



Second Session – Forty-Third Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**  
**DEBATES**  
**and**  
**PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report  
(Hansard)**

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Tom Lindsey  
Speaker*



**Vol. LXXIX No. 79A - 10 a.m., Thursday, October 30, 2025**

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

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
ASAGWARA, Uzoma, Hon.	Union Station	NDP
BALCAEN, Wayne	Brandon West	PC
BEREZA, Jeff	Portage la Prairie	PC
BLASHKO, Tyler	Lagimodière	NDP
BRAR, Diljeet	Burrows	NDP
BUSHIE, Ian, Hon.	Keewatinook	NDP
BYRAM, Jodie	Agassiz	PC
CABLE, Renée, Hon.	Southdale	NDP
CHEN, Jennifer	Fort Richmond	NDP
COMPTON, Carla	Tuxedo	NDP
COOK, Kathleen	Roblin	PC
CORBETT, Shannon	Transcona	NDP
CROSS, Billie	Seine River	NDP
DELA CRUZ, Jelynn	Radisson	NDP
DEVGAN, JD	McPhillips	NDP
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FONTAINE, Nahanni, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GUENTER, Josh	Borderland	PC
HIEBERT, Carrie	Morden-Winkler	PC
JOHNSON, Derek	Interlake-Gimli	PC
KENNEDY, Nellie, Hon.	Assiniboia	NDP
KHAN, Obby	Fort Whyte	PC
KINEW, Wab, Hon.	Fort Rouge	NDP
KING, Trevor	Lakeside	PC
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Dauphin	NDP
LAGASSÉ, Bob	Dawson Trail	PC
LAMOUREUX, Cindy	Tyndall Park	Lib.
LATHLIN, Amanda	The Pas-Kameesak	NDP
LINDSEY, Tom, Hon.	Flin Flon	NDP
LOISELLE, Robert	St. Boniface	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Malaya, Hon.	Notre Dame	NDP
MOROZ, Mike, Hon.	River Heights	NDP
MOSES, Jamie, Hon.	St. Vital	NDP
MOYES, Mike, Hon.	Riel	NDP
NARTH, Konrad	La Vérendrye	PC
NAYLOR, Lisa, Hon.	Wolseley	NDP
NESBITT, Greg	Riding Mountain	PC
OXENHAM, Logan	Kirkfield Park	NDP
PANKRATZ, David	Waverley	NDP
PERCHOTTE, Richard	Selkirk	PC
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Turtle Mountain	PC
REDHEAD, Eric	Thompson	NDP
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

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, October 30, 2025

*The House met at 10 a.m.*

**The Speaker:** O Eternal and Almighty God, from Whom all power and wisdom come, we are assembled here before Thee to frame such laws as may tend to the welfare and prosperity of our province. Grant, O merciful God, we pray Thee, that we may desire only that which is in accordance with Thy will, that we may seek it with wisdom and know it with certainty and accomplish it perfectly for the glory and honour of Thy name and for the welfare of all our people. Amen.

We acknowledge we are gathered on Treaty 1 territory and that Manitoba is located on the treaty territories and ancestral lands of the Anishinaabeg, Anishinewuk, Dakota Oyate, Denesuline and Nehethowuk nations. We acknowledge Manitoba is located on the Homeland of the Red River Métis. We acknowledge northern Manitoba includes lands that were and are the ancestral lands of the Inuit. We respect the spirit and intent of treaties and treaty making and remain committed to working in partnership with First Nations, Inuit and Métis people in the spirit of truth, reconciliation and collaboration.

Please be seated.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader):** Honourable Speaker, I seek leave to see if you—we can call Bill 225, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Universal Screening for Learning Disabilities), and not recognize the clock until all members that wish to speak to it have, and bring it to a vote.

**The Speaker:** Is there leave to allow the member for Tyndall Park (MLA Lamoureux) to call—sorry about that.

Is there leave to call for concurrence and third reading debate of Bill 225, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Universal Screening for Learning Disabilities), and with the House to not see the clock until the question has been put?

Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Speaker:** Leave has been denied.

**Mr. Johnson:** Can you please resume debate on Bill 222.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—  
PUBLIC BILLSBill 222—The Criminal Trespassers Act and  
Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act

**The Speaker:** It has been announced that we will now resume debate on second reading of Bill 222, The Criminal Trespassers Act and Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act.

The debate is standing in the name of the honourable member for Lagimodière, who has nine minutes remaining.

**Mr. Tyler Blashko (Lagimodière):** Good morning, Honourable Speaker. It's a pleasure to be here on this glorious Thursday morning to speak about Bill 222, The Criminal Trespassers Act and Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act. It's been quite a week here. I'm really excited to be here this Thursday.

But I think what we're—what I think the opposition is trying to get at in this bill—it's been a while since we've heard them speak about it, but we're—I think we're trying to get to a point of like, building senses of safety and community, and a sense of we can trust our processes and our institutions to be responsive to our needs, both as individuals, as families and as communities.

So I think that's their intention here. And I think we need to look at the track record of what we do in government to build that sense of safety, to build that sense of accountability. And so I want to look at a few things that our government has done in our first two years in government to really build that sense of accountability and safety and community.

I want to acknowledge a lot of this work has been led by our Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. Wiebe), so I want to acknowledge his work. And I also want to highlight the—sorry, the long blade or the removal of the long blades in different stores across Manitoba. It's made a huge difference, it's something the community was calling for, it was a concern for safety. And he took the initiative to work with retailers to get those off the shelves. And not only

here in Manitoba, but he also worked with online real-retailers so that actually, across Canada, long blades are less accessible. And this was leading to real impacts in community where folks are feeling safer and there's less long blades on the streets. So I want to thank him for that work right there.

We also invested in—when we're talking about trespassing, we're talking about property—we made major investments in our security rebate where individuals, households and—as well as small businesses could apply for rebates for different security programs to ensure that their properties felt secure and were secured in different ways.

And we heard across our many constituencies from homeowners to landlords and also to small-business owners that this has made a real impact on their lives and their sense of safety in their communities. So I also want to thank the minister for that. I think he's doing a great job.

And then we're also talking about the retail theft. I think trespassing applies to retail spaces as well. And we've done real work engaging with the community of small-business owners, retailers who are experiencing different types of theft. And we've seen real improvement, both in like downtown Winnipeg but also across the province.

I know there's a downtown safety initiative over in Brandon that's seen real results. So when we're talking about trespassing and safety of property, we're thinking both of personal property but also our retail space as well. So our Attorney General (Mr. Wiebe) is doing some really amazing work in terms of ensuring safety across the province. So I want to thank him for that. So lots of different policies coming out, but there's also financial investments that we need to talk about: financial investments that were made, but also financial investments that weren't made.

We had seven and a half years of PC government and you would think the part of tough on crime would be looking to invest in law enforcement. But we really didn't see that during their time in office. So in 2017, they scrapped the ankle bracelet monitoring program, and then in 2018, they froze funding. And all this impacts law enforcement's ability to engage with property owners on issues of trespassing.

In 2019, they looked around and decided that municipal police forces didn't need their help. In 2020, there was no increase to funding and also in 2021, still no increase. But then we got to 2023 and there was a great, sunny, brand new day where we were willing to

work with municipalities and law enforcement to explore their needs and increase funding to ensure that they were able to address trespassing concerns and property concerns.

\* (10:10)

And so we were there as partners at the table, ensuring they were receiving the funding they needed. So we've been happy to increase funding across law enforcement across the province. RCMP, Brandon, here Winnipeg, it's been a really wonderful partnership that we've been able to build. And we know that they are—these different law enforcement agencies are happy to work with us because they're seeing real results, they're seeing it from their staff but they're also seeing it from their interactions with community.

And so I want—I think it's a little—it's interesting that we're here on October 30. October 30, the day before Halloween, the penultimate day of October. Some people know it as gate night. And—yes, so it's not a day that's recognized in our legislation, it's not in the days, months or weeks that we recognize. But I know, as a kid, as a teenager, there were some times my friends were engaged in—maybe I never engaged in it, from what I can recall, but I heard rumours maybe of toilet paper in trees of neighbours, things like that. Real, like, low-key, fun stuff that kids do on October 30. And so I think it's really interesting that we're here today talking about trespassing and talking about, like, the impacts of trespassing and the impact on property owners.

So yes, I know not everyone likes Halloween. Historically, some members on the PC side have not always enjoyed Halloween. But when I think about—when I reflect on gate night, I think about the time I worked with high school students—we have a lot of educators on this side of the House, really doing important work, building up students' capacity to make sense of right and wrong and develop different values and morals.

And so I think it's really important that we consider young people in the development of these laws. Maybe, like, unintended consequences; maybe that's what we need to think about, unintended consequences. And we know PCs sometimes think about unintended consequences, usually related to feeding kids in school, and, like, yes, there's consequences unintended: kids staying in school, maybe not trespassing. Maybe that's an impactful way to address trespassing, is feeding kids in school, keeping them there, ensuring they're fed. But they've decided to go down a different route. They were worried about those

unintended consequences, but I think we do really need to think about the unintended consequences of this type of legislation.

This legislation, paired with the private member's resolution we're going to be hearing in the next hour, is really moving towards an American-style, stand-your-ground point of view. And we see what happens in the US with stand-your-ground legislation, where property is valued above the lives of community members, of youth, of parents, and it's really a dangerous road to go down. So I'm really—that is the unintended consequence I'm worried about, is the impact of communities and this encroachment of this stand-your-ground ideology that's coming from south of the border.

And so when I'm thinking about that, I also can't help but reflect about the experiences of Colten Boushie over in Saskatchewan, where, unfortunately, he lost his life to Gerald Stanley. And so I think we—I appreciate the opposition's effort, maybe their intention, but definitely unintended consequences are something we need to consider when we're looking at this legislation.

And, with that, I want to thank the Honourable Speaker for all this time.

**Mr. Rick Wowchuk (Swan River):** I rise today on behalf of the people of the Swan River constituency—and, give you an idea, this is a very rural constituency that goes all the way from the 53rd parallel north of Dawson Bay through the Swan Valley, to Ethelbert, across through Roblin, Russell, Binscarth, and also east of Rossmore, Vista.

So this takes in rural Manitoba where we always encounter a lot of things happening in the early hours of the morning on the lot of the remote farmyards and in these remote—or in these communities and things.

And we believe that Manitobans work hard, respect the law and should protect what's theirs. Your government should stand with you on this, not with the trespasser who breaks in at night.

And that's what Bill 222, The Criminal Trespassers Act and Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act, is all about. It makes one simple common sense change: criminals shouldn't be able to sue the people they were trying to rob.

For too long, loopholes have allowed offenders to use the courts against their victims. This bill closes that loophole and it restores fairness to the system.

Honourable Speaker, rural and northern Manitobans know this as reality. A farmer wakes to find someone siphoning fuel and a homeowner confronts thieves in his shed. In the scuffle, the trespasser gets hurt, and suddenly, the property owner is hauled into court. That's not justice, that's revictimization.

Bill 222 ensures that someone who trespasses with criminal intent cannot sue the homeowner for injuries sustained while committing a crime—only in extreme cases where the property owner's actions are wilful, grossly inappropriate and lead to a criminal conviction would liability apply. This isn't a stand your ground law. It doesn't excuse violence. It restores balance between law-abiding Manitobans and those who exploit the system.

Honourable Speaker, property crime is rising—in communities like Swan River, Flin Flon, The Pas, McCreary, Roblin, Inglis. Break-ins, fuel theft, copper theft—these are daily realities that threaten rural livelihoods. Government press releases about getting tough on crime mean little if citizens still feel unsafe.

This bill gives honest Manitobans some assurance that the law is on their side. It recognizes that farms and rural properties carry real risks. Machinery, livestock, rough terrain—and those who trespass assume those risks.

Alberta's already led the way with similar legislation, the Trespass Statutes (Protecting Law-Abiding Property Owners) Amendment Act of 2019. It works. And Bill 222 mirrors that success. It keeps Manitobans in step with our prairie neighbours who are standing up for rural families and business owners.

Honourable Speaker, Bill 222 doesn't change the Criminal Code or excuse reckless behaviour. It ensures that property owners acting in good faith to protect their homes aren't treated like criminals. Right now, people across rural Manitoba are installing cameras and new locks because they've lost faith that the system will protect them.

This bill helps to rebuild that trust. It sends a clear message: the court exists to defend victims, not reward offenders. If you break the law, you don't profit from it.

Honourable Speaker, this is more than legal language; it's about restoring common sense. Manitobans who rise before dawn to feed cattle, run shops or protect their families deserve to know that their government values their rights.

\* (10:20)

Bill 222 provides that reassurance. It protects property owners from unfair lawsuits, respects the rule of law and it reinforces the principle that responsibility lies with those who choose to commit crimes, not those who suffer from them.

So I say to the members of the House: let us stand with Manitoba farmers, business owners and homeowners. Let us pass Bill 222 and protect those who 'proTECT' what they've worked for all their lives.

Honourable Speaker, this bill is about fairness, accountability and respect for the law-abiding Manitoban. It's about ensuring that justice serves the victim, not the trespasser. And I urge everyone in the Legislature today to support Bill 222, and let's get it passed.

Thank you.

**Hon. Mintu Sandhu (Minister of Public Service Delivery):** It is an honour to rise today to speak to Bill 222, The Criminal Trespassers Act and Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act.

Honourable Speaker, this bill talks about the safety in the community, safety for the homeowners, but this is also—when we talk about safety, we have to start with one simple truth. Real safety comes from real investment in people, in communities and in the justice system that protect them. Not slogans, not empty promises; real, concrete actions. And that is what our government is delivering.

Just yesterday, our Minister of Justice (Mr. Wiebe) announced \$2 million to expand Manitoba's Operational Communication Centre, the command centre that handles every emergency call for RCMP services in our province. That investment means six new RCMP officers, 10 new public service dispatches and 24-7 risk management support for law enforcement.

Again, Honourable Speaker, it's an absolute honour to speak to Bill 222.

It means when someone in the rural Manitoba picks up the phone to report a violent crime, a crash or break-in, there's someone on the other end ready to respond. That is how you keep communities safe, by bringing law enforcement the tools they need to do their jobs. And that is the difference between our approach and the approach of the former PC government.

From 2017 right through 2023, PCs froze police funding in Manitoba—not one increase, not a penny more for Winnipeg police, Brandon police or the

RCMP. They left police forces to struggle with rising crime, high costs and fewer officers on the ground.

And Manitobans paid the price. Under the former PC government, crime went up, communities were left to defend for themselves while the government sat on their hands.

And so, in 2023, Manitoba voters decided that the PCs and their soft-on-crime approach wasn't worth their time. That's why—you know, this is important to talk about Bill 22. This is, again, want to highlight what the Conservatives haven't done to protect the communities, to protect the rural homeowners. Communities were left to fend for themselves while the government sat on their hands.

And so when we came into office, we made it clear that safety matters. We increased funding to all municipality police forces by 28 per cent, the largest increase in decades. And we didn't stop there. We made sure police services will get a 2 per cent annual boost to make sure law enforcement has what it needs, not just today but tomorrow too. Because keeping Manitobans safe isn't a partisan issue, it is a basic responsibility of the government.

We have backed that up with a record investment: 24 new Winnipeg police officers dedicated to the community policing, 12 already on the street, 12 more coming this spring; \$4 million for bail reform to keep violent offenders off the street; \$2 million of the Manitoba Security Rebate Program, helping small businesses protect their property and their employees—Honourable Speaker, I actually misspoke—it is \$10 million not \$2 million, that investment we are doing in the community; \$2.9 million for electric-electronic ankle monitoring, a program that the former PC government cancelled back in 2017.

We brought it back because Manitobans deserve a justice system that actually works to keep them safe. And that investment has paid off. It's been praised by law enforcement, including the National Police Federation who called it, I quote, a direct response to what our communities have been asking for, end quote. That is what action looks like, Honourable Speaker.

We have also taken real steps to address retail theft, a major concern for the families and small-business owners. We engaged with 187 local businesses through our retail theft initiative to understand their needs. And those efforts have already led to 981 arrests and over \$122,000 in recovered merchandise.

We also took long-bladed weapons off our store shelves and worked with online retailers to stop people from buying them legally. These are practical, common sense steps that make people safer in their communities, be it here in Winnipeg or rural Manitoba.

We have invested in the justice system because we know safety doesn't stop with an arrest. It depends on a justice system that is fair, efficient and accessible.

We have hired 35 new Crown attorneys, given them a fair deal and added over 20 new court support staff. We have reduced court clerk vacancies by 85 per cent in Winnipeg and 69 across—69 per cent across Manitoba. Our courts are now better staffed, better supported and better able to protect Manitobans.

Honourable Speaker, I remember the member from Lagimodière was talking about unintended consequences with this bill. And also Halloween is just around the corner, you know. Tomorrow is Halloween. So this is where those unintended consequences the member from Lagimodière was talking about.

We have also seen, it was in the news recently, I think it's called the ding-dong ditch. That was in the news. And, you know, that's—unintended consequences can happen with that as well. And also in my own community in The Maples, Honourable Speaker, we have a group called the Amber Trails, Amber Gates community Facebook group.

\* (10:30)

And I have seen it there as well, Honourable Speaker. Kids playing games with this ding-dong ditch and somebody told me this is a national trend. You are hearing it not only here but you are also hearing folks from other provinces; even from, like, far away, such as in—even in India.

So this is—again, we don't want to see someone getting killed with this, some kids playing pranks on the houses. I know they shouldn't do this. This is—they should be studying at home or playing on—in the community, maybe playing soccer, basketball or something else, you know, but not to do these things. But they are kids, right? So they do these things just for the fun, but they shouldn't do that.

And that's why this bill is—I don't see those—

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

**Mrs. Colleen Robbins (Spruce Woods):** I'd like to briefly talk about the criminal trespass—Bill 222, The Criminal Trespassers Act and Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act.

Under the current legislation and common law, an occupier may be held liable for an injury or a death of an individual trespassing on their property. These amendments will protect an occupier from a civil liability for injury or death of any reason short of a wilful and grossly disproportionate act that results in an occupier being convicted of an offence under the Criminal Code, Canada, that is prosecuted by indictment.

The amendment does not allow for a person to set booby traps and create a dangerous situation where the intent is to harm an individual. Amendment does not alter any criminal liability that an individual may face. This is not a stand your ground law. The Criminal Code and common law rules regarding self-defence and protection of property are unchanged.

This bill stops criminals from attempting to use the courts to benefit from their criminal actions at the expense of their victims and the public. This does not excuse criminal behaviour on the part of a property owner. This bill does not promote vigilant justice, nor does it condone or encourage property owners using violent and dangerous means to protect property.

It is important that Manitobans not be revictimized by criminals. This government seems to be unwilling or unable to stop the increase in violent and property crimes across this province. This is a small but important step to restoring the balance between the law-abiding Manitobans and the criminals that continue to take advantage of the system and continue to reoffend.

The situation just in MacGregor highlights the need of a law like this. Could you imagine a situation where after victimizing a household, the perpetrators injure themselves while attempting to escape, then turn around and sue the property owner for their injuries? The judiciary of—have called for this a—legislation across Canada.

So we need, as Manitobans today, to protect the people, the property owners, the public from the criminals. We need to pass Bill 222.

**Hon. Jamie Moses (Minister of Business, Mining, Trade and Job Creation):** I'm glad to take a few minutes to put some words on the record regarding The Criminal Trespassers Act and Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act, Bill 222.

But before I begin, Honourable Speaker, I just want to take a minute given there's a few notable events coming up and that this bill gives us a chance to talk about public safety, that Halloween is tomorrow, October 31.

I know a lot of kids and families will be out in communities right across the province, enjoying the Halloween festivities. I know in my neighbourhood, it's been a bit of a revival in Halloween post-pandemic: a lot of kids and families going out, enjoying the trick-or-treating activities. But I want to encourage community members to be safe out there, so if you can, get your kids to wear those reflective either materials or lights so they can be seen by vehicles. They have flashlights, that's great. Make sure you supervise them as best able, and that when they get those treats and candies home, that you give it a little review and once-over and make sure anything your kids are going to be eating and enjoying those treats, you do so in a safe way.

So as we—with respect to the criminal trespassers act and bill 22, I also want to make sure that we talk about the purpose of this bill and make sure that we understand what the opposition members are bringing forward in this private members' bill. It is—the purpose is to establish this bill, the criminal trespassers act, and make amendments to the liability—occupiers and liabilities act. It would make changes in a few ways.

And first, in schedule 1, initially, it would make laws governing civil claims for damages made by trespassers against occupiers of the premises. Schedule 1 of it, it really talks about—it bars lawsuits against an occupier for the premises for the injury or death of a person who is 12 years of age or older, and who trespasses for the purpose of committing a crime. The occupier is liable to a criminal trespasser only if the actions are wilful and grossly disproportionate in the circumstances and results of the occupier being criminally convicted, and that amendments are made to ensure that the time period for filing the claim against the occupier is extended until after any criminal charges against the occupier have been resolved.

Schedule 2 of the amendment is the provision that currently limits an occupier duty of care to—in specified circumstances, it expanded to apply to any persons aged 12 or older who enters an occupier's premises without permission.

Now I just want to put that on the record there, some comments around the changes that are proposed here before we get into the debates on this bill.

And it's important to also note that a PC government is bringing—opposition is bringing for this motion, and it's important to understand the context of why they're bringing this forward with respect to the actions they took while they were in government. And when they had that opportunity in government, and not only was it noteworthy that they didn't bring in this piece of legislation or this amendment, but that they also had, I think, a pretty poor track record when it comes to dealing with crime and dealing with community and public safety.

What we saw under the PC government was increased funding pressures on those community safety organizations and on law enforcement. We saw a funding freeze under the former government, which led to all municipal—municipalities which fund the police forces having an austerity approach under the former government. It's a 28 per cent increase, and so that's a very significant impact that we've seen as a result of their mismanagement of public safety. So if this, coming on the heels of a failed time in government, I think is noteworthy context to add into the conversation.

Also, Honourable Speaker, I just want to also take a moment to say that coming up this weekend is also the shift to daylight saving time—away from daylight savings, and so people in Manitoba will be shifting their clocks. Of course, it's fall time, so we fall back an hour. And I think we also see an increased risk of—whether that's stress, whether that is of concern for things going on as a result of the time change. We also see an increase of traffic incidents and car accidents and damages on our roads and highways. And so I want to just urge Manitobans to be safe out there, now both during Halloween tomorrow and also during daylight savings coming up this weekend, that we, you know, take care to make sure we keep our community and ourselves as safe as possible.

\* (10:40)

Now, back to Bill 222, we want to make sure that we don't repeat the mistakes of the former PC government when it comes to crime. We know that crime exploded under the former PC government and, quite frankly, they don't have a track record of taking any significant steps to resolve the crime that exploded under their record.

We know that they scrapped the ankle monitor program that, you know, claiming it wasn't successful. But they clearly didn't replace it with anything of any substance. And so it's a huge gap on those folks who we want to make sure are following through on their



conditions of being released. An ankle monitor program plays a part, plays a role in that. We know that they froze, froze and froze funding to municipalities and agencies, that they looked around and decided that municipal police forces didn't really help—you know, that there was no interaction and no increase to supports for those rural and local police forces. And then, certainly, we know that supporting police officers was not something that they really cared about or took any actions to support.

Now since we've been in office in the short two years that it's been, we've already taken some significant steps to support security through funding additional police officers. And specifically here in the city of Winnipeg, there's 55 new officers that are patrolling now because of our actions, that weren't on the streets in the former PC government.

And members opposite talk about the impacts on the rural community that Bill 222 would have, and members opposite mentioned farmers and wanting to protect farmers. And so we know, in those areas, RCMP officers play a significant role.

And I also want to give a shout-out at this moment to say that in those rural and northern areas where RCMP are doing the good job of protecting the wide-ranging potential challenges that might be facing, criminal activity that might be facing rural and northern communities, I also want to give a shout-out to conservation officers who also work to protect community members with respect to wildlife and other instances where people and community members might feel unsafe, might be in dangerous situations, and make sure that we are protecting all parts of our community and society.

But when it comes to the RCMP and the record there, members opposite don't have a leg to stand on. It's important for us to make sure we support those law enforcement officials and those agencies by putting together real solutions, not just dealing with a bill like this which deals with things after the fact of criminal activity, but how do we support communities by preventing criminal activities in the first place, which is why I'm proud to be part of a team with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Wiebe) who took long-bladed weapons off the store shelves, making sure that we reduce the opportunities and the weapons with which criminals would have to commit violent acts.

This is a proactive step that helps all Manitobans, whether you're in the city, whether you're in rural and suburban community or whether you're in a rural and northern community, you can feel that our—and feel

and know that our government is taking real action to address violent crime in a preventative way; not like Bill 222, which does it in a—you know, after-the-fact way, after there's been criminal activity, but in a proactive way.

And I think that's part of our key solution to both supporting law enforcement and making sure we get tough on crime and criminal activity, but also that we work to get to the root causes of crime and preventative measures that deal with criminal activity. And so we know that supporting new RCMP officers is part of the solution and we're very happy to do that and work in tandem and collaboratively with members from law enforcement.

And that's why we've had really good response in working with folks with AMM, for example, and they've supported our initiatives to reduce crime. And they've supported some of our work to increase those front-line officers and deal with repeat and prolific offenders in a meaningful and substantive way, and expanding those responsibilities that we have.

We think that's the right approach. We think it's—approach that both takes into account preventative measures and tough law enforcement measures, making sure that people who do the good work of protecting our community have the resources they need, and not what—proposed in Bill 222.

Thank you—

**The Speaker:** Time has expired.

**MLA Eric Redhead (Thompson):** I rise today to put a few words on the record to Bill 222, The Criminal Trespassers Act and Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act.

You know, at its core, this bill claims to protect property owners. But, Honourable Speaker, the law must never place property above people or human life. That is exactly what this legislation risks doing. Our government believes in keeping Manitobans safe in their homes, their businesses and their communities. But safety is not achieved through fear or punishment; it is achieved through smart investments, fair laws and justice that applies equally to everyone, not just those who own property.

Our government is taking real action to make communities safer. Just yesterday, we announced a \$2-million investment to expand Manitoba's Operational Communication Centre, strengthening the RCMP's ability to respond to violent crime and critical incidents across our great province. That investment will

add six new RCMP officers and 10 dispatchers providing 24-hour operational supports so Manitobans can get help faster when they call 911.

That is real action, Honourable Speaker. It's not a slogan, it's not politics.

When the former PC government was in power, they froze police funding for six years—from 2017 until the day they were voted out. They never once increased funding for RCMP, the Winnipeg Police or Brandon Police Services. Their inactions had real consequences. Manitobans saw rising crime, fewer officers and communities that felt abandoned. Under their watch, the Winnipeg police lost 55 officers. That's 55 fewer people patrolling our streets, 55 fewer people helping victims, 55 fewer people protecting families.

When the PCs had the chance to act, they turned their backs. In 2017, they scrapped the ankle monitoring program, a tool used to track violent offenders, claiming it was ineffective. In 2018, they froze funding again. In 2019, still nothing. In 2020 and 2021, during some of the most difficult years for public safety, they did not lift a finger. And in 2022 and 2023, when Manitobans begged for help, they ignored them. Manitoba saw a government that was soft on crime but hard on communities, more interested in blaming victims than funding police.

In 2023, Manitobans decided they had had enough. Our government has taken a different path, and we have made historic investments to strengthen law enforcement and public safety. We increased funding for all municipal police forces by 28 per cent, the largest increase in Manitoba's history. That's our government, Honourable Speaker. We introduced 2 per cent funding escalators so police never again face years of freezes and cuts. We invested \$4 million in bail reform, \$2 million in Manitoba—\$2 million in the Manitoba Security Rebate Program and nearly \$3 million to expand electronic ankle monitoring, a program now endorsed by the National Police Federation as a model for Canada.

We created 35—we hired 35 new Crown attorney positions, hired 20 new court support staff so that justice is not delayed or denied. We provided 1 and a half million dollars for downtown safety action plan, new RCMP units in Swan Valley and safety programs in Brandon and in Thompson. Those are real investments, Honourable Speaker—

**The Speaker:** Order, please.

If I could ask the member to tie his comments back to the bill we're discussing. I realize sometimes we try to paint a picture, but if you could tie it back to the bill, please.

\* (10:50)

**MLA Redhead:** Thank you for your guidance, Honourable Speaker. I am sort of an artist trying to paint a picture here, but it does tie back to Bill 222.

Bill 222 does not make our community safer, Honourable Speaker. Instead, it opens the door to dangerous interpretations of justice, particularly when it comes to Indigenous peoples and rural property.

This bill would bar lawsuits by trespassers injured or killed while committing crime unless the occupiers' actions are extreme, that they result in a criminal conviction. That might sound reasonable on paper, Honourable Speaker, but in practice, it risks justifying violence and reinforcing systemic inequities in our justice system.

But, Honourable Speaker, I cannot speak to this bill without remembering Colten Boushie, a 22-year-old Cree man from Red Pheasant First Nation. In August 2016, Colten was shot in the back of the head, killed on a farm near Biggar, Saskatchewan. His death should have sparked conversations about racism, justice and reconciliation, but instead, too many voices, including official ones, shifted their focus to property rights and rural crime.

Colten was painted as a trespasser, and that's what this bill does, Honourable Speaker, as though it somehow justifies the loss of life. That is why this bill is troubling. It sends a message, intentional or not, that property rights outweigh human rights, that some lives are less valuable than others if they cross that invisible line.

That is why we cannot let Bill 222 pass. We cannot allow what happened there happen here in Manitoba. We cannot pass a law that emboldens vigilantism and deepens mistrust between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Manitobans. To pass Bill 222 would be to say that we have learned nothing, that we are willing to repeat the same mistakes and entrench injustice in the name of property.

Honourable Speaker, our government is showing that there is a better way—a better way than Bill 222. We are strengthening our justice system by hiring prosecutors, reforming bail, expanding ankle monitoring and working with police forces across the

province and communities to tackle the root cause of crime, which this bill does not do.

We're tackling addiction, poverty and inequity. We're not pitting Manitobans against one another. We are building a province where everyone, no matter their background income or where they live, can feel safe and valued. We're working with Indigenous leaders, municipalities and law enforcement to ensure the justice system serves everyone fairly. We are building safer streets without sacrificing justice or compassion, which is what Bill 222 does.

Manitobans deserve better than empty gestures and divisive bills like this one. We will not solve rural crime or community safety by passing legislation that risks repeating tragedies of the past. We must build laws that value human life above all else, laws rooted in fairness, empathy, accountability—that is the work our government is doing every day, not just through words, Honourable Speaker, but through record investment in police, record investment in justice and investment in Manitobans. Real safety comes from strong communities, not from fear.

So, Honourable Speaker, I will not support Bill 222. I will stand with Manitobans who believe that justice should protect everyone, not just those with property lines to defend.

Ekosi, Honourable Speaker. Thank you.

**MLA Jennifer Chen (Fort Richmond):** Bill 222, The Criminal Trespassers Act and Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act, has been debated quite substantially in this House, and many of my colleagues have shared a lot of good thoughts on it. And, today, I'm pleased to rise to put some words on this bill.

Honourable Speaker, this bill raises important questions about safety, responsibility and fairness. While its stated purpose is to address issues of liability and trespassing, we must consider the broader impact it may have on Manitobans and the message it sends about how we value both safety and justice. Bill 222 would establish a new criminal trespassers act and amend The Occupiers' Liability Act.

It would prevent lawsuits against the property occupier for injury or death of a person aged 12 or older for trespasses for the purpose of committing a crime, unless the occupier's actions are wilful, grossly disproportionate and result in a criminal conviction. It will also amend The Limitations Act so that civil claims are delayed until criminal charges are resolved.

Honourable Speaker, every Manitoban deserves to feel safe in their home, workplace and community. But safety cannot come from reactive or divisive measures; it must come from thoughtful, evidence-based investments in public safety and justice that address both the causes and the consequences of crime. That is exactly what our government is doing.

Since taking office, we have made record investments in law enforcement and community safety. After years of frozen funding under the previous government, we increased the funding to all municipal police services by 28 per cent, the largest increase in Manitoba's history.

We also introduced a 2 per cent annual escalator so police forces have stable and predictable funding into the future.

While the former government froze police budgets from 2017 onward and cut 55 Winnipeg police positions, our government is rebuilding. When law enforcement is properly supported, communities are safer and more resilient.

We are also hiring 24 new police officers—Winnipeg police officers dedicated to community policing, 12 already serving and 12 more arriving this spring. These officers will enhance visibility, build trust and strengthen public safety across the city.

Honourable Speaker, our government has also reinstated and expanded the electronic ankle monitoring program that was cancelled in 2017. With a \$2.9-million investment, this program now helps law enforcement monitor offenders and prevent repeat offenses. It has been endorsed by police leadership as an effective tool that directly responds to community needs.

Honourable Speaker, our government's approach to public safety is guided by fairness, prevention and partnership. We are focused on practical steps that support both law enforcement and community well-being. We believe that protecting property and protecting people must go hand in hand, and that laws must be clear, fair and consistently applied.

Terms like grossly disproportionate must be defined carefully to ensure fairness in our justice system and to prevent confusion or misuse. Manitobans expect the leadership that makes them safer through real action, not symbolic legislation. They want a government that invests in police services, supports communities and strengthens the justice system. That is

the path we are on: building safer, stronger communities across Manitoba.

Honourable Speaker, our commitment is clear. We will continue to provide law enforcement with the resources they need, ensure our courts are fully staffed and effective and to create conditions where Manitobans can feel safe in their homes, workplaces and the neighbourhoods. Through prevention—

\* (11:00)

**The Speaker:** Order, please.

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have five minutes remaining.

The hour being 11 o'clock, we now move on to private members' resolutions—the honourable Opposition House Leader.

### House Business

**Mr. Derek Johnson (Official Opposition House Leader):** On House business.

**The Speaker:** The honourable Opposition House Leader, on House business.

**Mr. Johnson:** Honourable Speaker, pursuant to rule 34(8), I am announcing that the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Thursday of private members' business will be one previously put forward by the honourable member for Borderland. The title of this resolution is Right to Defend Your Home and Family.

**The Speaker:** It's been announced that, pursuant to rule 34(8), the private member's resolution to be considered on the next Thursday of private members' business will be the one previously put forward by the honourable member for Borderland. And the title of the resolution is the Right to Defend Your Home and Family.

\* \* \*

**The Speaker:** The honourable House leader—Official Opposition House Leader.

**Mr. Johnson:** Something like that, thank you.

Honourable Speaker, could you please canvass the House for leave to allow me to call Bill 225, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Universal Screening for Learning Disabilities), for concurrence and third reading debate, despite rule 24(6), and despite the House is currently in the private members' hour allocated for private members' resolutions, and not to

recognize the clock until all members have spoken that wish to, and the question is put?

**The Speaker:** Is there leave to allow the Official Opposition House Leader to call for concurrence and third reading debate of Bill 225, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Universal Screening for Learning Disabilities), with the House to not see the clock until the question has been put, despite rule 24(6), and despite it being the hour allocated for private members' resolutions?

Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Some Honourable Members:** No.

**The Speaker:** Leave has been denied.

### RESOLUTIONS

#### Res. 23—Right to Defend Your Home and Family

**The Speaker:** We will now move on to private members' resolutions. The resolution before us this morning is resolution No. 23, the Right to Defend Your Home and Family.

**Mr. Josh Guenter (Borderland):** Honourable Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen),

*WHEREAS those in this Chamber acknowledge violent crime has become an epidemic in Manitoba, as exemplified by the recent violent home invasions and aggravated assaults of two Winnipeg seniors and a couple in Thompson; and*

*WHEREAS the soft-on-crime laws of the Liberal Federal Government and the Provincial Government have created a scenario where violent repeat offenders can be released on bail to re-offend within hours; and*

*WHEREAS in rural and remote communities, law enforcement presence and policies are often insufficient to ensure a timely response in an emergency situation; and*

*WHEREAS sections 34 and 35 of the Criminal Code of Canada allows Canadians to use "reasonable" force to defend themselves, others, and their property; and*

*WHEREAS too often, people in that situation must make a split-second, life-and-death decision and do not have time to consider the nine questions and conditions currently specified in the law; and*

*WHEREAS too often, those individuals who must make that split-second, life-and-death decision are hounded by the criminal justice system afterwards, while the real criminals go free; and*

*WHEREAS responsibility for incidents of this nature should lie solely with the criminal who illegally enters someone's home and assumes the risks associated therewith, not the person who rightfully lives there; and*

*WHEREAS being the victim of a crime and possibly facing prosecution for acting in self-defence has negative impacts on the mental health, financial health, well-being, and sense of safety for Manitobans and Canadians; and*

*WHEREAS the Criminal Code needs to be amended to reduce and clarify the conditions of self-defence in situations where people illegally enter their home and pose a threat to themselves or others, eliminate the duty to retreat before using force before acting in such self-defence, and provide civil and criminal immunity to persons who legitimately take such actions against illegal intruders; and*

*WHEREAS Canadian juries have consistently upheld the self-defence rights of homeowners in relation to people and property, as everyone has a right to feel safe in their own home.*

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba call on the federal government to amend the Criminal Code to clearly establish that a person is justified in using reasonable force, including deadly force, to protect themselves, their family, others or their home when an individual unlawfully enters or attempts to enter their dwelling and is reasonably perceived to pose a threat to life or safety.

***Motion presented.***

**The Speaker:** The honourable member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen)—the honourable member for Borderland (Mr. Guenter).

**Mr. Guenter:** Honourable Speaker, I rise this morning to introduce the resolution entitled, the right to defend home and family. This is something Canadians and Manitobans have been asking for for a long, long time.

Too often, we've seen those who are forced to defend themselves or their loved ones treated like criminals while the real criminal goes free. The individual who has illegally broken into someone's home, their place of safety, and destroyed their sense

of safety in the place that should be most sacrosanct goes free. And the person who lives there, who belongs there, the person who loves that home and the people in that home, the person who is trying to defend that home, that safe place and those in it, gets charged as a criminal. That is not justice.

And that's why I say today with this resolution that a person is justified in using reasonable force, including deadly force, to protect themselves, their family and others in the home when an individual unlawfully enters or attempts to enter that dwelling.

Now I'll be very clear because I know that those opposed to this common sense resolution are going to try to muddy the waters by talking about a bunch of stuff that doesn't have anything to do with this specific resolution. No one is advocating for a shoot first, ask questions later approach. That's not what this resolution is about.

No one is saying, if someone steps foot on your property, you should have carte blanche to just blow them away. What this common sense resolution does do is call upon this government to call on the Government of Canada, who are the only ones who can change the Criminal Code, to take the onus off of the law-abiding homeowner whose space and safety has been violated and put it on the criminal where it belongs.

Responsibility for incidents of this nature should lie solely with the criminal who illegally enters someone's home. They should assume the risks associated therewith, not the person who rightfully lives there. And it's happening more and more. We all know that under this government and the current federal government, crime is rising. That's what happens when you let bad guys out on bail: the same guys out on bail over and over again to reoffend.

Violent crime has exploded across Canada, including in this province. We read about it every day: in schools, on buses and in people's homes. There was a story a few weeks back of the home invasion here in Winnipeg, the violence done to an elderly couple in their own home. The case in Thompson: a man, his partner and six children in the home. A gang of people enter and stab the man multiple times. Imagine the terror for those kids. Imagine the trauma.

Just earlier this month, a Winnipeg man whose home-based business was broken into was shot seven times in the leg while thieves made off with over \$1 million in valuables. And this man and his family

are now leaving Canada and moving back to India, saying they don't feel safe here.

There's the recent case from Lindsay, Ontario just this summer where a 44-year-old man confronted an intruder in his home who was armed with a crossbow. The homeowner grabbed a knife and a fight broke out. The intruder was seriously injured and airlifted to hospital, while the 44-year-old homeowner was charged with aggravated assault.

Honourable Speaker, I know of a case a few years ago in Winnipeg on a sunny afternoon in a nice part of town. A criminal followed the daughter of a family home from school. He forced his way into the home, and with a gun, he took the family hostage.

He took them into the basement and made members of that family do unspeakable things to each other—hours of this. Then around 10 o'clock, the father and son managed to get free and overpower the man. A fight started. The mother fled, naked and terrified, to a neighbour's house, and the neighbour came and helped the men subdue the criminal, at the same time ensuring no revenge was taken against him, while his wife called the police.

\* (11:10)

When the police arrived, they took the man to jail. But guess who else went to jail? The father, the son and the neighbour. The father and son were fighting for their lives and the dignity of the mother and daughter; the neighbour was just there to help. They still got arrested, spent hours in jail. That is not right. The criminal should assume the responsibility, and by extension, the liability, not the person who lawfully dwells there for whom that home is their place of safety.

In homes all across Manitoba, there are many Manitobans who understand that this is just common sense. Our sense of justice, of moral law and natural law tells us that we ought to protect what is pure, beautiful and innocent from harm and evil.

The reality is that we don't have police officers standing guard over us 24-7 at the end of each of our driveways; you are your own first responder. Sadly, in the vast majority of cases, by the time police arrive on the scene, all that is left for them to do is to conduct the investigation and lay charges; that's it.

I cite a tragic case from Lorette only four years ago, where a senior couple had their home broken into at 1:15 in the morning. They called 911 and the RCMP from the St-Pierre-Jolys detachment raced to respond,

but by the time they got there, the phone line had been cut and they found the couple stabbed to death in the home. Manitobans should have the legal right to defend themselves in their homes, period.

Now members opposite are going to say: well, they already do, this resolution is redundant. And I say: no, it is not, because while the Criminal Code of Canada does allow for individuals to use self-defence, the conditions set to govern the use thereof are simply not realistic and as a result are unreasonable.

Nine questions—they're good questions—they do exactly what they're supposed to do, that is to discern and differentiate between reasonable self-defence and unreasonable violence. But here's the problem, Honourable Speaker: these nine existing conditions are completely reasonable after the fact, but they are completely unreasonable and unrealistic in that moment. No one in a terrifying split second, potentially life and death situation, is going to waste their time trying to call to mind what those nine things are before they protect their kids, protect their spouse, other vulnerable people. And nor are we saying, as we are saying with this resolution, should they have to.

Here are the only questions you should have to ask: (1) is this person illegally in my home or trying to illegally enter my home; and (2) do I believe they present a threat? That's it. Two simple questions. Are they in my house illegally? Do they present a threat? And the reality is, the result is going to be the same whether the law is changed or not.

Brave Canadians and Manitobans, good fathers, mothers and friends will do what they need to do to protect their homes, protect their kids. They're not thinking about the nine questions, they're thinking, I need to protect my kids, I need to survive so I can make sure my kids are cared for and safe and I will do whatever it takes to make sure that happens.

When people are backed into a corner, when it's life and death, Manitobans are going to do what they need to do. And, by the way, Canadian juries have consistently upheld their right to do so and acquitted those charged.

This resolution calls on the provincial and federal government to affirm that law-abiding citizens, folks just trying to do the right thing—protecting their loved ones, their kids and moms and dads—shouldn't and won't have to go through the indignity of arrest, indictment and trial for a case that should never have been brought.

The home should be sacred. It should be respected. Those who live there should always be safe and feel safe.

Thank you, Honourable Speaker.

### Questions

**The Speaker:** A question period of up to 10 minutes will be held. Any questions may be addressed in the following sequence: the first question may be asked by a member from another party; any subsequent questions must follow a rotation between parties; each independent member may ask one question. And no question or answer shall exceed 45 seconds.

The floor is now open for questions.

**Mrs. Rachelle Schott (Kildonan-River East):** Honourable Speaker, under our NDP government, there are more police officers on the streets. We're recruiting new officers after the former failed PC government let 55 police officers go through their cuts and inaction.

My question for the member opposite is why he refused to protect Manitobans and their property and instead decided to get rid of those 55 police officers?

**Mr. Josh Guenter (Borderland):** I'd urge that NDP member to do a little bit of self-reflection. In their very first year in office, the number of homicides in rural Manitoba nearly doubled, from 30 in 2023 to 55 in 2024. The irony of saying something like that when Winnipeg has the highest violent crime rate in Canada, more than double the national average.

Again, I'd urge members—[interjection]

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Guenter:** —of the NDP to reflect and also to ask questions that are relevant to this resolution.

**Mr. Wayne Balcaen (Brandon West):** I would really like to thank the member for Borderland for bringing this extremely important resolution forward, calling on this government to talk with the federal government about this law, this opportunity to protect Manitobans.

So can the member explain how this legislation provides greater protection for law-abiding property owners against unfair civil lawsuits from criminal trespassing, as well as their safety?

**Mr. Guenter:** Unfortunately, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Wiebe) was making so much noise that, while I am in close proximity to the member for Brandon West, I couldn't hear all of his question.

But essentially, the resolution simplifies this matter for Manitobans by reducing those nine questions in sections 34 and 35 of the Criminal Code of Canada to essentially two: is this person illegally in my home or trying to illegally enter my home, and No. 2, do I believe they present a threat?

Thank you.

**Hon. Mike Moroz (Minister of Innovation and New Technology):** I do have a question. One of the examples the member from Borderland used was the tragic case from Lorette four years ago.

Just want to clarify who might have been the government in Manitoba at that time, and why the appropriate officials at that point didn't raise this important issue?

**Mr. Guenter:** Yes, of course the NDP are going to try to use—to try to turn this into a political issue. But I'd encourage them—this shouldn't be political. This is about protecting innocent life. This is about allowing—[interjection]

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Guenter:** —Manitobans to protect their loved ones when police are not able to make it there.

As I said in that case, the police did everything they could to get there. They got there—and when they got there, sadly there were two bodies on the ground. The point I was making is that police, far too often—it's just the way it is—are not able to respond in time, in the split-second life and death situations. That's what I was talking about.

**Mr. Konrad Narth (La Vérendrye):** I'd like to start by thanking the member from Borderland for bringing this great comment and this resolution forward.

And can that member please explain a bit about how the soft-on-crime policies of this failed government are contributing to the epidemic of violence we see across our province under this NDP?

**Mr. Guenter:** I thank the member for La Vérendrye, my friend, for that question—great question. And yes, violent crime has exploded across this province, across this country, but in particular in Manitoba.

We've seen just recently some tragic news stories, and I talked about the one just briefly where this family was—had their home-based business broken into. Two of the men in that family were shot—both were shot. One was shot seven times in the leg, nearly lost his life and is now recovering. And they're saying

they're moving—they're leaving Canada because they don't feel safe here.

\* (11:20)

There are other stories that I have as well, and I'd be happy to table those. But I think Manitobans under—feel less safe and they tell us consistently, surveys show, they feel less and less safe—

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

**Mrs. Schott:** Honourable Speaker, the member opposite is conveniently glazing over their years of cuts and mismanagement. Manitobans were so important to protect wide—when police forces have the resources to do their job. That's why our NDP government brought in a 30 per cent increase since taking office for all municipal law enforcement organizations with regular increases going forward. It is the—needed relief after the former PC government froze funding for the entire time they were in government.

So why did the PCs refuse to protect Manitobans and their property and instead decided to freeze funding for all law enforcement in Manitoba during their time in government?

**Mr. Guenter:** What does this member—what do members of this NDP government have to say to victims who are assaulted in their homes, the senior couple who was stabbed in the middle of the night when their home was broken into? What do they have to tell Manitobans, then, that they should hide and comply? Comply with the thieves, comply with those who are assaulting them like that officer suggested in Ontario just recently, that the best thing to do is just to comply.

Do NDP members think that innocent victims of crime—does the Minister of Justice (Mr. Wiebe), who we haven't heard from yet, does he think that Manitobans should simply comply with criminals?

**Mr. Balcaen:** I'm glad the member for Borderland (Mr. Guenter) brought up some cases where individuals who were only protecting their lives, their families' lives and the dignity of their home have been arrested and charged.

So does the honourable member think it's fair or just that under this government the bad guys go free and the victims get charged?

**Mr. Guenter:** I thank my colleague and friend, the member for Brandon West (Mr. Balcaen), for that great question. And I thank him for his years of service as a police officer. And I thank, as well, all the

police officers across Manitoba and across this country who do great work.

The reality is they're the ones who arrive on scene and have to deal with the grisly results of outcome of a rampaging criminal, and so I thank them all for their service. But absolutely, we—he has brought forward cases we've talked in this Chamber, this PC team has, about the sad case of Kellie Verwey, many others. We think of the tragedy at Hollow Water First Nation.

These are acts committed by repeat offenders, people who are out on bail—

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

**Mrs. Schott:** Honourable Speaker, has the member opposite considered how dangerous this kind of rhetoric can be, when we've seen in Canada the claims of defending property have led to deadly racially charged outcomes like the killing of Colten Boushie?

What assurances do the members opposite have that this PMR is not going to make those tragedies more likely instead of preventing them?

**Mr. Guenter:** Yes, unfortunately, the NDP are trying to race-bait, there. And I would just say, in the case—and they cited the case of Colten Boushie, and in that case, the jury system rendered its verdict. Gerald Stanley, who was the victim in that case, who we never hear them mention his name, he was the farmer who was—whose yard was repeatedly plundered by thieves. And he was acquitted by a jury, and there was no appeal. So I think the members opposite need to do a little more reflection.

And, by the way, this is not—this is about protecting innocent life. This is about protecting innocent Manitobans and allowing them to do what they need to do to protect their loved ones. And I'd urge members of the NDP government to get on board.

**Mr. Narth:** I'd like to once again thank the member from Borderland for trying to clarify the purpose of this resolution in that last answer.

But since the NDP don't seem to get it at all, can the honourable member please clarify the very specific parameters of what we're asking for with this resolution?

**Mr. Guenter:** I thank the member for that question.

Essentially, what we're saying is that the onus should be put on the criminal who's breaking into the home. The government should have to prove that the liability should be on the criminal, not on the



homeowner, essentially, and take those nine tests—those nine questions that are laid out in sections 34 and 35 of the Criminal Code—and reduce it to two, and give Manitobans the right, the ability to defend themselves and their loved ones.

Manitobans know this. They hear stories of violent crime and all the rest, and they say: well, when it comes to protecting my loved ones, if this is the situation, better to be judged by 12 than to be carried by six.

**Mrs. Schott:** Why are the—Honourable Speaker, why are the PCs pushing a motion that encourages Manitobans to take law into their own hands instead of focusing on real public safety solutions, like hiring more—

**The Speaker:** Order, please.

My mistake. The time for question period had expired.

### Debate

**The Speaker:** The floor is now open for debate.

**MLA Shannon Corbett (Transcona):** I rise today to address this Progressive Conservative resolution calling on the federal government to amend the Criminal Code in the name of so-called self-defence or stand-your-ground protection.

Let's be honest, this motion is not about protecting families, it's about politics. It's an imported idea that belongs elsewhere, not in Manitoba. It is dangerous, unnecessary and completely out of touch with the real work being done to keep Manitobans safe.

Honourable Speaker, we already have laws in Canada that protect people who act in self-defence. Sections 34 and 35 of the Criminal Code are clear: Canadians have the right to use reasonable force to protect themselves, their families and their property. The law already balances rights and responsibilities. What this PMR proposes would upend that balance. It would incur split-second judgments under fear, and it would make more—make tragedy more likely, not less.

Speaker, is this truly the Manitoba way? Is this the legacy we want to leave for our children? Manitobans are known for their resilience, their kindness and their sense of community—friendly Manitoba. We are a province of neighbours who look out for one another, not a province that thrives on fear or conflict. Yet this PMR risks undermining those very values.

Let us take a moment to reflect on what this resolution implies. It suggests that the path to safety is through escalation, through confrontation. But research and common sense tells us otherwise. Confrontation often leads to more harm, not less. It creates a cycle of fear and violence that is difficult to break.

Honourable Speaker, this is not just a theoretical concern. Across Canada, we've seen examples of situations where confrontation has led to tragic outcomes. In some cases, individuals have taken matters into their own hands, only to find themselves in legal trouble, or worse, in harm's way. Consider the case of a homeowner who, in a moment of fear, confronts an intruder. What begins as an attempt to protect their family can quickly escalate into a dangerous and unpredictable situation.

In 2020—sorry. Consequences can be devastating, not just for the individuals involved but for entire communities. Is this the future we want for Manitobans? A future where fear dictates our actions? Where we feel compelled to confront danger rather than seek safer, more constructive solutions?

Honourable Speaker, let us also consider the unintended consequences of this PMR. By promoting confrontation, we risk normalizing a culture of fear and suspicion. We risk creating divisions in our communities where neighbours see each other as threats rather than allies.

And let us not forget the impact on vulnerable populations. For some Manitobans, particularly those from marginalized communities, this resolution could exacerbate existing inequalities. It could lead to situations where individuals feel targeted or unsafe, simply because of who they are.

\* (11:30)

We must also consider the strain this approach could place on our justice system. Encouraging confrontation could lead to an increase in violent incidents, which, in turn, could overwhelm our courts and law enforcement agencies. This is not a sustainable path forward.

Let us take a walk down memory lane and review the PC record. Crime rose under the PCs' watch. After seven and a half years of cuts and inaction from the failed PC government, crime skyrocketed across the province, leaving families to feel unsafe. But when crime exploded under the former PC government, they decided to do nothing: 2017, they scrapped the anklet—bracelet monitoring program; 2018, they froze, froze, froze; 2019, they looked around and

decided that municipal police forces didn't need their help; 2020, no increase to funding for municipal law enforcement; 2021, still nothing.

In 2022, when police forces were asking them for resources they needed, after years of frozen funding, still nothing from the members opposite. In 2022, crime rose under the previous failed PC government, a 44 increase—per cent increase in attempted murders; a 40 per cent increase in homicides; a 39 per cent increase in firearms offences; a 26 per cent increase in vehicle thefts; a 21 per cent increase in robberies; an 8 per cent increase in sexual assaults; a 19 per cent increase in breaking and entering; a 13 per cent increase in fraud.

In 2023, as they approached the election, they still decided that police officers were not worth their time. No Manitobans were safe under the PCs' watch. They froze funding to every law enforcement agency in Manitoba year after year.

Not only did crime get worse because of them, but under their watch, there was a net loss of 55 Winnipeg Police Service officers with a growing population across the city. Time and again, they used fear tactics and misinformation to scare Manitobans and we can't afford to go back to those divisive ways.

That is what this bill does. It divides the people in our province.

But the worst part is, their failures didn't stop at the Perimeter. Members opposite cut or froze funding to Brandon Police Service, Manitoba First Nations police service, Altona Police Service, Ste. Anne Police Service, Springfield and Winkler police services.

Instead of taking accountability for their inaction, the now opposition PCs are using their legacy of failed crime initiatives to score cheap political points. The PC government's cuts to services and supports only made the situation worse.

The PCs cut funding to community safety by \$2.6 million, cutting valuable funding for crime prevention, Community Correction and the Family Resolution Service. The PC government refused to support restorative justice, choosing to eliminate the Restorative Resolutions program, preventing Manitoba offenders from pursuing alternatives that would have allowed them a second chance at success. Instead of listening to the community organizations and those struggling to support Manitobans, the PC government ignored their request to create safe consumption sites, questioning their effectiveness.

Over and over, the PCs have ignored sound advice from experts and closed their eyes to solutions that would provide Manitobans with stable housing, food stability, addiction support and mental health services. For years, Manitobans have been calling to support—for support to address the root cause of crime in our communities, and instead of collaborating, they picked fights with law enforcement officials. They left Manitobans in vulnerable positions that made them more likely to engage in criminal activity and violent crimes.

Honourable Speaker, there is a better way. Safety does not come from confrontation, it comes from prevention. It comes from building stronger communities, investing in mental health resources and ensuring that law enforcement has the tools and training they need to respond effectively.

And on this side of the House, that is what we are doing. We brought in a historic investment to ensure police officers and RCMP are there for Manitobans when they need them. This government is investing in real solutions to improve public safety. We took long-bladed weapons off store shelves and away from those who use them to commit violent crimes.

Investing—we're investing in 24 new police officers, Winnipeg police officers for community policing. We announced \$2 million to expand Manitoba's Operational Communications Centre to strengthen law enforcement's ability to respond to violent and critical incidents.

Imagine, instead of encouraging confrontation, we focused on creating environments where dangerous encounters are less likely to occur in the first place. Imagine if we invested in programs that address the root causes of crime, poverty, addiction and lack of opportunity. These are solutions that will make a real difference and these are the solutions that reflect the values of Manitobans.

**The Speaker:** Member's time has expired.

**Mr. Wayne Balcaen (Brandon West):** It's always a great privilege and a pleasure to stand up in the House and speak to very important bills and resolutions. And this one certainly falls in the upper deck of the importance level when it comes to resolutions.

We're talking about the safety of individuals, we're talking about the safety of families, of kids, of children, of innocent victims: people that are victimized because of poor choices by criminals—oftentimes criminals that are out on bail and have been

released time and time and time again under this failed NDP government.

You know, we look at the chances for individuals to have a safe life and a safe haven. And that would be their home. Their home is a place where individuals should be able to come home, be with their family, have quality time. But no, those rights seem to be taken away from individuals by criminals who will present threats, who will present violence, who will present opportunities to cause harm to individuals while they're only—only—doing is enjoying their home, the place that is supposed to be safe, the place that is supposed to be where they can enjoy their lives. And that's what this bill is all about, or this resolution.

This resolution is about safety and it's about protecting innocent lives all across Canada, but more importantly, here in Manitoba where we've seen the homicide rates near double here in Manitoba over this term that the NDP has been in government. So we're talking about a climate of safety that is only getting worse since 2023 when this government was elected and came into government and not caring about the safety of individuals within our communities.

And I'd highlight this with the broken promises that have been made over and over and over again. That's why there is no trust in this government, Honourable Speaker: broken promises, headline-seeking, looking for photo ops rather than real legislation and real protection of Manitobans. Case in point, we've seen growing crime, drug problems and issues that are happening up in Swan River, Manitoba, in the Swan Valley area.

So to highlight this, the minister said, let's do a press conference. Let's get out on front of this and, you know, we'll do some photo ops and we'll make this promise that we're going to set up a general investigation section in Swan River. That section would be charged with taking care of home invasions and places where individuals are feeling unsafe in their homes and crimes have happened.

\* (11:40)

But you know what's happened, Honourable Speaker? Nothing. Nothing has happened on that file and it's coming up to the one-year anniversary. There's no GIS section stood up in Swan River. There's no safety for those members. It was simply another broken promise by this NDP government to put the veil of safety on but really not acting on this. That's just one of many that this government has made the promise, have broken the promise and then it ends up

with the good people of Manitoba wearing those broken promises.

Another one, another broken promise that actually really impacts why this resolution is so important is the broken promise on bail. I can still see it to this day: 2023 and I was running to become the member for Brandon West and I was watching the news and there was a debate on and the member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Kinew) was in the debate. And when asked what he could do, he clearly stated: bail, I can fix bail within 100 days.

Well, we're 700-plus days now and bail still has not been fixed. As a matter of fact, this Premier (Mr. Kinew) said he could do it on his own. He didn't need any other levels of government, no other levels of government. He himself could fix bail.

What's happened in the last two weeks? We have heard the Justice Minister in Ottawa pleading with the federal government: please, please help us, I know we made a mistake, I know that we gave false narrative and false promises that we could fix bail. And now please come and help us put some legislation forward at the federal level so that you can be our saving graces. And that's what's happened.

It's another broken promise, Honourable Speaker, that leads to the unsafe conditions here in Manitoba. And this is why we need to bring a resolution such as this forward. We really want to protect Manitobans. That's just too off the cuff of these broken promises that are constantly being made for photo ops and for headlines rather than really looking after the protection of Manitobans.

And you know, I don't actually blame the Justice Minister himself for this. It's systemic throughout the NDP government, so he is just the messenger. And unfortunately, the Justice Minister gets put in a terrible spot at times. And I know he has to listen to his Premier, he has to listen to the ideology of the party. But he knows better. He knows that this resolution is extremely important and he knows that placating to the minister—the First Minister and to his party is not bringing action and safety to Manitoba. It is not happening.

*MLA Carla Compton, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

So, you know, I would implore him as the Attorney General (Mr. Wiebe) for this Province to stand alone and make great decisions about safety for the people of Manitoba and for the safety of all people. You know, people that are in—simply enjoying their home, that are doing nothing illegal, nothing wrong.

They're simply wanting to be with family and enjoy that time and then somebody decides to break in, take away their safety, commit horrible, horrible crimes against individuals including and up to homicide—which I've spoken to earlier in this speech, honourable deputy Speaker—and that's that homicides under this government in rural Manitoba have more than doubled.

And I know it's very, very difficult for the Justice Minister and for the NDP to get a grasp on that, but really what's happening is their soft-on-crime agenda and their partnership with the federal Liberal-NDP coalition—it's just—it's manifested itself into these extreme unsafe conditions across Canada but more importantly, right here in Manitoba—right here in Manitoba

You look at the surveys that have been done and people are feeling less safe here in Manitoba since 2023. And you know why, honourable Speaker? It's because of the ideology of this government and, perpetrated by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Wiebe), bringing forward a false narrative of their safety when they know that crime is skyrocketing in the last two years here. It has reached a level that we have not seen before.

We have a rampage of seven youth, age 12 to 15, just earlier this week causing havoc across Winnipeg for retailers and for people that were simply minding their own business. And that's exactly what people are doing in their home, simply minding their own business, when we have individuals breaking in, causing harm and making sure that their life is no longer enjoyable.

This is reducing the nine questions that one must bring forward, you know, questions under the Criminal Code of Canada that are embedded in this and making individuals unsafe. So now they have to think quickly, the spur of the moment. Their lives are in jeopardy; their lives are on the line, that of their family. It's an emotional time; it's a high-intensity time. And they have to think, okay, do I meet these nine criterion? They're never going to have the chance to do that.

You know what's going to happen? They're going to be buried by six rather than tried by 12. And that's unfortunate that we have to see death come to individuals, we have to see grievous bodily harm to individuals because of ideology.

Let's get together. Let's move this resolution forward, honourable Speaker.

**Hon. Glen Simard (Minister of Municipal and Northern Relations):** No Manitoban should ever feel unsafe in their own home. Every person, whether they live on a farm outside of Swan River, in a small town like Beausejour, or in a Winnipeg neighbourhood deserves the peace of mind that when they look—lock their door at night, they and their family are safe.

That's why today's debate matters, because when families experience crime, when someone breaks into a home, steals a truck or threatens a loved one, it's just not property that's taken; it's a sense of security that can take years to rebuild.

Honourable deputy Speaker, I want to begin by saying clearly and compassionately, we stand with victims of rural crime. We hear their stories. We know the fear that sets in when a 911 call feels too far away. We know the anxiety that follows when crime reaches your driveway, your shop or your home.

That fear is real, and it's our responsibility as legislators to respond with real solutions.

But this PMR, this proposal to amend the Criminal Code and enshrine broad, stand-your-ground powers does not make Manitobans safer. It is unnecessary, it is dangerous and it risks making tragedy more likely, not less. It suggests that safety comes from confrontation, that arming people with legal immunity will somehow deter crime.

But safety, honourable deputy Speaker, doesn't come from confrontation. It comes from prevention; it comes from strong policing; it comes from smart investments and a justice system that works.

### ***French spoken***

Je veux commencer en disant clairement et avec compassion : nous sommes solidaires des victimes de la criminalité rurale. Nous entendons leurs histoires. Nous connaissons la peur qui s'installe lorsque l'appel au 911 semble trop loin. Nous comprenons l'anxiété qui s'ensuit lorsque le crime frappe à votre entrée, à votre atelier ou à votre mesu – maison.

Cette peur est réelle, et c'est notre responsabilité en tant que législateurs d'y répondre par de vraies solutions.

### ***Translation***

*I want to start by saying clearly and compassionately: we stand in solidarity with victims of rural crime. We hear their stories. We know the fear that sets in when a 911 call seems too far away. We understand the*

*anxiety that follows when crime strikes your driveway, your workshop or your home.*

*That fear is real, and it is our responsibility as legislators to respond with real solutions.*

### **English**

Real solutions, that's what our government is focused on delivering. We don't have to guess what works; we can look at the results. In 2024, Winnipeg recorded its first meaningful drop in violent crime severity in a decade, down 5 per cent. Overall crime severity fell another 5.2 per cent. That's a second straight year of decline after years of spikes under the former PC government.

Province-wide, StatsCan reported Manitoba's Crime Severity Index fell nearly 4 per cent in 2024.

\* (11:50)

These are real improvements, not slogans. These were achieved through real investment, co-ordination and leadership. Chief Gene Bowers of the Winnipeg Police Service said it best: For the first time in four years, the volume of violent crime has declined and there is a more significant reduction in how serious crimes—in how serious the crimes were. Those are his words. They are proof that our approach is working.

Because, deputy—honourable deputy Speaker, we remember what came before. Under the last government—seven and a half long years of frozen budgets, including Brandon, and failed policies—Manitoba saw crime skyrocket. Between 2022 and '23, violent crime surged: attempted murders up, homicides up, firearms offences up, vehicle thefts up and robberies up.

### **French spoken**

Parce que, Madame la Présidente, nous nous souvenons de ce qui est venu avant. Sous le dernier gouvernement – sept ans et demi de gels budgétaires et de politiques ratées – la criminalité au Manitoba a explosé. Entre 2022 et 2023, la criminalité violente a grimpé en flèche : les tentatives de meurtre ont augmenté, les homicides, les infractions liées aux armes à feu, les vols de véhicule et les vols qualifiés.

### **Translation**

*Because, Madam Speaker, we remember what came before. Under the last government—seven and a half years of budget freezes and failed policies—crime in Manitoba skyrocketed. Between 2022 and 2023, violent crime skyrocketed: attempted murders increased, as did homicides, firearms offences, vehicle thefts and robberies.*

### **English**

And what did the former PC government do? They froze funding to every police service in this province: Winnipeg, Brandon, Manitoba First Nations police, even small-town forces like Ste. Anne and Altona. They cut funding for community safety by \$2.6 million, eliminated restorative justice programs, closed correctional facilities and ignored expert calls for prevention.

We're actually opening correctional facilities, centres for justice. They left 'polif' short-staffed and communities feeling abandoned. In total, Winnipeg lost 55 police officers under the PCs, 55 fewer officers protecting families, investigating crimes and building trust in our communities. That's their record.

So when the opposition now brings forward a resolution that tells Manitobans to take justice into their own hands, to meet fear with force, it rings hollow. Because the truth is, the PCs had their chance to make Manitobans safer. Instead, they made it less safe.

Honourable deputy Speaker, we must never forget that behind every headline about crime is a human being, a victim, a family, a community trying to heal. That's why we must be so careful about the messages we send. When a government signals that people should just depend—defend property first, history tells us who pays the highest price. The Colten Boushie tragedy remains a painful reminder that so-called stand-your-ground laws disproportionately endanger Indigenous people and racialized communities.

Our laws should de-escalate violence, not normalize it. They should protect victims, not encourage split-second decisions under fear. The last thing Manitobans need is a policy that tells frightened homeowners that the safest pass is to pull the trigger instead of calling for help.

### **French spoken**

Les lois doivent protéger les victimes, pas encourager les décisions prises par la peur. La dernière chose dont le Manitoba a besoin, c'est d'une politique qui dit aux propriétaires a – effrayés que la voie la plus sûre est d'appuyer sur la gâchette, plutôt d'appeler à l'aide.

### **Translation**

*Laws should protect victims, not encourage decisions made out of fear. The last thing Manitoba needs is a policy that tells frightened homeowners that the safest*

*course of action is to pull the trigger rather than call for help.*

**English**

Honourable deputy Speaker, our approach is grounded in evidence, compassion and accountability. We're not talking about slogans; we're talking about investments that deliver results. After years of stagnation, our government increased funding to all municipal police services by 28 per cent, the largest increase in Manitoba history.

We invested in 24 new police officers for community policing, with 12 already on the streets and 12 more on the way this spring. We also provided \$2 million to expand Manitoba's Operational Communication Centre, adding six RCMP officers—officers and 10 dispatchers to improve emergency response across rural and northern Manitoba. That means faster response times when seconds matter.

As AMM president Kathy Valentino said, these additional resources are both timely and essential. And she's right because rural and northern communities deserve the same rapid, co-ordinated protection as those in our cities.

**French spoken**

Madame la Présidente, nous pouvons être tous d'accord d'une chose : aucun 'manitoban' – manitobain ne devrait se sentir impuissant lorsque le crime frappe à sa porte. Mais la solution n'est pas de dire aux gens de s'armer ou d'agir seul. La solution est de s'assurer que l'aide est là et, quand ils ont besoin : des agents bien formés, une répartition efficace, des lois solides, une prévention coordonnée.

**Translation**

*Mr. Speaker, we can all agree on one thing: no Manitoban should feel powerless when crime comes knocking at their door. But the solution is not to tell people to arm themselves or act alone. The solution is to ensure that help is there when they need it: well-trained officers, effective dispatch, strong laws and co-ordinated prevention.*

**English**

We owe it to victims, especially those in rural and northern Manitoba. Give them security without asking them to risk their lives for it. We owe it to the next generation to create communities built on trust and co-operation, not fear and confrontation.

So the choice before us today is clear. We can build on the progress that's reducing crime.

The evidence is before you: have record police funding, better tools, smarter justice and meaningful prevention. Or we can adopt a PMR that undermines accountability and puts more Manitobans at risk.

**French spoken**

Le choix qui s'offre à nous aujourd'hui est clair. Nous pouvons nous appuyer sur les progrès réalisés pour réduire la criminalité, un financement record de la police, de meilleurs outils, une justice plus intelligente et une prévention significative. Ou nous pouvons adopter une résolution qui mine la responsabilité et met davantage de Manitobains en danger.

**Translation**

*The choice before us today is clear: we can build on the progress made in reducing crime, record funding for policing, better tools, smarter justice and meaningful prevention; or we can adopt a resolution that undermines accountability and puts more Manitobans at risk.*

**English**

Our government chooses safety, compassion and results. We choose prevention over provocation. We choose to make Manitoba safer for everyone, not by rewriting the Criminal Code for confrontation, but by rebuilding trust, protecting families, ensuring no one in our province ever feels alone again.

Thank you, honourable deputy Speaker.

**Introduction of Guests**

**The Acting Speaker (Carla Compton):** So before we move on to the next speaker, we have seated in the public gallery from Peguis Central School, 30 grade 8 students under the direction of Jacqueline Kerzel.

This group is located in the constituency of the honourable member for The Pas-Kameesak (Ms. Lathlin).

\* \* \*

**Hon. Mike Moroz (Minister of Innovation and New Technology):** I want to echo the words of my colleagues. Everyone in this Chamber already agrees that Manitobans have a right to feel safe in their homes, in their communities, and the government has a very clear responsibility to ensure that that's the case.

This resolution, however, does absolutely nothing to make that true. In fact, it contributes to an atmosphere of fear and animosity that makes all of us less safe.

What I'm most disappointed about in this bill, it's very much a dog-whistle bill that is beneath debate here.

But what truly disappoints me about this is that I know full well, in a couple of hours, the member from Borderland will get to his feet and complain about the fact that some minister or other on this side of the House didn't bother to answer a question that he'd asked in this Chamber.

Couldn't—he'll be outraged by that. And yet, when asked questions about the record of the previous PC government in relation to law enforcement, or when asked a specific question about a case that he used as an example of why this resolution needed to be advanced that occurred during that term, he chose

not to answer that. Why wasn't this a priority for the government at that time?

So I'm curious why that would be. Why didn't he address those things? There's really only one potential answer. And that's because it's not the PC pattern to solve crime, to address crime; it's the PCs' pattern to campaign on crime—

**The Acting Speaker (Carla Compton):** Order, please.

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable minister will have eight minutes remaining.

The hour being 12 noon, the House is recessed and stands recessed until 1:30 p.m.

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**

**Thursday, October 30, 2025**

**CONTENTS**

<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>		<b>Resolutions</b>
<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS</b>		Res. 23–Right to Defend Your Home and Family
<b>Debate on Second Readings–Public Bills</b>		Guenter 3256
Bill 222–The Criminal Trespassers Act and		Questions
Amendments to The Occupiers' Liability Act		Schott 3259
Blashko	3247	Guenter 3259
Wowchuk	3249	Balcaen 3259
Sandhu	3250	Moroz 3259
Robbins	3251	Narth 3259
Moses	3251	Debate
Redhead	3253	Corbett 3261
Chen	3255	Balcaen 3262
		Simard 3264
		Moroz 3266



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>**