

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 3, 1978

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Department of Health — Vote 32

Item 10 (continued)

Mr. R. Katzman (Rosthern): — Before we left at 5:00 o'clock we were going into 166 man hour months which works out to be approximately 13 fulltime people. Is there a specific time within your estimates that you have to have these bodies for a six-month period or something and that's why it's not year-round?

Hon. Mr. E. Tchorzewski (Minister of Health): — Sorry. I was consulting by deputy on something else. Can you repeat the question?

Mr. Katzman: — Basically it works out that you will have 13 people on a year-round basis and if that is the case, and you are going temporary, is it because you are using them for a six-month period or something?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, it depends on how you work it out. Let me give you . . . during the supper hour we did some little working out of what this . . . more specifically what is provided for and it may help the member.

As I indicated before that this section under 'other personal services' provides 166 man months that can be utilized — 43 man months is temporary clerical for peak work periods such as sending out invitations and processing enrollments (that's invitations to students and parents); 123 man months, dental nurses and dental assistants covering basically two considerations, that is why we have them. One is because of a high proportion of young female staff, women staff. There is quite a considerable increase for potential maternity leave and they're as an example — replacements on temporary. We have now five staff on maternity leave at the present time. Secondly, utilization by pre-school age groups as we have now expanded it there. It is difficult to predict and from what my staff is able to figure out, based on experience, those positions needed will be converted — eventually some of them to permanent position. We would rather not do that until we know what the demand is going to be with new circumstances in the plan.

Mr. Katzman: — With that last statement you say that some of them you hope, will become permanent you think, but you are not sure.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I didn't say 'hope'. I said I think it is likely that may happen but only experience will tell us.

Mr. Katzman: — How many would you think by your projections?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — We don't know.

Mr. Katzman: — And because you deal so heavily within the school-frame year, do you need much relief in the summer — holiday relief because wouldn't they mostly be taking summer vacation?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, no problem in the summer at all.

Mr. Katzman: — In other words, you don't need to bring temporaries in for summer vacation period. Is that correct?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — You're right.

Mr. Katzman: — I'm right, O.K. Now, would you have a peak period of say, September until January and that's the reason for another portion of these temporaries?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm told that it is pretty well the same throughout the school year. There are no peak periods. I thought before supper, and I think I made some comment that I thought there might be but I am advised that there is no such thing as a peak period.

Mr. Katzman: — Now, let's assume that you have a temporary of say, eight months during this financial period, then you don't need a person for four months and then you need a person. Will you hire this person back on as a temporary again?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If there is a need in a particular area and if a person is in that location and is available and if that person falls within the Public Service Commission requirements, then indeed, yes.

Mr. Katzman: — O.K. What I read from what we went through before supper time and what we are going through now is where we used to say the mines had 59 man day employees because 60 days was a permanent position, basically you have, out of these 13, maybe 4 or 5 of them coming back each year for six or seven months during the peak period and then laid off and then coming back again. That is the way I read the answers you are giving me. Is that a proper estimate?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — We use and get allocated permanent staff only where it is necessary and we know they would need permanent staff. There is always going to be, there always has been, some degree of need for temporary staff in a very limited sense. This is very limited and I can tell you that the amount of temporary personnel provided under this subvote really works out to something like .4 man months per permanent employee — that's very minimal. So, to the extent that it is necessary to have some temporary personnel, we have them. If the circumstances change, or when they change, then the department will have to make its requests known to the Treasury Board about converting one or whatever to a permanent position. But that would not happen unless it was determined that that position would be necessary on a permanent basis.

Mr. Katzman: — I agree with what you are saying on a 12 month period but on a six month peak period, which you will basically have each year in this particular subvote, is it not possible that every year you could have one, maybe two people, coming back as temporaries in a certain area to pick up the heavy load when school gets going and then you don't need them all year so of course they are laid off — and then next year you need somebody for a while and then do it again. I am not suggesting . . .

Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, that's not right.

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Conservative Opposition): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions I would like to ask the minister. How many children are covered by the plan now?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I would direct the member to the Saskatchewan Dental Plan annual report. He puts great stock in reports; he's got one; he should look at it. On page 19 under Enrolment of Eligible Children, Saskatchewan Dental Plan enrolment as of August 31, 1977, you will find that the total number enrolled is 58,789.

Mr. Collver: — Well, I am very pleased that the minister can read the report, that is in August of 1977. However, the new budget proposes to have two extra age groups. My question to you is very simple, how many children are covered by the plan now — 58,789 at that time — surely you must have an assessment of how many there are in the new age groups that you have added? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I didn't ask for the enrolment. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Provincial Secretary hasn't entered into very much this year as he is pretty busy with his Potash corporation and so on, but I notice he is entering into it and answering questions on behalf of the Minister of Health. Obviously, the Minister of Health can't make it himself.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — By the end of February, approximately 71,000.

Mr. Collver: — Well, that's 71,000 and that's the number I was looking for and I appreciate the minister bringing forward that number. What is the total capital cost of the equipment that has been allocated to the provincial dental plan, the Saskatchewan Dental Plan, to date?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, page 32 of the annual report, and that will be in this particular thing, fairly up to date is, \$1,387,652.04. This is for total cost of renovation paid by the Department of Education up to August 31, 1977.

An Hon. Member: — What was the four cents? Fees to management consultants?

Mr. Collver: — Are you prepared now, Mr. Minister? Are you suggesting that only \$1,387,000 worth of dental equipment is presently being utilized in total by the Saskatchewan Dental Plan?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I gave you the amount for renovations which is the figure that I gave you. The opening inventory was \$1.1 million and \$72,798.

Mr. Collver: — So the total is \$2,400,000 worth of equipment that is in use across the province. Does the department make any allocation of any kind whatsoever, in its budget allocations for such things as space utilized or power used or gas used or anything like that? Or does it just take it free from the schools and so on, where they make their visits? In other words, is there any allocation for rent, or anything like that, or just none whatsoever?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — In answer to the member's question, we don't budget for it in Health, we make a note of it in the annual report, as you have here and I gave you that figure previously, which includes the renovations and the cost of the program per child can be worked out on the basis of the depreciation.

Mr. Collver: — Well, Mr. Minister, what you haven't answered is this. You have allocated to the Saskatchewan Dental Plan for the upcoming year \$7,195,940. What I'm asking you is in that allocation that is for the provision of the services for 386 dental employees plus the part-timers and so on but included in that you get space free from schools, do you make any allocation under that expenditure, do you reward the school

boards, for example, for the use of their space? Is there any allocation of any kind made for the space cost or the cost of the lights that you use in the schools or any of those costs that you get free across the province that the school boards have to pay for.

Mr. Smishek: — School grants pay for it.

Mr. Collver: — Well, what I'm trying to say and the former Minister of Health and now the Minister of Finance has said that supposedly the school grants pay for these services so one way or another the Government of Saskatchewan is covering it but what I'm attempting to do is to come up with some idea of the actual cost of the Saskatchewan Dental Plan in total and I think that's a fair number that the people of Saskatchewan would be interested in. If there is nothing could the minister or his officials estimate in some way what the value of that allocation might possibly be?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, indeed I can. The member asks once again the member for Qu'Appelle was asking me some questions on this on the first day of my estimates. He was interested and I said then as I want to say again to the member for Nipawin that the Saskatchewan Dental Plan has done an excellent job and if you want to consider it, you can I think, fairly consider it on a number of ways but you want to consider it on the basis of cost per child you will find that in 1974-75 the cost per child was \$158.29, the cost per child in 1976-77 was \$83.52 per child, which is a pretty significant reduction in the cost per child which says a great deal about the growing efficiency of the plan, one of the reasons being because of the number of children going through the system but also because of experience that's there. I know the member is going to get up as the member for Lumsden did, Qu'Appelle, used to be from Lumsden, sorry. I forget these changes happen so fast. He said, yeah, but that's O.K. he said \$83.52 is one thing but if you consider all these other costs it's going to be an awful lot more. Well, I want to tell the member for Nipawin that that's not the case at all because if you . . . we can work out and show you that if you take the estimated rental for the period of time, if you take the cost of renovation paid by the Department of Education of the \$1.387 million that I mentioned, if you consider the depreciation at 5 per cent, you will find that those additional costs, 5 per cent, you will find that those additional costs are \$1.15, keeping all those other things into consideration, \$1.15 so if you don't want to accept the figure of \$83.52 per child, I am prepared to offer \$87.07 per child which I still think is a very economical program.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, that's wonderful, it's magnificent to go through a bunch of numbers but, however, since you have 58,000 the minister has given me for 1976-77 yet the minister budgets in 1977-78 for some \$6,692,000; the number of children that he just gave us was 58,000 children which works out to something like \$120.00 per child in the year 1977-78. There's a little question about that why he would be suggesting that we should be living with 1976-77 figures or trying to present those to the people of Saskatchewan when in fact, he's got right in front of him the 1977-78 numbers and we're supposed to be dealing with 1978-79. What we're trying to find out, Mr. Minister, is this, and I think it's a reasonable assessment of the situation that we want from you rather than the words 'excellent job,' or 'magnificent performance' or whatever colorful phrases you want to use, we'd like something a little more accurate . . . (interjection) . . . yeah, the truth, that's a darn good term. Well, I didn't hear the truth from the minister, Mr. Chairman, if . . . (interjection) . . . oh, well, we can collect all kinds of things, including . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I think we can do with a little less assistance from some of the members here and let's proceed in and keep on this subvote 10, please.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I am on the subvote, am I not?

Mr. Chairman: — You are on the subvote, proceed please.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Minister, the capital cost that you have just read across to us, was \$1,387,000 plus \$1,107,000 which is a total of approximately \$2.5 million worth of capital. I think that's the correct number, perhaps you could nod your head if that's true, \$2.5 million. You are talking about dental equipment and that kind of thing. Anyone that would suggest that that would last 20 years just doesn't understand anything about medical equipment or dental equipment or any other kind of equipment. A 5 per cent depreciation factor you use for a concrete building, you sure as heck don't use for equipment that you are going to be using out there on a day basis. A much more realistic depreciation factor would be 20 per cent. I think on a reasonable basis, even allowing the minister the benefit of the doubt, let's allow 10 per cent for depreciation, that's fair and 10 per cent interest for the money investment, so that comes to a total of 10 per cent for interest at \$250,000, 10 per cent for investment or depreciation, another \$250,000, that's a total of \$500,000 added to — oh, the member for Saskatoon-Buena Vista laughs, he doesn't understand depreciation or interest or anything like that. Oh yeah, that's a good suggestion. But if you take \$500,000 as a reasonable write-off of your capital cost over the course of the year, and then the minister has not allocated any portion whatsoever for the free space, the lights, the heat, the telephones that are being granted to them gratis by the school boards across the province; and I ask you one more time, Mr. Minister, rather than the \$83.52 from your calculation, we would like to see that calculation brought forward here on the table tonight and surely the minister is prepared to do that. What, if anything, has your department done in allocating to the plan any cost factor for the free facilities received by the dental plan around the province?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — First of all, the member wondered what the cost per child might be for 1978-1979 and I can tell him that our estimate is that it is going to be basically the same as it was for the last year. Secondly, we are calculating in the cost per child the \$1.15 which I mentioned to the member a little while ago which includes heat, space and all those other things. So that is under consideration. I'm saying that the cost per child of \$87.07 includes a \$1.15, which considers the other costs such as heat, space and other related items. Now the member might argue otherwise, he's quite welcome to do that. I'm telling you, Mr. Chairman, and this House what the costs are. I'm also telling you, Mr. Chairman, the member opposite in this House that those are very, very efficient costs. They have also provided a service to students that normally did not receive those services and so that's why I say, I have said before, there are other benefits besides consideration of the costs and those are benefits on the prevention side to those students already in it. And I am pleased to say that the percentage of students enrolled is somewhere in the area of some 90 per cent now.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, it has just been brought to my attention that in the year 1976-1977, the minister's great costs that he is allocating of some \$87.00 which he said and I think . . .

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It's \$87.07. I said the cost per child was \$83.52, there was \$1.15 for depreciation on renovation of schools and in order to get that \$87.07 there are also the other related costs of space, rental and so on which is \$2.40, \$87.07 per student.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to draw this to your attention. Now the minister's numbers that he just handed to us for the forthcoming year, he said there were approximately 71,000 young people going to be enrolled. What he is saying is that for depreciation on \$2.5 million worth of equipment, that's what the minister just gave me for depreciation that they are going to allow some 71,000 times \$1.10 or \$1.15 — was it \$1.15, Mr. Minister, you said?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes.

Mr. Collver: — \$1.15 times 71,000 students; they are going to allow \$80,000 depreciation on \$2.5 million worth of capital and then try and make the people of Saskatchewan believe and everybody else in this Assembly believe that \$80,000 depreciation is reasonable on \$2.5 million capital cost. That's what he said to us tonight. And even using the minister's own words, it might interest the minister to know that in the Swift Current Health Region in the year 1976 they provided dental work for the same number of students for that age category of student — \$72 per child in the Swift Current Health Region provided by dentists in the Swift Current Health Region, provided by fully qualified people, \$72 per child. Yet the minister talks about the excellent job, the reasonableness of the plan, the excellence of his administrators, the excellence of the program and yet in the Swift Current Health Region it's, in the minister's words, it's \$16 per child less. Now how does the minister account for that?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The member opposite once again plays with his figures, he doesn't listen and when he hears he uses the figures he wants to use to try to mislead this House and the public of Saskatchewan. He's got a pretty fair reputation about that. I said there were 71,000 students, about, enrolled in February of 1978. The member has taken that 71,000 in some strange way and is applying it for the next fiscal year. He has failed to consider the fact that there will be additional students in that particular year, something in excess of 6,000 students — if you would spend some time listening you might be able to calculate it out for yourself. He also finds that in the depreciation on the renovation there is some \$69,382 calculated and that on the basis of the cost is fairly reasonable. I am sure even the member opposite would agree that the normal — this is on the building — that the normal life span of a building of 20 years is not unusual.

Mr. Collver: — No.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Good, then that figure is pretty precise. Also keep in mind that there is another figure for depreciation on the equipment which is a different item than the building of \$151,578 calculated at 15 per cent because there is a different kind of depreciation you can put on equipment than on building. I am sure that he wouldn't argue about that.

Mr. Collver: — Well, Mr. Chairman, this is going too far. When I first asked the minister he told me that as of August, last year, 58,789 young people were enrolled in the dental plan and he read from his book. He said, the member can read so he read it from his book. I said, no, Mr. Minister, I don't want to read from the book, I want to know how many are in the program do you anticipate in this coming year? You said, 71,000. Is that the correct number?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, the member asked how many students in this year and I said there were 71,000 as of February and the record will show that.

Mr. Collver: — So what you are saying to me, Mr. Minister, is that there are going to

be some 6,000 more, so that would be 77,000 young people enrolled in the plan as of this coming budget year. Is that the approximation you take?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — All right, now that the member has asked the question about 1978-79, maybe he did earlier, I didn't quite get it. As I said, I still will stand by it, as of February there were 76,000; we anticipate by 1978-79, when the new age group in the fall fall into place and become eligible, September of this coming year, the enrollment will be in the area of 86,000.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell me how the additional young people became enrolled between August and February of some 12,000? What was the additional . . . the pupil enrolment as I understand it across the province is dropping. I believe the superintendent . . . (interjection) . . . No, no, I agree with that but not between August and February. How did we get in the plan between August and February 12,000 additional students?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The school year begins in September and between August of the year before you would have the former enrolment in September after August which would be the February figure; you would have the students who would be enrolled because of another age group.

Mr. Collver: — Well that's the figure I want. Now out of the 86,000 students that you are talking about, even so at \$1.15 allocation for depreciation on \$2.5 million worth of equipment and you've brought in . . . is that \$1.15 down the tube now? What is the total depreciation allowance that you are allocating in this calculation of cost per student? What is the total depreciation allowance on the \$2.5 million worth of equipment?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Page 32 of the Saskatchewan Dental Plan annual report, it says on the bottom . . .

Mr. Collver: — For 1978-79, if that's O.K. with you. I'm dealing with some numbers here on 1978-79. What is your assessment of the situation for 1978-79?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — While they are working some of that together let me give you how the whole thing is put together. You will find on page 32 a note that says:

The Department of Education covered the costs of establishing dental clinics in elementary schools; \$1,332,253.70 was spent prior to August 31, 1976 and a further \$55,398.34 was spent during September 1, 1976 to August 31, 1977. These expenditures are capital in nature and should be amortized over the life of the facility based on a depreciation rate of 5 per cent. The depreciation rate will be approximately 5 per cent of that \$1,387,652 which equals \$69,382 which at that time divided by 60,231 children works out to \$1.15 per child.

That's on the facility. Let me see what we have on what is expected for this coming year. . . . (inaudible) . . . Further, in answer to the member's question, we don't know how many clinics the school board is going to add in this next year so we can't give you the precise amount but as they are added and I don't anticipate there will be that many more because many of them are on stream now, two more in your unit. As those clinics

are added obviously that figure of \$1,387,652 is going to increase and therefore the other side will increase some small amount as well.

Keep in mind that the increase of that between September 1, 1976 and August 1 of 1977 was \$55,000.

Mr. Collver: — Obviously the minister doesn't want to quibble over whether it is \$120 per student or whether it is \$80 per student. I'm not going to quibble over that either. I'm going to take a round number and say \$100 per student and I think that is a reasonable approach to this coming current year of approximate costs, \$100 per child enrolled in the program. I would like to ask the minister if his department has made any assessment of any kind whatsoever as to what the average cost, the average cost, of the dental work done outside the plan is on those students who are enrolled. In other words, what do the parents and the students have to pay to their dentists over and above what they get free from the plan?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well we don't know what the dentist will charge but the number of children who would get service from the plan and over and above that some more service would be almost negligible and I can assure the member of that. I want to state again for the record, Mr. Chairman, that I wish the member opposite would not try to put figures in his description of the plan that are completely incorrect. He wants to pick a set of figures out of the air . . . (inaudible) . . . dental plan are \$100 a student. I want to make it clear that that is just absolutely not true. The costs are not \$100 a student; I have given the costs; I have said the costs are \$83.50. As I've said the costs are \$83.52 and if you calculate the equipment depreciation, you calculate the rent and the space that the cost per student are not \$100 per student that are, as I said earlier, \$87.07 and I think that those figures are undisputable and if the member asks, as he has already, what we can estimate the cost will be for the coming year, I am able to tell him that we estimate that it will be basically the same.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, the minister is reading 1976-77 figures, we are dealing with a budget for 1978-79, which is a skip of two years not one year. For him to suggest that they will be the same as last year, when he is quoting the year before figures, is absolutely facetious and ridiculous. He is not quoting to us from '77-78, he's quoting to us from '76-77. When we estimate \$100 per child, I don't think it's an unreasonable thing to suggest that the minister is asking to spend \$7,195,000 plus depreciation plus out-of-pocket expenses for 86,000 young people. I don't think that that is far off \$100 per student, if my arithmetic adds together, that comes to pretty darn close to \$100 each for '78-79. Now, my point though, is this, which the minister didn't answer. When he says it is negligible, the amount of dental work done on young people from the age of 4 and 11, which is the new age group. He is suggesting that young people of the ages of 4 and 11, aren't seeing dentists any more in Saskatchewan and through the private practice. That quite simply isn't true. And I'm sure his Deputy Minister of Health has assessed the situation as to how much work is being done outside the plan by the dentists of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, I want to tell the member that we pay for emergency services in cases where the dental plan is not available and we pay for certain referrals. Those costs are calculated into these figures which I have given you, so you cannot add on to the cost per student statistics which I have provided. And I think that you asked what those costs might be.

Mr. Collver: — No, from the minister not how much is included in this figure, how

much do his officials estimate, are not included in the figures, but paid for by the parents of the students who have to get this work done.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — We don't know that. How are we to know that? We don't know how much some cases, some parents on their own, who take their child to a dentist are paying out. That's not within the purview of the Department of Health. The amount that we are estimating to be paid for referral and emergency services within the context of the plan, is \$148,200.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Minister, obviously all dental work for children is not included in the program. The other dental work that is not included in the plan has to be done by dentists in private practice. Surely his deputies have an estimate of how much work is done by dentists in private practice outside the dental program.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The only thing that the plan does not cover is orthodontic work. Now, the member wants the Department of Health officials and me to tell him how much is spent by the private citizen of Saskatchewan is going to his private practising dentist for those kinds of services. I'm telling the member we don't have that figure, how do you expect us to know every time someone takes his child to his orthodontist. No way are we requiring them to record that on some computer or something, that's his business. So we don't have that kind of statistics.

Mr. Collver: — Well, I'm pleased to see that. I imagine then that the minister is telling me that periodontology is also included in the program, is it?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I am informed that the amount of periodontal work done is very slight. If there is a particular care the child needs, we will cover it.

Mr. Collver: — So, what you are saying is that all periodontal work is covered under the dental plan. The only thing that isn't covered then, is orthodontistry. What about dental surgery? Is that covered?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — (Nods his head, Yes).

Mr. Collver: — All dental surgery is covered, I notice your officials nodding O.K. Mr. Chairman, the cost let us say and I think the minister will agree, will certainly be more for 1978-1979 than \$87 per student. So I think that the minister must agree that for 1978-1979 \$100 is pretty close. If you want me to stand here and work out the exact number of what the minister has been telling us, I would be happy to do so. Would a \$100 per student be reasonable or do you want to say \$95 — what number do you want?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I don't know how many times I have to tell the member, Mr. Chairman . . . I said the costs were \$87.07 all things considered. I have also said that that is going to be the area in which the costs are going to be in 1978-1979, and not as the member continues to try to allege, that it will be considerably lower. That is just not the fact.

Mr. Collver: — No, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. We are going to have to add it up, I guess. Maybe the minister could take down these numbers: \$7,195,940 divided by 86,000 students — how much is that, Mr. Minister?

An Hon. Member: — Work it out.

Mr. Collver: — I would be happy to, but I'm sure your figures are right there. Your officials are right there. Those were the numbers given to me, Mr. Minister of Labour. I said that is the number that is in the Estimates book and 86,000 was the number of students they expected to have enrolled this coming year.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Having done some arithmetic for the member for Nipawin, it should break down to \$83.67.

Mr. Collver: — Yes, that's about what the minister said all right, and that is the \$7.195,000 divided by 86,000. Now you are saying to us then, the total cost is going to be around \$87 to \$90 — \$90 for round numbers — or do you want to take \$87.07? That's the number you want to take?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If you want to calculate the depreciation at 5 per cent for the building, and if you want to calculate 15 per cent depreciation on the equipment, I am prepared to stand by those figures fairly closely.

Mr. Collver: — O.K. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will allude to the minister's comments about \$87. Would the minister tell us why, it is \$87 for the Saskatchewan Dental Plan and \$72 for the same service in Swift Current?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member uses some figures of \$72.50 or \$72.60; I am not sure that I can accept those figures. If he can show me where he gets those figures and show me them and work them out, then I would be prepared to answer the question. But I'm not prepared to answer the question using my statistics which can be backed up, against his statistics which he has not yet backed up — so, if he can back them up and show me how he gets them and where he gets them, if he can explain that all of the children are enrolled and all of the people who qualify, participate in the plan, and all of the people who qualified, participated in the plan, then we are prepared to talk about it.

Mr. Collver: — What does the minister say is the cost per student in the Swift Current Health Region where the service is provided by dentists?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I am not the minister of that plan, we don't have that information here, therefore.

Mr. Collver: — That having been said and taken then I gather the minister will be prepared to accept the statistics that have been provided to me by that plan that it was not administered by you.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — No, Mr. Chairman, knowing the member opposite I am not prepared to accept any statistics from him until he is able to back them up. He says he has statistics that were provided to him by the plan. I want to see those statistics. I want to see what they reflect rather than just see a round figure. I think that party over there has got a record in this House of showing that they cannot be trusted even in the statistics they provide in here.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, sir. I think that we have had a fair run on this and I am going to acknowledge another member of the Assembly here. I think the member for Rosetown-Elrose signified he wanted to speak.

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Chairman, I have worked with the plan since

its inception, since it came in. Two years ago one of the problems with the plan was the moving of the dental nurses and dental technicians who worked in pairs from place to place rather than assigning them to an individual school unit. I must say that the assignment now of the 'in pairs' to an individual school unit has worked very successfully and there are a number of reasons why it has worked successfully. One is because the same individuals coming back to the students throughout the year and another is being located in a central point for the climatic conditions working one point in the winter time and so on. I can list many reasons.

I want to ask the question now that they have been assigned and the plan has taken up that type of a program. I would hope that you would not go into the shuttle system again that you had in the first few years and I would just like to have your comments on that.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, I thank the member for his positive comments on the way it is operating. I can assure the member that that is not our intention to go back to a shuttle service. In the first two years as I am sure he will accept they were the developmental years. There weren't that many clinics established and so, therefore, some of these other provisions had to be made. We are not looking at going back to that kind of an approach because the present system, I think, is working very well.

Mr. Bailey: — A question I have, Mr. Minister, why has there been . . . at first you know we established very quickly in the first two years what we called a dental lab . . . and had some accusations brought to bear that we had a couple of the most expensive ones in the province. We have since been slated for two more and I have attempted over the last two years to in fact get them in place because sooner or later we have to do that. What has been the delay there (and I notice I am talking about my own jurisdiction), but has there been an overall delay in the adding more of the permanent dental labs in the program? What has been the delay in the last two years?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — My staff tells me they are not aware of a problem. You use the words 'dental lab'. Do you mean the dental clinic?

Mr. Bailey: — Yes.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The clinic, O.K. My staff tells me they don't recall any general difficulty in the establishing of these dental clinics. In some cases there may be from time to time (and I am sure experience will show) where there has been a shortage of space and that's taken some time to rectify, but other than that there is no general problem. If you have a particular problem in your case then we would be prepared to pursue it and see what the issue might be on that. But I don't know whether we can in a general way deal with it but we would be happy to follow it up.

Mr. Bailey: — O.K. Do you have a number as to the number of clinics, Mr. Minister, that are currently under the draft, or currently being planned? How many clinics will go in this year?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The estimate my staff gives me is that somewhere upwards of 40.

Mr. Bailey: — Well, I suggest that you change those estimates and make it 42. I'll provide you personally with the additional two numbers. Thank you.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to let the minister know that the statistics of

\$72 per child for the year 1976 which was comparable to his \$87 came from Dr. Jim Tynan who is the senior dentist in charge of that program in the Swift Current Health Region. So if the minister wants to find out any further information as to how those statistics were arrived at, I'm certain he can contact Mr. Tynan or Dr. Tynan and he would be happy to provide that information and perhaps you might also be prepared to provide information to your department on how he can run out there \$15 per child less than what the Minister of Health can run.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I will believe the reduced figure the member uses when I see it. I don't question the doctor's figures. I question the member's interpretation of them and I've done it and I'll do it again if the member's prepare to tell me what that figure includes in the line of services. I'm prepared to look at it. He's not prepared to do that, he obviously doesn't want to do it because he knows that he is being a little bit misleading in this House with the kind of allegation he is trying to make. That's not new. He's again shown the example.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Chairman, just before he gets on I want to relate another question in relation to these figures. First of all, I don't question the \$83 or the \$87. I'm sure that the minister can calculate the number of students and he can number the number of dollars that are allocated to the program, comes out to \$83 and he supplements it with the depreciation costs on the formula so I would presume that the \$87 is fairly correct. I would like to ask the minister, what percentage of the 86,000 children receive service each year?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — We anticipate a little over 90 per cent of them would have all of their treatment needs met.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Minister, let's not waffle waffle. I asked you what percentage of the 86,000 people included in the plan from 1967 to 1974 will receive service in the upcoming year. You must know how many patients of that age bracket, what percentage of the children were served last year. I'm not talking about their needs met, I'm asking you how many of them will receive service?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It is anticipated there will be 86,000 students enrolled. That's not all of the students who could be enrolled. That's a pretty high percentage nevertheless. Out of that 86,000 it is estimated from the experience we have had in the past that something short of 10 per cent, for various reasons, either the parents enroll them and then don't bring them or the child may be ill on the days of his appointments, they may not get the full treatment of the plan.

Mr. MacDonald: — Just let me pursue this a minute. Now, I'm sure that no government would turn around and operate a plan of this kind without having some specific statistics. There are 86,000 children enrolled, 10 per cent will receive no service whatsoever, is that — did I understand what the minister said?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — As I said a little earlier, about 10 per cent would not get all of their needs met. They will get some degree of treatment but not all of their needs met because as you very well know, there will be cases where a student has an appointment and he won't come at that particular time. That's what I am getting at.

Mr. MacDonald: — Can the minister tell me another thing? What percentage of those children only receive one evaluation or one examination?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I don't know whether we can even figure that out. That is not the type of question we have a precise statistic for because there will be some students who will only need one treatment. There are some who will need three or four. I cannot give you offhand precisely the number of students who will, we don't even know how many will, take only one treatment. Only experience will show that when the records are made and compiled. Then, I suppose, with a considerable amount of time that can be put together but we don't have it handy right here. I can pursue it later and see if we can give you, when my staff has had time to look at it, that kind of information. I can't be that precise right now.

Mr. MacDonald: — Well, I think the minister does have that information, that the Department of Health does have it. The point I am trying to make is that I think these type of statistics are false, not necessarily for the reason the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) says, but you are talking about the cost per student enrolled in the program. You are not talking about the cost of the patient or the patient served and they are two vastly different things. For example, you put a dentist in a town of 10,000 people and he serves 1,000 of them and charges each of them \$100. You say the costs are related to the 10,000 or to the 1,000? What are you doing in the dental program is assessing the cost according to the number of students enrolled. In other words, there are so many students of age from 1967 to 1974. We are putting \$7.1 million in, there are 86,000 students, you divide 86,000 into \$7.1 million and you come to \$83. I say that is balderdash. That's not an accurate statistic, it is not an honest statistic. The only way you can do it is the per patient served, the same as a doctor in a community. You don't turn around and say that the cost per person of the service is related to the total people in the community, you say the cost of the service is related to the patients that are served and you don't do that in this particular statistic. All I am saying is that the cost per patient of this dental program is far in excess of \$87, it could be maybe up to double the cost in the dental health program.

Mr. Romanow: — What would you do with it?

Mr. MacDonald: — Would the Attorney General be quiet or stand on his feet and make another speech? Every time he wants to defend something he does it from his seat. Stand up and defend it. We are talking about the statistics in the minister's assessment of the cost of the dental program and they are absolutely false. He is talking about the cost per student enrolled, not of the cost of the service provided. Any other doctor, any other dentist, talks about cost of the service to the patient that they provide, not the cost of the number of kids in the area or the number of kids in that age bracket in the province. I would like the minister to comment on that and I would say that in all probability the cost would be far in excess of \$87, it could be maybe up to double the cost in the dental health program.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — First of all, I will disagree with the member, Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the record. The plan as we have it provides care to children in Saskatchewan where they are and that's one of the major merits of the plan. It provides care to all children in Saskatchewan who wish to enroll. And we have, I might add, a very high enrolment of the children who could be enrolled in the plan. He wants to take the number of services. He wants to take the times that children had his tooth pulled. He got it pulled because he came too late because there were no other services available. There are other benefits in the plan. It is also a preventative plan which is showing in the number of students and children who have had to come back a second time being on the decline, coming back for a test and an inspection, true, but from the point of view of needed services the record is very good because of the preventative aspect of the plan. How do you put a dollar value on that? That's a service and that's one of the things that

one has to consider as was considered in New Zealand where the plan was implemented and the record shows that it had some considerable benefit down the age groupings as those students who began in the plan became older. Those are benefits that we are proud of and are prepared to justify.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Chairman, one more comment. What the minister is saying, is trying to stand up and once again give cliches. Every time the Minister of Health gets caught in a cost estimate in his department, he stands up and gives a cliché or says the political party is for deterrents or against health or for this. What we are trying to establish is what it is for the cost of service for the dental care program in Saskatchewan. The minister is saying that there are 10,000 children that receive no service whatsoever but we are charging them \$71 or \$87, the same as we are the children that are receiving service. I'm telling the minister simply that it is about time you started to cost out on a per service basis or a per patient basis, the same as any medical program does, the same as when you pay the doctor dues you pay the doctor on the per patient, you pay the doctor on the number of items of service that he provides, on the patients that he looks after. You don't charge him or he is not paid on someone like myself that never goes to him. Those statistics are false. You turn around and inflate them and say they cover 87,000 children because they happen to be enrolled or they could possibly have service. We are trying to say, then you take a dentist, he says I charge \$100 per patient, then you turn around and say our program is only \$87 for all the students that are enrolled. Now how can you compare a dentist on a per patient basis and your program on the number of students that are enrolled in it? That's socialist arithmetic the same as all the other arithmetic, in the Department of Health. If you want to make a comparison between the private dentists of this province and the dental program, then you do it on exactly the same basis taking the number of the per patients that the dentist serves and the average cost and the number of patients or the number of children that are served under your program at the average cost, then we will have a fair evaluation as to whether or not what the costs of this program are.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, if the Saskatchewan Dental Plan is a socialist plan I'm pretty proud of it. That may be what it is. If that's what the member wants to define it that's perfectly O.K. with me. The fact of the matter is it's a good plan. The fact of the matter is we now have children in Saskatchewan who have access to dental care, who have never had and had it not been for this government would not have today a dental plan for their needs. The member well knows it and the member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Conservative Party knows it as well. If that's the tag you want to put on it then I'm prepared to accept it because I think it's a good plan.

Let me make you a little bit of comparison. The member wanted a Saskatchewan Dental Plan compared to fee-for-service costs. Well I've give you some estimates, O.K. Saskatchewan Dental Plan — first of all I want to say this, it can't be accurately compared with a private dental practice for several reasons and you should listen to them. First of all, in private practice the cost of travel to obtain services is borne by the patient and in Saskatchewan in the dental plan that we have the major portion of travel cost are borne by the plan. Secondly, the dental plan is taking dental service into many smaller communities which I have said which could not support a private practice dentist. This way they wouldn't have a service.

Thirdly, certain costs borne by private practice dentists are not included in dental plan costs and cannot accurately identified. These things include such things as heat and light in school dental clinics and so on, and four, certain services provided by the

Saskatchewan Dental Plan did not have a fee item in private practice and the member knows that as well and he should consider it. Fifth, the College of Dental Surgeons fee schedule is a guide only and dentists may charge more if they wish. These are the reasons why you cannot make a straight comparison as the members over there would like.

They are really arguing for the fee-for-service approach. That's what they are wanting in the provision of a dental plan and that is why the Manitoba government, the new Conservative government in Manitoba, has served notice that it is going to wipe out the dental plan which was established there by the former NDP government, similar to the one in Saskatchewan — they have already served notice. But keeping all of these things in mind, I want to say that an attempt at comparison can be made by applying the College of Dental Surgeons' fee schedule to the list of services provided during the program year. If you take (and these are the statistics I have, because they haven't worked out — don't ask me to do it for 1978-79 because I don't have them worked out), but for 1976-77, the Saskatchewan Dental Plan average cost per child was \$53.52. You can add those other things we talked about a while ago and come up with \$83.52. You can add the renovation depreciation and equipment depreciation and you will get the \$87.07. The estimated cost for fee-for-service is \$94.91 — keeping these things in mind in case the member might be interested.

Mr. MacDonald: — Once again, if you are trying to say that the average cost of the service of a dentist is \$94, then I'm telling you that it is far cheaper than your dental service — your dental plan — far cheaper because you are charging \$87 for the number of pupils who are enrolled in the program, not for the number of children who receive service. You are turning around and talking about the dentist at \$94 per patient — that is awful cheap and awful reasonable, and don't suggest when you talk about the travelling (the travelling is included in your cost) and you know it as well as I do. All I'm saying, Mr. Minister, don't get up and say you are trying to get rid of the health program and the dental program or this program. What we are trying to do is estimates. We are trying to identify on behalf of the taxpayers, what it is costing for this service so that they can evaluate whether the service is good or bad, and that is what we are trying to do, is assess the cost. I'm saying that your figures are based on a totally different thing. You are saying that the estimated cost per patient for a dentist is \$94 and the cost is \$87 for the number of pupils enrolled, not those who see the program, and I say to you that the dentists are doing a very, very good job in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments in regard to the dental plan. I heard some comment regarding the Swift Current Health Region and their dental plan which left me no other opportunity but to get up and participate in this particular debate.

I found it rather interesting though at the start, that the Minister of Health was attempting to take credit for the dental plan which now exists in the province of Saskatchewan. Let me say from the beginning that I believe that the present dental plan is basically a good one with a few modifications. However, it was a Liberal government from 1967 to 1971 which first set up the machinery to enable the province to go into the dental program. The test project took place in the member for Estevan's constituency around Oxbow. It was at this point in time that the pilot project was set up. Experience was gained from that operation plus the experience that was gained from the operations in Australia and I understand New Zealand as well. The ground work to establish the present dental care program was undertaken by a Liberal government back in 1967 to 1971.

There is some argument here in the House today about costs between what it costs in the Swift Current Health Region for dental care and what it costs throughout the province. I will say, yes, it probably is a little bit cheaper in the Swift Current Health Region but the reason for that cost being less is because they are not providing the same level of service to the people in the southwest as they are providing to the rest of the people in Saskatchewan.

My children are enrolled in the Swift Current dental program and they are also enrolled in the provincial program. The children involved in the provincial program get their dental care at the schools. There is no extra driving around or tearing around. It costs more money to provide a dentist at each and every school throughout the province of Saskatchewan. The dental program in the Swift Current Health Region is set up in such a way that the children or the parents of the children have to drive a considerable distance to find a dentist who will qualify under the dental program set up by the Swift Current Health Region. Also, the dentists employed by the Swift Current Health Region are not the only ones that provide this service. If a patient, for example, wishes to go into Lethbridge, Alberta, or some other place outside of the health region and take advantage of the dental services there, they can do so and it is covered under the dental plan of the Swift Current Health Region. It is a reassessment I understand and I understand there is some deterrent fee as well, which applies to the dental care that is provided by the Swift Current Health Region. So, there is no doubt in my mind that the cost could be less in the Swift Current Health Region but not because they are doing as adequate a job as what they are in the rest of the province. I would say the sooner we can get the provincial dental program operating as the only program in the Swift Current Health Region, the better care the children of that area are going to have.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the member's very frank comments and what he said is the reason why I questioned the figures that the member for Nipawin was using. He used \$72 and some cents and never made any mention whatsoever about the level of services. I indicated that in my reply to him and said that I would not be prepared to make the comparison he wanted unless I knew the level of services that were being bought for that \$72 and until I had them, I wasn't prepared to argue about them. The point was well made. I appreciate what the member for Morse has just said, by being frank and honest about it. I also want to say that I am in no way going to deny that indeed the Oxbow project was begun. I think it was a good idea to get it started and it provided us with some very considerable and enlightening information about what we needed to do and what we needed to consider in the courageous implementation of a program province-wide — the only place where it exists in Canada at the present time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.N. Wipf (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The member for Morse, I was very surprised to hear him talking, Mr. Chairman. The statement he gave usually comes from that side of the House, and I was looking over at the minister to see if he was mouthing those words but the member for Morse was doing the talking and it sort of surprised me. It's the same though, identical philosophy — he thinks like you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Minister, you talked about some of the payments that are going to be made for work that is done by dentists — the referrals that you mentioned and emergency service. Would you give me a list of them? What type of referrals and what type of emergency service must be done in order to have it done outside of the Dental Plan?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The member wanted a list of some of the types of referrals that are made and the services that are therefore provided. I will give him a reference on page 27 of the annual report which will give you a complete list. I will give you some examples for the record: — initial oral examinations, specific oral examinations, occlusal x-rays, bite wing x-rays, panoramic x-rays, diagnostic models, topical fluoride and dental prophylaxis, oral hygiene instruction, phasure sealants, caries control, removal of decay. That is just a small list of a very extensive list the member can find on page 27 of the annual report.

Mr. Wipf: — You stated that the dental plan didn't cover any orthodontist work. That must be paid for by the parents themselves, I believe you said, if I understand you correctly. Are there any plans in the near future to bring orthodontist work for children 4 to 11 years old, or whatever the age group is, into the dental care plan?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — In the case of very severe problems, not those that are done for cosmetic purposes, but where there are severe problems, we are having some discussions with the federal government on whether together we might not be able to fund a project utilizing dental nurses under the strict supervision of an orthodontist to develop that kind of an approach. That's where we are right now and up till now we have not been totally or we have not been successful in those discussions, we are pursuing them.

Mr. Wipf: — Just a couple more questions. Mr. Minister, you said you have 86,000 children registered in this plan doing work on 77,000 of them. How many children are there in Saskatchewan between the ages of 4 and 11?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — In answer to the member's question out of that 86,000, that 86,000 is out of a total potential enrollment of about 120,000. Keep in mind that now pre-schoolers are included in some numbers. Their rate of enrollment will not be as great we anticipate as the children who are school children.

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — Just a couple of questions for the minister. What guidelines do you use when establishing a clinic with regard to the number of students in the school before you establish a clinic in that school?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If there is 80-100 students enrolled, then the department will start negotiating for a clinic. If it's less than that, then we will look at other alternatives such as portable units or moving the students, but it's 80-100.

Mr. Stodalka: — I'd like to suggest that sometimes you should consider the factor of distance as well as the number of students. Maybe you possibly do because I think the plan is working much better than it did in the first couple of years. One of the problems we still sometimes have is that of transporting students. If while a certain number might be sort of a way you can start deciding whether or not you are going to have a clinic, I think that the distances of transportation might be considered as well.

I was also wondering, what is the number of patients that you feel one of those dental nurses can handle in one year? What is the number of patients they can look after?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, I should have mentioned that. Distance is of consideration. I think you will find in your part of the province that probably has been a consideration that has been made because of the distances involved and the

population being widespread; but we'll get you the answer to the other question.

Yes, about 560 students per year for dental nurses in the year coming up, the one we are considering in these estimates.

Mr. Stodalka: — I understand, or I am informed, that there is a possibility that there will be a surplus in the number of graduates that are coming out of the school, the technical institute here in Regina. Is this a fact and if it is what possible opportunities are there for girls that graduate, or boys that graduate, from this particular program?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — That's the point the member makes, is the possible numbers of graduates as compared to the possible job opportunities and that might be greater. That's something that we are considering right now. You may remember that several weeks ago (maybe I had better say several months ago) I agreed to the request by the private dentists in the province who have been asking since the plan was implemented whether the dental nurses could be utilized by the private practitioners? Now the government has given approval to that request and so hopefully the negotiations which are now taking place will provide some of those opportunities. Other than that the normal turnover of nurses will be the kind of thing and the expansion of the program will be the kind of thing that will determine the needs of those who are graduating.

Mr. Stodalka: — Just one final question. If I remember correctly, I believe that you have extended the benefits this coming year or this coming September to include all 4 to 14 year olds, is that the rate? If that is or is not the case would you please indicate what further extensions that are planned? I noticed in reading your New Deal for New People you were talking of going to 18 years of age. Is that still the plan?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The program is being expanded this year to include the age groups 4 to 11. We have a government commitment to expand the program to the age of 18 and we are proceeding in that direction annually, depending on the resources that are available and the personnel that are available and so on. The commitment is there and I can assure the member that I am quite determined (and the government is) to carry it out.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — I raised the matter of an agreement or a contract that had been signed between either the government or the program and the dental nurses. It was kind of an indenture agreement whereby they undertook not to work for any other employers once they had gone through the training program and that was tabled in the House approximately two years ago. Are you now saying (and at that time there was a surplus) are you now saying that you are changing your policy as to the commitment that dental nurses must make when they enter the program or complete the program?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first let me say this, the dental nurses knew when they enrolled in their courses that they would not be able to be employed while the program was being developed and we made that very clear as the government. My colleague who is now the Minister of Finance made that quite clear. They would not be employed in private dentists' offices. What I am telling the House is that now that the program has been stabilized and has developed to a point where the supply of dental nurses that the program requires is adequate we have announced that we are prepared to negotiate with the dentists and we have started those negotiations to permit them to employ the dental nurses in their offices, so to that extent, yes indeed, there is a change in policy.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — When you established the program and developed a training program for the dental nurses, are you saying then that you did not take into account the stabilization that you set up a physical plant for one aspect of the training that was going to put out so many dental nurses every year or every two years and that that was to be ongoing and that you developed the plant to do that without taking into account that at some point there would be a stabilizing or a level of stabilization in the need for the number of dental nurses?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Before we had an experience to indicate what the attrition rate would be which is something one could not predict with any degree of accuracy, we wanted to assure that the amount of dental nurses that were required by the plan were available. That's why the former policy was there. We indicated and I have that in my files because I have carefully looked at the situation, to the dental profession that until we were able to determine that and until we were able to get the program stabilized and on stream adequately that we would not be able to permit the hiring of dental nurses in private offices. The dental profession has made that request in the past and we are now in the position, we find, where we can permit that to happen.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Of course what you are saying is that when you developed the program you developed a training program to produce the maximum number of dental nurses to service the program at its peak and to continue on that basis and the maximum number to get the program started up and you geared up at the outset for a program to produce the maximum number although in the future you may perhaps not need it. Now, are you going to request the private practitioners to contribute now to pay the cost of this training program? Is that going to be part of your agreement?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, we don't ask the doctors to pay for the training of the registered nurses or the nursing assistants. To no greater extent will we be asking the dentists to pay for the training of the dental nurses. It will be treated in the same way as any other medical profession.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Well then, there is also a change, that the original training schedule or training structure that you established is now going to be utilized not just for the dental program but to supply dental nurses to the profession, to the private practitioners and at no cost to them.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — If the private practitioners want to hire the dental nurses that's perfectly okay; they can do that.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — What would be the saving to the government cutting back in the training program to merely graduate the number needed actually by the dental program?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — We don't have that kind of figures here. The member might be interested in knowing that the training of dental nurses is under the Department of Continuing Education and I am sure that they can provide that pretty accurately. We are unable to provide that.

Mr. Collver: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he realizes the cost per person enrolled in the Saskatchewan medicare program, in other words the cost per person enrolled of medicare to the people of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I fail to see what that has to do with the estimates

under this subvote.

Mr. Collver: — Well, I am sorry that the minister fails to see because the minister has been referring in the past to cost per pupil enrolled in the dental program and what I wanted to do was to draw to his attention comparative statistics. For example, the member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) talked about the Swift Current Health Region and the benefits of the Saskatchewan program which, unfortunately, does not have dentists examining the children whereas in the Swift Current Health Region the program does have dentists, fully qualified dentists examining the children, so I suggest that on balance there may be some pluses to the provincial plan in terms of convenience but perhaps in terms of the productivity of the practitioner, perhaps in terms of the expertise of the practitioner, perhaps the children in the Swift Current Health Region are in fact getting a bigger bang for their buck as the Attorney General has asked me to state. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Minister, that the cost of medicare for the coming year is anticipated at \$82,553,410. That is the estimate under Item 24 that the Department of Health has requested in this budget.

There are approximately 930,000 people in the province of Saskatchewan, well 950,000 not quite now, for the benefit of the Attorney General, but I'll take 950,000 as a good example. That's a terrific number and the Attorney General will find that if he divides 950,000 people, which is the number of people enrolled in medicare in Saskatchewan, he will find that number comes out to almost \$87 per person enrolled and that includes all of the costs of medicare, all of the cost of medicare are provided to the people of Saskatchewan for \$87 a head. That is, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the ones who can't hear, that includes all the cost of the doctors and the specialists for the old people and the young people, middle aged people and the little people and the sick and the weary and the halt and the lame.

And now, Mr. Chairman, the minister tries to tell us that he is doing a great job in providing dental care for the children from 4 to 11 by less qualified people than dentists for \$87 a head per person enrolled (those are his figures) and furthermore, Mr. Chairman, he is telling us that over and above that, the people of Saskatchewan have to pay for orthodontists, for the dentists who do all of the work for those people between the ages of 0 and 4 and all of those people from 11 to retirement, from 11 until they are old. Well, the Attorney General says, so what. I say to the Attorney General that if he adds together all the costs of this dental program the way it is designed now with the fact that what the Attorney General fails to recognize is that less qualified people than dentists are providing the service all over the province to all of these young people, there is something wrong — there is something wrong with this program. If the Attorney General says he doesn't want the biggest bang for the buck; he says that it's okay if we go out of the province of Saskatchewan and we provide for the people a denticare program which does not work, that's too expensive for what you get. Then he says, well if you say the people can't get into hospitals, that they are waiting on long waiting lists; if you say it is costing the people too much money for their 15 year old and their 14 year old and their 13 year old going to the dentist because we as a province can't afford to include them in the plan, there is something wrong, Mr. Attorney General.

Mr. Romanow: — What would you do about it?

Mr. Collver: — Well, Mr. Attorney General has asked what we would do about it. All right, first of all there is a better kind of program. The better kind of program to the one that is here is one that the dentists themselves run, Mr. Attorney General, as has been

done in many jurisdictions throughout North America, through the school system, through the school system that they can run and they do so on a voluntary basis in most instances. They provide their services, Mr. Attorney General, throughout the provinces or throughout the areas for nothing, for nothing on a voluntary basis.

Mr. Romanow: — For nothing?

Mr. Colver: — Yes sir, for nothing. Mr. Chairman, also the dental profession wants to see and have offered to the Government of Saskatchewan the opportunity to have a full dental service for the young people of the province of Saskatchewan through the schools, through the schools, yes sir, for nothing on a voluntary basis. They have offered this, yes they have. The Minister of Health laughs, the Minister of Health laughs and says, my goodness isn't this crazy. Well, I say to the Minister of Labour, who can't believe that people are prepared to give of their time and effort to have a good program in the province of Saskatchewan, admittedly, the dentists would want their costs covered; they would want any costs of their assistants covered, and they would want to be able to use the school system. But they have offered to the minister and to the government of the province of Saskatchewan, a program that would have provided a similar kind of service to this, to all of the children of Saskatchewan, supervised by the dental profession, at a much, much . . . 'look, Ralph, for nothing' . . . the Attorney General says. What I said is that they're prepared to volunteer much of their time and effort, for nothing is ridiculous. But a far, far lesser cost than \$7,195,000 to get this service plus the cost of the dentists throughout Saskatchewan providing for other people, plus the cost of orthodontics and the dental profession has offered it, has offered to run it for you. Well, Mr. Minister, he says it's not true, that the dental profession in Saskatchewan has offered to operate a program, similar to this program, throughout the province, for the use of the school system. Does he deny tonight that the dental profession has offered to operate such a program for the minister?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The member opposite, every day, every day, never cease to amaze me even more. He says things like the dental profession would do the service, therefore, he must also mean at the same kind of level as the dental plan is providing for the same number of Saskatchewan school children and pre-school children for nothing. That's what he said. I say, that's a bunch of nonsense, Mr. Chairman, and he knows it. Whatever he is saying, I don't know whether he is a little tired at this time of night or whether he's got some other problem, but that is a bunch of nonsense and he knows it. He uses some comparisons about medicare and he tries to show how it would cost less. Well, anybody with any kind of knowledge of administration or business or mathematics will know that there are some benefits of scale. He will know that in the dental plan, services are provided for 86,000. Under medicare, services are provided to about 1,000,000 Saskatchewan people. And he fails in his little analysis to talk about whether all of those almost 1,000,000 Saskatchewan people will, in each and any particular year, take advantage of the medicare program, same kinds of arguments as you can use in support of the dental plan. He chooses not to mention any of those things. He does not consider the transportation costs under the medicare program that is covered under the dental program; he just ignores that.

Mr. Chairman, he has again displayed one of the other planks of the Conservative Party platform. He has displayed the fact that they will do away with the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan. Some of his colleagues over there, have that as well. They said they will do the Manitoba approach . . . \$50 and 20 per cent of the rest. He has displayed in this House, as now is on record, as "out to get the

community clinics". He did that the other day and that's a plank in the Conservative platform — out to get the community clinics. He has displayed, as has his colleagues, and if you compare other provinces with their Conservative governments, that we will once again have a health tax or health premium in Saskatchewan . . . deterrent fees. He mentioned deterrent fees two or three times here, in the process of this discussion. He now has displayed that the Tories, and I think even the Liberals in this case, the member for Saskatoon Eastview isn't here, but he's mentioned it before, one of the first things they would ever do is do away with the dental plan and go back to the volunteer basis, on some illusion that it would be provided free. Once again I have to see that proposal of providing it free. Let me tell you what that would mean. There wouldn't be 86,000 children who would be getting dental care. There wouldn't be 86,000 children who would be getting needed treatment as well as needed preventative dental care. Before the dental plan was in place quite substantially less than 30 per cent of Saskatchewan children received dental care. That's what the Conservatives want to go back to when they say they are going to do away with the dental plan and go back to the private dentist approach because that's what they would do. And the example is pretty clear of that happening in Manitoba. The member tries to give the wrong information about saying things like the children don't get treated by a dentist. That, too, Mr. Chairman, is wrong. The initial analysis and the initial test is done by a dentist, the work that is done by the dental nurse is done under the supervision of a dentist and if the members opposite would take some time and show some interest in the kinds of things that are happening in Saskatchewan and go to one of these clinics, go to North Battleford, Prince Albert, to go Nipawin, for example. The member could go there and visit some of his constituents and he will find that all of this is in the plan. So don't throw those kinds of mixed up statistics and try to prove a point that you know is not provable. The fact of the matter is that you are proposing that the Saskatchewan plan go back to the voluntary approach. You are proposing to cut off most of those 86,000 children from accessibility to a dentist because there aren't enough dentists in rural Saskatchewan to provide that kind of service and you know it. So essentially that's what you are saying and I am saying to you that this New Democratic Party government is not prepared to go that approach. We have implemented a good program which began to do its pilot project and it is recognized in the report out of Oxbow. It's a good program. Saskatchewan people know it is a good program. They accept it and I challenge you to go out on the hustings when the time comes and fight against it, because I will tell you one thing, you go out there and fight against the Saskatchewan Dental Plan and you go out there and fight against the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan and you go out there and try to defend your Conservative Party's position, including your federal leader on deterrent fees and health premiums, and there aren't even going to be 11 of you on that side of the House, you will be lucky if there are any of you there at all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Collver: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I gather the minister has just proven the point that I made because he refused to answer the question that was asked of him as to whether or not the dental profession in the province of Saskatchewan has offered and has offered to administer a program for nothing. Quite frankly, the minister has refused to answer that question. He knows full well that that is true, that they have agreed or they have offered to offer such a plan, such a program and to supervise such a program so that the administrative costs that the government has built into its plan would not be there and that in fact it could be there for more money to extend the benefits of the program to have a better dental program. You see, Mr. Chairman, what's happening here is that the government members are trying to suggest that only they can design good health care programs. Only they can administer good health care programs.

You can't possibly, if you didn't have the initials NDP after your name, you couldn't possibly dream up a program that would be of benefit to the people. You couldn't possibly, as the member is trying to suggest, you couldn't possibly save some money on the dental program so you could extend the benefits and have more people who are able to take advantage of the dental care program. You wouldn't possibly devise a new Pharmacare program that is along the Manitoba model, but the minister knows full well we have never said that it was a \$50 deductible, ever, nor have we ever said we would have the 80 per cent benefit, ever. We said that the deductible type program in Manitoba was better for the patients, better for the doctors, better for the pharmacists and better for the Government of Manitoba because it costs less to administer.

The only benefit to be derived in the province of Saskatchewan, with the Government of Saskatchewan's Pharmacare program is one and one only . . . and that is that the Minister of Health or his deputy may push a button any time he wants and find out how much drugs each single citizen of Saskatchewan is taking at any one time. That's the benefit to the Government of Saskatchewan. We don't think that's a benefit. A deductible program doesn't allow you that option because the patient is responsible and the patient knows and the doctor knows what drugs they are taking, but the government does not. It only knows the ones they are paying for over and above the deductible limit and that deductible limit might be \$30 or it might be \$40. It might be \$25 for a family for a year. But it is a deductible type program as opposed to the first dollar coverage and the formulary list that the government here is proposing.

What the minister is suggesting today, Mr. Chairman, is that he is not prepared to answer the question when someone tries to help them to make a plan better, when someone tries to suggest that there is a profession in the province that has offered to assist the government in providing a better service. What the minister refuses to accept and has continuously opted for is to refuse to accept any suggestions that any of the programs brought forward by the NDP government at any time are capable of being criticized by anyone. The moment, Mr. Chairman, that anyone in this Assembly suggests that maybe the plan might be run a little better, that maybe there are other things that you could be doing that would help you to provide better service to the people, the minister opts for a political dialogue about how you're going to destroy the health care system. Instead of taking a little friendly advice as it's intended and for what it's worth, ah yes, instead of taking . . . that's right, instead of taking a little friendly advice, instead of saying look, maybe we aren't perfect, maybe the programs aren't absolutely letter perfect, maybe this dental care program that we've got here could be better and maybe we should examine the possibility of looking at the dental profession's offer to administer the program for us. Maybe we should look at that, because maybe they could administer a program through the schools with better service, more qualified service for less money, and therefore, we could extend the benefits. But would the NDP look at that? Oh, no. Why not, Mr. Chairman? Why wouldn't they take such a suggestion? Why wouldn't they look at the program and say, Mr. Chairman, why does it cost us \$87 per head for 86,000 students for a dental care program and it only costs us \$87 per head for all of medicare. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because the medicare program primarily is on a fee-for-service basis. And maybe the reason that it only costs us \$87 per enrolment for all of medicare is because there is the fee-for-service basis involved in medicare and maybe we should look at a dental care program that is costed out on the basis of fee for service. You couldn't possibly have fee-for-service dental care plan for the young people of Saskatchewan. But if it was costed out on the basis and shown to the people in terms of the financial information on that basis maybe we could take advantage of some of these suggestions that are being made that can make the program better. Mr. Chairman, there is no point in continuing on in suggesting that the

dental care program be made better because it makes no difference to the members opposite and, especially to the Minister of Education, what anybody suggests pertaining to any betterment of the plan.

Mr. Smishek: — I wonder if the member would permit a question before he takes his seat. Certainly, if he agrees to it, can I ask him a question? . . . (interjection) . . . that's right, certainly it's a . . . Mr. Chairman, the hon. member . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. The member made a question which may be answered by anyone in the House.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, during the last few minutes you heard the hon. member for Nipawin make a number of allegations that the dental profession has offered to provide a voluntary free dental program for the children of Saskatchewan, administered for nothing and delivered for nothing. Mr. Chairman, when the dental program in Saskatchewan became introduced when I was . . . now the hon. member is now backing off his position. He's now backing off, Mr. Chairman. I think it's only fair that we ask the member to produce the evidence when the offer was made, to whom was it made, and in what form it was made because I can assure the members of this House that when I was Minister of Health and when the dental program was introduced there was no offer made or any voluntary free dental program for children to be either administered or delivered. Never at any time was that proposal made and we still don't have that proposal. Mr. Chairman, I think it's only fair that the hon. member without making these wild, misleading, totally miscalculated allegations that he produce the proof. Fine. He shakes his head. I can tell the hon. member when the dental program was being introduced there were at least three dentists on the public committee that was established and never at that time was any such proposal made. I can tell the hon. member that Dr. Geisthardt who was then the president of the dental association was on the committee. He did submit a dissenting report. I think there are two items which he dissented on, one of which was accepted. If the dental profession has all of a sudden become that generous, Mr. Chairman, why didn't they offer that before, why don't they offer it to the government now? As the hon. member may or may not be aware, we do employ on a part-time basis, a lot of dentists who are in private practice. I am not aware that they have offered to deliver any service without any cost to the children of Saskatchewan. Now maybe they offered that the hon. member's children, maybe they have offered it to his children but they certainly haven't offered it to the thousands of children in the province of Saskatchewan. I think it is only fair, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member produce the evidence so that we can test whether he is now talking in the wind or whether he has any evidence to submit. Hopefully he will submit it in writing that we will be able to check.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Chairman, we have seen one of the strangest sights tonight. The Minister of Finance has laid allegations against two members of this House in the past, supposedly unfounded, says he has proof outside the House. When he is challenged to give the evidence, to tell the truth, to put up or shut up, he runs and hides and says oh, I hope this matter is forgotten. I really want everybody to forget about my scurrilous statements made outside the House. Now here is the same minister standing up trying to say that someone has made unfounded allegations and that he wants proof. You have no right to ask anybody for the proof of anything with your actions. You are gutless. When it comes to making allegations in the House, you did it on the

bribery, you did it against the two members running federally and you don't have the courage to stand up. What a hypocrite, I say to the minister. You now want to accuse someone else of making statements and yet you are afraid yourself. I say that there are going to be two rules. One set of rules is going to apply to you as applies to anybody else in the House and secondly, if we can't get the answers from your minister you are sure not going to get answers from us until the next election. The people will get the answers and I'll tell you they'll like the answers that we give a lot better than the ones that you refuse to give.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have answered every question that the members opposite have asked. The record will show that. But I want to say something else. We have now seen, maybe for the first time and maybe not, an example of guerrilla warfare in the legislature of Saskatchewan. You know guerrilla warfare is when they sneak out of the bushes and they take a shot at you, or they throw a bomb and they take off and they hide. Well that's been the practice of the Conservative caucus over there. The Leader of the Tory Party came out and he took a couple of pot shots. He took a pot shot in relation to the drug plan and the Swift Current plan. Without any qualification he indiscriminately threw a bomb hoping that it would explode and maybe make some marks some place. He shakes his head in agreement. Then he indiscriminately threw another bomb and when the Minister of Finance challenges him to pony up and show that he's got some evidence, he doesn't even get up. He has to get the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) to get up in his defence.

That's not the first time that has happened either. The members will recall a little incident where the Leader of the Conservative Party was very, very close — I'm not a lawyer — but I would say that he was very close to leaving the impression that he was trying to interfere with the Moore judicial inquiry into corrections. He took another one of those throw the bomb and hope that you make some marks someplace, maybe in the headline, and it was the same member over there who had to come to his defence then as he did again tonight. Now, clearly that is the tactics of the Tories over there; they are not interested in the facts. They are not interested in listening to the information I give them when they ask a question, they just want to ramble along and make some of these indiscriminate points without anything to substantiate them. I want to join with the Minister of Finance and I want to ask the Leader of the Conservative Party, will he, for the first time after he or one of his colleagues has made an allegation, get up in this House and give paper providing the evidence of that request.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Let the Minister of Finance do that.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I think I still have the floor . . . (interjection) . . . Yes, we have . . . Yes, yes, when I am ready. Mr. Chairman, I have one or two little things I want to say yet before the buggies (sic) — well I hope you will get up and give us the evidence, not his rhetoric, the evidence. Because his rhetoric doesn't mean very much unless it is substantiated. Now, the member says that the Conservative Party would revert back to a voluntary system for dental care. You know, I wonder whether the member opposite has ever bothered to or tried to get a dentist appointment lately? And I wonder if he's ever wondered how long it takes to get a dentist appointment in Saskatchewan because of the great demand on the dentist time. And he should consider that when the Conservative Party are going to implement that kind of a program on the children of Saskatchewan. Yet they are going to do away with ours at the present time. That's what they are proposing that they would do. Let me give you some examples about the way our plan works as compared to other provinces. Interesting, Mr. Chairman, that the member uses this as an excuse to leave the House

so that he doesn't have to answer the request by the minister. I can answer myself. You see, the member for Qu'Appelle, Mr. Chairman, left his seat and because he has left his seat, the Leader of the Conservative Party found he had nobody to defend him so he had to leave the House. Now that the member for Qu'Appelle is back, he should invite his leader back so that he knows he's got some defence. But let me give you some examples of what's happening in other provinces with dental plans and what's happening in Saskatchewan. You know, Mr. Chairman, in Newfoundland they have a plan up to 11 years old for children. It is a fee-for-service plan, it is a Conservative plan, it is provided by the practitioners. Mr. Chairman, 36.4 per cent of the potential children are covered by the plan, or get services . . . not for nothing, fee-for-service. That's right. In Nova Scotia, all children born after January 1, 1967 through private practitioners, on a fee-for-service have a plan, 28.8 per cent of those children get any services from the plan. In Saskatchewan, 83.4 per cent of the children are getting some service. In Manitoba, before the present Conservative government began to do away with progressive kinds of programs, it had 82 per cent of the children. And I can vouch, Mr. Chairman, that the record will show that that's soon going to drop down to 28 or 30 or 31 per cent like it is in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia and Quebec.

That's one of the justifications of the Saskatchewan plan. Let me just give you one more example. In 1976, Mr. Chairman, a study was conducted to evaluate the quality of the care that was provided by the Saskatchewan dental nurse. And in February of that year there were three dentists from out of the province. Dentists, one specialist in children's dentistry and two specialists in restorative dentistry that made a survey of 410 children from kindergarten to grade two. Those people in their study said that the quality assessment of stainless steel crowns show that the Saskatchewan dental nurses and dentists performed to the same standard as private practitioners. There is no question of quality, as the Leader of the Conservative Party tries to insinuate. The Saskatchewan dental nurse is providing, that study said, basic restorative treatment at a high level of coverage and quality.

I don't know what the member is trying to do, but it is clear that one of the things that he is trying to do is discredit a good program. He is trying to discredit a good program and, once again, has started a policy of the Conservative Party which I am glad to see that the public of Saskatchewan, through the debate in these estimates is beginning to find out what it is.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, if we can get those kinds of results from these debates on these estimates I am prepared to stay here for two weeks. It seems that the longer we stay the more news is there that the people will get to learn about where they stand. We know where the Liberals stand. They have been around. They have been in government. They have done all these things, but we are now finding out where they stand and I think that is good.

Mr. Larter: — Mr. Chairman, how can the minister stand up there and back a Finance minister who hasn't got the guts to back up statements that he makes in the House about other people and he is going to back him up. I can't understand this. I think you are backing the wrong horse. This is unbelievable. The Finance minister makes statements that are completely unfounded and the Minister of Health is going to back him up. I think he is backing the wrong horse and I think the minister had better take a second look at whom he is backing over here.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note what has really happened in the last few minutes. You will notice that the Leader of the Conservative Party made a number of allegations that the dental profession, they volunteer to deliver a dental plan without any cost to the children of Saskatchewan, for nothing — they administer the plan for nothing. Reportedly this was offered to us. When I asked him to produce the evidence, Mr. Speaker, what happened? After the fabrication of this tissue of myths that he has tried to create. I asked him the question to produce the evidence; the hon. Leader of the Conservative Party ran — he ran away — he ducked the House because he has no evidence.

I think it is important that this House take note of this. He is always able to make speeches; he is always able to make allegations but when it comes down to producing the facts you know, he runs.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the media will take note of this myth that he was trying to degrade for the last two hours on this program, attacking a program that has certainly stood out as a prime example of the way to deliver a dental program to the rural communities.

One of the things that the Conservatives have to learn is that in the province of Saskatchewan, when it comes down to a supply of dentistry, in the last number of years we have regrettably, not been able to increase the number of dentists in the province very significantly. I am not sure how many dentists we have right now but we guess would be not more than about 225 dentists in the province of Saskatchewan. That has been the number that we have lived with for the last 30 years. The other regrettable thing is that the dentists in Saskatchewan are primarily located in the larger urban communities and when it comes down to delivering dental programs to rural Saskatchewan and we examined when we were studying the dental care ideas and concepts of how we can deliver a program to the largest number of children in Saskatchewan, and the only way (incidentally it was the Dean of the college of Dentistry who chaired this committee) he and a number of other dentists, as well as other people interested in dental care for children in Saskatchewan, came up with this concept. It has been a good concept. It is a concept which has also been copied by Manitoba and I know that Quebec people have been here. I know that the Government of Canada has a Health and Welfare department which is interested in what we are doing. It is an outstanding program, Mr. Chairman, and it is regrettable that the Conservatives are knocking the program, knocking the dental nurses as well as knocking the dentists who are co-operating and acknowledging that this is an ideal plan and a good plan for the children of Saskatchewan.

Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Chairman, while we are making allegations against members of this Assembly and in the interest that there be some degree of consistency in the approach of members, does the Minister of Finance have evidence that two members of this House have abused their franking privileges as they are seeking federal nomination or federal election?

Mr. Chairman: — Order! Order, please. I have to call that statement out of order please.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Then I direct the question to the Minister of Health. Do you not find it somewhat of an interesting fact that you are spending, practically on a per capita basis, exactly the same amount of money for a dental program for a certain relatively narrow segment of the total population as you are for the total medicare package for

the province of Saskatchewan for all citizens?

Hon. R.J. Romanow (Attorney General): — I would like to rise and make a few comments on this aspect of the debate. Mr. Chairman, the comments that I would like to make relate to the question of obviously the subvote and the dental plan and the fact that the Progressive Conservative Party has adopted that position tonight that if they were elected as the government of the province of Saskatchewan they would provide a bigger bang for the buck, (using the Leader of the PC's expression) in the dental plan which did bang, is the reversion of a dental plan back to a private dental program. The Leader of the PC Party says that the costs under this dental plan are too high. The Leader of the PC Party says, "Something is drastically wrong" (those were his words), with this dental plan. The PC Party leader went on to a great and detailed length of the examination of costs and when I asked him and the Minister of Health asked him what the PCs would do, he told this House that he would revert back to a voluntary private practitioners program. That is the position of the PC Party in the province of Saskatchewan — make no mistake about that! The member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake confirms that. I don't know what the member for Swift Current is holding in his hand but anybody who was in this House this evening specifically and clearly heard the Leader of the PC Party say what I said. Everybody has.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just consider the ramifications of that statement. Prior to 1971 there was no dental plan in the province of Saskatchewan but the experiment project down in Oxbow, the member for Morse says. The PCs of Saskatchewan, if they were to be elected the government, would go back to those good old days. They would abolish this plan because, according to them, it costs too much, something is wrong — they would go back to a private practitioners voluntary, for nothing plan. That's the bigger bang for the buck! Mr. Chairman, these estimates have revealed the position of the PC Party and how big the bang is going to be if they ever should be elected the government. Now they are going to do away with the dental plan; they are going to look at some question of hospitalization at a per diem basis; they are going to whittle away on the community clinics. We had that on the subvote the other day when the Leader of the Conservative Party got up again and said there was something wrong with the way the clinics were being funded, too much money, \$200,000 is too much money. He said he was going to do away with the clinic concept of programming, at least cut them down, and now on this subvote, Mr. Chairman, the position of the PC Party is that they are going to give the people of Saskatchewan a very big bang. Well, I say that is the kind of an unwelcome bang and a kind of a noise and a kind of a destruction of a plan that the people of Saskatchewan don't want and won't accept.

There is another very important aspect of this, Mr. Chairman. Not only did the Leader of the PC Party say that he was going to go back to the private dental plan scheme but he also says that the dental society has indicated to the government that they are prepared to offer a dental program voluntarily, for nothing, and he knows that. That is what he said, Mr. Chairman. Now, the Minister of Health has said that he knows of no such statement. The former minister of Health has said that he knows of no such statement. Yet the Leader of the PC Party says that he knows of such a statement that apparently was made. The members of this House are entitled to ask the Leader of the PC Party who made that offer, when was it made, to whom was it made, what were the financial implications of such an offer? What consultation has there been?

Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to something more as legislators, whether we are in government or not. We are entitled to something more than just simply a statement, a statement on a very major plan, a statement and then a departure and a refusal by the

PC leader to pony up the evidence, a refusal by the member for Qu'Appelle or any of the other members of the PC caucus to tender that evidence in his absence. Mr. Chairman, either this offer was made or wasn't made. Frankly, I think we all know the answer here. The answer is that no such offer was made, as the ministers have indicated. The answer is that the PC leader is talking through his hat in trying to sell his PC policy on the dental plan when he says that he is going to revert back to the voluntary fee-for-service operation. I am going to ask all of the people connected with the dental plan who have had some in the field experience with that, some of those just to contemplate the consequences of that kind of approach, Mr. Chairman, to contemplate for a moment turning the clock back — how many years? Is it five or six years? Turning the clock back to the provision of a dental plan on that kind of a basis for our children — that's what the PCs want to do. Mr. Chairman, that may be PC efficiency but it sure isn't what the people of the province of Saskatchewan want. And the member for Qu'Appelle, on this vote, throws political barbs at the Minister of Finance at the question period; you will have your time tomorrow and the days after. You can do anything you want in terms of these two little debating points that the member for Estevan tried to make to the Minister of Health. You will have that chance tomorrow and otherwise, but you fellows, you fellows don't realize what you have just said, or maybe you do realize what you said in the province of Saskatchewan on the dental plan operation. You have just told the people of this province that if you are elected you're going to lower that big bang. That's exactly what you've said and I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, as I close, sometimes you get that feeling almost of cocky arrogance in the PC Party in Saskatchewan, that there is a determination that they will govern in 1979 no matter what happens. That's the kind of thing you had, at least you had six months ago before you had these little kinks and cracks and difficulties creeping into the PC machine and we know they exist there. We know they exist there. I want to tell Mr. Chairman and the members of this House and you can tell it by looking at these boys tonight that that kind of an arrogance has gone down the road absolutely with the kinds of policy positions that are unveiled during these Health estimates.

I cannot believe my ears when I hear the Leader of the PC Party and a premier aspirant telling the people of Saskatchewan that he is going to dismantle the dental plan. I can't believe my ears.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose I should apply for the Hearing Aid program, but I know what you are telling me. You are telling it loudly and clearly that that's a position and I know that it won't probably get any coverage tomorrow. It doesn't deserve it, doesn't deserve it, no, no it doesn't deserve. There will be some other aspects in the press which will get the headlines in the operation. That's fine, but I tell the member for Qu'Appelle, the soon to be leader from Qu'Appelle if I can put it that way. I made a mistake. I tell the member for Qu'Appelle the party is in a kind of situation that is going to be told throughout the province of Saskatchewan. That's the kind of situation which results, member for Swift Current for a number of people who will want to come out for the New Democratic Party and to defend the programs which are under serious political attack by the PCs. Yes, like bad Beulah, yes, like bad Beulah.

And I tell you, Mr. Chairman, like bad Beulah and Spencer Woof, Mr. Chairman, and others that will be announcing. I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the House that I just simply couldn't believe what I heard tonight when I heard the Leader of the PC Party enunciate this dental plan. I'll tell you, you are going to have a battle on your hands before you guys do away with the dental plan here in the province of Saskatchewan, make no mistake about that.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, we heard the Attorney General . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order!

Mr. Wipf: — Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General has come on with his bale load, his party speech again. It happens every time. It is like a mother killdeer when somebody gets too close to her brood she goes limping off and tries to get you away from the other side. I don't believe that you have heard anybody on this side of the House say they are going to get rid of anything in hospitalization plans. What you are standing up and doing is defending the statements of your own members on that side of the House and the member for Yorkton who made it loud and clear that you wanted to get rid of hospitalization. I said the same thing as you just said. It will be a long, long fight before you try and get rid of hospitalization as long as there is a Conservative in this House. I am a member of the community clinic here.

The Minister of Finance stood up and made himself quite a speech also. We have had some questions out on the floor that haven't been asked, some allegations that came across from that side to this side about the use of franking privileges and you say that when we make a statement we must answer the questions to you and Mr. Chairman. I'd like to get back to some questions on the dental care plan here. Mr. Minister, since the inception of this plan could you tell us or tell me the cost per student, from the first year. What would the average cost per student in the first year of the plan and up to where it is today?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — About two hours ago in 15 minutes I gave those figures and in 1974-75 it was \$158.29; in 1975-76 it was \$107.86; in 1976-77 it was \$83.52. Figures haven't changed since the last two and a half hours ago and I'm surprised that the member opposite would use such a weak effort to try to steer the debate away from what he knows has discredited the Conservative party even further in this House and in Saskatchewan. I think, maybe, he should have followed the instructions of the member for Qu'Appelle who told him to be quiet and sit down when he was trying to get up and

speak. I thought, Mr. Chairman, there was only one leader of that party who would do that and I thought that's why there was so much dissension in that party. But, obviously, it seems that even if they dump the one leader, some of the potentials over there would use the same approach. So it would be like a chain reaction, you see. I think maybe they might have done a better job, nevertheless, if the member for Lumsden Qu'Appelle had got up and made his comments.

I want to just deal with one other point that the member for Nipawin raised. He made a very serious allegation in this House before he skipped out. Mr. Chairman, the member for Nipawin made reference to the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan and he said that the only purpose of that plan is to push a button, that the deputy minister or one of his officials would push a button and find out what drug anybody in Saskatchewan takes. Now that is not an accusation, Mr. Chairman, that I can let go unchallenged because that is a serious charge against officials in the government, whether they are in this legislature or whether they are in the civil service working in the department to allege that that would be the kind of thing any official of this government will do for whatever the reason might be. I deny that. I deny it and I want the Leader of the Conservative Party to get back in this House and tell me why he said that. Now, Mr. Chairman, he also tried to backtrack on the Conservative Party position on the drug plan saying he never said they would establish one similar to Manitoba. I have here a transcript from a speech he made in Moose Jaw, I believe it was, to a senior citizens meeting. And he said, "We have been suggesting for the last three years that a prescription drug plan similar to that introduced in the province of Manitoba be implemented in Saskatchewan". Unquote, word for word. Now that member over there may now deny it as he does with other things but the record will speak for itself. That caucus and that party would do away with the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan. They have said it and now today they have made it clear what they would do with the Saskatchewan dental plan. And I want these 386 employees of the dental plan to contemplate that and I'm sure they will. I want every parent of these 86,000 children who will be benefiting from the dental plan to consider what services their children will be getting when if the Conservatives were to turn it back to the way it was. And I'm sure that they will consider that. We see here today an attack on the program for the sheer sake of cheap politics by Tory members opposite in the same way as they have made an attack for the sheer sake of cheap politics in their allegations of filthy hospitals and I see the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland here and I would like him to get up and maybe tell us some more about those allegations and why he did not substantiate them. He still hasn't substantiated them and in the same way the Leader of the Conservative Party has not and will not substantiate his remarks here and said that somehow the dental profession has offered to establish a dental program in Saskatchewan for children free. Untrue. And I challenge the members over there to prove that it is.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Minister, I could sum up my response to the usual diatribe of the Minister Attorney General by one simple word and that is 'nuts'. It is typical of the absolute and utter balderdash that the Attorney General attempts to perpetrate upon the people of Saskatchewan.

You know it is strange, it is strange the Attorney General every once in a while has to step up and attempt to bail out some minister. Once before it was the Minister of Health; tonight it is the Minister of Finance, who has pulled his hit and run tactics and has now run to the back and is afraid to endorse the allegations that he has made. I think the press made note of the fact that the Minister of Finance was very, very strangely inconsistent on his approaches as to what should be produced in the Assembly.

There seems to be some confusion to the Attorney General as he is attempting tonight —

April 3, 1978

he should have done it from his knees. I think it would have had a more dramatic effect as he is pleading for a little press. He has been getting more in Cuba lately than he has been getting here and I think that is the reason for the Attorney General to be making the untrue and blatantly false accusations that he has made tonight. To clear it for the Attorney General before I make some other comments, I am going to read for him a document. I know that he wouldn't consider reading it and I know that the hon. members opposite would like to hear some details from the document that I am going to read.

It is particularly advantageous for the Minister of Health who has admitted already tonight that they have seriously miscalculated their costs of supplying a training program for dental nurses so that there is an oversupply of nurses and they are now going to have to make arrangements with the private practitioners, a serious error in judgment by the Minister of Health. I am going to refer to some of the general policy physicians that the Attorney General has stated to be non-existent.

First of all we believe, in the Conservative Party, that we can run this government better than the members opposite. I think the Minister of Finance, having lost \$45 million and is going to have to pay it back at 35 per cent interest rate, would be well advised to listen to how to run a department because he is one that sure does not know what is going on under his very nose and is prepared to throw away several millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in the province of Saskatchewan. As I say, he would be well advised to listen to the Conservative Party when it comes to running a government because we can do it better.

We would, as a matter of general policy — and this was raised by the Attorney General — combine the Departments of Health and Social Services to eliminate the bureaucratic overlapping and encourage an integrated and complimentary health and social service program. Surely, surely if there is any department really that should be removed from the present administration, it is the Department of Social Services with its golfing lessons for the inmates and its canoeing trips for the inmates and its hiking and its tours and its waste in the welfare system that has been proven and documented over and over.

Mr. Chairman, we have made it clear in public statements that we would place a new emphasis and a greater emphasis on preventative health care. I will admit that the government opposite has gone to great lengths to improve access to the medical care system for most of the people of Saskatchewan. That is a legacy that no one is going to take away from them but when it has come to the question of preventative health care you have been sloppy and you haven't put the emphasis on it that you require and merely paying \$500,000 to Dunskey Advertising, your own party flack organization set out in the Public Accounts for the Department of Health alone, to have a bunch of people dancing across the TV screens before an admiral saying how good it is to feel good is silly and you know it's silly. The fact is that is all you have got to say about preventative health care in the province of Saskatchewan as I say, a bunch of people dancing across the TV screen feeling good.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the Attorney General as well, we have indicated we would make changes to the drug program. We specifically stated what we would do. We would eliminate the unfair prescription fee, deterrent fee, call it what you may. You have been long critical of the Liberal Party for deterrent fees and yet you have one on your drug program. I will tell you one thing, the people of this province will welcome the Conservative Party position. I challenge the Attorney General to say that

he will remove the deterrent fee from the drug program. Stand up on a matter of principle, tell the people . . . I'm not finished speaking, sit down . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order! What is the point of order?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that we are on the subvote dealing with the dental plan; the hon. member is discussing the prescription drug plan. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that I would suggest that the hon. member deal with the dental plan rather than the prescription drug plan, that subvote is coming up.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please! I think the point of order is well taken but I would like to remind both sides of the House that they have been straying and dealing with other topics that do not necessarily relate to the subvote we are on. I would like to remind the members again that to me we are making a mockery out of parliament. I am afraid that our parliament and our British tradition eventually will make monkeys out of us. I say to all members to please adhere to the rules and regulations of the House. I think it is in the interest of the people whom they represent to try and stay within the bounds of the regulations and it is only in doing that that you are carrying out your duties as hon. members of the House. Again, please relate your remarks to subvote 10.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your admonition. I am sure that Mr. Chairman is prepared to be even-handed and give me some opportunity to reply to the Attorney General. I am aware of the constraints that he has imposed. I would also like to take the opportunity to reply to the obviously very, very sensitive Minister of Finance and indicate that his credibility when it comes to operation of the government has been seriously questioned as he well knows. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the debate could go far ranging but in fact this is the document and this is the program that the Conservative Party will institute and I will table it in a minute. The difference between this commitment and the commitment of the party opposite when it said it wouldn't nationalize potash industries, it wouldn't touch potash industries is going to be obvious to the people and this will be believed and your statement will not.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this subvote if I may. We have heard some colorful speeches here tonight and colorful adjectives applied to some of us. That, I tell the member for Qu'Appelle, was a first one that applied to me, maybe fully accurate for all I know but I am going to tell him in any event that is the first time around that I have heard that.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, what does bother me. I'm speaking on this subvote and the issue here before us is the dental plan; one of the issues that is before us is the PC Party position on the dental plan. One of the issues that you have raised here, Mr. Chairman, is the question of democracy and indirectly (and I don't want to drag you into the debate) a question of credibility. Now the whole purpose of the member for Qu'Appelle's last intervention — this business of integrating health and social services and preventive health and the feeling-good programs and all of that stuff, before you cut him off, was in the course of reading from a document which he alleges is a PC document which he is to table (and I note that he has not yet tabled it). I will ask him to table it if he will, please. He said he will. The whole purpose of that document is to say that that is the PC Party position and somehow by implication (although he didn't say it) that that document said that I am wrong in what I said I heard the Leader of the PC Party say about this dental plan. I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the credibility of the entire institution of this House is surely stretched when everybody here in the Chamber and in the gallery and in the press gallery heard the member for Nipawin, the PC

leader, distinctly and clearly say and elaborate on the proposition that if he was the government he would do away with the dental plan and he would set up a voluntary for-nothing scheme which was, as he has alleged, offered to us by the private practitioners and the dental industry. Those are the words. I heard them myself, Mr. Chairman — not some document that the member still refuses to table (and I ask him again, will he table it?). I will ask the member for Qu'Appelle to table that document that he quotes (somebody said that he would) — not the words that are written there but the words that have been spoken here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the words that have been spoken here by the Leader of the PC Party on the dental plan. I repeat to the members of the House, have been absolutely, unequivocally clear. You heard him say it. There is nobody in this room who can deny that he said it. Now, how in the world can the member turn around (he can call me nuts, he can call anybody he wants nuts) — how can he turn around by simply calling those kinds of adjectives and wish away something which all of us have heard? How can he pretend that it doesn't exist? How can he say that somehow it exists in the document which he, as I said the member refuses to table?

Mr. Chairman, I am saying to the members of this House, when you talk about credibility, on this subvote the credibility of the PC Party is further damaged when you get the kind of performance that you get from the member for Qu'Appelle who says or invites me to say that somehow I am twisting the words of the Leader of the PC Party. I am asking the member for Qu'Appelle if I was in error. You will have a chance to follow me right away, I'm going to sit down. You tell me in cold blood that what the Leader of the PC Party just said 25 minutes ago, he didn't say. I interpret to you again, he said that he would do the better thing when I asked him, namely the voluntary for-nothing voluntarily administered by a private practitioners' program. Furthermore, he said that that was offered to us. That is exactly what was said to us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the member will get up and tell me (and I don't think even he would do that) — half an hour after it was said, will tell me and tell this House publicly that those words were never uttered — if he says that, Mr. Chairman, then I tell you we see here literally the collapse of the PC Party right in front of us because that is exactly what they said. That is exactly the position of the PCs when they strike the dental plan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we will debate some day if the member chooses to table that document (the PC Party document) — we will debate some other day, under some other vote as you probably point out, whether the feeling-good program is good or a waste of time (silliness as the member says) and there is a vote for that I think. The issue before us is this subvote number 10 — shall we appropriate these funds for a dental program for the province of Saskatchewan. That is the issue before us. We know where we stand — the PCs say, no. They don't want the vote appropriated here because they think the plan is inefficient; something is wrong, and that is exactly what the PC leader said, Mr. Chairman, I challenge anybody in this House, in honesty, to get up and tell me that he didn't say that 20 minutes ago.

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Chairman, I have been challenged, as well, to table the document. I am going to, before I do table the document, remind the House, remind all hon. members that this is the third time that the Conservative party has been challenged by the members of the treasury benches to table its policy statement. This, tonight, will be the third time that the Conservative Party has in this Assembly tabled its policy document. What is disheartening, Mr. Chairman, and I am disappointed in the

Attorney General of all people, when we do table it it is not read by the government opposite. It is not read. It is not read by the very member, I think the Attorney General — and I stand to be corrected — was one who challenged us to table this very document last session or a year ago. He stood up in this House and the Premier did, I know that for sure, and he asked and he refused, he refused to read it. In other words what this Attorney General is saying, as he has proved twice tonight, he doesn't care what anybody else said. That is the point made by the member for Nipawin. When you want to criticize the operation of a program opposite, they don't listen, they don't care, because they are either convinced that they are almighty right in the way that they are doing things alone. The Minister of Finance has proved daily that he is completely off base when it comes to the administration. Time and time again you could sit down in a room, you could have the best type of program you want, you could have the best teachers in the world to hammer this program home and over and over and over again, as does every single one of them on the treasury benches, they would close their ears; they would shut their eyes; they would close their mouths so they don't absorb anything and then they would walk out and say the Conservatives don't have any policy. Where is the Conservative policy? And you have all heard the Attorney General say that over and over and over again.

I am going to challenge the Attorney General tonight to make this commitment to the House, that if I table this and I am prepared to, that he will give the commitment, his word, that he will read it. That he will read it from cover to cover and if there are any big words I will give the commitment that I will explain the big words to him. I will make that commitment as a member of this Assembly and a colleague of the Attorney General.

The fact is that we could table this policy statement a hundred times and not one of you has got the political fortitude to read it. There is not one of you that has got the political fortitude to admit that the administration of government by your treasury benches leaves a great deal to be desired. I say to you it is an admission you should make well before the next election because the people see it. The people see your mismanagement daily and we've made, I have referred to them earlier, some very, very specific proposals, more detailed proposals than you have given as to the better administration of our health care system in this province. The people will decide, the Attorney General is right. But there is going to be a big difference between your approach and the public's approach. Do you know what the public is going to do? They will probably get one copy of this, Mr. Attorney General and the big difference is, Mr. Chairman, that they are going to read it. I am prepared to table it but I want a commitment from you that you are going to read it this time because I tell you with The Election Expenses Act we can't afford to use all our policy brochures going to you guys to sit on them when, in fact, we want to get them out to the public because they are believing it and they will read it and that is the kind of government that they will want to see in 1979 set out in this document.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, I want to avoid making this kind of a personal comment but I can't hold myself back and that is to say that I hate myself having been dragged into this kind of a comment . . . yes I do . . . a five-minute speech that says you have got to make a commitment to read this thing. I make the commitment to read this thing but I tell you it will be like any other PC document that I have read and by the way I tell you right now and it is irrelevant I think to this whole issue. I checked the records; you did not table any PC document in the past and if you did that doesn't matter; I stand corrected but you haven't tabled it on the official record. It is recorded so we will know. But leave that as an aside. I don't want to get into an argument about whether the PC document is a great document or a bad document; I don't know and frankly I don't care.

That is not the issue in front of us . . . no, I don't care. What I do care about is what your leader says in the legislature about what he is going to do as the would-be premier of the province. That I care about. I asked you to get up in front of the House and tell me that my statement about what your leader said was wrong. You didn't and frankly you couldn't because you have got to maintain some of your own personal credibility. The fact of the matter is that he said the dental plan was — I don't want to repeat the arguments again because we know them to be the case. You can wave the document, whatever it is from now until next election time but the fact of the matter is that the PC leader of the province of Saskatchewan made a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan and you heard him make that commitment. You said that the present plan is wrong and we have got an offer that he is going to capitalize on going back to the voluntary dental plan operation. That is the issue, Mr. Chairman; that is the subvote, the dental plan. That is the simple issue and you can yell all you want about the programs or about the bailouts of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Health. That is not relevant. We are asking the people of Saskatchewan through this representation in the House to either say 'yes' or 'no' to the millions of dollars that are involved in the dental plan. I am entitled to draw the conclusion to repeat the words made by the Leader of the PC. Not one of you can deny that because he said it and you know he said it. I invite the member for Estevan to get up and tell me that I am wrong, that he didn't say it just a half an hour ago. Get up and say it publicly. I am going to sit down in a moment . . . Sure it's on the tape. That is all you will say. It is on the tape. That is the situation that he is in.

Mr. Chairman, that is the position that the PC caucus is in tonight. I know we all make speeches and we all play games in a political operation. I know what the member for Qu'Appelle is trying to do and in a sense I kind of admire him for trying it. But let's cut through all the under brush. Let's focus down on the issue. This subvote number 10, dental plan, is it good or is it bad? We stand for this. You have told us what you stand for. That is the only speech I make to highlight that point. You are the guys who have tried to get in there with all kinds of documents and other issues. That is certainly the most important issue before us tonight. I say, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize to the House for taking up the time of the House and especially to my colleague, the Minister of Health, but as far as I am concerned you simply can't run a show or railway in that fashion. You simply can't say in cold blood what you are going to do with a particular plan and then try and obfuscate the issue with all kinds of other irrelevancies. Mr. Chairman, the people of Saskatchewan expect more of our political parties and our leaders. They are not getting it. They are not getting it from the Liberals who have described this plan as a frill, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley made a tremendous speech I recall last fall describing what kind of a frill it was, and he agrees he agreed tonight it is a frill. So we know where the Liberals stand and we know where the PC stand and we certainly know where the New Democratic Party stands, Mr. Chairman, right behind subvote number 10.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap): — Mr. Chairman, in response to the Attorney General we notice some very glaring omissions from the Attorney General and a very, I think, salient statement of the policy of the government opposite. We heard which kind of makes the whole estimate an academic exercise I suggest but we heard tonight I think a statement of one of the real tragedies in democratic parliamentary government and that is the statement by the House Leader which says I don't care what you guys stand for. I don't care what the other parties stand for. In other words . . . and he just emphasizes it again. There is the man who epitomizes arrogant government and arrogant administration because he won't listen to anybody else and I will tell you that is probably the dominant reason that's going to lead you to defeat next time around, is the

fact that you are an arrogant government. The fact that we could stand up and give you suggestions and proposals and you know what you say. I don't care. My officials tell me that you are all wrong. That you have got no suggestions. That you have got no policy. That is precisely what you have said. And you are proud to say that. I suggest to the Attorney General that that is precisely the kind of attitude that does yourself discredit and I think it indicates the way the government opposite operates. We have made it clear to you that we could run the dental plan better and I believe we could. I think the very statement for example that we have spent on the dental program on a per capita basis exactly what we are spending on our medicare program, but our medicare program has got probably a thousand times more services. It has the private practitioners of all stripes. It has the private practitioners carrying on their own practices and their own businesses. It has major hospitals, service centres, and hospitals throughout rural Saskatchewan. At the same time it is costing, on a per capita basis, the same as the dental care program. The member for Nipawin was right when he said there is something wrong when that happened. I suggest to you it is not the idea of a dental program, as you seem to suggest, it is the way it operates.

I am telling you, Mr. Attorney General, first of all there is the matter of operation. If I was sitting in your chair and somebody came up and had a good idea I would say, yes, I will listen. I will tell you, as well . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order please!

Mr. Lane: — Thank you. I don't think that any more of the caucus or Cabinet dissension should be brought to the floor of the House when the Minister of Labour has just called the Attorney General a psychopath. I am surprised. This is the second time that we have seen that internal dispute.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Attorney General, the fact is that there is something wrong when a dental program costs as much on a per capita basis under our whole medical care system. I think if you were honest with yourself you would admit that and we would operate it better.

I will tell you as well that stated in that policy for the accommodation of health and social services we will run that whole social area better than you will, with access to more people at a lot cheaper cost to the taxpayers of this province. I think the public of Saskatchewan has seen too many indications of the mismanagement from the day you left the cheques in the shoe boxes in DNS. Until you lose \$44 million in New York at 35 per cent interest, when you have stated — and I tell you it can be administered better and the Attorney General knows that; we intend to do it better.

Again, I am prepared to table this document the day you are prepared to make the commitment you would read it. I am not prepared to add a reasonable rider that you say you will read it but I don't care what you say anyway. That is a waste of time, obviously. I think you should read it and I think you should care because you have made it clear tonight that you are prepared to endorse the mismanagement that has been stated. You are prepared to endorse the mismanagement of the Minister of Finance because that is the principle involved and that is the one you have endorsed. I'm surprised that you have done it but you've done it in spades tonight.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does one thing. He says that it is mismanaged — the dental plan. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are responsible as a government in our democratic system for mismanagement and for policy or

management but I say, Mr. Chairman, unequivocally, that when a member of this House says that a plan has been mismanaged, he is saying that the dedicated civil servants of this province who are involved in the management of a scheme are guilty of mismanagement. I say, Mr. Chairman, that those simply are not the facts. When the PCs say that they are mismanaging the dental plan (the civil servants) and to the civil servants, us, that can only be translated by, as a minimum, a drastic change in the administration of that dental plan, and as a maximum, not only a drastic change but a drastic reduction in the dental plan. That is exactly what is meant by mismanagement because the logical question that everybody is entitled to ask is, assuming that you are right — that it is mismanaged, the next logical question is, what would you do about it?

Now your leader answered what he said he would do about it. Yes, he said he would give a big bang for the buck. He said that there was a volunteer program offered by the private practitioners of the province of Saskatchewan to run this plan more efficiently, cheaply. That was his answer when I asked, to the second question about how would you clean up the management. Now everybody in this Chamber heard that — everybody heard that, and that is the one thing that you are simply trying to not address the question to. You are not addressing that question specifically when you talk about the mismanagement operation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say to the member for Qu'Appelle and to the PC operation here, to all of the PCs, you are doing a two-pronged thing here. I am entitled as a person of this province — a policy-maker for the time being, to make a judgment call on your policy solution to the dental plan, and I repeat again, I don't care for one moment for your policy solution to your plan — not one moment. I don't intend to care for one second, to any kind of a PC Party position which advocates the abolition of 350 positions of people who are offering the dental plan, who are advocating the abolition of the dental plan and substituting it for some sort of a private operation. You want me to say it again? I don't care for that kind of an idea, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think the people of the province of Saskatchewan care for it either.

Mr. Chairman, the member says it is a terrible attitude. If I adopted the PC attitude I would have deterrent fees, I would have the dental plan destroyed, I'd have all these other things we talked about in these votes under the name some how of having an open mind to good management. Mr. Chairman, that may be PC management, that may be the PC leader's style of management but I repeat again, it is not the style of management that the people of Saskatchewan or the NDP government supports 100 per cent of the way. I tell you you are going to rue the day, politically, that your party articulated this policy today on the dental plan and on the management. You are going to rue the day for the 85,000 children and their parents who will know the position that you have taken in this area. Again, I say this with all the sincerity that I can muster in me, those are the words that were said by the leader and there isn't one person including you and you have had since 9:15 to deny that that was what the leader said. Not once.

Mr. Chairman, I move this committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: — I wonder if the Attorney General will allow me and then I will accept his motion. I think it is only proper and fitting in spite of the endurance that this person has had during this day, and I am speaking of Mrs. Ronyk I understand is celebrating her birthday today. I think it is only proper and fitting that we wish her the very best and hopefully we can end on a tone a little better than what it has been this evening. Maybe

tomorrow will be a brighter day. I accept the Attorney General's motion now that we rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:02 o'clock p.m.