

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a real pleasure for me today to welcome a group of students from Waldeck, Saskatchewan. The school is one in which my son attends, and my nephew. It's a real good school. It's got good teachers, good kids, and I want to welcome them here. They're accompanied by Mr. Hustak and Mrs. Pat Dyck Bunkosky. My neighbour, Barry Beisel is the driver of the bus, and I want to have all of the members of the Assembly welcome them here today. Thank you very much for coming.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to introduce through you, and to this Assembly, a group of students from James O'Begg School, which is only about eight miles down the road from the Waldeck School. These students, this morning, they are about 20 in number and they are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They have with them their teacher, David Franz. They have a couple of parents, I believe, in Donnalee DeKowny and Gary Whitney. I don't have the name of the bus driver, but the bus driver is with them. They got here safely, and the bus drivers in Swift Current will get them home safely too.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members to welcome these students, and I will look forward to meeting with them outside on the lawn today at approximately 11 a.m.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Unemployment in Saskatchewan

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Premier of Saskatchewan. Mr. Premier, today's figures released by Statistics Canada show the shocking fact that unemployment in Saskatoon is now at 11.4 per cent, one in nine, the second worst in all of Canada. The only city with a worse record of unemployment, Mr. Premier, is Sherbrooke, Quebec, with 11.6 per cent.

And I ask you, Mr. Premier; I ask you: how do you explain the inability of your government to get the economy of Saskatoon and, for that matter, all of Saskatchewan rolling again? How do we explain that to the people of Saskatchewan, and in particular to the 11,000 who are looking for work in the city of Saskatoon today? How do you explain that?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, we go through these statistics monthly. Every month the members of the opposition come and complain after they've wasted another month of House time so that the programs of this government cannot continue. What we have is that Saskatchewan has moved ahead of Manitoba, and it's behind only Alberta and Ontario in employment. We are

making progress, and there's a sign here that diversification is working.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — New question to the Premier again, Mr. Speaker. The minister says we come to complain, and you bet your boots we come to complain, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Premier, for two years now your economic development policy has been just one thing: the sell-off and the give-away of our resources. And the steady rise of unemployment in Saskatchewan is proof positive that your plans are not working.

And I ask you, sir, I ask you, Mr. Premier, when will it end? When will your government come up with some real workable ideas for job creation and economic development in the province of Saskatchewan; and when will you scrap your failed ideological plan to privatize the province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, in the last month employment went up 20,000 over the prior month; of that 20,000 there were 4,000 more women employed in Saskatchewan than there were a month ago. Clearly the policies of this government are working. And if we got this legislature working again, we could bring in more policies that would have even more people working in this province.

So what we have is this government trying to build Saskatchewan and the members of the opposition trying to tear down everything that's being done. They're trying to stand on the other end of the province while we're pulling this province into prosperity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, a new question again to the Premier. Mr. Premier, if your government's plans are working so well, why does the Minister of Human Resources, Labour and Employment have to take questions directed to you? Why are you hiding from the questions directed by the opposition about your record of employment?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — You know, Mr. Premier, that last year Saskatchewan had by far the worst record in Canada for loss of people from the province of Saskatchewan. And I ask you, sir, to be accountable and to stand in this House and to explain to the people of Saskatchewan just what your new and real ideas are to get the economy working and to get people in Saskatchewan working again. Will you answer that question, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we have introduced legislation in this House; we have initiated projects in the

city of Moose Jaw and close to them; we have gone, Mr. Speaker, to create diversification and water projects and fertilizer projects and wire and cable projects; tourism, Mr. Speaker, in the city of Moose Jaw; diversification in this province through two upgraders, through a paper mill, through Saskatchewan Place for tourism. And every single, solitary one of those, Mr. Speaker, the member from Moose Jaw North has opposed — every single, solitary one of them.

For 54 days in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, to help people here bring in agriculture legislation which will help them save the home quarter, help them refinance the farm, helps in diversification and processing and manufacturing in the meat business, and all the things that we can do through high-technology, and every single time, Mr. Speaker, the member from Moose Jaw North, and as the paper says, the Romanow radicals, have rejected it and voted against it.

Even \$1,400 per man, woman, and child on a Health budget — rejected by the members opposite, Mr. Speaker. They know that they . . . I can hardly wait to see, Mr. Speaker, hardly wait to see that the rain could come down and interest rates can come down, because it'll make people feel better. They'd vote against rain if they had the chance, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Supplement to the Premier again, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, your words sound impressive when you say . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order, order.

Mr. Hagel: — As I said, Mr. Speaker, supplement to the Premier. I listen to your words and I look at your track record, Mr. Premier. If your plans are working so well, why do we have this shameful record of unemployment in Saskatchewan, and why are people fleeing the province of Saskatchewan in record numbers, going to other provinces looking for hope and for a future for themselves and for their families. Will you explain your record in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, when it was difficult in agriculture in rural Saskatchewan with 22 and 23 per cent interest rates, the members opposite did nothing, Mr. Speaker. And we have put, literally, in combination with the federal government, hundreds of millions and billions of dollars into agriculture, and Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do that.

And in this legislature right now we have proposals and we have legislation that will help save the home quarter, help save towns and villages, will help diversification, processing and manufacturing, and Mr. Speaker, all they do is sit there and debate day after day, the nonsense, Mr. Speaker, of they're against every single solitary process — manufacturing, small business, diversification project — that this government has introduced for small business, for towns, for villages, and rural people, Mr. Speaker. People have been hurt in rural Saskatchewan, and we

want to defend them, and they will not vote in here.

Whether it's Canada Packers, Mr. Speaker, in Moose Jaw, whether it's Intercontinental Packers, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatoon, whether it's the small businesses in Yorkton, the processing and the manufacturing that can build this province, the NDP 54 days in a row stand there and vote against it, Mr. Speaker; voted against the budget, vote against health care, vote against social services, stand in their place and hijack this legislature, and say they are for the people, Mr. Speaker. They have no idea how to help the people; that's why they're sitting over there, Mr. Speaker, and that's why they'll stay over there, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Business

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Premier. I wonder, given his last answer, whether or not later this day we could move to Bill 41, The Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act. We would very much like to move to it . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order, order, order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Given the Premier's bravado today, and I think against the advice of Nancy MacLean, getting involved in question period against his better wishes, I wonder whether you would move to Bill 41 this afternoon or interim supply, anything but the bell-ringing and the SaskPower privatization issues which you're pushing in this session.

Can you think about moving to Bill 41 or interim supply later this day?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I sent a proposal in a letter to the Leader of the Opposition today, and said that this House has sat for 54 days, Mr. Speaker, and the opposition is unprepared to vote, Mr. Speaker — unprepared to vote. And the government's agenda, Mr. Speaker, which is agriculture diversification, health care . . . Mr. Speaker, I want the children in this legislature to listen to the opposition, listen, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order. I recognize the Premier. Order, order. Order, order.

I think if hon. members would stop hollering from their seats when the Premier's on his feet, perhaps the Speaker could hear what he's saying. That's why I'm on my feet for the third time since he's risen, so we could hear what the Premier's saying.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the children of this province will be working in the fertilizer plants, Mr. Speaker, that we're building in Moose Jaw and close to Moose Jaw. The children of this plant want to see the

agriculture legislation passed. The children of this province want to see the kind of legislation that we could do to protect farmers, Mr. Speaker.

And the opposition will only sit here and threaten, Mr. Speaker — 54 days, \$30,000 a day. Over a million and a half dollars has been spent by the taxpayers of this province, and the members opposite sit there and will not pass and not debate, Mr. Speaker. They will not vote, Mr. Speaker.

They call from their seats, Mr. Speaker, and they say, it's two years into your mandate; call an election; we don't want to vote in this legislature. That's what they say.

They don't want to vote, Mr. Speaker, because it's the government's agenda. We had a budget, we had a Speech from the Throne, we outlined legislative things that we were going to do in this province, and we expect elected members in this legislature to debate, Mr. Speaker, and to vote. And they have rejected that, Mr. Speaker.

I call them today — vote! You vote in your place today and be counted, and we can get on with all the legislation that the people of Saskatchewan want to see. Don't be political cowards; stand in your place and vote in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dental Care for Children

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, you set the agenda in this House. You can move on to any business that you want to, Mr. Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health. And talking about children and their families, Mr. Speaker, this weekend is the second anniversary of one of the most disgraceful events in the history of health care in this province.

It not only marks the anniversary of your government's dismantling of the school-based children's dental program, but it also marks the anniversary of cruel, heartless firing of some 400 dental workers.

Three years later, Mr. Minister, what has your government done to live up to the statements made by your Premier in November of 1987 when he admitted that your dismantling of the program had been a mistake and that a program would be instituted to bring proper dental care to the children of our rural communities?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member . . . Mr. Speaker, the children's dental plan that is out and across Saskatchewan now and that is serving rural students . . . The members opposite will often say, and you will have heard them before in this House, and I will have heard them before, and they talk about the fact that rural students, rural children do not now have access to dentists and dental care.

Mr. Speaker, rural students and rural families do have

access to dentists and dental care, and rural students and rural families are taking advantage of that access. And, Mr. Speaker, rural people now have . . . in '87-88, 67,000 students registered in the dental plan, and rural students, 62,000 received services; 92.3 per cent of all those students receiving services . . . Mr. Speaker, the incidence of students going and children going to the dentist in rural Saskatchewan is stronger than it is in urban Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, stronger than it is in urban Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — And, Mr. Speaker, one other reminder. Those members — and I remember it well and some others here will remember it as well — they thought it would be the greatest issue going in the Assiniboia-Gravelbourg by-election. A major issue — we'll talk about, in their terms, the lack of access to dental services by children of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, a far-flung and rural area.

Mr. Speaker, it was not an issue as they tried to present it, and as a matter of fact that area, for example, has the highest incidence in the province of children taking advantage of their access to dental services and to using dental services, and they do have good dental health among the children of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, I want the children in the gallery today to hear the real facts with respect to the dental program, that according to your department, Mr. Minister, there are now 34 satellite rural clinics, as opposed to 578 satellite clinics in 338 communities. And out of these 34, there's something like seven being served by the same dentist.

Fact: there were 188,000 children eligible under the old plan compared to 142,000 under your program. There were 167,000 using the old program compared to 126,000 using your plan.

Fact: the percentage of those who were eligible for . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think the hon. member should be getting to her question. She had plenty of time to set the stage, and she should be getting to her question. I'm sure she realizes that.

Ms. Simard: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to ask the minister how he explains these facts, so I'd like to give him a couple more to explain.

The Speaker: — Hon. members can't give a speech before they ask their question, and I think that's what you'll be doing if you present more facts. So I'd just ask you to get to your question.

Ms. Simard: — Okay. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the percentage of those who were eligible for service under your plan who completed dental service is 78 per cent compared to 92 per cent under the old plan — I'm talking completes, Mr. Minister, not utilization — completes — and in view of the fact your government

dismantled the best children's dental program in North America, and you failed, you have miserably failed to replace it with a comparable plan, how do you explain these numbers, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, as I hope all members in the House will notice, and I'm sure they do coming from the member who has just taken her seat, how she emphasizes the word in her own dramatic way, the word "fact" and she says, fact and fact. Mr. Speaker, we have heard facts from the member before, facts like: this gentleman is on the waiting list in Saskatoon. When I found out that that gentleman was on the waiting list in Edmonton and not on Saskatchewan at all, that was a fact as well on another day.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, on several occasions to the House, the member will bring facts to the House which turn out not to be facts. And that needs to be pointed out to the House today. And it's well-known across the province now, and becoming more well-known as it relates to her statement of today, and as it relates to her terminology about satellite clinics and her suggestion that the children's plan, the former children's plan, where a therapist would visit a school in some of the smallest communities on one occasion in the course of a year — one occasion in the course of a 52-week year — and that member has the audacity to call that a satellite dental clinic for the people of that community.

Mr. Speaker, that speaks directly to her use of the word "fact." It is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, satellite dental clinics that are now out in rural Saskatchewan that were not there before — that were not there before — in fact, in some communities who have never had a dentist before, those satellite clinics are providing services, not only to the children of rural Saskatchewan but to their parents and to their grandparents who want to remain living in rural Saskatchewan and give their services and receive their services in rural Saskatchewan. Those, Mr. Speaker, are the facts.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, the facts are that I speak to people — this is a new question, Mr. Speaker — I speak to people on a regular basis in rural Saskatchewan who say that they have extreme difficulty in getting their children to dentists and that it costs them substantially more . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Order.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, people from Gravelbourg have told me that it costs them to drive into the city in order to get adequate dental care. It costs them in gas, it costs them expenses.

Mr. Minister, you brought up the Gravelbourg situation and for better than a year now your government has promised that they . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order. Order. Order. Question period shouldn't be a debate, and I believe that's what's happening between these two members. Would the hon. member get to her question, and the minister will answer the question and not in a long way.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, can you tell us whether or not there is a new dentist in Gravelbourg today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises the community of Gravelbourg. On two occasions — I believe it's two occasions — in this House, I have said and I say again: there are two dentists; there are two dentists who are prepared to go to Gravelbourg at any time, one who lives in Assiniboia, Mr. Speaker, one who lives in Assiniboia and practises there, and one who practises in Regina who will set up a satellite clinic in Gravelbourg. That is the case, and that has been the case for some time. That, Mr. Speaker, is a fact.

The other fact is that the community of Gravelbourg, through their committee led by their mayor — who the members opposite know well — has said no, no, we will not have a satellite clinic, we will have a full-time dentist in Gravelbourg or nothing, to enhance their political agenda. Fine, if they want to enhance their political agenda, but let's talk about the children who could use the service if the satellite clinic could be there.

That's number one, Mr. Speaker. The second point is the following . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I'd like the minister to . . . Order. I've been asking members to shorten their questions and answers. It's true that you can answer a question, you can take a great deal of time to answer a question — I'll give you a few seconds to wrap it up.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — And the other point, Mr. Speaker, speaking of Gravelbourg, that's the same member who carried a letter around which she said was fact, which said five hospitals in this area will close. She said this is a fact. It was not a fact, and the people knew it was not a fact.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Sale of Silver Lake Farm

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister of privatization. Mr. Minister, can you tell this House why your government saw fit to sell the Silver Lake farm to a group of Tory supporters and reject the bid of the local community area to purchase the farm for the economic benefit of that community?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, as most people know, there were four government farms in northern Saskatchewan: one at Cumberland House; one at Ile-a-la-Crosse, two at Green Lake, one being the central

farm and one being the Silver Lake farm.

Three of those farms were turned over to the communities, turned over to the communities. In the case of Green Lake, the Silver Lake farm was turned over for \$1; the assets were about \$600,000. The second farm, that was the Silver Lake farm, was put out for public tender or bid, and the village of Green Lake bid along with a number of other bids — 13, I believe, in total. Theirs was not the successful bid.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, again a question to the minister of privatization. What did the . . . the value of the operation was 2.5 million. What did the Tory supporters pay for that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know where he gets the term "Tory supporters" from, but I've indicated to this House, when the deal is totally complete, all the legal work, I will be tabling the amount of the bids, but not until that has taken place.

Mr. Goulet: — I would like to know exactly how much they paid for it and whether or not they were the lowest bid, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just repeat again, when that deal is completely closed in all aspects of it, I will be making that public knowledge.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Minister, a new question. You have made . . . you gave 12 million acres of land to Weyerhaeuser in the surrounding area. The people made economic development proposals to you, and they've bid on the thing. The Premier has taken apart and shot down the Metis at every situation that he can get. I want to know whether or not you will support the Metis community and re-examine that bid again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think a \$600,000 asset for \$1 is certainly a fairly good deal for that community.

The Speaker: — The time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce another school group.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I missed a very large group from Swift Current this morning in your Speaker's gallery on this side. It's a grade 5 class, Mr. Speaker, from Ashley Park School. There's 36 students in number and they have with them their teachers Zang Mah and Louise Kozlowski, and three chaperons, Mr. Speaker.

They've witnessed a very active question period, and that usually brings up a question period from the students with the MLAs. I would ask all members to please welcome them today and wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would seek leave of . . .

The Speaker: — Order. We're not at orders of the day; we're only at ministerial statements.

The Speaker: — Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to, pursuant to rule 39 . . . Mr. Speaker, I rise . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. What's the point of order?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The member from Moose Jaw South was just on his feet wanting to raise an important issue before orders of the day, and you ruled him out of order, then recognized the Premier before recognizing our member, and I wonder how that would work.

The Speaker: — The member from Moose Jaw South rose at an inappropriate time. But on orders of the day, the Premier was on his feet and I recognized him.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. The Premier was on his feet, and I asked the Premier why he was on his feet. Order, order, order, order. Order. Order. There is a procedural remedy where the member can move a motion that the member for Moose Jaw South be heard.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the member for Moose Jaw be heard.

An Hon. Member: — Moose Jaw South.

The Speaker: — Seconder?

An Hon. Member: — I second that motion.

Motion negatived.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

MOTION UNDER RULE 39

Civil Crisis in People's Republic of China

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move a motion with respect to the civil crisis in the People's Republic of China.

Saskatchewan has had a long-standing and friendly relationship with China, beginning in the 1960s with the first sales of Canadian wheat. Since that time, Mr.

Speaker, trade between the province of Saskatchewan and the People's Republic of China has increased to more than \$1 billion annually. China is our second largest trading partner, and our trade relations are important to the provincial economy here in Saskatchewan.

Less than four weeks ago, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. On this particular rule, the hon. member must ask leave. The hon. member, in order to put the motion, must give a very, very brief explanation. Now we had a situation of that, I believe it was yesterday, and where we asked for the motion to be put. And I believe that we should follow that procedure so that the hon. members know what they're giving leave for.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. members and the Speaker did not hear me when I first stood and I said, I rise pursuant to rule 39 to ask leave of the Assembly to move the following motion, a motion of urgent and pressing necessity in this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: — Perhaps I'm not making myself clear. Would the hon. member put the motion so the hon. members on this side could hear what the motion is, and then they can either give leave or reject it.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I've asked for leave pursuant to rule 39 to move the following motion:

That this Assembly condemns the violence, oppression and the loss of life of peaceful demonstrators calling for increased democracy within the People's Republic of China. This Assembly extends its deepest sympathies to the families of those killed and injured, and joins the universal appeal for an end to further violence against Chinese citizens.

This Assembly further urges the Chinese government to demonstrate tolerance and openness in resolving this crisis and restoring peace to that country. This Assembly urges the federal government to exert all efforts to raise this issue at the United Nations and at other international forums, and to press for international opposition to these violent acts and for the restoration of peace and respect for the human rights in the People's Republic of China.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Less than four weeks ago, the chairman of the People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Wan Li, stood in this House for the first time in Canadian history — and as far as I know, Chinese history, Mr. Speaker — at the heart of our democratic system and spoke about the friendship and the co-operation between our two great nations.

A symbol of his respect for democracy and openness and truth and freedom was expressed here, Mr. Speaker, before you and before the people of Saskatchewan in this

Legislative Assembly. We take it seriously, Mr. Speaker, when invited guests come to this Legislative Assembly, and we expect those that speak in this Legislative Assembly to respect the democratic traditions.

Up until that time we were pleased with the progress that the People's Republic of China was making towards openness and towards democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan deplores the current situation in China. We condemn the violence with which the government is suppressing the people. We call for an end to the military action, and a return to a peaceful resolution of this civil crisis.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I met with the Prime Minister of Canada and urged him to direct Canada and all Canadians to raise the issue at home, locally, and abroad, and at the national level, to raise it in the United Nations, and other international forums. In addition, I assured him that Saskatchewan is willing to relax the rules and assist with extension of visas for Chinese students and visitors in this province.

Over the last two days, Mr. Speaker, I have met with Chinese students, Chinese-Canadian associations in Saskatoon and Regina. They shared their pain and their concern with me, Mr. Speaker, and I felt their anguish for their families and their friends in China very deeply. I indicated that we would do everything possible we could to help them get news from home, and contact their friends and relatives and loved ones in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, in each of our meetings, these individuals advised me that they wanted the Government of Saskatchewan to impose strategic sanctions against the Government of China. Mr. Speaker, we want to help the people in China, but we do not want to aid the abuse of human rights.

We are not willing to impose measures which will hurt the Chinese people, Mr. Speaker; we want to help them. We will not oppose measures which will allow them to go hungry or impede their ability to grow food. So any actions imposed must be weighed very carefully, Mr. Speaker, against the potential injury to the people in China themselves.

In response to this call, the Government of Saskatchewan is willing to consider other options such as the temporary embargo of technological and information exchanges, like in telecommunications, for example. We will consider delaying cultural and educational and sports exchanges. All these things are currently under consideration at the local, and indeed the national level, Mr. Speaker.

The Government of China must know that using violence to suppress its own people is unacceptable in the eyes of Saskatchewan and Canada, and indeed in the eyes of the free world.

So I do move, seconded by the member from Swift Current, the Minister of Energy:

That this Assembly condemn the violent suppression and the loss of life of peaceful demonstrators calling for increased democracy within the People's Republic of China, and that this Assembly extends its deepest sympathies to the families of those killed and injured, Mr. Speaker, and joins the universal appeal for an end to further violence and persecution of Chinese people.

This Assembly further urges the Chinese government to demonstrate tolerance, openness, and truth in resolving this crisis and in restoring peace to the country. This Assembly urges the federal government to exert all efforts to raise this issue at the United Nations and all other international forums, and to press for international condemnation of these violent acts and for the restoration of peace and respect for human rights in the People's Republic of China.

I so move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member from Swift Current.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I believe the seconder of the motion wished to speak.

The Speaker: — I didn't see her on her feet, and you were standing. If she wishes to speak, she may, if you give her leave.

An Hon. Member: — Does he lose his place if he gives leave?

Mr. Calvert: — I would like to assure my place in the debate following the seconder of the motion.

The Speaker: — Yes. Agreed.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member from Moose Jaw South. I was a little slow this time — only this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as seconder of the motion this morning. It, needless to say, was with some shock and dismay that Saskatchewan people, along with all Canadians, I might add, watched and they listened and they read of the events taking place in Beijing, China, in the past week.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, that shock and that dismay moved around the world, from country to country, province to province, state to state, and person to person. And we watched, Mr. Speaker, in horror, what can only be called an act of violent suppression.

Our witness to the bloodshed and the killings that began over an unarmed, peaceful protest for democracy leaves one with nothing but a feeling of outrage.

Last October, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of visiting China on behalf of the Saskatchewan government and I spent 16 days in that country in places such as Beijing, Guangzhou in the south and Guangdong province. And I travelled to what was, by Chinese standards, a small city

of two million people to Changsha in the Hunan province, and the Hunan province is a very agriculture province similar to Saskatchewan. I also had the opportunity of meeting with officials and people in Shanghai.

During the course of the 16 days, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of taking an 18-hour train ride into Changsha through a lot of country, I think, that most tourists probably would not see. I guess if there was anything that was impressed upon my mind, it was two things: one was the beauty of the country, and secondly was the energy of the people that resided in that countryside.

(1045)

We met with local community leaders, most of them being farmers, and we learned that while the culture is different and the language is different, that in fact those farmers there were not much different than the farmers in Saskatchewan. They talked about growing conditions, the price for their crops, fertilizers, the input costs, and the weather. And we also met, Mr. Speaker, with professors and students.

One of the things that we noticed during the course of the visit, Mr. Speaker, and it was much talked about by the people that we met with, it was the economic reforms taking place in China. There were stores — places for people to buy basics such as clothing and shoes — that had not been there two years before; they no longer had to line up to put their order in at the government shops; the market places were busy and they were full; and the farmers for the first time, Mr. Speaker, were being allowed to sell their products themselves.

I had the good fortune, Mr. Speaker, of having two people from China travel with me the course of those 16 days, two interpreters, a young woman with the English name of Maggie, and a young man that we called Russell. We had many long hours of discussion of what was happening in China. And these two young people, Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, at a very young age both served some time in the Red Guard in China.

One day I asked them where it was that they thought the economic reforms of China were eventually going to take them. And Russell's comment was: to democracy; to be like you in Canada. That is what I want, he said, to be able to decide where I want to go and then go; he said, to be able to leave my country in freedom and to return to my country in freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we in Canada live in a democracy, we work in a democracy, and we raise our families in a democracy. But, Mr. Speaker, most of the time all of that is done without thought for, or of, the democracy. And I would suggest today, if we have done anything to democracy at all in this country, the very worst has been the indignity of taking it for granted.

Freedom of speech, tolerance of thought, acceptance of other ideas, the freedom to protest, to speak out, freedom of our press. An open system and a system for justice and fairness. The freedom to vote, to call elections, to have elections, to exercise our democratic right.

Mr. Speaker, we have this today. The Chinese do not. But one thing became clear this week, Mr. Speaker — they strive for it. And the other thing that was very clear and will be for ever imprinted upon the images of our mind is that they died for it.

Mr. Speaker, I join the Premier in extending sympathy to the families of those killed and injured, and I join the universal appeal for an end to further violence against Chinese citizens.

In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to indeed second the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am confident in saying that any member on this side of the House would count it a privilege to be the first on this side of the House to speak to this motion this morning. Mr. Speaker, I have this privilege, as the opposition critic for the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation, that particular arm of government that deals with international aid in our world. And, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House, all we MLAs were hosted at a reception in this building put on by the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation, a reception that gave we, as members, a window on the world — not just our province, not just our nation, but a window on the world.

And yesterday at that reception, many of those who were there to represent member agencies expressed their own thought and concern about recent events in China, and their own thought and concern and sympathy, in some cases, for those who have lost family and friends, and their particular concern for Chinese students and Chinese families living in this country.

Mr. Speaker, after meeting with some of those member groups of SCIC (Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation) yesterday in the reception here at the legislature with all members, it seemed important to me at that time that this issue indeed be discussed within the House and be given a priority of debate. And so as you will know, Mr. Speaker, I had proposed to move this day, before orders of the day, a motion not dissimilar to the motion that the Premier has brought to the House this morning, a motion that contained some other provisions, but in essence and in spirit a very similar motion.

I am pleased that we do have this opportunity in the Saskatchewan legislature too, to address the events of the past number of weeks in China and, more specifically, to address what we as a legislature and representing the people of Saskatchewan might do in this regard.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, at the close of my remarks, I will wish to move one amendment to the Premier's motion that, in my view, falls entirely within the spirit of the Premier's motion, and it's my sincere hope that this can be made a unanimous motion of the House today.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of remarks to the issue, I have prepared these few . . . and I do not anticipate speaking at length on this motion. I know that other members of the

government side and other members of the opposition side will want to contribute.

Few events, Mr. Speaker, in recent history have so captured both the attention and, I think, raised the hopes of people around our world as did the student demonstrations in communist China these past few weeks. The courage and the determination of the young Chinese students, and all of their many supporters, was an inspiration, I think, not only to the people of China but to the people of the whole world. And to Canadians like ourselves, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was a reminder that we too often take for granted those fundamental freedoms of our democratic society.

The Chinese students were calling for a free press. They asked simply for honest government as they sought intellectual liberty, all of those things, Mr. Speaker, which we Canadians assume, just assume are rights of citizenship, things that we Canadians too often take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, in China, unfortunately that is not the case, and as we well know it is not the case in most of the nations of the world. True democracies, the true functioning democracies are a minority in our world, Mr. Speaker, a minority in the world community, and too often we as Canadians forget and take for granted our democratic rights and freedoms and just how high a price freedom can demand, democracy can demand. And the events we have witnessed in China in the past few weeks surely would serve to remind us all of that fact.

As we observe those events, Mr. Speaker, surely what we were seeing in those early days was a classic example of peaceable dissent in the struggle for democracy. When the students in Beijing built their goddess of democracy, their own version of the Statue of Liberty, when they built that statue in the square there was no violence, no violence, Mr. Speaker. When those Chinese students stood in front of the tanks and the trucks of the People's Army and prevented the People's Army from moving onto that square, there was no violence, Mr. Speaker, no violence.

In fact, as you well know, many members of the Chinese army at that time deserted their posts and in fact joined with the student protesters. But it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that even peaceable defiance is seen as a threat by the totalitarian regime in communist China. That regime responded to the peaceable dissent with the senseless slaughter that we witnessed. That regime turned its tanks, its guns, and its troops on innocent students, and we and the rest of the world watched in horror.

Mr. Speaker, in *The Globe and Mail* on Monday, June 5, the editorial writer asks the very significant question why — why this slaughter of human lives? And that editorial notes, and I quote it:

The slaughter advances no policies, secures no significant end except a brief stunned silence over the bodies of the victims. China's hard-liners have made a pact with the devil — one of whose names is Anarchy.

Mr. Speaker, maybe to some us, maybe to many of us, Beijing, China, may seem to be a world away, but it is simply not, Mr. Speaker. Beijing, China, is as close as our two universities, the University of Regina here and the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, where there are students here to study, whose husbands and whose wives and whose children, whose parents, whose grandparents are yet at home in China. Beijing may sometimes seem like a world away, but it is not, Mr. Speaker. I venture to say there's not one of us in this House who does not represent constituents who today wonder, and perhaps worry, about family in their homeland of China.

Beijing is not a world away. It is but a satellite; it is but a few blocks away; it is about two universities away. These are our neighbours, Mr. Speaker. These are our brothers and sisters, and when our brothers and sisters and our neighbours in this world are oppressed, we cannot, must not, and should not remain silent.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe the community of nations world-wide, with leadership from our nation and our province, should react swiftly and clearly to show that China's totalitarian regime will pay a heavy price for the senseless slaughter of innocent people. And we in this province and in this House must search for ways to condemn the regime, but not to punish the ordinary people of China.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why we on this side House share the position of the government. We do not support sanctions on the sale of food or of agricultural products to China, such as the export of potash for the growing of wheat. A refusal to trade in those types of goods would not hurt any of the totalitarian regime, but only reduce the standard of living for many of the same people that we would want to assist.

We share the view of the government opposite that there are sanctions which could be used and should be used; sanctions with respect to new technologies, research and development work; technologies and sanctions that could be implemented, and we urge the government to implement those kind of sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, but there is yet another action which we believe that the Government of Saskatchewan can take and should take at this point in our history. I want to take just a moment to discuss that option.

Mr. Speaker, for many months now the government of our province has been negotiating with the government of communist China to sell that regime a portion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House disagree strongly with the very principle, the very principle of selling any portion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to any foreign nation, and we remain today opposed to the idea of privatizing PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan International).

But if we just put that debate aside, surely, Mr. Speaker, surely, even the supporters of the privatization of PCS, even the supporters of potash privatization can no longer, surely can no longer support the ideal of selling a portion

of our potash industry to the government of communist China, a government that in recent weeks we have seen is willing to gun down its young.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear last night, after leaving the House, I was pleased to hear the Premier of this province on the news indicate that he was willing to do just that — willing to move to stop all negotiations for the sell-off of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to the government of communist China. And so I, at the close of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, will want to move an amendment to that effect, and I would hope that all members present would be willing to follow the lead of their Premier and this amendment in voting for it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is one small way that we as Canadians, that we as residents of Saskatchewan, that we as duly elected members of this House can send a clear message to the leaders of communist China, and perhaps, in doing so, rekindle some hope in the hearts and the minds of the world's most populous nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the ordinary people of China must see international pressure coming to bear on their leadership if they are to be encouraged to continue in the struggle for democracy. And I do believe, Mr. Speaker, with the support of the international community, the people of China will ultimately triumph over their current authoritarian government.

Mr. Speaker, those martyrs to democracy that were slain in the Tiananmen Square in Beijing, they will inspire demands for change that will not be stopped by guns, nor shut up in prison cells. Even I believe the most callous member of the communist China's regime will learn finally that real power does not come out of the barrel of a gun — that real power does come from the hearts of the people.

And so, Mr. Speaker, with my amendment that I soon will move, and with the motion made by the Premier, I would urge the hopes and prayers of all members of this legislature, that in the days, the weeks and the months and the years ahead in China, that violence will not be met with violence; that hate and anger can be overcome; that the violence which we have seen will be conquered by the non-violent dissent.

(1100)

So I would close just with a short quote from that man who in many ways changed the shape of our continent when he taught and preached that doctrine of non-violence, and I refer to Dr. Martin Luther King.

And Dr. King, when he won the Nobel prize in 1964 had this to say:

Non-violence is the answer to the crucial political and moral questions of our time — the need for man to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to oppression and violence. Man must evolve for all human conflict a method which rejects violence, aggression and retaliation. And the foundation of such a method is love.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion of the Premier, but would wish to move this amendment, seconded by my colleague from Regina Lakeview.

I would amend the Premier's motion to read:

And further, that the Assembly calls on all the nations of the world to unite in condemnation of these abhorrent acts and in support of peaceful attempts by the Chinese people to bring democratic reforms to their country; and, that the Assembly call upon the Government of Saskatchewan to end all negotiations to sell any portion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to People's Republic of China.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The debate continues concurrently.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to enter the debate on this motion because I think that it's very timely, and I think it's very important for the provincial government to show some commitment in strength towards helping the students in China and towards a resolution of the events that have unfolded over the last few weeks.

The events over the last few weeks have, as the other speakers have pointed out, shocked many of us around the world, and it has saddened us, Mr. Speaker. It makes us realize just how fragile our basic democratic fundamental freedoms really are: things such as freedom of speech; freedom of assembly and association — that is, the right to be with whomever you want at any time and to congregate in groups; freedom of the press; the right of the press to report the news accurately, as they see it. Freedom from arbitrary arrest is another fundamental, basic freedom that Canadians and Saskatchewan citizens enjoy, freedom from being detained arbitrarily by the police or by armies.

And we enjoy those freedoms as Canadian citizens. And when we see a situation unfold, as it did in China in the last few weeks, we realize just how fragile our basic and fundamental freedoms are. We witnessed some students on hunger strike. They were not eating in order to bring to the attention of the leadership in China their desire for more free press, their desire for a democratic country. They wanted to bring these things to the attention of their leadership.

And we witnessed TV clippings of the leadership meeting with the students and talking to them about some of their concerns, and in the initial stages agreeing that something should be done to improve upon some of the problems that they raised. But that was in the initial stages, Mr. Speaker.

But then as the demonstration got larger and as the powers were threatened because the demonstration was getting larger and their power base may be threatened by the call for democracy by the students, we saw the leadership sort of disappear from the media, and we

weren't too sure exactly what was going on as far as the powers that be in China were concerned.

But we saw the bravery of the ordinary person, the bravery of the ordinary men, women who were in Tiananmen Square erecting their version of the Statue of Liberty and insisting on democracy for Chinese people. And I think that we have to honour and respect those people for the bravery that they showed over the last few weeks. But what they were asking for was simply basic fundamental freedoms and the right to democracy — fundamental freedoms that we enjoy every day, Mr. Speaker, in Canada and in Saskatchewan.

And it was amazing for us to see people in China challenging the government. It was amazing for the western world as we witnessed this. And we had a certain sympathy and empathy for the students who were crying out for more democracy in their country. And so we all watched the events unfold, and we watched as things became more tense. And eventually the army was sent in, and what we witnessed was a blood-bath, Mr. Speaker — a blood-bath.

The freedom fighters, the student dissidents, were accused of being counter-revolutionaries by their own government. And what they were asking for, Mr. Speaker, were rights that we enjoy every day in this country, and they are considered counter-revolutionaries. And what we see now in China, Mr. Speaker, are the radio waves and the TV stations generating Chinese government propaganda, and the freedom of press is being restricted in China today as a result of the events that have taken place in earlier weeks.

And last night on the media there was a report of a statement by Li Peng, the Premier, who met with the army and who is, according to the media, accused of having given the order to slaughter the young people of China. And he said to the army: comrades, you have done a great job. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is appalling.

And the media coverage indicated that there was not one single statement of remorse, no expression of regret for the deaths of the young people and the people in Tiananmen Square who were mowed down by their own army and by their own government. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that shows an appalling lack of respect for people.

A government slaughtering its own people — a government slaughtering its own people — young people. And my heart, as many of the hearts of my colleagues, go out to the mothers and fathers of these young people who were mowed down in that bloody weekend.

And then the government has imposed martial law in China, and I understand that the human rights atrocities are continuing because the students are being rounded up, and in effect, as I understand from our media, there is a witch-hunt under way for any students who participated in this demonstration. And so the human right violations and the human right atrocities in China are continuing, Mr. Speaker. And they must be stopped and we must express our outrage and horror at the massacre that took

place just a few days ago.

And what we see happening in China is this battle for democracy, this battle for freedom of the press, is changing to a battle for basic rights such as the right to live, the right to speak your mind and not get shot for it. So we see a bit of a change in the dynamics that are occurring there as a result of the movement by the army and orders from the government.

And all this has happened, Mr. Speaker, when China was making significant progress, significant progress economically, and, I might add, politically. So what we've witnessed in the last few days is a step back into the future for China.

Post-Mao China experienced significant regeneration, Mr. Speaker. Between 1979 and '86 the People's Republic doubled its national output. In a 10-year period trade increased by 300 per cent, savings by 250 per cent, productivity by some 65 per cent, and income by 130 per cent.

But when we have new economic regeneration of this sort and new economic thinking, with it comes social and political consequences, Mr. Speaker — social and political consequences. And with it comes a cry from the people for more democracy and more freedom like we enjoy in the West.

And our relationship with China and the Pacific Rim, Mr. Speaker, is a very important one, and we cannot ignore it, because in fact we are a Pacific nation as well, Mr. Speaker. We cannot ignore this relationship. It is important to us.

But I feel that Canada's policy with China has primarily focused on the economic aspect as opposed to the human rights aspect. And I feel that Canada has been more concerned with commercial interest in China rather than with human rights interest. And perhaps we have not done what we should have done to encourage China to move towards a more humanistic, human rights approach with its people. Perhaps in our desire to encourage Canadian commercial interest we have neglected to emphasize our concern for human rights in China and other Pacific Rim countries, Mr. Speaker.

We can and we should be more interested in human rights in these countries; more interested in their military conflicts and their security issues, in their political injustices. Because we are a Pacific Rim country, and because, Mr. Speaker, in the overall scheme, when young people and students are hurt in China, when they are mowed down and killed, it is an offence to all mankind, including us here in Canada.

There appears to be a reluctance to accept responsibility, on the part of our government, to enhance the human rights in countries such as China. And I think it is important by this motion that we encourage our government to take a strong stand on this and to do it now.

And what I witnessed after this massacre was not a government that unequivocally came out and took a strong stand, but a government that was talking about the

atrocities of the army, not the atrocities of the Chinese government.

And we have to put the responsibility where it is, Mr. Speaker, which is with the Government of China. And according to the news media that I saw last night, it is Li Peng, the Premier, who ordered the attack and who told the army: comrades, you've done a great job.

And the Government of Saskatchewan has been negotiating with these same people, Mr. Speaker, to sell a portion of our potash corporation so that these same people would own a portion of our potash corporation. And I believe it is time now for the Government of Saskatchewan to say unequivocally, and to send an unequivocal message to China, that we as Saskatchewan citizens and Canadian citizens and as citizens of the world object to these atrocities; we object to the blood-bath; we object to the massacre; and for that reason we are going to eliminate any further negotiations with respect to China buying Saskatchewan's potash corporation. It is something that would not hurt the people themselves, but it would be a strong expression of our contempt for the atrocities that took place.

(1115)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — At this point, I just want to quote from Tommy Douglas, a quote that has been used on many occasions, but once again, yet again, Mr. Speaker, it is relevant to what is taking place.

Tommy Douglas said at one point:

The measure of a nation's greatness does not lie in its conquests or its gross national product or the size of its gold reserve or the height of its skyscrapers.

And we know that China's economic condition has been improving substantially. Tommy goes on to say:

The real measure of a nation is the quality of its national life, what it does for its least fortunate citizens, and the opportunities it provides for its youth to live useful and meaningful lives.

The real measure of a nation is the quality of its national life. And, Mr. Speaker, our national life has quality because we do have fundamental, basic freedoms. We have the freedom of expression, the freedom of association; we are free from arbitrary arrest, and we have freedom of press in this country. And that enhances the quality of our national life. That is one aspect of enhancement of the quality of our national life.

And we love and we respect our youth, and we try to provide ample opportunity for them. And if they speak out against us, we try to listen and understand what they're saying and to deal with it in a peaceful and democratic fashion.

And I say that Li Peng and the Government of China would do well to listen to some of these thoughts from

many people around the world.

And I say that we have to be aware, we must be aware that China is a nuclear power, Mr. Speaker, and as such can pose a threat to us all. And this same government that is a nuclear power has no compunction, Mr. Speaker, in mowing down hundreds, if not thousands, of its own young. And we have to be cognizant of that when the Government of Saskatchewan is negotiating to sell off potash to China, sell Saskatchewan Potash Corporation to China.

The Chinese leadership must be told about our outrage. They must know the world is watching and that the world condemns what they've done. We in Canada support peaceful attempts at bringing about democratic reform. But it is now time for our government, with a strong voice, Mr. Speaker, to voice its opposition to the acts of violence, to condemn the Chinese government for the acts of violence that have been perpetrated on Chinese young people and, therefore, on all mankind, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. Without in any sense questioning your ruling earlier in the day, Mr. Speaker, it was our view that our motion ought to have had precedence. Notwithstanding that, we did not insist on that because we wanted to make it crystal clear that this is an issue that ought to transcend the politics of the day, as important as those issues may seem at the time.

Mr. Speaker, the winds of change are blowing through eastern Europe and Asia in a manner which has not happened in this century. We have in the Soviet Union, people voting for the Supreme Soviet, electing, city of Moscow electing . . .

An Hon. Member: — Boris Yeltsin.

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, thank you. Yeltsin, who was an anathema to the politburo.

We have in Poland, elections to their parliament . . .

An Hon. Member: — *Sejm*.

Mr. Shillington: — . . . *Sejm*, as it's called. Something that has not . . . probably hasn't happened before in Polish history in quite the way it's happening now . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Why is it the member on his feet?

Mr. Martens: — I'd like to have leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the Minister of Environment, who is the member for Eston-Elrose (Rosetown-Elrose), it gives me a good deal of pleasure to welcome a group of students here from Elrose. I don't know . . . they will probably know where Stewart

Valley is, and I used to play hockey with Stewart Valley. I was the goalie, and we went up there a lot of times to play, and sometimes you beat us and sometimes we beat you.

But I want to welcome you here to the Assembly, and they are accompanied by their teacher, Darlyn Edmison, Barb Trayhorne, Danny Bachand, Vaughan Hess, and Linda Simon is the bus driver. We want to welcome you here, and I understand that you are on a busy schedule, so we just want to welcome you, and that you have a good day. And I'd like all the members of the Assembly to join me in welcoming you here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MOTION UNDER RULE 39

Civil Crisis in People's Republic of China (continued)

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the winds of change are blowing through eastern Europe and Asia in a manner which we have not seen in this century: freer elections to the Supreme Soviet than has ever taken place in the history of that country; some delegates elected to the Supreme Soviet who were an anathema to the politburo, that who clearly represent a different point of view than what has occurred heretofore.

Principally, the city of Moscow elected a delegate who, to put it mildly, was not . . . was on the outs with those in the central committee. In Poland, parliament elected with a clean sweep by Solidarity, the trade union which grew into a national movement of liberation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we had all hoped that same winds of change would blow through and would affect the largest nation on earth. Not only has China nuclear weapons, it also has, if my memory serves me correct, between one-third and one-half of all the people who live on earth are Chinese.

If these movements which have started in the Soviet Union under Gorbachev, spread to eastern Europe, had also spread to China, this would be a much safer place in which to live. The world would have been a good deal safer.

All of us watched the events in China with interest, with a hopeful anticipation. It has never been my pleasure to have spent time in China. I know people who have were impressed with the progress that China had made on an economic front. The hunger, starvation, which was so much a part of Chinese life before the Second World War, had largely disappeared.

We had hoped that the Chinese nation was ready to move to the next stage of its development, which its communist neighbours in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe seemed to be managing peacefully, to a democratic government. Regrettably, that didn't happen.

All of us must feel a certain sense of sadness and a sense of a lost opportunity to make this world a safer place for us and for our children and grandchildren. That which might have happened peacefully in China, which might have occurred peacefully as it did in the other Asian nations,

now seems to be beyond hope.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the sense of lost opportunity which all of us hoped we might see early in May, in addition to that emotion, I think all of us felt a sense of horror at the events which actually took place in Beijing.

Mr. Speaker, one is hard put to find an example in modern history of an army behaving with such brutality towards the people that any armed forces protect. Mr. Speaker, one can think of the events at the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg. Before the Russian revolution, the Czarist troops shot a handful of people, and after some years the revolution followed. In Paris in 1968 when students and the population of Paris immobilized the government all during the summer, a couple of people were shot. At Kent State University a few people died.

When one thinks of those events and compares them with what happened in Tiananmen Square, one is hard put to find another example of such brutality, savagery, and butchery — tanks rolling over tents with students inside them, either unable to get out or unaware of their danger; troops machine-gunning the population like so many blades of grass.

Mr. Speaker, the English language is probably inadequate to describe our sense of horror, our sense of outrage. We stand with those Chinese in China and outside of China who seek to bring the liberties and freedom which we know and which we often take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, all of us meet with students, such as are here from Elrose. All of us, I think, most of us point out that this is a democratic institution. I like to point out to such students that Canada, almost alone among democratic nations, achieved its democratic institutions without any loss of life. For that we should be truly thankful, Mr. Speaker.

And at a time like this, when hundreds of thousands of people have died in China for a small fraction of those liberties that we enjoy, we need once again, Mr. Speaker, to give pause to thank our good fortune that we were born in this nation and that we achieved the institutions we have without any loss of blood.

Mr. Speaker, I know other members want to speak, and I will not take a long time on this. I simply wanted to rise to add my words to those which have been so eloquently expressed, to the thoughts which have been so eloquently expressed by the member from Regina Lakeview and the member from Moose Jaw South.

I want to express a sorrow at the lost opportunity which might have been achieved in China, a horror at the carnage, the butchery of the 27th Army in Beijing, and the strongest possible condemnation of any government, be it communist, capitalist, or somewhere in between, which would turn such a savage army loose on its population. I know other members want to join with me in condemning the actions of the government in Beijing, and I take my seat, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1130)

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to add a few words to the debate that has already begun on this particular issue. What we have witnessed here is a government that's gone too far, gone too far. The Government of China has gone too far in this particular issue. I believe it's a Chinese sage or philosopher who said, may you live in interesting times. Isn't that ironic that a Chinese person said that — may you live in interesting times. The meaning, of course, could be a blessing or a curse.

I think it depends on the times. In this case it's a mixture, because what we saw happening in China was refreshing, and I know that we all took hope from the gathering in the square in Beijing. We felt that there was an opportunity here for democracy to grow and flower in China. It's important that that happen because China, as has been said earlier in this debate, is the largest nation on the face of this earth, the largest nation.

When communist countries have been faced with the kind of development we saw beginning in Beijing, the difference is obvious how they've addressed it. The Government of China has been harsh and brutal in putting and suppressing the flowering of democracy. Other countries that have been mentioned are Russia and Poland. The difference is obvious. The governments in Russia and Poland have yielded, had yielded to the wish of the people. They have not gone too far. The Government of China has gone too far.

China has a civilization that goes back thousands of years, probably one of the oldest civilizations that earth has experienced. And I suppose the societies that have existed in those thousands of years in China have, by and large, been rather brutal and despotic, and sought to protect themselves from outside forces, when they were not outside their own boundaries attacking their neighbours.

To do that they built the Great Wall of China, a magnificent structure that stretches for miles and miles along the border of China. It is said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Wall of China is the only man-made object that can be seen from the moon. This is what the astronauts reported when they visited the moon, that the Great Wall of China is the only man-made object that can be seen from the moon.

The Great Wall, to a certain extent, accomplished its goal in keeping out the outsiders from China. But today we have a different situation. The Great Wall will not keep out the ideas from outside of China or those ideas that spring up within China about democracy. And the mass communication that we have in the world today will pierce any kind of wall of that nature with ease. We saw that during the time that the students assembled in the square in Beijing.

Ideas are a powerful force, and the ideas of those students — whether they were generated internally in China or whether they were forces from outside of China, it does not matter — they served the purpose of getting the people thinking and talking and acting and wanting to

improve their society, to make it more democratic. I know we were all hopeful that they would achieve their goal.

I want to say something about . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Kopelchuk: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I apologize to the member from Saskatoon Westmount and thank him for allowing me this interruption.

We have in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to introduce from the village of Endeavour, the Endeavour School, they are 30 students in grades 5 to 8. They are in the city touring the legislature and, I'm sure, other parts of Regina.

They are accompanied by teachers Marc Jaques, Don Chorneyko, Dennis Thiessan, and chaperons Pauline Strijack, Linda Dolton, Ron Young, Tony Roelens, and Carol Walters.

I would like to inform the members of the legislature that I had the pleasure early last spring to help these students of Endeavour open a brand-new school that they are now taking advantage of.

I would like to wish them a warm welcome to the legislature, and I look forward to meeting with you later for pictures and drinks. And I hope you have a pleasant day in Regina. Please welcome them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MOTION UNDER RULE 39

Civil Crisis in People's Republic of China (continued)

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also want to join with my colleague in welcoming the students from Endeavour to this Chamber where we're discussing a very important motion before the House, which we by and large find ourselves in agreement with, I believe.

I will endeavour, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to speak on behalf of the amendment which has been offered to the motion which is before us. The first part of the amendment merely strengthens and reinforces the original motion brought forward by the Premier.

The second part of the amendment reads:

and that the Assembly call upon the Government of Saskatchewan to end all negotiations to sell any portion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to the People's Republic of China.

I want to support that amendment by saying this, Mr.

Deputy Speaker. In the beginning, I am philosophically opposed to selling any portion of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to any foreign government. My level of anticipation and concern rises considerably when I'm selling . . . when I, as part of the Government of Saskatchewan, am participating in selling part of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to a government who has been so brutal in the repression of the democratic ideals of its young people. I abhor being put in that position.

Other nations are making sacrifices, other nations are making sacrifices in this same area, and I want to be sure that the people of Saskatchewan put something meaningful on the table when we say to the people, the Government of China, and to the world, that we're concerned about what happened in China. For example, I read in the *Globe and Mail*, Report on Business, on Thursday, June 8, 1989, that:

Hopewell Holdings Ltd., a Hong Kong-listed property company, has stopped work on two coal-fired power station projects in China.

We're talking about a lot of money here, Mr. Deputy Speaker — \$5.1 billion. This company is holding up over \$5 billion of projects in China, and they're saying something meaningful to the Government of China that they're concerned. I won't go into the reasons why they might be concerned — they may be more economic than philosophical; however, the fact is there that they're holding up over \$5 billion of projects.

The same article in the *Globe and Mail* goes on to say:

Another casualty (meaning projects — casualty of a project) could be Hong Kong's first domestic telecommunications satellite, which involves a consortium of Britain's Cable and Wireless PLC, Hutchison Telecommunications Ltd., and Beijing's CITIC Technology.

So there is another company. And I may draw to the attention of the members of the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that the Sask Telecommunications is involved in developing projects in China. I think it is incumbent upon us to restrain any further development of Sask Telecommunications in China.

In putting forward the resolution about selling part of the potash corporation to China, I believe our initial speaker made it quite clear that we as members on this side of the House will not support sanctions on the sale of food or agricultural products to China such as wheat or potash.

Our main concern is that we put something meaningful on the table such as the sale of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan to this brutally repressive government in China. Consequently, the amendment has been offered, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What we are saying in the amendment is that we are putting more than words on the table.

When I look at the motion that's moved by the Premier, the words are well-meaning. When I look at our amendment, the words are well-meaning, but it has the

additional impact of saying that we've put something that's of concern to the people of Saskatchewan on the table so the people of China know that we're serious about this — so that the people of Saskatchewan know that we're serious about this.

So therefore I would ask all members to join in the support of the amendment which we have offered, which I think quite clearly shows that we're prepared to sacrifice something for those young people without arms who gave their lives in the capital of China to the brutal suppression of the communist government of China. We have to be meaningful in this resolution. Therefore, I support the motion; I support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to endorse the comments that have been made thus far about the resolution with respect to the events going on in China at this moment.

And I want to add to that a little bit, in terms of what it is that we can do that will actually be meaningful to the people of China and that will actually be meaningful in their cause, in their struggle for democracy in China.

It's obvious, I think, that we in this House all want to assist in some way to help the people there, as led by the students and led by their intelligentsia, in their struggle to obtain freedom of expression and freedom of movement and certainly freedom of association — those freedoms which we associate with our democracy.

And when you look at it from a historical point of view, Mr. Speaker, some writers and historians have written that in order for a revolution to take place, or a change in government to take place, there are certain elements — there are four main ingredients, four elements that have to be in place in the country for a revolution to be successful.

And I think in this case we can look at it as a revolution. And a revolution doesn't necessarily have to mean that it's something that involves blood, a loss of blood. There can also be such a thing as a peaceful revolution. But certainly it can be thought of as going from a totalitarian state to going to a democracy is certainly revolutionary, and I want to use the word in that context.

What are the conditions? Well the four conditions are: first of all, that there has to be a common issue or a common cause for the people — and certainly they have the common cause there, the cause being democracy; you have to have the leadership able to lead the people in the country; there has to be a decay in the morale of those that are in authority at the time; and last of all, there has to be some way of disseminating the information.

If those four elements — the issue, leadership, the decay on the existing authority, and the method of disseminating information — are in place, then you can have conditions ripe for a revolution to take place. And I want to deal with each one of these very briefly, Mr. Speaker.

(1145)

The issue of democratization in China I think is well established and that that issue is there. It's something that has been taking a long time to establish in any country. Certainly we know that in the French Revolution, prior to the French Revolution, the middle class in France had rising expectations, and they got together with those that were in poverty, and slowly, after seeing what had happened in the American Revolution, they were able to generate the same ideas.

The issue, for example, historically, prior to the United States' revolution, was the issue of taxation, taxation without representation, which they felt was very anti-democratic, and it certainly was, and that's what spawned their revolution, was the cause for it. And I believe that the issue in China is something that's equally universal and that the stage is properly set for it.

Secondly, after having the issue, you need, as I mentioned, leadership. In this case the revolution is being led in China by students, and there is an educated and a capable, very capable body that is able to lead in the direction of democracy.

We see, as a matter of fact, that one of the things that's happening is that the existing regime is attempting to destroy this leadership. I believe that that was the reason for them bringing the tanks in and the soldiers in to the students, so that if you could destroy this one tenet, then you can put away and put down this peaceful revolution — or at least it was peaceful until the army walked in.

Mr. Speaker, as another example where there was a revolution, that was the Riel rebellion here right in Saskatchewan. It was put down by putting out, snuffing out its leader, Louis Riel, which might have otherwise become . . . might have taken longer, or there might have been different conditions.

The third tenet of a successful revolution is that somehow or other those that are already in authority have to be . . . become unable or be disarmed . . . become unable to defend their position. This usually arrives from internal dissent within the existing authority. That is a difficult thing to achieve.

In the case of China, this was happening to some extent because we saw the Chinese students fraternizing with some of the people in the army, the people in the army, the soldiers in the army then feeling that they really couldn't turn on their own. Well what happened then, of course, is they brought in a different group of soldiers that was still — that hadn't made friends with the students or hadn't been befriended by the students, and who were still very loyal to the existing leadership.

Again, historically, if you take a look at the American Revolution, the situation there was that the people in authority in the American colonies felt more of a moral — or at least many of them did — felt more of a moral obligation to the citizens of the U.S. than they did to the citizens over in England, and weren't about . . . so the leadership was moved in the direction of the revolutions.

We see a similar thing happening in Poland and in the Soviet Union where the leadership there is recognizing that they no longer have the moral authority to rule according to the old ways, and are slowly trying to make overtures and lean . . . and at least give the appearance of leaning towards democracy. Whether or not it will happen in actuality, we don't know.

Again, if we . . . or if we look as an example for our own . . . the Riel rebellion, which was quashed here. The leadership of the Canadian government at that time was able to call on the North-West Mounted Police, who had well-salaried policemen and they had well-fed horses, and they weren't about to turn against the government of the day. And of course that revolution was put down or quashed rather easily. If, on the other hand, the RCMP or the . . . pardon me, the North-West Mounted Police, at the time, had felt that their loyalties were not to the government but were more with the Metis, things might have been different.

But I raise this point to show . . . to bring out the point that at some stage, if we are going to try to help here in any way, we have to be cognizant of the strength that's inherent in being in office, in authority, and the need for undermining the morale of the existing authorities in order for the democracy to take its rightful course in China.

And of course the last tenet here, Mr. Speaker, is the tenet that I indicated earlier, the one of disseminating information. Even if all of the other three tenets are in place, this revolution still cannot be successful if the people in the country are unable to communicate with each other, and if the common cause is unable to be disseminated throughout the country.

Information is your vehicle of change. It's very important then that anything that we do would be to assist students who are in North America, who have contacts in China, to be able to continue to be in contact with what's happening in China. It's important for us to make and maintain certain contacts with the people, not necessarily with the authorities but with the people in China. In this respect we know that institutions like the Voice of America have been important in moulding people's opinion towards democracy in Poland and in the Soviet Union, and I expect also in China.

We saw pictures of students in Tiananmen Square pushing their fellow students away from the cameramen from the West. They were saying, no, let the cameras take the pictures so that the people around the world can see, and in that way they know that they'll perhaps get some of the pictures back into China because they know that what's happened there is that their press has now been censored.

I think a couple of other examples, Mr. Speaker, would be that . . . or at least one other example is where in South Africa, where they were on the verge of an internal revolution, and in South Africa they are banning the press. One way of suppressing a revolution is to cut off the information network. It's been said that revolutions are not won at the barricades, but they're won in the hearts of people, and to get to the heart of somebody you have to

be able to talk to them.

I can only conclude then, Mr. Speaker, that the best help that we can give from Saskatchewan would be twofold: first of all, would be to keep the information flow going to China. Anything that we can do to keep the information flow going to China would be valuable.

There are 4,000 exchange students in Canada from China. There are 40,000 exchange students in the U.S. If that kind of exchange is maintained, then under those conditions we can keep the issue of democracy and the spark of democracy alive — help to keep it alive. It was through this kind of student exchange that the students were able to organize themselves in the first place. We saw some of the students, who I expect were in America, build a replica of the Statue of Liberty right in Tiananmen Square. They had, fortunately, become infected with democracy when they were over in our country or in the United States of America.

The importance of maintaining communications was, I think, epitomized by the poet Ralph Waldo Emerson, who wrote the Concord hymn, and it was sung at the Battle Monument on July 4, 1837. And I want to read the first verse to you, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world.

He was talking about . . . The shot he was talking about was speaking for democracy, making the claim that if democracy was established in the United States of America, it would spread around the world.

The last comment I would like to make then, Mr. Speaker, what we can do to help — I said first of all we should do anything we can to keep the information flow going: things like student exchanges, things like cultural exchanges. And the last thing I think we can do . . . second thing I think we can do is to make sure that we are tough on the leadership and that we don't improve the morale of the leadership but that we do anything we can not to improve the morale of the leadership in China. And the strong thing we can do there, and something tangible and definite from the province of Saskatchewan, is to stop our negotiations regarding the potash sales with the Chinese people. I think that would be the strongest moral suasion that we could use there and help the Chinese people in their struggle for democracy, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 11:57 a.m. to 11:59 a.m.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas

Devine	Wolfe
Duncan	Gleim
McLeod	Neudorf
Berntson	Gardner

Lane	Kopelchuk
Taylor	Britton
Muirhead	Shillington
Schmidt	Lingenfelter
Hodgins	Tchorzewski
Gerich	Koskie
Hepworth	Brockelbank
Hardy	Upshall
Klein	Simard
Meiklejohn	Kowalsky
Martin	Hagel
Toth	Pringle
Johnson	Lyons
McLaren	Calvert
Hopfner	Lautermilch
Petersen	Trew
Swenson	Van Mulligen
Martens	Koenker
Baker	

Nays

— 45 Motion negated on the following recorded division.

— 00

Yeas**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 12:03 p.m. to 12:04 p.m.

Motion as amended agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas

Devine	Gleim
Duncan	Neudorf
McLeod	Gardner
Berntson	Kopelchuk
Lane	Britton
Taylor	Shillington
Muirhead	Lingenfelter
Schmidt	Tchorzewski
Hodgins	Koskie
Gerich	Brockelbank
Hepworth	Upshall
Hardy	Simard
Klein	Kowalsky
Meiklejohn	Solomon
Martin	Goulet
Toth	Hagel
Johnson	Pringle
McLaren	Lyons
Hopfner	Calvert
Petersen	Lautermilch
Swenson	Trew
Martens	Van Mulligen
Baker	Koenker
Wolfe	

Nays— 47 **Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

— 00

House Business

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, in the new spirit of co-operation which we obviously have here in the Assembly now, moving off of rules to debate an important issue, I want to move a motion, seconded by the member from Regina North East, that:

I move that the next order of business be Bill 41, An Act to amend the Agricultural Credit Corporation Act of Saskatchewan.

I move, and that would be seconded by the member from Regina North East.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The division bells rang from 12:08 p.m. to 12:09 p.m.

Shillington	Goulet
Lingenfelter	Hagel
Tchorzewski	Pringle
Koskie	Lyons
Brockelbank	Calvert
Upshall	Lautermilch
Simard	Trew
Kowalsky	Van Mulligan
Solomon	Koenker

— 18

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Order. I'm afraid we can't hear the members' response, and we'll need the co-operation of the members.

Nays

Devine	Toth
Duncan	Johnson
McLeod	McLaren
Berntson	Hopfner
Lane	Petersen
Taylor	Swenson
Muirhead	Martens
Schmidt	Baker
Hodgins	Wolfe
Gerich	Gleim
Hepworth	Neudorf
Hardy	Gardner
Klein	Kopelchuk
Meiklejohn	Britton
Martin	

— 29

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!**MOTIONS****ORDERS OF THE DAY****GOVERNMENT ORDERS****ADJOURNED DEBATES****MOTIONS**

Amendments to Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Andrew.

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's very interesting to note the effects of bell-ringing as we've just seen in the moments that have transpired in this Assembly, and how the bells can ring to good effect, but how the government can ignore doing anything positive for the people of the province when it comes to legislation and dealing with legislation.

Now what we just saw, Mr. Speaker, was a situation in which the bells rang to call members to a vote, to vote on what is known as Bill 41, and I have it here in front of me. And this Bill 41 is an Act to amend the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan Act.

And as we know, the Minister of Agriculture, who is the Premier, ought to be willing to deal with an important piece of legislation in this Assembly as people are called to scrutinize it and examine it in this Assembly. As Minister of Agriculture, the Premier has a responsibility to deal with this legislation, and simply chooses not to.

This government has an agenda which is to privatize SaskPower. This government wants to bulldoze ahead with its privatization plans willy-nilly and ignore public opinion and ignore the democratic process. And it doesn't really matter what kind of legislation and public business this Assembly ought to be turning its attention to; when the government has opportunity to deal with legislation, it chooses not to. It chooses not to.

And I think that is beginning to be a damning indictment of this government, that it rejects the democratic process; that it has no will or interest in dealing with legislative matters of any kind of consequence. And we see this from the Premier himself, from the Minister of Agriculture, who refuses to get up and do an honest day's work in introducing his own legislation as Minister of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1215)

Mr. Koenker: — And I would even go so far as to say that it's a sad day for Saskatchewan when Saskatchewan farm people can get up in the morning and do an honest day's work, that this Premier and Minister of Agriculture can't get up and deal with his own legislation. Why would that be?

Why could it be that this government will not deal with legislative matters in front of it? Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a very simple explanation for it. This government doesn't want to deal with what amounts to a full legislative agenda.

I'll just check here for a moment to see how many Bills we presently have before us in this Legislative Assembly. The Act to amend the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan Act, as I've been talking about, was Bill No. 41. But we have Bill No. 42, for example, which is an

Act to protect the spousal rights of homesteads. And this too isn't being dealt with because the government has an agenda to ignore the legislative process and to deal with its privatization preoccupation and to, as a consequence, put forth a motion to muzzle the opposition, to muzzle the people of this province, and to change the rules for bell-ringing.

And this attempt to muzzle the opposition, to limit the ringing of bells affects even legislation from the Minister of Highways. We have Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, which isn't being dealt with. And it's not a particularly long piece of legislation, not inordinately complex.

One would think that the Minister of Highways could certainly stand up today and begin to deal with this piece of legislation. The opposition, I can assure you, is certainly ready to deal with it. It's only nine pages long — actually, it's only eight and a half pages long.

But the question is why, why won't the Minister of Highways, exactly as the Minister of Agriculture Acts, why won't they come forward with their legislation? They've had ample opportunity this past week to leave behind the subject of bell-ringing. And it's at a point now where the opposition can scarcely understand how it is that they refuse to deal with legislative matters that this Assembly ought to be dealing with.

It isn't as if we need to have an amendment to the rule regarding bell-ringing. That simply isn't the case. The public should know that there is a rule in another book that is used here in the Legislative Assembly, a book of *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*, and this book has a rule to deal precisely with the question of bell-ringing.

But this government, in its blind agenda to sell off the assets of this province, feels it must have a bell-ringing motion that limits bell-ringing so that it can do what it pleases against the will of public opinion, against the overwhelming sentiment of public opinion.

When polls show that 67 per cent of the public reject the sell-off of SaskPower, the government's blind drive to privatize SaskPower is picked up in this Assembly with the present motion we're debating to change the bell-ringing legislation. And there's just no question then in the minds of the public that the two issues of privatization of SaskPower and the ringing of bells are inextricably linked together, that it is the tool of this government to muzzle the opposition and to limit bell-ringing precisely so that it can sell off SaskPower. And the two are linked inextricably.

What we're proposing, Mr. Speaker, is that the government get on with the real business of governing the province, to get on with real issues of consequence, and to leave behind dealing with this book of *Rules and Procedures* and to deal with the legislation, a full legislative agenda that meets the real needs and concerns of Saskatchewan people in a way that the bell-ringing motion doesn't even begin to approximate. And this is what's so ludicrous and ridiculous about the motion before us.

When we have not only an Act from the Minister of Highways to amend The Highway Traffic Act, Bill No. 43, but we have a Bill to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act, which is Bill No. 44, the public would sooner have that kind of real legislative issue dealt with than a Bill to amend the bell-ringing and to limit bell-ringing to one hour.

Now it may be that in considering an Act to amend The Liquor Board Superannuation Act, Bill No. 44, there are serious issues at stake, issues of great political consequence. Probably inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of Saskatchewan people are not superannuates of the Liquor Board itself, this particular piece of legislation would not consume public attention.

But let's assume for a moment that it affected everyone in Saskatchewan in the way that the privatization of SaskPower would affect them. Then to have a Bill to limit the bell-ringing to one hour would be a concern for the people of Saskatchewan, if they were superannuates and looking for amendments that pertained to them directly.

And if the questions implicit in this particular Bill No. 44 were offensive to the people of Saskatchewan, then they would want to know about those offensive provisions and sections of the legislation. Inasmuch as it pertains to them, they're entitled to know about offensive provisions. They would want to know, and they would want to make sure upon hearing what this legislation really constituted and how it impacted on their lives, they would want to make their feelings and opinions on this subject known to the government and also to the opposition.

And it's precisely this kind of opportunity that the present rules of the Assembly allow when the bells are allowed to ring for an unlimited duration of time. And to limit the bell-ringing to an hour would not give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to examine this particular Bill No. 44.

Now as I've said, there is really a whole pile of legislation that is before the Legislative Assembly at this point that merits public scrutiny and public attention and ought to be dealt with, but the government seems not to have an agenda to deal with these kinds of issues and instead wants to deal with the bogus, and in some respects, fundamentally silly issue of a rule change.

And the people recognize it as a bogus and a silly issue that is of little or no consequence to them personally. While I say, Mr. Speaker, that this issue of bell-ringing is bogus and silly for the overwhelming majority of Saskatchewan people, that's not to say that it's entirely bogus or silly. There's a sense in which there's a very serious side to this particular piece of amendment to the legislative rules, and that is the issue of democracy that I've been talking about these last number of hours.

The concept of democracy, Mr. Speaker, is one that is frequently talked about here in this Legislative Assembly and is a burning concern to both sides of the House. It's very frequent to hear members on either side of the House talk about democratic process and democratic rights and democratic institutions. It's not so frequent to hear

members talk about the provisions for rule changes, or to hear members talk about provisions for the ringing of bells. Certainly we've heard a lot of talk about that subject in the last two or three weeks.

But ordinarily we aren't consumed in this Legislative Assembly by procedural questions or detailed questions of rule, other than, in ordinary circumstances, to refer them to the judgement of the Speaker and the Clerks of the Legislative Assembly who deal with these in a far more functional fashion than we do as legislators.

But when we do turn to the subject of democracy, it's interesting to note that as often as it's talked about by both sides of the House, it's one thing to talk about it and it's another thing to practise it, to put democracy into practice.

And in this connection, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that beyond a shadow of a doubt the motion that we have before us from the hon. member from Kindersley, the Minister of Justice, the proposed motion that the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* be amended after rule 33(1) by changing rule 33(2) to call for the bells to be sounded for not more than one hour, I would say that this is a test of whether we talk about democracy from one side of the House or another, or whether we actually attempt to put it into practice — whether we talk about it and mouth it and give verbal assent to it or whether we actually are serious about implementing democratic concepts and democratic procedures.

And it's in the wisdom of the tradition of this Assembly, of the men and the women who have sat in this Assembly over the years, that they have held out, not for the mouthing of obeisance to democracy but for a practical service of democracy by having rules for the Assembly that practise what the members preach from both sides of the House.

And that's as it should be. And we would certainly hope that in considering a rule change to limit the amount of bell-ringing, that any such change would put into practice the democratic ideals that we all talk about and preach, that it would put into practice these ideals for the Assembly itself.

And I would go one step further, Mr. Speaker, and say that we would hope that in putting these democratic virtues and ideals into practice for the Assembly, we would take it one step further and put these ideals into practice for the people of the province. Because, finally, what we're talking about in changing the rules of the Assembly, that we're talking about rule changes that either do a service to the people of the province or do a disservice to the people of the province.

(1230)

And the question might well be asked then, of people across the province, what does this particular motion by the hon. member from Kindersley, the Minister of Justice, what does this particular motion, this proposal to change the rules, do to democracy? What does it do for the people of the province?

Does it do a service or does it do a disservice to the people of the province? Is it a genuine service to practical democracy and to facilitate democratic interaction in the province outside of this Assembly? And I think that's one of the hallmarks of scrutiny that this legislation has to bear. It isn't a question of whether it serves simply the democratic process here in the Assembly, but we have to ask ourselves, does it do genuine service to the practice of democracy outside of this Assembly.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say in terms as forceful as I can that the present rule that we have for this Assembly guarantees — guarantees the democratic process outside of this Assembly. And that's why we on this side of the House, as New Democrats, are so insistent that this rule change be opposed.

This rule change to limit bell-ringing to one hour must be opposed because it does nothing — nothing — to facilitate the democratic process outside of this Assembly. And as I say, it's one thing to have a rule change proposed that will affect the democratic process within the Assembly; it's quite another thing, Mr. Speaker, when we have a motion like this to change the democratic process outside the Assembly. And when it comes to that, we simply have to take a stand and say that this proposal, this motion to change the bell-ringing and to limit it to one hour, has to go. It has to go. It can't stand up to public scrutiny.

And I say this, Mr. Speaker, because of the experience, that crucible of fire that the province has gone through in the last number of weeks over the SaskPower privatization issue. What have we seen, Mr. Speaker, these last weeks, but the democratic process full-blown, full-blown not in the Legislative Assembly because the bells were ringing and the members were not here for the most part, but the flowering and the flourishing of the democratic process across this province.

Now to be sure, some members of the Legislative Assembly were in the Legislative Assembly while the bells were ringing. They were here because fundamentally they saw no need for the bells to be ringing — no need at all for any kind of public scrutiny on an issue as important as the privatization of SaskPower. Implicit in their sitting here in this Assembly while the bells were ringing for 17 days, was the assumption, leave it to us — leave it to us; we will take care of the issues; we will govern the province; we will do what we please.

The members that sat in the Assembly and took that particular view of things, that the bells needed to be shut off, and who would now advocate a curtailing of the bell-ringing with this particular motion from the Minister of Justice, would be doing the people of the province a grave disservice in curtailing their opportunity to review the actions of this Assembly and subject it to a democratic scrutiny.

Now I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it's not without precedent that the democratic process has been scorned; not without precedent in this Assembly that the people of the province will know that the present government has problems with public scrutiny of public accounts by the Provincial Auditor.

But the scorn of the democratic process isn't simply limited to questions surrounding the auditor when he can't see 50 per cent of the public spending figures of this government. The scorn and contempt for democracy shown by this government has been exemplified, I would say, in fact even today when the Premier can stand in this Assembly and extol the virtues of democracy in China and deny its existence here in Saskatchewan by introducing as an item of business for the Assembly today a motion to limit the ringing of bells. Now how can that be?

Think of the duplicity in that kind of action, Mr. Speaker, when a person can stand and extol the virtues of democracy in China and condemn the violence there. And I quote from the motion itself that the Premier introduced, "calling for an increased democracy in the People's Republic of China."

That's what the motion said — calling for increased democracy in the People's Republic of China, and at the same time — well, five minutes later the motion that he brings before this Assembly consequent to that one, after that motion, is to limit democracy here in Saskatchewan.

And I say, what duplicity, what hypocrisy! — on the one hand, to talk about democracy in China and to give lip-service to it across the seas, while right here in Saskatchewan the Premier would curtail the exercise of the democratic process. It simply goes to show that what the government wants is for people to do as they say, but not as they do.

And this begins to be disturbing, Mr. Speaker, when we see a consistent trajectory of government actions over the weeks and months and years — not just in this Assembly but outside of it as well — where the government would want to rein in free, full expression of public opinion; where the government wants to talk, for example, of public participation, but brings forth a rule to limit bell-ringing; to pre-empt the kind of public participation that we saw on the privatization issue this spring; when it wants to pre-empt and preclude public participation in decision making as to whether public utilities should be sold off; and wants to introduce tight-fisted rule changes that it thinks the public has no understanding of or no regard for simply because they're procedural rule changes for the Legislative Assembly; when it wants to bulldoze those kinds of rule changes forward to suit its own agenda and not the public agenda.

And the important thing to understand then about this rule change that we have before us, the rule change that the bells to call in the members shall be sounded for no more than one hour, the important thing to know about this change is that it was done with — what kind of consultation? It was done with no consultation whatsoever.

And isn't that in keeping with the kind of government action that I've just talked about moments ago? A government that simply doesn't want to consult with the opposition, let alone the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it was interesting . . . it's more

than interesting; it's informative to look at the beginnings of the democratic ideal in ancient Greece, as I've been talking about, and to note that it was Plato who had little regard for the democratic process himself.

Why did Plato have little regard for the democratic process? Well it basically did in his teacher, Socrates. Little wonder then that he would have scorn for democracy.

And in his writings he marvels . . . in the *Republic* he marvels, in talking about the democratic city, and writes, quote:

Without experience of it no one would believe how much freer the very beasts subject to men are in the city than elsewhere (talking about a democratic city). The dogs literally verify the adage and "like their mistresses become." And likewise the horses and asses are wont to hold on their own way with the utmost freedom and dignity, bumping into everyone who meets them and who does not step aside. And so in all things everywhere, they are just bursting with the spirit of liberty.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — This is Plato, in the *Republic*, talking about democracy, and the horses and the asses of the streets bursting with liberty.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the kind of regard that the government has for the people of Saskatchewan. In bringing in legislation like this, it has scorn for the people of Saskatchewan as if they were horses and asses.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — And he goes on to say, and I'll just conclude with this note:

And do you note that the sum total of all these items when footed up is that they render the souls of the citizens so sensitive that they chafe at the slightest suggestion of servitude and will not endure it?

Little wonder, Mr. Speaker, little wonder that the souls of citizens chafe under servitude and will not endure it. The people of Saskatchewan, when they look at a proposal to privatize their own public utility, SaskPower, and the concomitant rule change to ram that privatization through . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Order, order. The hon. member has referred several times to the issue of SaskPower . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — . . . and I pointed out to him that he is engaging in repetition and I . . . Order, order, order. The hon. member has referred to that issue several times. He is engaging in repetition. I'm bringing that to his attention.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1245)

Mr. Koenker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think . . . I concur with your reading. I think that in a fundamental respect that the issue of SaskPower is not related so much as the . . . perhaps the issue of lawlessness and servitude in a democracy is related to the kinds of questions implicit in a rule change to restrict bell-ringing. Because what else is it for a government to introduce a rule change such as the one that we have before us? What else is at the heart of the issue? What else other than lawlessness is at stake when the bells are allowed to ring in unlimited fashion?

The ringing of the bells then is really, at root, a question of tyranny and lawlessness; a question of whether there's going to be public foolishness. And the question becomes whether we're going to have the kind of freedom of public expression that behooves public debate and genuine public participation in public debate, or whether we are going to constrict that and abandon the democratic ideal.

It's not without scorn for the opinion of the people of Saskatchewan that such a rule change is introduced into this Assembly. It's not without scorn for the people of Saskatchewan that a government would say, there's no need for the bells to ring more than an hour. That will do quite well; that will suit our purposes; that will serve us quite conveniently to have the bells ringing for only one hour. It will present only minor inconvenience, and then we can get on with doing what we bloody well choose.

We saw, Mr. Speaker, that the . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'd like the hon. member to watch his language in his debate.

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure what you're . . . I meant no . . .

The Speaker: — I am referring to the phrase "bloody well" as used by the hon. member. I don't think that's acceptable in this House.

Mr. Koenker: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I certainly didn't intend that at all. I didn't intend that at all.

The bell-ringing can have a good effect. We know that bell-ringing can have a very good effect when we see how it functioned, as it normally does, just this morning when we talked about the situation in China and people were called to consider the democratic questions implicit in what's happening there these days.

I want to just refer to the famous funeral oration of Pericles, who had the reverse point of view of democracy that Plato had, and he writes, in his funeral oration:

We live under a form of government which does not emulate the institutions of our neighbours; on the contrary, we are ourselves a model which some follow, rather than the imitators of other peoples.

It is true that our government is called a

democracy, because its administration is in the hands, (get this, Mr. Speaker) not of a few, but of the many; yet while as regards the law all men are on equality for the settlement of their private disputes, as regards the value set on them it is as each man is in any way distinguished that he is preferred to public honours, not because he belongs to a particular class, but because of personal merits.

And I say that these words are well-considered in the context of a rule change here where we don't give regard to the way in which people, as individuals, are preferred with respect to public honours, because they belong to a particular class or because of particular merits that they will have a say, that they will have more of a say than other men or women.

I am sure that if Pericles were writing today, (I'll say this parenthetically), he would be using non-sexist language, which would be a very democratic thing to do. But . . .

An Hon. Member: — Changes to rules to include non-sexist language in the House.

Mr. Koenker: — Well the suggestion is made by the member from Rosemont that perhaps the rules should be changed with a view toward eliminating non-sexist language in the House. And that's something that might well be looked at. And I would like to propose to you, Mr. Speaker, that you, as someone who's very conversant with these kinds of matters, give consideration to that, and that we have a committee to look at those kinds of changes.

And it's precisely the lack of a committee that is the problem with this particular motion to limit bell-ringing to one hour. It is a unilateral action of the government that gives preference to public honours of particular men and women because of their class or because of their personal merits, and doesn't look at the administration, as Pericles says, of public affairs being in the hands, not of the few but of the many. This is what happened when the bells rang for 17 days. The administration of public affairs was not in the hands of a few.

And this is what undoubtedly enrages the government about the present rule, is with the present rule in place, they can't keep the administration of public affairs in the hands of a few. They can't keep the administration of public affairs simply in the hands of Executive Council, or the cabinet, or this Legislative Assembly if the bells are allowed to ring for unlimited durations of time. The debate is moved into the streets, where that debate should be taking place, Mr. Speaker. The debate is moved into the streets, and in moving into the streets, is passed from the hands of a few, the public affairs are passed from the hands of a few into the hands of the many.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Power to the people, Pericles. That's maybe what we should call it — power to the people, Pericles. No wonder his funeral oration is famous throughout history. No wonder it has bearing on the issue that we're talking about today.

He goes on in this same oration to talk about, in a democratic society, about:

. . . our freedom from suspicion of one another in the pursuits of every-day life: for we do not feel resentment at our neighbour if he does as he likes, nor yet do we put on sour looks which, though harmless, are painful to behold. But while we thus avoid giving offence in our private intercourse, in our public life we are restrained from lawlessness chiefly through reverent fear for we render obedience to those in authority and to the laws, and especially to those laws which are ordained for the succour of the oppressed and those which, though unwritten, bring upon the transgressor a disgrace which all men recognize.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — These words of the funeral oration talk about reverent fear for the laws — reverent fear for the laws.

And we have here a question of the laws of this Legislative Assembly and how we should be governed — what kinds of rules or laws or procedures we should have here in this Assembly, and not just for this Assembly but for the public. And we might be well advised to consider the kind of reverent fear we would have for the laws, especially, as Pericles says, especially those laws ordained for the succour of the oppressed, for the succour of the oppressed.

And don't we know, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to privatization of SaskPower, many will be oppressed — will be oppressed with higher fuel bills, higher natural gas costs, and higher electrical bills. The people of Saskatchewan will be oppressed, and that is why we ought to have reverent fear for the law of this Assembly as it exists in the present rule.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Power to the people, Mr. Speaker. The bells can never ring too long if the people are empowered and if the poor and the oppressed are succoured and protected.

What we have is a government opposite who would use its power to abuse and oppress the people of the province, to ignore democratic process, to curtail the ringing of the bells, and we need to consider what kind of society that leads to when we have an anti-democratic form of government that wants to keep the administration of public affairs, not in the hands of the many but in the hands of the few.

For the bells to ring too long is really a question of judgement. Who is to judge the appropriateness of how long the bells should ring? We have here a situation in which we have two conflicting judgements or opinions as to how long the bells should ring.

We have one which is the existing rule that has been judged over the years, in the wisdom of our predecessors

in the Assembly, that the bells should ring for as long as the public deems appropriate. And we have another judgement that says, no, that's not correct. The member from Kindersley, the minister from Justice, would pass judgement along with government members and say, no, we need to have a rule that would curtail the ringing of bells.

And so the question becomes: how are we to judge precisely how long the bells should ring? Well we seem to have two very fundamentally conflicting opinions in that regard. We wonder then, where would a compromise be? Where could a compromise be in a question like this?

I think the answer is really quite simple. The government ought to refer this whole matter to committee and let a committee take charge of this issue. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue. I have many things to say, but I have . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I would request leave of the Assembly to deal with a motion respecting absence from the House of a member of the legislature to attend a CPA (Commonwealth Parliamentary Association) conference?

The Speaker: — It being 1 o'clock, we'll consider that the debate has ended for the day. The minister has asked for leave to introduce his motion.

Leave granted.

MOTIONS

Leave of Absence to attend Commonwealth Parliamentary Association

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, by leave of the Assembly, seconded by my seat mate, the member for Melville:

That leave of absence be granted to the hon. member for Wilkie, from Wednesday, June 14 through to Tuesday, July 4, 1989, to attend on behalf of this Assembly, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association first annual seminar in Lusaka, Zambia.

Motion agreed to.

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER

Ruling on a Superseding Motion

The Speaker: — Before adjournment of the House, I would like to make the following statement. For the clarification of the Assembly, I want to make a statement regarding one of the proceedings which took place earlier today.

Before orders of the day, the member for Regina Elphinstone moved that the next item of business be Bill 41. The motion was allowed to be put, without leave, on the grounds that it is a superseding motion which does not require leave.

Upon further reflection, I wish to make a clarification regarding the future application of this procedure, since it is a procedure we have been only using lately.

The purpose of a superseding motion is to set aside or supersede a question which is then under debate. In this regard, I refer members to *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly* as follows, rule 10:

A motion for reading the Orders of the Day shall have preference over any motion before the Assembly.

And, rule 41:

When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the Orders of the Day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the Assembly.

I further refer members to *Beauchesne's Rules and Forms*, Fifth Edition, citation 417 (2)(b) as follows:

Superseding motions, though independent in form, are moved in the course of debate on questions which they seek to set aside. They may only be moved when a question is under debate . . .

Our rules of the authorities are clear that there must be some business before the House in order for a superseding motion to be in order. The motion moved earlier today was moved on orders of the day when there was no question before the House.

I therefore wish members to understand that in the future a superseding motion such as the one moved earlier today can only be put when the House is in the midst of debating a motion.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, just so I can understand this. There was a procedure used — I forget, it may be a couple of weeks ago — by the member from Melfort, while we were introducing rule 39's motions, that we move to the next order of business. Would the same application apply to that ruling that you made that day?

The Speaker: — The member's asking the question of a motion that was moved approximately two weeks ago. I believe that's what he said. And as I recall it, there was some business before the House at the time the motion was presented, the business before the House where members were asking for leave of motions under rule 39. So there was some business, so according to that, that motion should have been in order, the way I recall it.

It being past 1 o'clock, the House stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:07 p.m.