

Saskatchewan

LAWS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Immigration

Mar 27: The government announced [changes](#) to the Saskatchewan Immigrant Nominee Program in response to new federal immigration rules. Earlier this year, the federal government cut provincial immigration nominee allocations by 50% and added a new requirement that 75% of nominees already be living in Canada as temporary residents. In selecting its 3,625 nominations, the SINP will prioritize health, agriculture, and skilled trades.

Action Point: Find out what companies and their HR directors need to know to [navigate the immigration law maze](#).

New Laws

Apr 9: Saskatchewan launched a new digital recruitment campaign titled “Saskatchewan is Calling” to lure physicians from the U.S., particularly family physicians and those who practice in emergency medicine and anesthesiology.

New Laws

Apr 14: Saskatchewan added 16 locations to the list of communities who are eligible for the Rural and Remote Recruitment Incentive program providing up to \$50,000 to cover the costs of making 3-year return-in-service offers to new, permanent full-time employees in 9 high-priority health occupations, including nurses, medical technicians, and continuing care assistants in rural areas. RRRI incentives are now available to 70 rural communities across the province.

Drugs & Alcohol

Jun 1: Saskatchewan eliminated the provincial sales tax exemption on vapour products. Vaping products will continue to be subject to the separate vapour products tax. In addition to generating \$3 million in revenue per year, imposing the PST on vaping products is expected to discourage young people and others from using them.

Action Point: Find out how to comply with [workplace smoking laws](#).

CASES

Workplace Harassment: No Employer Duty to Investigate Harassment Complaint of Non-Employee

Employees can't sue companies that they don't work for for “negligent investigation” of their workplace grievances. That's the punch line of an important new ruling from Saskatchewan's highest court upholding the dismissal of a money damages lawsuit by a SaskTel employee against the City of Saskatoon for failing to investigate the complaint she submitted to the City's Ombudsman about the company's CEO creating a toxic work environment. It'd be one thing if the employee actually worked

for the City. But the City didn't have an employment or any other kind of legal relationship with her that would impose a duty of reasonable care to investigate her complaints of workplace harassment [[Hollinger v SaskTel Centre](#), 2025 SKCA 40 (CanLII), April 11, 2025].

Action Point: Find out how to implement a legally sound [workplace violence and harassment investigations policy](#) at your workplace.

Health & Safety: Inspector's Bias Undermines Validity of OHS Violation Citation

An OHS officer inspecting a school construction site repeatedly tells the superintendent that he's looking for a violation to cite while also remarking that it was an excellent site. He then observes 2 workers not wearing safety glasses. He's also unhappy that the site's written traffic control plan isn't available online. So, he offers the contractor a deal: you can take either the safety glasses or traffic plan citation. The contractor takes the first option because the workers not wearing safety glasses weren't its employees. Having not realized this, the OHS officer issues the traffic control plan citation. The contractor appeals, denying the allegation and claiming that the officer didn't base his decision to issue the citation on reasonable evidence. The appeal fails as the adjudicator rules that the violation was legitimate regardless of the officer's intentions. The case then goes to the Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board, which finds that the officer's intention to find a violation to cite is, in fact, relevant to determine whether his opinion was based on reasonable, credible, and documented evidence and that there was, in fact, a written traffic control plan for the site; but the Board also rules that there was evidence to support the adjudicator's finding that the plan wasn't "readily available" [[Wright v Govt of Sask \(OH&S\)](#), 2025 SKLRB 12 (CanLII), March 24, 2025].