



SECOND SESSION — THIRTIETH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

**VOTES
AND
PROCEEDINGS**

No. 56

Wednesday, April 29, 2026

1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

SPEAKER TABLES REPORTS

The Speaker laid before the Assembly the following:

Saskatchewan Advocate for Children and Youth: 2025 annual report

(Sessional paper no. 194)

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Petitions of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan were presented and laid upon the Table by the following members: Tajinder Grewal and Noor Burki.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

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

To immediately make public the full list and map of existing service disruptions.

(Addendum to sessional paper no. 165)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

The following bill was introduced, read the first time, and ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting:

Bill No. 621 — The Public Works and Services (Prioritizing Local Jobs) Amendment Act
(Sally Houser)

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN AND CENTRAL AGENCIES

Colleen Young, Chair of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies, presented the committee's fourth report for the thirtieth legislature, which is as follows:

The Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies adopted the committee's fourth report for the thirtieth legislature, which is as follows:

2026–27 Estimates

The committee considered the following estimates for the executive branch of government and adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, that there be granted to His Majesty for the twelve months ending March 31, 2027 the following sums:

Executive Branch of Government

For Finance	\$375,000,000
For Public Service Commission.....	\$43,573,000
For SaskBuilds and Procurement.....	\$190,361,000

The committee considered the following estimates for which no funds were requested:

Executive Branch of Government

For SaskBuilds Corporation

The committee considered the following estimates for which no amounts were required to be voted:

Executive Branch of Government

For Finance — Debt Servicing (Statutory)

For Saskatchewan Residential Fuel Charge (Statutory)

Lending and Investing Activities

For Municipal Financing Corporation of Saskatchewan (Statutory)

For Saskatchewan Power Corporation (Statutory)

For Saskatchewan Telecommunications Holding Corporation (Statutory)

For Saskatchewan Water Corporation (Statutory)

For SaskEnergy Incorporated (Statutory)

Debt Redemption, Sinking Fund and Interest Payments

For Debt Redemption (Statutory)

For Sinking Fund Payments — Government Share (Statutory)

For Interest on Gross Debt — Crown Enterprise Share (Statutory)

2025–26 Supplementary Estimates No. 2

The committee considered the following supplementary estimates no. 2 for the Ministry of Finance and adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, that there be granted to His Majesty for the twelve months ending March 31, 2026 the following sum:

Executive Branch of Government

For Finance \$16,185,000

The committee considered the following supplementary estimates no. 2 for which no amounts were required to be voted:

Executive Branch of Government

For Finance — Debt Servicing (Statutory)

Lending and Investing Activities

For Saskatchewan Power Corporation (Statutory)

For SaskEnergy Incorporated (Statutory)

The committee recommends that upon concurrence of its report by the Assembly, the sums as reported and approved shall be included in the appropriation bill for consideration by the Legislative Assembly.

(Sessional paper no. 195)

On motion of Colleen Young:

Ordered, That the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Crown and Central Agencies for the thirtieth legislature be now concurred in.

**REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE
RAPPORT DU COMITÉ PERMANENT DES AFFAIRES INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES ET DE LA JUSTICE**

The following bill was reported without amendment and consideration in Committee of the Whole on Bills having been waived, by leave of the Assembly, it was moved by the Hon. Everett Hindley:

That Bill No. 38 — The Building Schools Faster Act be now read the third time and passed under its title.

The question being put, it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 33

Scott Moe	Kim Gartner	Warren Kaeding	David Marit	Jeremy Cockrill
Jim Reiter	Everett Hindley	Jeremy Harrison	Ken Cheveldayoff	Eric Schmalz
Terry Jenson	Michael Weger	Travis Keisig	Jamie Martens	Sean Wilson
Chris Beaudry	Darlene Rowden	Alana Ross	Tim McLeod	Lori Carr
Brad Crassweller	Doug Steele	Colleen Young	Daryl Harrison	Kevin Weedmark
Barret Kropf	Blaine McLeod	Megan Patterson	Terri Bromm	Racquel Hilbert
David Chan	James Thorsteinson	Kevin Kasun		

NAYS — 20

Erika Ritchie	Noor Burki	Vicki Mowat	Trent Wotherspoon	Matt Love
Nathaniel Teed	Jared Clarke	Jordan McPhail	Meara Conway	Nicole Sarauer
Kim Breckner	Brent Blakley	Tajinder Grewal	Keith Jorgenson	Bhajan Brar
Hugh Gordon	Darcy Warrington	Joan Pratchler	Sally Houser	Jacqueline Roy

The said bill was accordingly read the third time and passed.

The following bill was reported without amendment and consideration in Committee of the Whole on Bills having been waived, by leave of the Assembly, it was read the third time and passed:

Le projet de loi suivant est rapporté sans amendement et avec la permission de l'Assemblée de passer outre au renvoi au Comité plénier sur les projets de loi, est lu une troisième fois et adopté:

Bill No. 39 — The Building Schools Faster Consequential Amendment Act, 2025

Projet de loi n° 39 — Loi de 2025 corrélatrice de la loi intitulée The Building Schools Faster Act

The following bill was reported with amendment, and pursuant to rule 89(a), it was accordingly ordered to a Committee of the Whole on Bills at the next sitting:

Bill No. 43 — The Municipalities Modernization and Red Tape Reduction Act

**STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
Ruling on a Question of Privilege
(Interruption of Member Statement)**

On April 27, 2026, the Member for Cumberland (Jordan McPhail) raised a question of privilege in accordance with rule 12 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*.

In his submission of evidence, the Member for Cumberland noted that on April 23, 2026, he was interrupted by the Speaker during his member statement. The member cited rules 18(2), (3), (4), and (6), which outline the rules for members' statements, and submitted that none of these rules had been broken.

In response, the Government House Leader (Hon. Tim McLeod) outlined the authority of the Speaker, arguing that "The Rules do not anticipate every circumstance that may arise in debate," and that the Speaker has "exclusive authority to interpret and apply those Rules in real time."

Questions of privilege are serious matters and therefore have a high threshold. As noted by Maingot on page 223 of *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, under the heading "A point of order is not a matter of privilege":

A breach of the Standing Orders or a failure to follow an established practice would invoke a "point of order" rather than a "question of privilege."

For these reasons, I find that a *prima facie* case has not been established.

Furthermore, while our rules don't specifically address content of members' statements, the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, 4th edition does speak directly to this. Section 10.6, under "Guidelines for Statements by Members," notes that "personal attacks are not permitted."

And 10.8, in the same section, states:

The Speaker retains discretion over the acceptability of each statement and has the authority to order members to resume their seats if improper use is being made of this standing order.

Finally, I would like to remind members of our collective responsibilities here. I quote from Speaker Toth's ruling on March 31, 2010 on a similar matter:

. . . personal attacks and innuendos have no place in proceedings of this Assembly. The comments are hurtful and only create disorder and retaliation. I ask Members not to make the period for Members' Statements into a series of attack ads. I ask you to not bring personal attacks and offensive opinions into this Chamber.

**STATEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
Ruling on a Question of Privilege
(Influencing the Speaker and Questioning Impartiality)**

On Monday, April 27, 2026, I received a letter from the Government House Leader (Hon. Tim McLeod) in which he raised a question of privilege under the provisions of rule 12 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*. He alleged that the Member for Cumberland (Jordan McPhail) breached the privilege of the Speaker when he publicly released a letter requesting that the Speaker release confidential details about another member's constituency office lease, shortly after delivering that letter to the Speaker. The Government House Leader alleges that in doing so, the member was calling into question the impartiality of the Speaker and attempting to influence the Speaker's decision to release the lease information.

The Opposition House Leader (Nicole Sarauer) provided me with a written reply in accordance with rule 12(4). In the response, she argued that the Member for Cumberland was only asking for the release of the lease information in his letter and was not questioning the authority or independence of the Speaker. I have reviewed the case and am prepared to make my ruling.

On page 255 of *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, 2nd edition, J.P. Joseph Maingot explains that:

Spoken outside the House by a Member ... language reflecting on [a] Member's parliamentary capacity would be considered contempt of the House; it has been inadvertently treated as a matter of unparliamentary language that should be withdrawn rather than brought to the attention of the House by way of privilege, which is the proper practice.

Maingot goes on to note that while the Speaker typically does not ask members to retract unparliamentary words spoken or written outside the House, "if one Member speaking outside the House reflects improperly on the conduct of another Member's parliamentary activities and the matter is raised as a matter of privilege in the House, the Speaker certainly has jurisdiction to examine those same words and determine if there is a *prima facie* case of privilege or contempt of the House."

In determining whether the Member for Cumberland's actions constitute a breach of privilege, it is important to note that "to constitute a breach of privilege a statement reflecting on the conduct of a Member in his capacity as a Member ... must tend to lower the House in the eyes of the public," as Abraham and Hawtrey outline on page 44 of *A Parliamentary Dictionary*. Maingot reiterates this point when stating on page 250 of *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada* that actions can "obstruct the House in the performance of its functions by diminishing the respect due it." Several comments made by the Member for Cumberland in his letter and subsequent media activity could indeed be interpreted as calling into question the impartiality of the Speaker and the integrity of the entire Assembly. There are a number of safeguards and processes in our parliamentary system. Rather than avail himself of the proper channels, however, the member has chosen to publicly bring a dark cloud upon this institution.

As stated in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, 4th edition, when a question of privilege has been raised, the function of the Speaker is limited to determining if a *prima facie* case has been established and it is the responsibility of the House to decide whether a breach of privilege or a contempt has been committed. At the heart of the current question is whether my privilege as the Speaker of the Assembly has been breached. To maintain the integrity and respect of this Assembly and institution, it is important for and the responsibility of this Assembly as a collective to decide the matter. Rule 12(5) requires that I must decide whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed or not. This is a difficult issue, and I have taken significant time to review the matter. Reluctantly, I find there are grounds for a *prima facie* case and for the matter to be considered as a question of privilege by the Assembly.

Pursuant to rule 12(6), it was moved by the Hon. Tim McLeod:

That the actions of the Member for Cumberland on April 22, 2026, constitutes a breach of privilege of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan resulting in contempt by attempting to influence a decision by the Speaker, and by publicly requesting the Speaker violate the privilege of another member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan;

That the Member from Cumberland apologize to the Speaker and the Assembly for his actions and remove any social media posts containing the letter and infographic.

A debate arising and the question being put on the motion, it was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 33

Scott Moe	Kim Gartner	Warren Kaeding	David Marit	Jeremy Cockrill
Jim Reiter	Everett Hindley	Jeremy Harrison	Ken Cheveldayoff	Eric Schmalz
Terry Jenson	Michael Weger	Travis Keisig	Jamie Martens	Sean Wilson
Chris Beaudry	Darlene Rowden	Alana Ross	Tim McLeod	Lori Carr
Brad Crassweller	Doug Steele	Colleen Young	Daryl Harrison	Kevin Weedmark
Barret Kropf	Blaine McLeod	Megan Patterson	Terri Bromm	Racquel Hilbert
David Chan	James Thorsteinson	Kevin Kasun		

NAYS — 20

Erika Ritchie	Noor Burki	Vicki Mowat	Trent Wotherspoon	Matt Love
Nathaniel Teed	Jared Clarke	Jordan McPhail	Meara Conway	Nicole Sarauer
Kim Breckner	Brent Blakley	Tajinder Grewal	Keith Jorgenson	Bhajan Brar
Hugh Gordon	Darcy Warrington	Joan Pratchler	Sally Houser	Jacqueline Roy

Thereupon, the Member for Cumberland apologized and agreed to remove the social media posts.

ADJOURNED DEBATES**Bill No. 48 — The Compassionate Intervention Act**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Lori Carr: That Bill No. 48 — The Compassionate Intervention Act be now read a second time.

The debate continuing, it was on motion of Jared Clarke adjourned.

Bill No. 57 — The Information Services Corporation Amendment Act, 2026

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Jeremy Harrison: That Bill No. 57 — The Information Services Corporation Amendment Act, 2026 be now read a second time.

The debate continuing, it was on motion of Hugh Gordon adjourned.

On motion of the Hon. Lori Carr:

Ordered, That this Assembly do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 3:39 p.m. until Thursday at 10:00 a.m.

Hon. Todd Goudy
Speaker

NOTICE OF MOTIONS FOR FIRST READING OF BILLS

On Monday:

Erika Ritchie to move first reading of Bill No. 623 — The Building Code Regulations (Henry's Law) Amendment Act