



SECOND SESSION — THIRTIETH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

No. 37

Thursday, March 19, 2026

10:00 a.m.

PRAYERS

SPEAKER TABLES REPORTS

The Speaker laid before the Assembly the following:

Elections Saskatchewan: *Statement of Expenditures — A Report on the Thirtieth General Election*, volume III

(Sessional paper no. 163)

STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER Ruling on a Question of Privilege (Misquote – Intent to Mislead the Assembly)

Yesterday, March 18, 2026, I received a question of privilege from the Opposition Deputy House Leader (Kim Breckner). In her case she alleged that the Premier deliberately misattributed a quote by a Saskatchewan health care worker to the Member for Regina Elphinstone-Centre (Meara Conway) in order to intentionally mislead the Assembly. A copy of the case was provided to the Premier (Hon. Scott Moe) and the Government House Leader (Hon. Tim McLeod). In response the Government House Leader claimed that the Member for Regina Elphinstone-Centre did not state she was quoting nor did the *Hansard* include the comments as quotes. Therefore the Premier could not have misquoted the member or misled

the House. I deferred my ruling so that I could carefully review all matters associated with the case. I am now prepared to make my ruling.

Central to this privilege case is whether the Premier's statement on March 17 was deliberately misleading, and whether he knew that he was misquoting the Member for Regina Elphinstone-Centre, and whether he purposely intended to mislead the Assembly. I will remind members that the threshold to prove intent is extremely high. If it is proven that a member intentionally misled the House, it would be within the practice of this Assembly and other parliaments to treat that as contempt. This is a serious allegation against another member.

To address the allegation that the Premier's comment was misleading and the quote was misattributed, although the Deputy Opposition House Leader has provided the verbatim remarks of the Member for Regina Elphinstone-Centre as evidence to her case, the member did not point to or provide any further supporting evidence as to the Premier's personal knowledge of the proper attribution of the quote or his intentions in referencing it on March 17. Intent must be proven with persuasive and substantiated evidence.

I want to remind members of the foundational parliamentary principle that all members are expected to be honourable and would not knowingly mislead the Assembly and also of the time-honoured tradition of accepting a member's words in the House.

In reviewing the evidence presented and statements made in the House, I do not find there is sufficient evidence that the Premier intentionally misled the Assembly and I find there is no *prima facie* case of privilege.

Before I proceed to the point of order raised on the same matter, I would like to remind members that privilege is a serious matter that should not be taken lightly. In this case, I find it rather curious that before I could rule on her point of order, the Opposition Deputy House Leader follows up the next day with a privilege case. I will now proceed to my ruling on the point of order.

STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
Ruling on a Point of Order
(Dispute Over Misquote)

On Tuesday, March 17, 2026, the Deputy Opposition House Leader (Kim Breckner) rose on a point of order alleging that, during question period, the Premier (Hon. Scott Moe) misattributed a quote by a Saskatchewan health care worker to the Member for Regina Elphinstone-Centre (Meara Conway). The Government House Leader (Hon. Tim McLeod) argued that it was a point of fact that the member said those words and asked that I review the record prior to making my ruling. I committed to checking the record and preparing a ruling for Thursday. Having reviewed the *Hansard*, video, and the precedents with respect to this matter, I am prepared to make my ruling.

It is a well-established practice in this Assembly that disputes over facts are left up to members to debate and not to the Speaker. Previous Speakers have ruled that it is not the duty of the Chair to verify the accuracy of anything said in debate, nor is it the duty of the Speaker to decide whether the comments of a member have been misquoted or misrepresented. Moreover, they have clearly articulated that the accuracy of quotes are wholly the responsibility of members and it has never been a practice nor a duty of the Speaker to authenticate anything said in debate or in question period.

Furthermore, the rules account for the possibility of a member's words being misquoted or misunderstood and provides members with a mechanism to correct the record. Speaker D'Autremont ruled on March 25,

2015 that, “Through debate members have an opportunity to question and explain comments made in speeches and to say when they feel they have been misquoted or misunderstood.” Although rule 54(1) may not apply directly to question period, it has been applied in this way by previous Speakers and the principle behind it clearly demonstrates the fact that the onus falls on members to correct misquotes.

The matter arising from this point of order is part of the nature of debate. On these grounds, I do not find this point of order well taken.

To conclude, I do want to caution all honourable members to use discretion when quoting from and characterizing documents.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Petitions of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan were presented and laid upon the Table by the following members: Don McBean, Keith Jorgenson, Hugh Gordon, and Brent Blakley.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

According to order and pursuant to rule 16(7), petitions from residents of the province of Saskatchewan, requesting the following action, were read and received:

To adopt fair and effective rent control legislation that limits annual rent increases.
(Addendum to sessional paper no. 13)

To meaningfully address the affordability crisis in Saskatchewan.
(Addendum to sessional paper no. 33)

To immediately build a new hospital for Yorkton.
(Addendum to sessional paper no. 154)

RESUMPTION OF BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Jim Reiter, seconded by Terri Bromm:

That the Assembly approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

The debate continuing, it was moved by Trent Wotherspoon, seconded by Keith Jorgenson:

That all the words after “Assembly” be omitted and the following be inserted:

does not approve the budgetary policy of the government because it fails to invest in cost-of-living relief, health care, and public safety while pushing the provincial debt to unprecedented levels; and further,

That the Assembly has lost confidence in the government.

The debate continuing on the motion and the amendment, pursuant to rule 6(6), the Speaker interrupted proceedings and adjourned the Assembly.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:00 p.m. until Monday at 1:30 p.m.

Hon. Todd Goudy
Speaker

NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR FIRST READING OF BILLS

On Tuesday:

Noor Burki to move first reading of Bill No. 616 — The Islamic Heritage Month Act

Hon. Alana Ross to move first reading of Bill No. 52 — The Heritage Property Amendment Act, 2026