'd feel more secure if the government of Manitoba was collecting that information for the government of Manitoba, rather going through voluntary boards, Sport boards.

The Chairperson: Thank you, Dr. Wintrup.

There has been a request—[*interjection*] Okay, just want to clarify, are you finished with that portion of your presentation?

Floor Comment: Yes.

The Chairperson: Okay, so we have a leave request for two minutes? [*interjection*]

Okay, are there any more questions from the committee?

Mr. Ewasko: Dr. Wintrup, thank you for your presentation.

I'm basically just going to thank you for your presentation. Thanks for the information. Thanks for the detailed notes as well. And, you know, as the minister has mentioned—it sounds like she's doing some listening, and that's good to hear. And, again, thank you for attending this evening, and very valuable information provided.

Thank you. And thanks for what you've done, not only in Manitoba, Canada—and Canada, but also across the seas and across the States as well. So, thank you.

The Chairperson: Dr. Wintrup, would you like to respond?

G. Wintrup: Thank you very much for the kind words.

Again, I really just came in because of the grave concerns I had with not so much of the attention behind the bill but the measurements mechanism that's going to be utilized to determine the effectiveness of that bill.

The Chairperson: Okay. Unfortunately, time is about to expire. However, we have had a leave request for an additional two minutes for you to wrap up.

Is there leave for an additional two minutes for Q & A from the committee? [*Agreed*]

So, two minutes is yours.

G. Wintrup: I wasn't expecting any additional time.

I, again, will just like to say, I'd like to commend what the government has done over the last few years in terms of Safe Sport, in terms of passing The Protecting Youth in Sports Act, as well as the intentions behind what they want to do with this bill in terms of making it safer for marginalized people from BIPOC and 2SLGBTQI community, as well as other marginalized people. I think it's great.

My concern is really with the mechanism to evaluate it in terms of going through the PSO, Sport Manitoba. And really I would, you know, would agree with the Leader of the Opposition, where we have PSO staff that are overworked, and I'm concerned about the burden that they will have doing this as well as just the safety of the personal information that's given to them, to volunteers and volunteers not being able to access that information and weaponizing it for their own self-interest.

MLA Kennedy: I got cut off in my last answer and I just wanted to say that I really do appreciate you coming in. I appreciate all the points that you've made and want to thank you for all of your work in this field. It's obvious that you are very passionate about this and it's your life's work, so I really do appreciate you coming down and sharing your concerns and your feedback regarding the bill.

Thank you.

G. Wintrup: Thank you very much.

The Chairperson: Okay, well, thank you so much for your presentation, appreciate the time.

And we have concluded Bill 41.

Bill 43—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act

The Chairperson: We are now moving to Bill 43, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act.

We will be calling our first presenter. I'll call upon David Grant, please.

Hello, Mr. Grant. Please proceed with your presentation.

David Grant (Private Citizen): This bill has a lot of stuff in it, and so I was glad to be able to read it through. It sets out some definitions and it requires some riders to wear electric—well, the riders of e-bikes—or, more correctly, battery-powered motorcycles—to wear helmets.

It forbids their use on roads over 50 'kiloms' an hour. With the speeds they're limited to, this is a very good thing and it'll make us all safer. The bill is silent on the monstrous danger to lawbreakers on lightweight bikes and battery bikes. Considering the actual risks to a person commuting on a bicycle versus on a small motorbike or a car, on narrow roads, the car and the motorcycle are passed less than once an hour. The bicycle may be passed 100 times an hour on a two-lane road. This presents danger. Each time that the bicycle is passed, even though there's a one-metre rule, it still puts the rider in mortal danger if they wobble or take a spill.

Operating a bicycle on a road with a centre line, in my opinion, should require a helmet and heavy gloves. This would be an easy way of bringing in a helmet rule. I know we've talked about that over the years, and right now, people can still ride bicycles without helmets.

On the other hand, when I was young and doing this stuff foolishly, the rules were even looser and so—but I think that would be a—if this would be the bill to put it in, if there's time to put that in, requiring a helmet not just on electric bikes but also on any bike on a road with a centre line, because that implies busier roads. And the helmet is one thing, heavy gloves are another.

I've been falling off bikes for more than 70 years. I try to keep off the pavement, but it does happen, especially for teens and young folks. Jeans and long sleeves and gloves are essential in avoiding medical care afterwards. It's okay if you have a jacket or jeans that have a bit of a rip and you don't have any blood coming out. That's a good crash.

I've been a safety officer at many competitive bike events. Most of these events require PPE, personal protective equipment, and that goes far beyond a helmet. Ill-dressed cyclists cost Manitoba Health a lot of time and money. The public interest would be served if you—if this bill required PPE for everybody on a bike on, as I say, divided roads and up.

MPI rules are largely set here in the Legislature. Note that one of the Justice Minister's laws recently forbade MPI from basing premiums on the risk of the main driver. That would seem to be an insurance matter, but the Cabinet felt that was a good idea and they made the change, and we have to support what's done here.

* (19:10)

If government truly seeks to protect Manitobans, it should require every vehicle operator on busy roads to be licensed and identified with a plate and—plate or fabric vest. You should require every operator of a battery bike to pass a safety course like the fine ones offered by Safety Services Manitoba. They train every motorcyclist in the province to ride safely and to watch out for stuff they might not think of. And I would think an e-bike, even if it's only going 30 kilometres an hour, can run into some of the same dangers.

So I noticed that in section 183, Bill 43 forbids towing a trailer behind a trike. It seems logical until you think about it. Every adult trike is more stable than any bicycle. My wife rides both in our community. And I was wondering, I don't understand why the prohibition is only for trailers on trikes. This seems like bias because the bicycle is more unstable than a trike. A bicycle going through a turn when the trailer tugs a little bit is a more unstable thing than with a trike.

So I would suggest that instead of prohibiting one and not the other, it would be more appropriate to set a maximum trailer limit for a bicycle or a trike. So if we say 80 pounds, because that counts the little kid in a 10-pound trike-trailer, but setting a maximum weight for a trailer would be in a direction of increasing safety, and I think that current rule is wrong.

Anyway, Section 187 is right to require helmets on trikes, because when a bicycle tips, it's like a person falling over, catching themselves with their hands. It's benign, generally, if you're wearing gloves. But the trike, when it tips, you're falling farther. And so I would say that if you're going to start off

with helmets, trikes are a good place to start. But, again, I don't see any problem with a bicycle on Pembina or any other major street requiring the rider to wear some PPE. And so that was that one.

I guess the other is, again, as I said earlier, why are we not requiring helmets on bikes on any street? We could begin with the ones over 50 'kiloms.' And because, in spite of the City wanting to make any road with a bicycle a 30-'kilom' road, we still do have a lot of them that are 60 and 70.

And I had a friend who spent all his Sundays for years doing laps of the Perimeter, 12 hours of the Perimeter Highway on a bicycle. I think he's nuts, but he liked bicycling and it was good exercise and, because the shoulder there is 8 feet or 10 feet wide, he was reasonably safe.

But anyway, that's my thought on that one, that the purpose of this is to prevent injury—crippling injury and so on. And anyway, that's—I think there would be a net improvement on that. I think that's the reason we made requirements and offered every motorcycle operated in the province has to have injury insurance. And that's to make sure that when they crash—because it's not if—when they crash, the medical expenses will be covered by the insurance group. And I would say the same could apply to battery bicycles, that every time they crash it should be covered by their insurance.

And anyway, the other matter is that e-motorcycles are not battery bikes, are not required to carry a number plate. The bicycle plates we used to have when we were little had tiny font; you could barely read them if you're standing beside the bike. On the other end, can you imagine our streets if gas-powered motorcycles were not required to carry a number plate? Most of us would ride safely. The crazy ones would be even crazier.

And so I think the need, now that we're dealing with and permitting battery-powered bicycles on the street, the need for insurance and licensing, putting a number plate on it, is big and the training idea—the idea of training them. Because if you can't operate a 40-'kilom' motorcycle without taking the course, why can you operate a 32-'kilom' battery bicycle without taking that course? So I think the precedent has been set.

And again, these are enhancements to the current law. And the other one is number plates. The bicycle, competitive bicycle events, just like skiing, people wear a vest, double-sided, great big number,

four-digit number, and that defines who's doing that. So, from a distance, anybody can see—you know, if it's a photographer getting too close to danger, we can see who it was.

And I would say the same would apply for bicyclists. If somebody blows through a camera light on a bicycle, nothing can be done now, but if we saw their five-digit number in the camera, that person could be dealt with, reminded to not do that.

So that's the, you know, just applying a technology. As I say, it's been used for decades in competitive skiing and bicycle events, and it would be very easy to bring it in here. And again, for roads that have a line down the middle, it would be an easy place to start. We don't want to mess with the kid and the parent riding on their back street. You know, that's something that really doesn't apply.

But—and again, that's my thought, and I'm glad this bill is there, and it would be nice if it had a few enhancements, but again, that's commonly what I come out to say. So, again, I thank you for your time, and I would hope—yes, I would hope the minister will take this stuff into account next time.

The Chairperson: Well, thank you so much for your presentation, Mr. Grant.

We'll turn it over to the minister for questions.

Hon. Lisa Naylor (Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure): Thank you, Mr. Grant, for your presentation today. What I heard, I heard some support for some changes in this bill and also that you are identifying additional changes that we might consider for amendments to The Highway Traffic Act in the future. So I've made note of those.

And I also just wanted to—try to put this in a question form. I wanted to provide a clarification and just ask what your thoughts are on that. You had identified concern, if I heard you correctly, about a three-wheel trike, like a bicycle trike, and interpreting that as not being allowed to haul a trailer, right? So I just want to clarify that the changes in this bill include the three-wheeled vehicle—

The Chairperson: The minister's time has expired.

D. Grant: On the topic of three-wheeled vehicles, my understanding reading that, because there were no other definitions, is that my wife's three-wheeled bicycle, which has 26-inch wheels on it and only one seat, that that would be forbidden from hauling a trailer. We've never thought of it; it's got a little grocery basket on it.

But I would think that a family where the mother has the trike, the bicycle trike, and wants to haul the kid, you know, the two-year-old in the trailer, that my reading of the act—the bill—is that that would be forbidden. If it's not, great, but on the other hand I have worried for a long time about people taking a one-year-old on the back of a bicycle, because we know they fall over. You know, bikes crash. I've got scars.

And I never considered that. My kids didn't go—they pattered around the driveway, and then when they're able to go on a—ride a bicycle on their own, we took them out on back roads. But I would never have considered hauling a two-year-old on a trailer down Regent or something.

So, again, I'm old-fashioned, but that's why, if you're going to prohibit trailers, that's what I would hope, the direction you'd go. And, again, if I've misinterpreted the law, fine. If, in your re-rebuttal, you're allowed to say that I was wrong in interpreting it that way, that'd be nice.

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): Thank you, Mr. Grant, once again, for again exercising your democratic right. Doesn't matter if the government or opposition brings forward a hundred bills, you have the right to come and say what you need to say.

I am, as well as you, waiting to hear what the minister has to say in regards to the three-wheel topic that you brought up, so I'm going to pass the floor over to you and then to the minister. I want to hear the rest of her answer.

D. Grant: Okay, Mr. Chair, is that—if that's allowed, I'd like to hear that too.

Thank you.

The Chairperson: So this is an opportunity for the committee to ask questions of the presenter as opposed to being asked questions, so we're going to turn it over to the minister to ask the next question.

* (19:20)

MLA Naylor: So my next question is this. I'm not sure if, Mr. Grant, if you had the opportunity to read—there were some definitions set out at the—as part of the changes to this act.

So, within the context of the definitions, three-wheeled vehicle is referring to a motorized vehicle. So it doesn't refer to, like, a pedalling, you know, like your—like the adult tricycle that you're referring to.

So can you tell me if you feel better about the legislation knowing that?

D. Grant: I would say not. I think the—if you're going to prohibit a three-wheel electric 500-watt bike versus a two, I think the three-wheel is inherently more stable. And so I would say that if you're going to limit trailers, I think the direction to go in is the weight of them. And if you're going to allow a trailer on any e-bike or bicycle, I would say the three-wheeler is the one that should have the trailer, not the tippy one. Again, my decades of experience.

But, no. I was aware of that definition and I think I read it when the bill first came out long ago, but if the—my wife's trike is not included, I guess I feel better, although she's not hauling a trailer ever. But—so that was all. Just the exclusion seemed interesting, so.

The Chairperson: All right, Mr. Grant. Thank you so much for your presentation. Thank you.

We will now move on to virtual presentations. We have two presenters online. Our first presenter is Mr. Steven Stairs.

Mr. Stairs, if you could turn your camera on, that would be great. Mr. Stairs, if you could hear us, if you could turn your camera on, that would be great. All right, Mr. Stairs, you may proceed with your presentation.

Steven Stairs (Private Citizen): Can you hear me?

The Chairperson: We can hear you.

S. Stairs: Excellent. That was my big concern.

I'd like to thank you all for taking the time out of your evening, you know. I know being a legislator is not always a great time but definitely the public thanks you for these kind of events. So, you know, yay democracy.

Some of you may know me from—well, probably committee hearings like this. This is actually a first for me. I'm not going to be talking to you folks about cannabis. So it's a little new for me, so bear with me if I seem a little scatterbrained, but I'm not an expert in e-scooters as I would like to be.

A little bit of backstory real quickly is I, with my vision problems, I've always had to ride a bike or rollerblade or skateboard or something along those lines because I could never pass a driving test. But I have functional vision; that's how I get around.

Well, mobility aids like PEVs have been a godsend to me because not only am I allowed to have travel and mobility now, but it takes a little bit of, like, you know, the effort off my chest and heart because there is a physical limit to how far I can go in a day just pedalling. So PEVs, especially electric scooters, have given me a sense of new freedom and mobility, which has been great. I mean, technology has been, you know, assistive in my life throughout the years, but this has been a great moving step forward regarding my ability to do independent things.

A little bit of backstory is I was hit by a car last year, May 2, on my e-scooter. Someone ran a stop sign. I was hit. I wouldn't be here today without the safety gear that I had on. So right off the start, I would like to say this bill hits the nail mostly on the head. I mean, the last presenter actually made some good points about cyclists not having to wear helmets, but that—that's another story.

I think mandating helmets for any use on a personal electric vehicle is—it has to be done. It's like wearing a seat belt in a vehicle, you know. It's part of responsible ridership. And I think the majority part of people, they would follow those rules. I think some need to be encouraged with things like legislation.

But I think, overall, from the rider community that I've been experiencing over the past couple of years, there is a sense of well-being and a sense of, like, why would we want to have a negative image projected to the public when we could just, you know, protect our noggin and have fun.

So that notion, great. I think the age restriction's great. My children are younger, 12 and 15. You know, the 15-year-old has an e-scooter but doesn't ride it around. But her friends ride them without helmets and with, you know, no protective gear. And it's shockingly disturbing that their parents don't see a need to make them have helmets or make them have protective gear. So maybe this legislation would encourage them to take that initial proactive step and be like, you know what, law says you have to wear a helmet, so you probably wear a helmet. Whatever works, right? Whatever protects our children's future regarding the safety aspect, I'm all for.

I would like to make a quick point, though. The last presenter actually made a really good point for me by mentioning that, you know, every time a cyclist or someone on a scooter is on the roadway on the side, every time they're passed by a vehicle, they are put in danger. And the more you maximize that danger, the more risk. Well, limiting a speed limit to, let's say,

25 kilometres on a 50-kilometre-an-hour road, you're going to get passed a substantial amount more times than if, say, you were going 40 kilometres an hour, keeping up with the flow of traffic more, not being so much of an obstacle.

As a daily—see, I almost said cannabis—as a daily scooter user, I am someone who has to have that sense of well-being, especially after the PTSD I have from my accident. I went through physiotherapy, you know, months of injuries; I have chronic arthritis in my shoulder, my hip and my knee on my right side from the injuries, so I'm always thinking about how I can be protected on the roadway, and one of them is by being able to be a flow-of-traffic person, rather than an obstacle to the roadway.

I think there's also another notion. I know this last presentation touched on trailers a lot, which I would really like to clarify something because I interpreted myself as a blanket ban on trailers, which I found really, really just confusing because you can ride a bicycle on a roadway with no speed limit, no mandatory helmet, and can have a trailer pulling behind it with a child in it and that's fine.

But an e-scooter that has a trailer—like my trailer, for example, has working tail lights, working turn signals. You know, it has all these things built into it that allow it to be not a hazard on the roadway. If anything it's another—it has flags on it, so it's a visual aid to show other people that there is someone on the roadway with a more distinct outline of image. So that way they see the flags; they see the person; they see the colours; they see the lights. I'm as visible as possible, and without that trailer I don't have the ability to do things like go grocery shopping, you know, pick up things from the pharmacy, you know, go on—I have a personal side business that I rely on some of that transportation for—to bring my electronic gear to things.

So it is giving—last year, I went camping with my scooter by myself with my camping gear and my trailer. It's given me this independence that I don't think a blanket ban really helps. And I think if you're going to categorize these personal electric vehicles into a category of, you know, let's regulate them, let's have safety aspects to them, I think it needs to be—I think it needs to not just look at the safety aspects of it, because when you do that and a broad stroke of safety approach ends up limiting people's freedom of mobility, limits their, you know, ability to purchase new vehicles.

For example, this bill, I know, was built off a pilot project that was created in 2022. Scooter technology has gone through the roof since then, so 500 watts on a limit for your motor, you might want to make that 1,000 because it's much more common.

Like it just—there are little nuances that I think could be tweaked to make this legislation really, really stand up to protect people rather than annoying people. And that's—I know the cannabis—or, wow, said it again—the scooter community is very small in the city, but they are frustrated. And it just happened to be that I'm another loud person in the group, so that's why I'm here. But I think if the government wants to make this bill work, it's super easy. Little tweak here, little tweak there, public safety in mind, but also allowing for people's freedom of mobility.

One thing I would like to touch on really quickly that I didn't know about, actually, before I talked to a lawyer friend of mine from the cannabis world, is the constitutionality of this. Now, bear with me, because you probably didn't expect to hear that word on e-scooter legislation.

* (19:30)

But the gist of it is that if cyclists are not posed with the same regulations as e-scooters, when they're, technically, in the eyes of the law, they would be the same type of conveyance, whether or not they're electric-powered or not, they're still a two-wheeled vehicle you push forward, that you get from point A to point B, okay. It's kind of like how a car and a truck are very different, but they're still a motor vehicle.

So what would happen is, if you're not penalizing the people who have cyclist rules as the same as you are e-scooter rules, then that becomes an undue persecution of the law, which, under Charter 15, the equal rights protections part is unfair. So it becomes unconstitutional if you're just poisoning—or posing these rules on e-scooters because they're new, but cyclists can—I mean, I could take my kid, again, down Portage Avenue in a trailer behind me, with no turn signals, with no helmet on. As long as, you know, I'm on a bicycle, it's fine. So I just think there needs to be continuity across the board.

And to finalize, I don't think that giving licences out to every cycle and e-cycle and personal electric vehicle—I don't—I think that's bureaucracy beyond and I don't think that would help.

So if you want to clarify the trailer thing, I would really appreciate it. I'm done.

The Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Stairs.

We're going to turn it over to the committee for questions.

MLA Naylor: Hi, Mr. Stairs. Nice to see you again; we've met before, had lots of meetings in the past, but not on this topic, as you identified.

So I appreciate your presentation today. I think that you've added some additional context that, you know, I can consider for future amendments to The Highway Traffic Act. And I appreciate you taking the time to come and respond to what you liked and didn't like in the bill as it is now.

And I'm really glad that you survived your accident last year. So, thanks for being here tonight.

The Chairperson: Mr. Stairs, you're welcome to respond.

S. Stairs: You almost made me cry. That's—thank you—still traumatic for me, so every time someone mentions the fact that I'm still here, it still, you know, makes me think about my kids and stuff.

So thank you for acknowledging my participation, and I'll look forward to conversations in the future regarding this and other things. I mean, I've had a great working relationship with this government so far. I'm pretty pumped.

Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside): Thank you to Mr. Stairs for your presentation.

As you were speaking there, you raised some really good points and just on your presentation that you left with us here, you made some good points there, and one of them being the speed limits and the other being the question about enforcement and practicality. I think those are some good questions as to how, you know, what tools and training that the officers are going to have in order to enforce these rules consistently and fairly.

So thank you for raising those points. I would hope that the minister will take them into consideration.

The Chairperson: Mr. Stairs, you're welcome to respond.

S. Stairs: Thank you, again. It's—I don't have a lot of free time in my life outside of my kids, but when I do have it, I like to dedicate it to things that I feel are important in my life or other people's. And if we can—

if I can put in a little bit of effort to make someone else's life easier, sign me up.

So I appreciate you giving me the opportunity.

The Chairperson: Well, thank you so much, Mr. Stairs, for your time.

And that concludes questions.

We're going to move on to our next presenter. We're moving on to, online, Dominic Lloyd.

If you could turn your camera on, Mr. Lloyd. Mr. Lloyd, if you could turn your video on—your camera on, that would be great. Okay, great. We can see you now.

So you may proceed with your presentation, Mr. Lloyd.

Dominic Lloyd (Private Citizen): Okay, sorry, there's a dog barking in the background.

Thank you all for allowing me the time to speak with you this evening. I apologize that I can't be there in person.

I ride an e-scooter, and I've been commuting on one for four years now, pretty much—

The Chairperson: Mr. Lloyd, my apologies. We're wondering if you could maybe—if there's a way you could move closer to the microphone or if there's a way you could maybe speak up. We're having a hard time hearing you right now.

Mr. Lloyd. [*interjection*] That's a good idea. Okay.

Okay, Mr. Lloyd, you may begin your presentation. Thank you.

Mr. Lloyd, you may begin.

D. Lloyd: Can you hear and see me now?

The Chairperson: Yes, we can, thank you.

D. Lloyd: Okay, apologies for that. Sorry.

What I was saying after I thanked you for the opportunity to speak and to apologize for not being there in person, I ride an e-scooter. I've been commuting on one for about four years now pretty much every weekday between April and November, between South Osborne and the Exchange District.

And I will echo what the presenters ahead of me have said. I think that we are all in favour of some regulation and some safety, and I think, you know, inclusion of scooters in The Highway Traffic Act will bring them up to date with what, you know, I am doing

and I think what the previous presenter is doing, which is, you know, wearing helmets, using lights and signals and exercising our duty of caution as folks who are sharing the road.

But I think as I've gone through the legislation, or the proposed legislation, there's some discrepancies between different types of personal electric vehicles, which is—causes some alarm for me, and I also, I think there—I don't see that there's been a lot of consultation with folks who ride e-scooters in the creation of this bill. It seems to set out some different rules for scooters and bikes. So that's kind of what I wanted to mention to you today and the reason why I came.

I looked up the consultations that were held, and I believe the Minister Naylor stated that consultations were held with, quote, AMM, with the City of Winnipeg, with MPI, Winnipeg Police Service, RCMP, rural law enforcement agencies, a bunch of rental service providers, Peg City Car Co-op, Green Action Centre, Winnipeg Trails, Manitoba Trails and Bike Winnipeg, unquote.

And so, you know, that is a great group of people and a lot of people who have a lot of road knowledge, but what I don't see in there is any sort of concerted effort to include actual users of e-scooters in that group, and that's why—that's why I wanted to come and speak to you today.

And, you know, the previous presenter spoke about speed, and I think he made a really good point about an artificially slow speed limit. Certainly, 25 is a very slow speed, and I say that as somebody who rides one regularly with a top speed of 30 kilometres per hour, and it seems like a negligible difference, but it definitely is a difference, the difference between 25 and 30, and I just wonder how many people who are involved in the creation of this bill and how many people with the power to make this into law have actually been on a scooter and can, sort of, tell the difference between 25 and 30 or even beyond, which is not somewhere I want to go.

But there are, you know, federal regulations that limit scooters to 32 kilometres an hour, so it's obviously something that's been contemplated at some point. And, again, I'll defer to the previous presenter for his comments about that, sort of, artificially low speed limit, particularly if you're putting people into traffic.

And, just anecdotally, to hammer that point home; you know, I use the Fort and Garry Street bike lanes on my scooter, and it is not uncommon for me to be

passed at 30K an hour by people who are on road bikes.

There—this was alluded to earlier in the presentations as well, but there is a little bit of a double standard, that 25K-an-hour speed limit which is proposed for scooters does not apply to e-bikes, and I'm curious about why there is a limit proposed for one type of personal electronic vehicle but not another.

* (19:40)

You know, we could get into the whole question of different types of speed limits. I know that there is definitely some conversation about lowering residential street speeds from 50 to 40. Even my own MLA, who I'm normally a big fan of, says he's not in a rush to do that. And I do appreciate Minister Naylor's comments earlier in the media that said, you know, she's willing to look into the—willing to look at the evidence for lowering those limits or granting municipalities a blanket ability to lower those limits from 50 to 40.

But I think what I'm wondering is, you know, as there is not a pressing eagerness on the part of the government to do that for folks in cars, why is there a pressing eagerness to do it for folks on scooters? And that, I think, is a little bit of a stumbling block for me.

The previous presenter also alluded to minimum ages. I do wonder why the minimum age for e-bikes is 14 and 16 for scooters. I don't understand why—that's a discrepancy. I don't understand why e-scooters are limited to streets over 50 but bikes are not—not that I want to ride on the Perimeter on my scooter. But, again, I'm not seeing a rationale in the legislation for why those vehicles which are defined under this bill in the same way, why they're being treated differently on those particular questions.

And I actually just looked through the bill and the proposed change, which is to strike out power-assisted bicycle and replace it with a personal vehicle. That phrase appears at least 22 times in the materials before you today. And to me, that says that the intent of the legislation is to make bikes the same, except they're not being treated the same in all those respects. And I don't know why that is.

So I think what I want to do is just conclude by reiterating the fact that I'm not opposed to regulation. And I think that the presenters here today, all of whom have sort of said the same thing, that there is a need for that. And, you know, we do want people to be safe and we want to be able to use these types of vehicles.

You know, I want to pay less for gas and I want to get home faster and I don't want to be all sweaty when I get to work. So that's why I choose a scooter, and it's proven a very good way for me to commute. And I think that, by and large, the proposed changes, there's some great stuff in here, but there's also some things that are not actually practical and don't reflect the reality of people who use these vehicles to get from one place to another where they have to be for their jobs and their families and their obligations.

And that's about all I need to say. Thank you very much for the opportunity. I'm sorry my difficulties were a little bit of a hurdle at the beginning, but I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

The Chairperson: Well, thank you very much for your presentation.

We're going to turn it over to the committee for questions.

And we'll begin with Minister Naylor.

MLA Naylor: Thank you, Mr. Lloyd. I appreciate you taking the time to share your perspectives with us tonight.

I appreciate it sounds like, in general, you're in support of the changes being made to The Highway Traffic Act, but you've also shared some additional context and raised some questions for future considerations. So I really appreciate your engagement on this, and I just want to thank you again for being here.

The Chairperson: Mr. Lloyd?

D. Lloyd: Thank you, Minister Naylor.

And, just to respond, I would say that there is a community. It's not a close-knit community, but there are a lot of people out there who are users of these vehicles for a number of reasons. And, you know, before bringing anything into law, I think it would be really great if those folks could be consulted directly.

Mr. Ewasko: Thank you, Mr. Lloyd, for your presentation.

I don't know where I'm looking. There we go. Right here. It's good.

Anyways, thank you for your presentation, Mr. Lloyd. and definitely a couple suggestions that I did hear the minister say that she'll take it—take some of these into consideration for future potential thoughts or possibly even amendments. So we'll see in the next few days here what comes of that.

So, thank you, again, Mr. Lloyd, for coming on virtually and using e-bikes. They are fun. Thanks.

The Chairperson: Mr. Lloyd, you're welcome to respond.

D. Lloyd: I'll just say thank you, not only to Mr. Ewasko but to the whole committee for allowing us this opportunity to be heard, and hopefully that all the presenters who've been here tonight will have offered some information that can be taken into consideration to make this ostensibly good legislation even better legislation.

Thank you.

The Chairperson: Well, thank you, Mr. Lloyd, for your presentation.

And that concludes the list of presenters that I have before me.

* * *

The Chairperson: In what order does the committee wish to proceed with clause-by-clause consideration of these bills?

Hon. Nellie Kennedy (Minister of Sport, Culture, Heritage and Tourism): I would propose that we go ahead and do Minister Naylor's bill. *[interjection]*

I would propose that we go ahead and do Minister Simard, myself and then Minister Naylor.

Thank you.

The Chairperson: It has been proposed that we—the order is Minister Simard, Minister Kennedy and then Minister Naylor.

Does the committee agree? *[Agreed]*

Bill 33—The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act
(Continued)

The Chairperson: Okay, so we will now proceed with clause by clause of Bill 33.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 33 have an opening statement? No? Okay, we thank the member.

During the consideration of a bill—does the critic from the official opposition have an opening statement?

Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside): I just want to comment on this, again, as I'd talked about with the first presenter, this is something that municipal officials have been asking for, for a long time, is some of this type of legislation to give themselves the autonomy

and maybe speed up some of the process in legislation.

You know, I always felt that, now that I'm an elected provincial official, that at the municipal level it's much more productive, as it doesn't take quite as long to get things done. But, no, I just want to comment, on behalf of some of the municipal people out there, that this—they're excited about this legislation and a little bit of house cleaning here—we just have to continue to work on it and make it better, make it a better bill, and make sure there's some action taken from it.

Thank you.

The Chairperson: 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]*

Clause 1 and 2—pass; clauses 3 through 8—pass; clauses 9 through 13—pass; clauses 14 through 16—pass; clause 17—pass; clause 18—pass; clauses 19 through 21—pass; clauses 22 through 25—pass; clauses 26 through 28—pass; clauses 29 through 34—pass; clauses 35 through 38—pass; clauses 39 through 41—pass; clauses 42 through 44—pass; clauses 45 through 47—pass; clauses 48 through 50—pass; clauses 51 and 52—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

* (19:50)

Bill 41—The Promoting Inclusion in Amateur Sport Act
(Continued)

The Chairperson: Now we will move on to Bill 41.

Does the minister responsible for Bill 41 have an opening statement?

Hon. Nellie Kennedy (Minister of Sport, Culture, Heritage and Tourism): I do, thank you.

I'm pleased to present Bill 41, The Promoting Inclusion in Amateur Sport Act, to the Standing Committee on Legislative Affairs.

Bill 41 advances a more inclusive approach to amateur sport by requiring provincial sport

organizations to establish an inclusion policy and to make best efforts to improve inclusion and reduce barriers within their programs and activities. Many organizations are already making meaningful efforts in this area, and this legislation acknowledges and builds upon that existing work.

We recognize that progress has not been consistent across the sport system, and this legislation will assist with that. While some provincial sport organizations have strong policies and initiatives in place, others face challenges related to capacity, direction or consistency, which can limit their ability to fully address barriers to participation.

This bill establishes a clear and consistent framework for inclusion across amateur sports. It moves inclusion beyond an optional practice to a shared and sustained responsibility, providing stability that ensures—endures beyond changes in leadership or governance. In doing so, it helps to ensure that inclusion remains a priority over the long term.

Bill 41 respects the important work already under way and strengthens it by introducing greater clarity, consistency and accountability. This bill is about ensuring that everyone in Manitoba who wishes to take part in amateur sport has a genuine opportunity to do so and that our support system reflects the diversity and values of our province.

Thank you.

The Chairperson: We thank the minister.

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

Mr. Wayne Ewasko (Lac du Bonnet): So I'd like to thank the minister and the department for bringing forward the—for Bill 41.

And I would like to talk about that the bill does recognize the reality and it sets out to create a framework that promotes inclusion and encourages greater participation. It places responsibility on provincial sport organizations under the leadership of Sport Manitoba to take deliberate and measurable steps toward inclusion.

There's much in this legislation that is worth supporting, and the requirement for a province-wide inclusion policy is an important step. For too long, inclusion efforts have been uneven, dependent on the priorities and the resources of individual organizations. A standardized policy creates

a shared foundation. It signals that inclusion is not optional; it is expected.

Equally important is the emphasis on education. Requiring board members and staff to complete inclusion training acknowledges that meaningful change begins with awareness and understanding. Policies alone are not enough; people must have the tools and knowledge to implement them effectively.

The introduction of participant assessments is another notable feature of this bill. For the first time, organizations will be required to collect demographic information to better understand who's participating in their sports and, just as importantly, who is not. This part, through the—some of the presenters from today, will be interesting, how we continue to move this bill forward.

This data has the potential to drive more informed decision making and targeted initiatives, even though in addition to that, a lot of the presenters—or a couple of the presenters had pointed out a couple potential flaws.

Finally, the annual reporting requirement introduces a measure of accountability. Organizations will not only need to act but also to reflect on and evaluate the impact of their actions. Taken together, these elements represent a thoughtful attempt to move from aspiration to action.

However, while the intent of this bill is commendable, its success will depend on how it addresses several important challenges.

First, there's a question of clarity. The bill refers repeatedly to, and I quote, under-represented groups, yet it does not define who these groups are. Without a clear and consistent definition, there is a risk that organizations will interpret this term. If we are serious about inclusion, we must also be clear about who we are trying to include.

There is also the issue of capacity. Not all provincial sport organizations are created equal. Some are large, well-funded and professionally staffed; others rely heavily on volunteers and operate with limited resources, as—again, our presenter had brought that forward.

Without adequate support, smaller organizations may struggle to comply. This could lead to unintended consequences, including reduced programming or increased administration burden on the volunteers. Organizations, sport bodies must have the tools,

funding and support they need to meet these expectations.

We must also consider privacy, very important in today's day and age, of course, and we've seen many different pieces of legislation that has come forward from the current government and also just some mishaps with—within various different organizations throughout our province. And I think, you know, this day and age, things and using technology and everything else is moving at a huge—hugely rapid pace, and so we definitely have to be mindful of all of that.

Then, of course, there's the question of enforcement. The bill establishes a number of requirements but is less clear about the consequences of failing to meet them. Without meaningful enforcement mechanisms, there is a risk that compliance will be uneven. Will organizations face penalties for non-compliance? Will funding be tied to adherence?

These are important questions that remain unanswered, but I have some faith that there's going to be some potential thoughts coming from the minister on this bill.

And, again, it's a good piece of legislation. The intent is definitely there. But I do think that there's a few points that definitely could strengthen this bill.

And, with that, Mr. Chair, I thank you for allowing me to say a few words.

The Chairperson: 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]*

Clause 1—pass; clauses 2 through 5—pass; clauses 6 through 9—pass; clauses 10 through 12—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

Bill 43—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act

(Continued)

The Chairperson: We are now moving on to Bill 43.

Does the minister responsible—*[interjection]*

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 Minister Naylor for Honourable Minister Simard.

Thank you.

* * *

The Chairperson: Does the minister responsible for Bill 43 have an opening statement?

Hon. Lisa Naylor (Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure): Good evening, Chairperson, members of the committee and registered presenters, if any of you are still online.

I'm very pleased to be here to discuss Bill 43, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act.

This bill amends The Highway Traffic Act and The Drivers and Vehicles Act to introduce two new vehicle classifications for personal electrical vehicles such as e-scooters and three-wheeled vehicles, along with rules for their use on roads.

* (20:00)

Additional amendments will restrict the level of automated driver-assistant features that may be used on Manitoba roadways and require overweight and overdimensional vehicles and trailers operating under special permits to be registered and plated.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who provided input and support for this bill, and I look forward to consideration of this important legislation by the committee. And I, again, want to thank all the participants who came out tonight to take part in the committee process.

The Chairperson: We thank the minister.

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

Mr. Trevor King (Lakeside): Yes, I just want to thank the minister for bringing forward this legislation.

There's some good proposals in here. And the presenters that we heard earlier tonight, I think it's important that we listen to the couple of good points that they made there.

I think one was stressed—was that—was the—maybe, the too low of a speed limit; and the other one, I think, was the enforcement of it and the training of—municipalities are going to want to know, you know, how that enforcement will be implemented and how—who it's going to be, what training will be available for the enforcement officers and the—to enforce these.

So I just want to make that point and put it on record that that gets attended to, that some attention is given to those points.

This committee is an opportunity for Manitobans to show their support or their opposition to it, and tonight we didn't see a whole lot of opposition to it but some great support and some great points brought forward that we could work towards making the legislation better.

So, thank you.

The Chairperson: We thank the member.

During the consideration of a bill, the enacting clause and the title are postponed until other—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*]

Okay. Clauses 1 and 2—pass; clause 3—pass; clauses 4 through 9—pass; clauses 10 and 11—pass; clause 12—pass; clause 13—pass; clauses 14 and 15—pass; clauses 16 and 17—pass; clause 18—pass; clauses 19 through 22—pass; clauses 23 through 25—pass; clauses 26 through 28—pass; clauses 29 and 30—pass; clauses 31 through 34—pass; clauses 35 through 37—pass; enacting clause—pass; title—pass. Bill be reported.

Okay, the hour being 8:04, what is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Rise.

The Chairperson: Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 8:04 p.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

Re: Bill 33

To Whom It May Concern,

On behalf of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM), I am writing to provide some brief comments regarding Bill 33: The Planning Amendment and City of Winnipeg Charter Amendment Act.

Firstly, we appreciate the continued engagement and consultation undertaken by Manitoba Municipal and Northern Relations throughout the development of Bill 33 prior to its formal introduction in the Legislature, including through the multi-stakeholder Planning and Development Working Group. This collaborative approach has been valuable in ensuring municipal perspectives are meaningfully considered.

Bill 33 represents the second stage of legislative amendments following Bills 3 and 4, both of which were enacted in 2025 and supported by the AMM. These earlier changes marked important progress in modernizing Manitoba's planning framework, and Bill 33 builds on that foundation.

The AMM also supported the statutory review of planning legislation, commonly referred to as the "Braid Report" or "Bill 37 Review", and welcomed the Province's Land Use Planning Action Plan in response, which adopted all 19 recommendations of the review.

Bill 33 includes several proposed provisions that aim to restore, respect, and increase the autonomy of local governments. These measures are important in reaffirming the role of municipalities as primary decision-makers in local planning matters.

In addition, the AMM notes that Bill 33 proposes to refine the scope of the Municipal Board's workload, particularly through changes to the public objection referral process. These changes have strong potential to reduce administrative burdens and associated costs for municipalities.

Overall, the AMM supports the intent of Bill 33 and remains committed to working collaboratively with the provincial government on its implementation. At the same time, we encourage the Province to continue pursuing opportunities to further streamline Municipal Board processes, particularly with respect to municipal borrowing by-law approvals to

further improve efficiency and reduce delays for municipalities.

Respectfully and sincerely,

Denys Volkov
Executive Director
Association of Manitoba Municipalities

Re: Bill 33

On behalf of the Urban Development Institute of Manitoba (UDI), thank you for the opportunity to comment to the Standing Committee on Bill 33.

UDI appreciates the Province of Manitoba's efforts to make targeted and timely improvements to Manitoba's planning framework. Several of the amendments in Bill 33 respond directly to issues identified in the Braid Solutions Statutory Review of Provincial Planning Legislation, which UDI participated in as an engaged stakeholder.

These changes reflect several core themes identified in the Braid Report, including the need for greater consistency, clarity, and predictability in planning and appeal processes, and represent a constructive step forward.

UDI acknowledges that Bill 33 represents an incremental improvement, not a full response, to the Braid Report. The statutory review identified a broader suite of issues and recommendations which include, among others:

- Refinement of appeal and objection mechanisms;
- Further clarification of the Municipal Board's role as an appeal body; and
- Improved alignment and consistency between The Planning Act and The City of Winnipeg Charter Act

UDI views Bill 33 as an early step toward implementing the Braid Report's recommendations and we encourage the Provincial government to continue collaborating with our industry and other stakeholders on the remaining recommendations identified in the Report.

We also believe that regional planning is critically important to the long-term growth and development of the Winnipeg Metro Region (WMR) and the Province of Manitoba overall. In light of the recent departures of a number of municipalities from the WMR, UDI recommends that the Province of Manitoba

resets the regional planning framework and provide clear policy direction on the future of the WMR and regional planning in Manitoba.

UDI looks forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the Province of Manitoba as additional legislative, regulatory, and policy reforms are advanced to improve Manitoba's planning system.

Lanny McInnes
Urban Development Institute of Manitoba

Re: Bill 43

To Whom It May Concern,

On behalf of the Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM), I am writing to provide some comments regarding Bill 43: The Highway Traffic Amendment and Drivers and Vehicles Amendment Act.

The AMM recognizes that the Bill establishes a provincial definition of personal electric vehicles and introduces provisions to address regulatory gaps that municipalities have been managing independently. The creation of a clear, province-wide framework is a positive and necessary step forward. We also appreciate the Province's engagement with AMM members, including presenting at the 2025 Fall Convention to gather feedback. This collaborative approach reflects concerns raised by municipalities and demonstrates a commitment to incorporating municipal input into the development of the legislation.

We also support the Bill's enabling approach to sidewalk use, which is prohibited by default but allows municipalities the flexibility to permit it based on local needs. To support effective and consistent implementation, AMM respectfully asks that Manitoba Transportation and Infrastructure (MTI) and Manitoba Municipal and Northern Relations coordinate the development of template municipal by-laws (e.g., options regarding sidewalk use or local restrictions) to promote safe and consistent use of personal electric vehicles.

However, the AMM has concerns regarding capacity and role clarity for police and municipal by-law enforcement. As written, it is unclear how enforcement will be implemented, particularly given already stretched policing resources. Municipalities may face challenges ensuring consistent and visible enforcement with limited personnel and resources. Without clear provincial guidance and support,

there is a risk that enforcement will become largely complaint-driven, further straining already overstretched police and by-law services. AMM recommends that the Province clarify the enforcement framework and confirm whether by-law and community safety officers can be utilized as additional enforcement capacity.

Finally, as this legislation is implemented, public education will be critical. AMM recommends that the Province develop standardized, province-wide public education materials to support consistent messaging and reduce duplication across municipalities. A coordinated provincial approach

would improve consistency and better support implementation, particularly given the financial and operational pressures currently facing Manitoba municipalities.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We shall look forward to continued collaboration with the Province to ensure that the implementation of Bill 43 is practical and consistent.

Respectfully and sincerely,

Denys Volkov
Executive Director
Association of Manitoba Municipalities

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>