



STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 1 — December 6, 2023

Published under the
authority of
The Hon. Randy Weekes
Speaker



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the
Legislative Assembly are available
within hours after each sitting.

<https://www.legassembly.sk.ca/Calendar>

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES

Hon. Randy Weekes, Chair
Biggar-Sask Valley

Ms. Nicole Sarauer, Deputy Chair
Regina Douglas Park

Hon. Lori Carr
Estevan

Ms. Meara Conway
Regina Elphinstone-Centre

Hon. Jeremy Harrison
Meadow Lake

Ms. Lisa Lambert
Saskatoon Churchill-Wildwood

Mr. Greg Ottenbreit
Yorkton

[The committee met at 15:30.]

The Chair: — I'd like to call to order the Standing Committee on Privileges. I'd like to introduce the members in attendance. It's Minister Harrison, Minister Carr, Ms. Lisa Lambert, Mr. Greg Ottenbreit from the government; and from the opposition, Ms. Sarauer and Ms. Conway.

And just introduce the agenda. First thing is going to be the election of Deputy Chair and the establishment of a steering committee that will go into the consideration. I recognize the Government House Leader . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . The first order of business is the election of the Deputy Chair. Pursuant to the rules of the Legislative Assembly, the Speaker is the Chair of the standing committee and the Deputy Chair shall be an opposition member.

I'd like to remind members of the process. I will first ask for nominations. Once there are no further nominations, I will then ask a member to move a motion to have a committee member preside as Deputy Chair. I will now call for nominations for that position. I recognize Ms. Carr.

Hon. Ms. Carr: — I will nominate Nicole Sarauer.

The Chair: — The seconder? Don't need a seconder? Okay, we're good. Ms. Carr has nominated Ms. Sarauer to the position of Deputy Chair. Are there any further nominations? Seeing none, I would now invite one of the members to move that motion. I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. J. Harrison: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move:

That Nicole Sarauer be elected to preside as Deputy Chair of the Standing Committee on Privileges.

The Chair: — It has been moved by the Government House Leader:

That Ms. Sarauer preside as Deputy Chair of the Standing Committee on Privileges.

All in favour of the motion?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Any opposed? Carried. I declare the motion carried.

Now a motion for establishment of a steering committee. I ask the Government House Leader to make a motion.

Hon. Mr. J. Harrison: — Sure. Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I would move:

That a steering committee be appointed to establish an agenda and priority of business for subsequent meetings and that the membership be comprised of the Chair, the Deputy Chair, and Government House Leader; and further,

That the steering committee shall meet time to time as

directed by the committee or at the call of the Chair, that the presence of all members of the steering committee is necessary to constitute a meeting, and that substitutions from the membership of the Standing Committee on Privileges be permitted on the steering committee.

I so move.

The Chair: — All in favour?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Any opposed? Carried. Now the consideration of the order.

Consideration of the order of reference adopted by the Legislative Assembly on November 22nd, 2023 as follows:

That the disruption and occupation of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan clearly constitutes a breach of the privileges of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan by preventing all members from exercising their duties and responsibilities as members of the Legislative Assembly; and further,

That this matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges for a full investigation and a report with a remedy to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly.

The Chair: — I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. J. Harrison: — Sure. Well thanks very much, Mr. Speaker, and thanks for your Chairmanship of the committee and having the meeting held here today to discuss the matter that had been referred to it by the House a couple of weeks ago.

So basically what I'm going to do, Mr. Speaker, is read a letter into the record of which you were the recipient, and which was cc'd to both the Opposition House Leader and to myself. And there was a request that the letter be used as a part of the consideration for this meeting here today.

Letter is from B'nai Brith Canada. And I think that most people are familiar with B'nai Brith which is the advocacy organization for the Jewish community in Canada. And I will table the letter, but I also will read it into the record:

Dear Speaker Weekes,

B'nai Brith Canada is Canada's oldest Jewish advocacy organization, nationally active since 1875. We write today to alert the members of the Saskatchewan legislature to the deep concerns of the Jewish community regarding the recent demonstration which disrupted the democratic functioning of the Assembly's work and during which extremely troubling and anti-Semitic slogans were chanted by protesters.

On October 7th, Israel was the victim of an unprovoked bloody attack by several Palestinian terrorist groups led by Hamas. Thousands of missiles were fired at Israeli civilian targets. Some 1,200 Israelis were massacred by the terrorists

in what can only be described as a horrific and brutal atrocity.

Moreover 240 people, including many children and elderly persons, were taken hostage. Residents of Saskatchewan have joined other Canadians in calling for their immediate and safe return. Canada has stood with the democratic world in condemning Hamas and recognizing Israel's right to defend itself. So has the Government of Saskatchewan.

Yet these protesters felt they had the right to disrupt the democratically elected legislature to openly vilify Israel, portraying the Jewish state as the aggressor rather than the victim of terrorism.

Instead of abhorring the terror attack, the demonstrators shouted slogans calling for the obliteration of Israel. In particular the phrase "from the river to the sea" is hateful and calls for Israel to disappear and its territory to be entirely absorbed by a future Palestinian state.

The slogan epitomizes the Hamas manifesto which denies Jewish history, incites vicious anti-Semitism worldwide, and promotes violence to destroy the Jewish state. In practice, the slogan "from the river to the sea" has encouraged acts of terror against Jews in Israel and elsewhere.

Jews are indigenous to Israel with a history dating back many thousands of years. Jews have always dwelt in the Holy Land, and denying their ancestry there is anti-Semitic incitement to terrorism. The use of this slogan impacts the Jewish community here in Canada. Attached please find our one-page informational document describing the pernicious impacts this hateful slogan has on our community.

In 1947 Canada joined the large majority of United Nations members in adopting resolution 181, which recognized Jewish statehood in the land where Jews have always been indigenous. Hamas inherits the legacy of those who, at the time, rejected the two-state solution which aimed to ensure self-determination for both the Jewish and Palestinian peoples. Those refusing the right of the Jews to their own country have been at war for 75 years.

The Abraham Accords, which are fostering peace and co-operation between the Jewish people and their Arab neighbours, offer a path we can all endorse. The call for the destruction of Israel and the implicit support of violent aims that the slogan "from the river to the sea" connotes must, on the other hand, be absolutely rejected and condemned.

B'nai Brith has enlarged its advocacy with the Government of Saskatchewan over the past two years. We are pleased with the seriousness the province gives to combatting anti-Semitism. In December 2022 to assist stakeholders better recognize and react to hate aimed at Jews, Saskatchewan adopted the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance, IHRA, definition of anti-Semitism. The province thus joined the Government of Canada and 40 other nations, five other Canadian provinces, and 30 states of the United States in adopting the IHRA definition, recognized globally as the most authoritative definition of anti-Semitism.

The definition is clear. Criticism of the state of Israel and its government in the same manner as any other nation is legitimate. Calling for its destruction and refusing to acknowledge its legitimate right to exist is anti-Semitism.

We note that Premier Scott Moe and Opposition Leader Carla Beck have been unequivocal in their denunciation of the use of the hateful slogan by these protesters. We thank them for that.

However the Jewish community in Saskatchewan is concerned that members of the Legislative Assembly may have aided to organize the demonstration, which we understand is the first time ever that the legislature has been disrupted and been unable to function.

In particular, news reports carried by several Saskatchewan news outlets suggest MLA Jennifer Bowes shared social media posts promoting the protest and quote her as admitting she was in contact with the protest organizers. The CBC report mentioned that members of the official opposition caucus met with the protest organizers on November the 14th. Several media quote protester Valerie Zink admitting the following: "That's what brought us to the legislature today, and the intention was always to deliver the message in that way."

It's difficult to believe that MLAs who helped facilitate this so-called peaceful protest were unaware that the legislative session was about to be disrupted. The event was evidently not spontaneous and required a large number of police and security forces to eject the protesters. Videos and photos available online show angry shouting protesters, efforts to remove the Israeli flag from the legislature rotunda, and a situation that could easily have degenerated to violence.

We do not agree with the quote from MLA Meara Conway made in the *Toronto Star* that the protest was "a peaceful disruption." The fact that there were no arrests does not make the incident less frightening for anyone not associated with these protesters.

The legislature has its own rules of functioning, and as Speaker you can take the appropriate measures in your rules of procedure, such as barring attendance of any of these protesters from future sessions of the Assembly.

We are however more concerned with the message certain MLAs have sent to the province's Jewish community. No MLA should endorse slogans that call for the obliteration of the Jewish homeland. No MLA should condemn Israel for its right to defend itself. No MLA should simply parrot the talking points of terrorist groups that are banned by Canada.

We invite the legislature to adopt a clearly worded motion to denounce the unprovoked attacks on Israel and on innocent civilians by the terrorist group Hamas, and affirm the right of Israel to respond and defend itself. We understand the Privileges Committee will be meeting later this week. We ask it to ascertain whether and how certain MLAs did in any way facilitate this disruption of the legislature and allow for the hateful, anti-Semitic "river to the sea" slogan to be chanted.

Jews have played an important role in the growth and success of Saskatchewan since before Confederation. Jewish farming colonies took root in what is today Saskatchewan as early as 1882. A historic synagogue in Edenburg, completed in 1908 attests to Jewish history in the province.

Today's Jewish population is primarily urban and continues to contribute to the well-being of the province in so many ways. Yet the appalling, chaotic event at the legislature has made the entire community feel targeted.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Most warmly,
Michael Mostyn
Chief executive officer
B'nai Brith Canada

Marvin Rotrand
National director, League for Human Rights
B'nai Brith Canada

And I so table that letter, Mr. Speaker. And I would add the government's concurrence with the letter.

And with that I would put a motion on the floor:

That this committee condemns both the organizers' and perpetrators' actions on November 20th, 2023, which resulted in a breach of privilege of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan; and

That this committee expresses its gratitude and appreciation for the professional work of the legislative district security unit, ushers, commissionaires, Sergeant-at-Arms, and all legislative staff in dealing with the breach of privilege; and further,

That this committee requests that the legislative district security unit, in co-operation with the legislative staff, review the incidents on November 20th, 2023 and develop proposals to prevent further breaches of privilege.

I so move.

The Chair: — The Government House Leader moved:

That this committee condemns both the organizers' and perpetrators' actions on November 20th, 2023, which resulted in a breach of privilege of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan; and

That this committee expresses its gratitude and appreciation for the professional work of the legislative district security unit, ushers, commissionaires, Sergeant-at-Arms, and all legislative staff in dealing with the breach of privilege; and further,

That this committee requests that the legislative district security unit, in co-operation with the legislative staff, review the incidents on November 20th, 2023 and develop proposals to prevent future breaches of privilege.

Any comments? I recognize Ms. Conway.

Ms. Conway: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chair. I have a few comments I want to put on the record. I'm just having a look here at the motion. There have been a lot of things said in the Legislative Assembly to date, and I think it's important for the opposition to correct the record on a few accounts because we've seen quite a performance, frankly, from that Government House Leader on this matter.

[15:45]

I want to begin by reading into the record new information that this opposition has obtained since the last time this matter was touched on in the Assembly. I'm going to begin by reading a record that I wrote to the director of the legislative district security unit on November 29th, 2023 as it's quite pertinent to this matter and to this motion. Again this was November 29th, 2023:

Dear Ms. Herman,

As official critic for democracy and Deputy House Leader, I am reaching out about a serious matter that has come to the attention of members of the Saskatchewan NDP caucus.

On November 22nd, 2023, House Leader Jeremy Harrison reported the following to the House as outlined at page 4754 of *Hansard*:

And during this event, Mr. Speaker, members were locked in a secure location. Protocols were followed by security, by members. And we didn't know what was going to happen next, Mr. Speaker . . .

MLAs and cabinet ministers were limited in their movement of the Assembly because we were locked in a secure location during the occupation.

That's the end of the quote.

Saskatchewan NDP caucus members were not locked in a secure location. Saskatchewan NDP caucus members were not asked to follow any protocols or even informed of any. In fact Saskatchewan NDP caucus members continued to roam about the building visiting with guests. For example, the member for Regina Rosemont went upstairs to speak with three attending school groups.

Mr. Harrison's account suggests government members received different treatment from legislative district security unit staff than Saskatchewan NDP caucus members. Members of the Saskatchewan NDP caucus are understandably concerned and seeking clarification.

I look forward to a prompt response.

Sincerely . . .

Signed by myself, critic for democracy, Deputy House Leader

And the Speaker, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the minister responsible for the legislative district security unit, Paul

Merriman, were all copied on this letter.

On December 4th, earlier this week, I received a response from the director of legislative district security unit, and she writes:

To Meara Conway,

Thank you for your letter dated November 29, 2023 regarding the disruption that occurred during the Legislative Assembly on November 20, 2023.

On November 20, '23 members of the legislative district security unit did not provide direction to government officials to lock themselves in a secure location nor did members of LDSU lock any individual or government official in a secure location. If individuals chose to lock themselves in a secure location, it was a determination made by those individuals. Accordingly Saskatchewan NDP caucus members received the same treatment as government members by the LDSU.

I trust this alleviates any concerns you and the other Saskatchewan NDP caucus members may have in this regard.

Certainly our concerns about the appearance of different treatment were alleviated by this letter, but it does raise questions about that Government House Leader's account of events, what was suggested both directly and indirectly about what happened that day. And this opposition has always been clear that the way that this event is being treated and discussed by this Sask Party government is all about distracting from its own failures.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of condemning speech, which this motion would have us do, we must tread carefully. This is the people's House. It's important to note that the expression at issue here, political speech at the legislature, would receive the highest possible protection under the Charter. This is the place where the protection of expression is most robust, and we are not the arbiters of acceptable speech.

The right to political expression is considered the lifeblood of any democratic society. Underlying values include democratic discourse, truth-seeking, and personal fulfillment. There are few, if any, rights of such fundamental importance. Political speech is at the very core of section 2(b) protection, being that it is vital to the democratic process. And it may only be curtailed "in service of the most compelling governmental interest."

Our leader noted her concerns, concerns at the disruption, and that was appropriate. And indeed, had these disruptions continued, had these protesters returned again and again, had we not been able to do our jobs, that would not have been protected speech. It would be inconsistent with the function of this place, which is the test that the courts employ.

This is not what we would have done, Mr. Speaker. We lost our question period, one of the few tools we have to hold the government to account. Individuals in this place — and by that I mean members of this Legislative Assembly — don't have to agree with the methods and content of speech in order to recognize that people have a right to be here.

So again, we tread very carefully. We must not get into rubber-stamping speech we agree with and denouncing the speech that expresses views we don't agree with, which is precisely what this government is asking us to do with this motion, is my fear.

Disruptions in this place have taken different forms over the years, including, I would note, by members of government themselves. Interrupting and suspending the business of the legislature has been a tradition used by parties in Saskatchewan to protest against specific issues or treatment.

The NDP [New Democratic Party] used it most effectively in the 1980s to stop a bill that would have eventually privatized SaskEnergy. The rules were rewritten such that the practice was outlawed in the '90s. In the 1970s the Conservatives of the day walked out of the legislature. And I've reviewed an article, a media article about that, and it appears that the House was suspended until they returned. A farm protest occupied the Legislative Building in 2000 for a couple of days, as well as overnight, and the building went into a lockdown, which essentially meant that the government couldn't operate.

Did we on this side once call to shut down anti-masking protests happening outside of this building? Never. We took them on. We disagreed with them, but we fought them on the merits. We didn't try to suppress them or condemn their speech.

I just want to refer also that this is consistent with the comments of the Premier himself. On September 14th, 2021 on Twitter he indicated the appropriate place for people to disagree and protest policy decisions is at the provincial legislature, not at our hospitals and health care facilities.

Asking this House of democracy to condemn individuals who come here to petition their legislature for a ceasefire is not something that we can do. It bears noting, since the latest chapter of this bloody conflict began, 1,200 Israelis and over 16,000 Palestinians, including over close to 7,000 innocent children, have died since October 7th.

On this side we have spoken openly about the tragic loss of life on both sides, whether Israeli or Palestinian. Our leader's comments on this conflict have been a call to understanding, to empathy, and for peace. She has called repeatedly for the release of all hostages, and she has called for a ceasefire.

Saskatchewan people believe that the loss of any innocent life is a tragedy. We worry that the contents of this motion and the approach of this government is further dividing the communities of our province that need to be brought together at a difficult time. Saskatchewan people have a proud history of standing up for human rights and advancing peace across the world.

And we have seen this government, desperate to distract from their failures, their scandals, as they limp from crisis to crisis, going on the offensive. What's more, the group that came here that day was a broad cross-section of society. There were campus groups. There were social work students. There was a number of individuals from one mosque in Saskatoon. A respected imam attended. Peace activists attended, many different individuals. And you can see even from the video posted by protesters that the entire first row of the east gallery didn't even stand or join in the chant for ceasefire.

It was disgusting and, frankly, dangerous to see the Government House Leader and even the Premier attempt to label us on this side as extremists, including the member for Coronation Park — the only member, the only Muslim member on our side and one of the few in the legislature who has never received so much as a parking ticket. He is now facing questions from his community about being labelled an extremist by the Premier.

It's disgusting to see this government ramp up this rhetoric. That man — that gentle, thoughtful, hard-working man who has contributed much to his community in so many ways, who has raised seven beautiful daughters — he welcomed and introduced members from his community into the legislature that day, and then he got labelled an extremist by the Sask Party government for doing it.

That has to stop. These are the kinds of loaded antics we've come to expect, who take more and more cues from Trump-style politics. It's divisive, and frankly it doesn't play well in Saskatchewan.

With regard to the third paragraph of the motion, Mr. Speaker, this event was then used as a pretext to put in place policies to restrict who could enter the galleries, require people to give names and addresses, requiring guests to give 72 hours' notice. This was heavy-handed, and we are on record strongly opposing those measures that could have a chilling effect on people's ability or desire to participate in their democracy. So we are very concerned and certainly not in agreement with those kinds of approaches.

Really what we saw before when this was first raised, Mr. Speaker, and what we're seeing today is, we believe, an attempt to distract from the record of this government. The Government House Leader's earlier accusations of NDP involvement in this disruption, which appear to be referenced to some degree in the letter read into the record, are simply not true. They were unfounded and they were made in the complete absence of proof, which is precisely why you made the ruling you did.

We had a Government House Leader accuse us of being extremists, ramping up divisive rhetoric. We believe this is because they want to distract from their record. But we believe that nothing is lower than trying to use this conflict halfway across the world, so steeped in pain, in misunderstanding, in entrenched views, to further sow division in this House and in this province. We will not feed into this, Mr. Speaker. We will not give in to notions of us versus them. We will not value some lives over others. And we will not condemn political speech in this House of democracy.

Our entire caucus has been meeting with members from Saskatchewan's Jewish community who, I might add, hold a range of views on this conflict. We've also been meeting with members of Muslim communities who again hold a range of views on this conflict. We've met with many individuals. Many understandably feel very strong about this conflict.

The Government House Leader has read one letter into the record from individuals outside of this province. I note and emphasize that individuals from our caucus have met with and broken bread with members of the local chapter of this organization, the Saskatoon chapter.

We valued those conversations. Those conversations will continue. The letter we received from that chapter had a very different tone than the one read into the record today. It raised concerns, yes, but it was very constructive and it was very conciliatory. We have received on this matter hundreds of letters, Mr. Speaker, from individuals across the province: teachers, doctors, data analysts, geneticists, students, and others.

But there is one from which I want to read in particular because it is from a Saskatchewan individual, a Jewish individual who is also active in a national Jewish human rights organization called Independent Jewish Voices.

And she writes:

It cannot be inherently violent to call for your own dignity to be respected. "From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free" is not hate speech. It's simply a call for Palestinian liberation and a call for the freedom and human rights of Palestinians to be respected in their homeland.

It is crucial to distinguish between supporting a cause for justice and promoting hatred. And of course when this slogan became an issue, Mr. Speaker, Jennifer Bowes made a statement, a nuanced statement. And she removed a like on a social media post out of respect for the fact that this statement is fraught, and in recognition that it is deeply offensive to others but it does not mean the same thing to everyone.

[16:00]

The best we can do as legislators operating on the other side of the world of this conflict is try as much as we can to foster a dialogue between the representative communities that we serve, to lean into empathy and humanity, and to spark hope for a lasting peace. We on this side will continue to do the much needed work of bringing communities together to call for an end to this violence and for a lasting peace.

True leaders bring people together, look for better paths forward. They don't try to wedge communities or sow division even if there is an opportunity for a quick headline, a political point, or a quick and easy distraction from a crisis. We will not be supporting this motion with the opposition because we believe that it doesn't work towards the goals that we've stated. It will result in further division. Thank you.

The Chair: — You read two letters. Are you tabling those?

Ms. Conway: — I read an excerpt from a letter. I don't have that person's permission to enter it into the record, but I could undertake to request permission. But I don't have it with me today. I don't have the person's permission.

The Chair: — Okay. It was two letters? One letter you wrote?

Ms. Conway: — Oh, I'm sorry. I do have those letters.

The Chair: — Yes.

Ms. Conway: — Yes, sorry. The two letters you were referring to are . . . Yes. So I have a letter from myself to the director of legislative district security dated November 29, 2023, and then a

response dated December 4th, 2023.

The Chair: — Thank you. I also just want to recognize the Government House Leader tabled the letter he read into the record from the B'nai Brith as well. Discussion? I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. J. Harrison: — Sure. I'm not going to be lengthy, Mr. Speaker. You know, I would say that deliberations when you're in the Privileges Committee are a serious matter. I didn't come here to make political speeches, so I'm not going to. But it is disappointing though that the opposition would take this opportunity to literally make political speeches. Happy to have a debate in question period. We do that every day, but when we're down here . . .

This committee meets very rarely. I actually can recall only one other meeting in the last 16 years, and I've been on this committee, I think, over that period of time. It's a serious matter. I mean when something comes down here, this is not because we're playing silly politics. And it's disappointing. It's disappointing. I would just say that, and I'll leave it there with regard to the comments from that member.

What I would say though is disappointing as well in her comments, on kind of not tone but fact, really is the attack on B'nai Brith and the questioning of the sincerity of what was submitted from this organization — they've had this letter for a week — about what they told us and how this impacted them. I very factually read into the record what was said. She's questioning that. And I think that says probably everything you need to know about this debate and about where the different sides of the legislature line up on this.

The fact is the House was shut down. The fact is that there was "grave disorder," and that is a term in the *Rules and Procedures* where the House was shut down by Mr. Speaker because we were unable as an Assembly to do our work. That's about as serious a matter as it gets. And I talked about this in the Chamber. It's about as serious as it gets. And that's why we're here.

And that's why I put this motion before the Assembly, frankly, which I think is pretty reasonable and pretty balanced. We could have put a motion into the Chamber, into this Assembly with a majority, that could have gone much further, that could have called for very real sanctions. We didn't do that because what we put here, I think, is a very balanced, very balanced — if not even going onto one side — approach to dealing with this.

So the members can . . . I wouldn't say the members, I would say that member can treat this Assembly or treat this committee as some sort of silly partisan game. It's not. And we're not here because this is some silly, partisan game. We're here because we weren't able to do our work as members because of grave disorder.

And what we have put in front of the committee — condemning those who were responsible for this; commending those who dealt with this, our security staff, and asking for them to do some work and make a recommendation about how it can be prevented from happening again — that is the absolute picture of reasonableness. And the fact that that member can't even support that, I think should tell anybody watching everything they need

to know.

The Chair: — Any other comments? Yes, Ms. Sarauer.

Ms. Sarauer: — I have no other comments other than Ms. Conway who spoke very well, spoke on behalf of all of us. And I think we're ready to vote on the motion.

The Chair: — Well we need to go into the question before the committee:

That this committee condemns both the organizers' and perpetrators' actions on November 20th, 2023, which resulted in a breach of privilege of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan;

That this committee express its gratitude and appreciation for the professional work of the legislative district security unit, ushers, commissionaires, Sergeant-at-Arms, and all legislative staff in dealing with the breach of privilege; and further,

That this committee requests that the legislative district security unit, in co-operation with the legislative staff, review the incidents on November 20th, '23 and develop proposals to prevent future breaches of privilege.

All those in favour of the motion please raise your hand. I count four. Opposed? Two. The motion is carried.

Okay. So since the committee is discussing a substantive report pursuant to rule 135(1), I would ask for a member to move a motion to move in camera. Ms. Carr moves. All in favour?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Opposed? Carried. We'll go in camera. Would it be okay if all the Clerks stay in attendance?

[The committee continued in camera from 16:07 until 16:20.]

The Chair: — We're back in session, and the time is 4:20. So before you is the first report of the Standing Committee on Privileges committee. I recognize the Government House Leader.

Hon. Mr. J. Harrison: — Sure. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think all members have had a chance to review the first report. And thank you very much to the LAS [Legislative Assembly Service] staff for so rapidly producing the report based on the discussion that just went on.

With that, I would move the following motion:

That the draft first report of the Standing Committee on Privileges be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

The Chair: — The Government House Leader has moved:

That the draft first report of the Standing Committee on Privileges be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

All in favour say aye.

Some Hon. Members: — Aye.

The Chair: — Opposed.

Some Hon. Members: — Nay.

The Chair: — Nay. Two opposed. Recorded division, 4 to 2.

I would entertain a motion to adjourn the committee. Mr. Ottenbreit moved. We are adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 16:21.]