

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Nineteenth Legislature**

**Tuesday, April 3, 1979**

**EVENING SESSION**

**Debate Continues on Resolution No. 3**

**HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) who called 5 o'clock this afternoon, I would like to make a few remarks on this resolution which we have been considering this afternoon. I find it rather interesting and curious that the member who felt so moved in the latter part of the sitting time this afternoon to say some remarks on what he thought was an important resolution, say what I gather to be not very much that was important. He did not even think it important enough to come back into this legislature when it resumed its sitting at 7 o'clock. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of irresponsibility that is symbolized by the efforts of those members opposite, including the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) who moved the resolution and is not here this evening. That kind of irresponsibility, Mr. Speaker, which would possess any member of this House in the opposition benches to try to do anything in their power all day today to scuttle a possible settlement between the Medical Care Insurance Commission (MCIC) and the SMA (Saskatchewan Medical Association) which would establish a new fee schedule. Mr. Speaker, they are so irresponsible in their attitude towards government, and when I speak of government I mean the legislature as a whole, that they could care less about the impact that that would have on Saskatchewan people and on our health care program.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear, you are right.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain motivations that we see among the members opposite. We see a deliberate attempt to discredit the medicare program, not only in this province. We see a deliberate attempt by the members opposite to discredit the medicare program in every province in Canada where there's a Conservative government and by the federal Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, who hasn't even had the courage to stand up and take a position on the debate of medicare across Canada in this federal election campaign.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution and the performance of the members opposite is not only an attempt to discredit medicare and to undermine the peoples' confidence in universal medicare programs — the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) should listen so that he will learn something — it is also a deliberate attempt on their part to divert attention away from the kinds of attacks that are happening on medicare across Canada today. Now we said, Mr. Speaker, in the last provincial election campaign, that medicare was under attack, and reference was made by the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) to certain statements made by Mr. Douglas. Well Mr. Douglas was right. Mr. Douglas said, as we all said in that election campaign that medicare was under attack by those who did not believe in universal medicare in the first place and . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What's wrong?

**April 3, 1979**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think the members have to pay some attention to the decorum of this Chamber. It's bad enough when a member is on his feet and calls another member a liar, but when members are shouting from their seat liar, I think that's totally uncalled for. The member should not have that kind of conduct in the Chamber because it lowers the whole level of debate and it lowers the respect in which this Chamber is supposed to be held. I would ask all members to avoid that kind of outcry from their sitting position.

### **Point of Order**

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member was not called a liar. I said they lied during the campaign . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I didn't say anyone called anyone a liar; I said somebody was calling out liar from their seat. That's what I heard and I don't think that's a legitimate point of order.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know who the member was who called that out from the seat but I think it, indeed, is very unfortunate if it came from the opposite side of the House. I shall say no more about that. But before you rose, Mr. Speaker, to bring the House to order, I was saying that the statements that were being made in October and September and that have been made before that and continue to be made with regard to the universal medicare program being under attack is true. I stand by those statements and I repeat them again today and I want to provide some evidence that will substantiate what I'm saying.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, anybody who would suggest that the withdrawal of almost 20 per cent of the doctors in Conservative Ontario cannot be seen as at some degree an erosion of the medicare program doesn't know what the world is all about. And that is what is happening in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, and that's why those members opposite are trying to divert attention away from the kind of policies of Conservative governments which cause that to happen. Any member in this House who would deny that the massive balance billing that's taking place in Conservative Alberta is not in some way an erosion of medicare doesn't know what the world is all about, and that's why the members opposite by this resolution are trying to divert attention away from confrontation and they say there's confrontation in Saskatchewan between the government and the doctors of this province; I say that that's just not true. There is not that confrontation, but there was last year, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Manitoba, a Conservative governed province, between the Minister of Health and that government and the Manitoba Medical Association and there were headlines all over the newspapers about the battle that they were having. They are trying to also, Mr. Speaker, by this resolution detract attention and divert attention away from positions which each and every one has taken from one time or another on the question of universal medicare and deterrent fees.

I would like the member for Swift Current, (Mr. Ham) to rise in this House and deny that once he said at a Conservative party convention in this province that he personally favoured deterrent fees.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like them to ask their candidate in Yorkton in 1975, a Conservative candidate, whether he favoured deterrent fees because indeed he did. I would ask them to deny that the former member for Rosetown said, and I won't misquote him or take him out of context, that people would pay \$10 a day to be in a hospital bed. Now you can interpret what you want out of that, Mr. Speaker, but it clearly means that he believed on behalf of those party members over there that if people had to pay \$10 deterrent fees they would not mind. There is no question about that.

Then there is the member for Thunder Creek, the spokesman of the financing proposals for the Conservative Opposition. His position is very clear. He believes in utilization fees which are no different from deterrent fees. I want to make particular note of this other fact, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite are trying to divert attention away from the issue of universal medicare as it is being put before the people of Canada in this federal election campaign. Let me tell you why.

It is interesting that whereas we had heard from the New Democratic Party leader, Ed Broadbent, and whereas we have heard from other people talking about what is happening to medicare across this country there has been a stone silence on the part of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada on the medicare issue and their leader, Mr. Clark. I have to ask why. I can hardly wait till Thursday. Is it because of the fact as the member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McArthur) pointed out that the official position of the Conservative Party at their annual meeting in 1974 was that health insurance should be a cost that provinces should bear? Is that why the Conservative Party of Canada is silent on this issue or is it because of the fact that their leader, Mr. Clark, believes as he is quoted in the Vancouver Sun of September 23, 1976 saying, and I quote:

Health insurance today encourages people to abuse the system by making unnecessary trips to the doctor.

He said, Mr. Speaker, that the would discourage what he sees as overuse by establishing a system to consider all or a portion of the doctor's visit as taxable income for patients. What does that mean? That means that the member for Souris-Cannington if he were to go to a doctor because he had an illness and if he received a thousand dollars worth of services, Mr. Speaker, the national leader of the Conservative Party is saying that that should be considered as income earned by the member for Souris-Cannington. That is why maybe they are afraid to get involved in this issue, Mr. Speaker, this province has a good record of providing health care programs and services to its citizens. This province has a good record of recruiting sufficient doctors to provide a very important component of that medicare universal service. Mr. Speaker, this province has a good record of making sure, before anywhere else in this country, that people do not have to fear the possibilities of becoming ill because of terrible costs that may be imposed upon them. That is a far cry, Mr. Speaker, from what we see happening in one of the richest, if not the richest province in Canada today. That is Alberta, where they have a Conservative government. In that province, Mr. Speaker, they have a heritage fund of \$4.7 billion. That is almost three times the budget of this province today. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, what do they do with it?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Yes, what do they do with it?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — They impose health premiums on their people so that they have

to pay in addition to that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They tax the sick and they tax the poor. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They make them pay those premiums. Even though they have this heritage fund and impose this tax on the sick, do they have a hearing aid plan like we have in Saskatchewan? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — This is all very interesting. However, I am obligated to deal with this resolution which is before us, and I am having trouble relating the Alberta Heritage fund to this resolution. The hon. member will understand, of course, if I allow him to go ahead that other members will also be able to enlarge the debate and respond to the comments about the Alberta Heritage Fund and how things are getting along in Alberta. I would ask the member to relate this to the subject at hand here.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, indeed I will relate the comments I am making to the subject at hand, because I am speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker. The amendment says and lists three reasons why there is not a confrontation between doctors and the government in the province of Saskatchewan. It also indicates the kind of positive things that have happened in this province with the NDP government, but I won't belabour this item which I was speaking of before you brought the possibility of my being ordered to my attention, Mr. Speaker. I will just say that the two items which I have mentioned — I could include in that the dental plan and the drug plan — don't exist in places like Alberta. I could include the fact that in Edmonton there are 6,800 people on the waiting list trying to get into a hospital . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I could include the fact that in Calgary there are over 6,400 people waiting to get into a hospital . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think, Mr. Speaker, when you want to create dissatisfaction among the people who are the providers of health care services which is encompassed in this resolution, one of the ways you do that is what is happening in places like Alberta and what is happening in places like Ontario . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . In Ontario it is not just a question of the medical care insurance fees that are paid by OHIP. It is a question of what has been happening over the last several years — the closing of thousands of hospital beds . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the imposition of deterrent fees on people in acute care beds.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) made some references in his remarks about the number of beds in the province of Saskatchewan and I want to reply to those remarks. He wondered how many beds there were. Well, let me tell him how many there are. Maybe one of the members over there will take notes so that they can tell him. I want the member to know that in Saskatchewan there are 7.4 beds per thousand people and if that's not interesting enough he should also know that in British Columbia there are only 6 per thousand people; in good old conservative Ontario, it's 5.3 and in Alberta with their \$4.7 billion heritage fund it's 6.1. The member asked Mr. Speaker, and I provided him with the information. I would also like to have him remember, because he was in the House in the last session, that on top of that we added last spring an additional 2 beds for every hospital for level IV care which they have never been able to have in the past.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) will obviously have to read this in Hansard.

Mr. Speaker, let me know turn to what I consider to be one of the most malicious comments made in this debate today. That is the clear and distinct statement by the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) that the quality of our doctors in this

province is poor. I want to underline that. Maybe the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) wasn't here but if she wasn't I invite her to read Hansard tomorrow because I can assure her that everybody in Saskatchewan, and in particular the medical profession in this province, is going to know what the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) thinks of the quality of care provided by doctors in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — That statement, Mr. Speaker, was probably the most telling revelation in this whole debate. I couldn't help but see in that some semblance or just some little indication of some kind of an attitude of discrimination towards doctors who come to this province from outside of this province or from outside of this country. Let me remind the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) and the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) and I'm glad he's back, let me remind them that if it were not for many doctors who came to this country and to this province in particular from other parts of the world, we would have had many hospitals in this province which would have closed down a long time ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that in the view of the government and in view of myself as the Minister of Health that we believe foreign trained physicians have contributed positively to the manpower needs of smaller communities. We're proud of the service which they have provided.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — We don't agree with the attitude taken by the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) speaking on behalf of the Conservative caucus in this legislature.

Now he also mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the question of Saskatchewan graduates. Let me inform the members of this House that we have had continued success in attracting an ever-increasing number of physicians to Saskatchewan from a number of places. The number is up by 272 since 1972, or 25.6 per cent. Mr. Speaker, in 1972 there were 1,063 doctors in Saskatchewan. In 1978 there were 1,335 doctors in Saskatchewan.

The member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) asks from where? Does it matter? If the community of Rabbit Lake, or if the community of Birch Hills, has a hospital and needs a doctor and can get a qualified doctor who came from Ontario or the United States (preferably from Saskatchewan) or from Britain or from India, what's wrong with that? The member for Regina South asks from where? I'd like him to explain, if he ever gets up to speak in this debate, what he means by that. There's a lot of people who would like to know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn more directly to the question he was asking. He was asking, what about the number of Saskatchewan graduates practicing in the province? Well I want to inform this House that between 1975 and 1978 the number of Saskatchewan graduates practicing in this province has increased by over 27 per cent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, that's a pretty positive achievement. That's a pretty positive achievement when we know that in the past that has not been the case.

**April 3, 1979**

When the members opposite say that the environment in the province for the practice of medicine is so bad that there is a massive exodus of doctors out of the province, I think that those figures prove them dead wrong.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — It is not that way! As I said in question period, it is not a case of a massive exodus of doctors. The better way to define it is that there has been a massive influx of doctors in the province. We're grateful for that!

Now, I forget, Mr. Speaker, whether the mover of a resolution has an opportunity to close debate. I think he has.

I want to ask the member for Souris-Cannington (E.A. Berntson) in his closing remarks to give us an answer to a certain question. I'll give him time to pick up a pencil. The member for Souris-Cannington, in his opening remarks, said that 40 per cent of Saskatchewan doctors are charging by direct billing or mode three. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that that is misleading. It's confusing. It discredits the medicare program in this province. I ask the member opposite to tell this House how he can substantiate that 40 per cent because he cannot. If he wants to say it's . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Then you deny it?

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Yes, I deny it. If he wants to say 40 per cent, I want him to stand up on his feet in his place and tell this House where he gets the information that the increase is up to 40 per cent, Mr. Speaker, because it absolutely is not the case. All that I can conclude from that . . . I regret to say that about the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) because I have a lot of respect for him. I kind of think we get along fairly well as the health minister and the health critic. He asks some of the better questions over there on the other side of the House and as he indicated earlier, he is even prepared to praise us when we do some things that he is in favour of as he did today when I announced the Joint Professional Review Committee. So I kind of regret to have to point that out to him; but I want to say that his allegation that there are 40 per cent of doctors who are direct billing is no different than the allegations made by some of those members at other times about such things as filthy hospitals which they were not able to substantiate and about beatings in camps which they were not able to substantiate. And I ask him to redeem himself.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . (inaudible) . . . the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) . . . Indian reservations.

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — I don't want to mention the ravaging of the garbage cans . . . And I ask the member opposite to redeem himself before this resolution is voted on, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the opposition to give this House one piece of evidence of confrontation between any member of this government and the SMA, the medical profession in this province. That's what this resolution says and I have yet to hear the evidence that was to be presented to support that resolution. I can, on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I have never seen those members so sensitive in a long time. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I want to provide some evidence which would indicate that there is a real positive relationship between the medical profession and this government.

Let me just give you some examples of things that happened only in this year. I announced earlier today the establishment of Joint Professional Review Committee. That didn't happen in isolation. That happened because of dialogue, discussion and negotiation among all the parties involved: the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the SMA, the Government of Saskatchewan and the Department of Health. That's a pretty good piece of evidence that there is a good relationship. I indicated earlier, and the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) talked about, a physician establishment grant which we have announced to encourage Saskatchewan graduates to establish in rural parts of the province. And it is a very positive program, Mr. Speaker. Already, and the program is only beginning in this month, but already there are people who are establishing in places in Hudson Bay. I wish the member were here, but there are three physicians out of the college of medicine in this province who are going to establish in the town of Hudson Bay because of the incentive provided by the Physician Establishment Grant Program, which we are instituting this year.

Mr. Speaker, to encourage our students of medicine at our college at Saskatoon, we, this year, increased the Jursi stipends to fifth year students by 100 per cent. Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty positive indication that we are interested in Saskatchewan graduates and we are prepared to help them in anyway that we can to encourage them to train here and to establish practice here.

I announced this year, Mr. Speaker, last month the establishment of an externship program which will provide fourth year students or third year students an opportunity to work in hospitals and throughout the province so that they can earn some money to go back to university. But not only that, to gain some experience in work-experience related to the training which they are taking.

Mr. Speaker, we have had continuous negotiations on the fee schedule even though it can be fairly said that those negotiations have been taking a long time. But the fact of the matter is that they have been negotiations. They haven't been threats, as has been coming from over there, and they haven't been complete capitulations by any side, because if we had done that as the members opposite obviously indicate we should have, the increase of the schedule would have been at 24 per cent. Now, will any one of the opposition members stand up and say they would favour a 24 per cent increase?

The member for Milestone (Mr. Pickering) just rose in his chair, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether he was doing it for fun, and I assume that he was. I want them to remember . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will get together with him later and I will tell him.

Mr. Speaker, we have had negotiations that have been taking place for some time. We have had both parties agree to the naming of a mediator. He has been doing his work and I am optimistic that we will have a settlement very soon. But I can't be quite that optimistic as the members opposite continually again and again, try to scuttle those negotiations and try to scuttle a potential settlement by creating the kind of thing that they obviously have been trying to create this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice on the members opposite that if the present state of delicate negotiations breaks down, it will be on their heads and there is no doubt about that! They don't want a settlement. They want to create a situation of confrontation. Let me answer two more questions asked by the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher).

He said in his remarks he wanted somebody on this side of the House to get up and say

**April 3, 1979**

whether there were more specialists in this province than there were in the 1950s. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise in my place and tell the member for Thunder Creek that yes, there are more specialists in the province now than there were in the 1950s and they are very qualified.

I've already answered the other question when the member asked if the quality of our doctors is low and the answer to that is no, it is not low.

Mr. Speaker, in winding up my remarks let me just say this: that CCF and NDP governments have led the way in developing social programs essential to people and we believe social services, like education and health, should be available to everyone without penalty. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the process of doing that we had to overcome some awfully big obstacles. Every step of the way we had to overcome opposition by Conservatives and Liberals who fought medicare and who fought children's dental plan and who fought the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan, but we did it and they are still fighting.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — And we are prepared to fight back, Mr. Speaker. Now they will rise and they will pretend to be in favour of universal medicare but they are in favour of universal medicare in the same way as Conservative and Liberal governments have been in favour of maintaining railway lines. They kept talking about it while railway companies shut down their stations, while the railway companies took away . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm making an analogy which I will not take very long to make . . . while the railways took away their maintenance personnel and let their lines erode and they gave them enough time for that to happen until the rail lines became so ineffective and so useless that people began to almost accept some of them closing down. And that's the kind of effort that is being applied in the attack on medicare that we see happening across Canada today.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister of this country has been going around along with his Minister of Health and Welfare. When he refers to medicare and says that it is being eroded by the provinces and they are responsible, what I want to say to him that it was that Prime Minister four years ago who stopped the funding of hospital insurance plans and did away with 50 per cent cost-sharing of medical care insurance plans in this country. And so those words he is now talking about are rather shallow.

Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, this government as a CCF government brought in the first medicare program into being in North America.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — It's going to be this government and this New Democratic Party whether it's in the province of Saskatchewan or the province of Ontario or at a national level. It is going to do everything in its power to see to it that medicare program continues to stay and continues to upgrade so that people of this country and this province do not have to fear the catastrophic costs that come about like you see in the United States where they have 50,000 bankruptcies a year because people have to go to hospital. That's not going to happen again in this country in spite of any efforts that some people who do not believe in medicare may try to make.



Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any doubt from what I have said that I will most wholeheartedly support the amendment moved by the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) and oppose the resolution of confrontation proposed here by the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) earlier this afternoon.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this. It appears that we've really stuck a rather tender note in raising this medicare issue today. We've had the whole gamut of performances. The first speaker, the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway), I would like to classify his dissertation as being rather dramatic. The second speaker, the fellow from Regina (I forget his constituency) I would classify as rather emotional and the third speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski), I would classify as being somewhat factual. The first speaker really put on a dramatic display. I think Shakespeare would have summed it up by saying it was a speech that was full of sound and fury and signifying nothing. I feel that a fair comment on his statement. In fact, to me it seemed that this man was trying very hard to bury a misdeed that perhaps he had performed a little while ago. It looked to me as if he was trying to cover somehow the obvious mistake he had made on the open line show in Saskatoon. The other thing I found rather amazing was that today, in this House in question period, I and other members of this caucus raised situations that concern people of Saskatchewan today, but in many of the references I heard from the other side, it was relating back to statements that were made by ex-members of this caucus going back into statements of the early '70s and '60s and again, failing to deal with the issue that is facing the people of Saskatchewan and the government today, in 1979.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Now, the member for Saskatoon Centre mentioned that he didn't get any phone calls. Well, listening to his rather bellowing dissertation, I can understand why no one would want to phone him. He didn't mention (and perhaps there weren't any) but I wonder if there were any phone calls or letters to the Minister of Health or to the Premier regarding medicare? I can see why they didn't write to the member for Saskatoon Centre.

Now, in reference to the member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McArthur). There are just a couple of things here that I want to clear up which I think were rather irresponsible statements. I don't like them to be the final word on the record. The one has to do with irresponsibility; he was charging us with irresponsibility. I think if you have been paying attention over the last while, fellow member, you will see that the charge of irresponsibility has been launched more so against your side of the House than ours.

The other statement of yours that was rather disturbing to me was the fact that we were not willing to allow the collective bargaining process to continue. I think that is a gross misrepresentation. We have never come out interfering with the collective bargaining from what I have heard.

Now the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Mostoway) also mentioned 272 doctors in the rural areas. I would like to ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski) how many doctors have been churning around in the rural areas. In some of the areas that I'm in, if you go to see the doctor one month you go back and it's a new one the next month. There's no continuity. There's people coming right through all the time.

**April 3, 1979**

One of the members in his speech quoted Dr. Kendel, the vice president of MCIC and I think it is rather obvious that he omitted the name of Dr. Penman. I would ask you to go out to the doctors, many of whom I have association with, and ask them about the popularity of Dr. Penman in Saskatchewan amongst the medical community. When you say there's no bureaucratic interference I would like you to have an evaluation of this man's standing.

Now the other thing that keeps coming up, and the Minister of Health is a master at this, he always is relating to Manitoba and Ontario and Alberta. You've heard my statements before. I'm concerned with Saskatchewan and I think you are too, but at the same time the Minister of Health relates to what's going on in Alberta and Manitoba and in the next breath he says, we were given a mandate on October 18 to do what we want in Saskatchewan. Well I'd just like to point out a fact to you. I'm sure you realize that the government in Alberta was given a mandate the other day to do just what they want. The government in Manitoba was given a mandate to do what they want, and the government in Ontario so your argument and your relationship . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Can't have it both ways . . .

**MR. TAYLOR:** — . . . kind of breaks down a bit to my way of thinking. Now the member for Saskatoon mentioned, and I'm sorry I don't know your constituency . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Saskatoon Centre.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — . . . Saskatoon Centre mentioned that the welfare of the citizens is the common denominator in this debate and I certainly agree with him. I would also add to say that we are against medicare is complete nonsense. That's nonsense to make a statement like that. In ending up, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that I was disappointed in the debate from the other side because the problem is today in Saskatchewan. There is an obvious attempt to sidestep, skate around the issues, the problems that are facing the people today. I would like to say this too in closing, to the minister. I'm sure when you make your agreement with the doctors it will most likely be a retroactive agreement. I wonder if you'll consider making retroactive payments to these people whom we mentioned today who will have had to pay what I don't think we can class as anything but deterrent fees.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't support the amendment. I would go with the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, this has been a very interesting day in the Saskatchewan legislature. It's an interesting day because I think that what we have seen attempted by the PC opposition, (if I may describe it this way) is a rehabilitation, or what they hope will be a rehabilitation in the eyes of the public, of their present position with respect to medicare issues generally, under the guise of this particular resolution which is before you. I think we saw that during the course of the question period where, in a new bold tactical change by the PC caucus, one minister received all the questions, presumably based on this kind of a series of negotiations and the attempt at negotiations. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the members of this House to examine carefully the words which have been stated by the members of the PC party today. I want the people of Saskatchewan to consider carefully what they want them to believe the PC position on medicare and on the general health programs. I say, Mr.

Speaker, if you look at the speeches very carefully, related to this resolution, only one conclusion can be made. The conclusion is that the attempt by the PCs today in question period and in this resolution, is an attempt, basically, to undermine public confidence in the government's efforts to negotiate a settlement with the doctors on the new fee schedule . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, no matter how much I yell to try and make my point, I simply want to say that the yelling from the opposite members prove my point . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm trying to make the proposition (which I think is patently obvious to everybody) that the question of the negotiations — negotiations . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I have to try again because I honestly can't hear myself speak. I think I'm making a pretty good speech so I'd better start over again.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You're right, it is a good speech.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! I wonder if the members could just tone it down a little. I'd like to hear what the Attorney General has to say on this subject.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There used to be a time, Mr. Speaker, in this legislature, when in my experience . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. Can the members please tone down their comments from their seats? If they want to speak in the debate, they'll have an opportunity and I think it lowers the decorum of this Chamber. Certain members are doing it and those members are setting a bad example for members who are new in this Chamber. I've said this before, someone has to set the example in this Chamber and it falls upon the members who have been here before to set the example.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I just wanted to say that there used to be a time in this legislature when I, on this side or the other side, welcomed interjections because they made part of a good speech. I must say in this legislative assembly, with all due respect to the opposition, none of the interjections are really the kind of interjections which inspire.

**MR. LANE:** — Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Do you want to keep the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) on the motion or do you want to discuss the manner of the debate in this House? To go on and discuss the manner of debate in this House, that's a new debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. That's not a point of order. I'll try and keep the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) on if you can hold the other comments down. I'll try and keep him on the subject.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), that if he does not want to hear me speak, he ought to leave the Chamber but please don't interrupt me as I try to make my speech to the members of this Assembly.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — This is the third time, Mr. Speaker, that I'm trying to make this proposition to the members of this House and to the public and I'm being hooted down by the PCs (Progressive Conservatives) now for the third time in a row. I am being

**April 3, 1979**

hooted down when I say that today's question period and this motion was placed on the order paper and the speeches that have been made were designed with one objective in mind and that was to undermine the public's confidence in this government's negotiations with the doctors.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — There can't be any other political objective for that purpose and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the objective of the PC Party in doing that is now linked to the next question. Why are they trying to undermine the confidence? They are trying to undermine the confidence in the negotiating process because, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to undermine the public confidence in medicare. That's what they are trying to do.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. LANE:** — . . . can't handle the heckling . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, why is it that the PCs have taken this position with this particular motion?

**MR. LANE:** — Because we're sick of what you did . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, they have taken this position with this motion because consistently since there's been a PC Party in the legislature, their opposition to medicare and the present system of billings that . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I want to take this opportunity to warn the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) that there is a way of making him keep quiet. Now the member for Qu'Appelle has been interjecting. This is the first time I've specifically drawn it to his attention. He's been interjecting, interfering with the debate and I tell the member, and I tell the member for Qu'Appelle there is a mechanism to deal with that. I don't want to use it. The mechanism will be found out soon enough if the member continues the conduct which is lowering the decorum of this Chamber and is interfering with the rightful debate of the members of this Chamber. Until such time as that happens the member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) has the floor . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order! I am not going to allow the member for Lumsden to speak to my point of order. The member for Saskatoon Riversdale.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would have thought that the member for Qu'Appelle would know that those other motions and other powers were, Mr. Speaker, having experienced them for four days last year or three days, if I may say so.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to make my short 10 minute intervention in this particular debate, Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted I think for the fourth or fifth time and had to take my place in the chair, I was making the position that the opposition party is undermining or attempting to undermine, that's the objective, the political objective, in question period to indicate that somehow the negotiations are being done without confidence, without skill, that there is a confrontation attitude. This is the position that they are taking. If that's the position they are taking the next question that should be asked is, why are they taking this position? They are talking this position, politically I'm talking about now, Mr. Speaker, in this motion, they are trying to politically show, they

think, other political parties and leaders on a national level, other governments on a provincial level, that somehow NDP Saskatchewan also has medicare and hospitalization and doctor fee negotiation problems. This is an attempt to buttress the present position that their leader federally, Mr. Joe Clark, is in and the predicament he is in with respect to medicare and the medicare position.

Mr. Speaker, it was indicated even in the House late this afternoon that the object of the PC motion was designed, aimed at the Ontario voter, aimed at trying to show that somehow Saskatchewan has got this same kind of problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the people of Saskatchewan that this motion is an absolutely incredible motion. One of the biggest difficulties that an opposition party has is establishing credibility. The reason that there are only 17 PCs is epitomized by this particular motion, the lack of credibility. Mr. Speaker, the PC Party has a leader which has lost credibility based on the last election. The PC Party has tendered a resolution which I think, to put it mildly, is an incredible resolution. Here's what they are asking to do. They are asking, Mr. Speaker, that there be a condemnation of this government for deliberately creating a confrontation atmosphere. That's what the motion says. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the members of this House, how do we create deliberately a confrontation atmosphere? Are we creating a deliberate confrontation atmosphere by negotiating in tough and fair terms, Mr. Speaker? Is that negotiating and creating a deliberate confrontation atmosphere? Members of the PC party opposite are asking us to negotiate carefully and responsibly with the public purse, the same public purse that they always criticize us for being free and easy with that to negotiate carefully and responsibly with the doctors is somehow creating a confrontation atmosphere . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I say that's patently incredible; I say that's patently nonsense. Mr. Speaker, the members from the PC party tried to make a big deal of this deliberately creating confrontation atmosphere by two incidents: one is a letter by Mr. Garnet Dishaw. He expresses his personal opinions. That's an opinion of the entire government, deliberately creating a confrontation atmosphere, Mr. Speaker? That's what the PC case amounts to. The second point is the Dr. Penman statements, the Dr. Penman statements that the Premier referred to and made reference to in the question period, the same Dr. Penman statements that have been made here. That is where their entire case rests, Mr. Speaker. Their entire case rests on creating a confrontation atmosphere on two things. Number one, the fact that the government is trying to negotiate responsibly; number two, that there is a letter by Mr. Garnet Dishaw and maybe number three, statements made by Dr. Penman. That they say is the sum and total of deliberately creating a confrontation atmosphere. Mr. Speaker, I say that this is simply not credible . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that is simply not believable by the people of Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The same old incredible Tories.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the press and the public — the member opposite said stick by the facts. I was listening to this debate very carefully all afternoon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I listened to it with absolute care, Mr. Speaker, and I heard nothing but three points. Actually one point was unstated — the first point about the government's negotiating tactics. I heard the Dishaw letter. If I heard it once, I heard it five times. I heard the Dr. Penman matter. If I heard it once, I heard it five times. I challenge any other member to tell me from the PC side or this side, what other piece of evidence has been tabled by the PC party? None . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, absolutely no other evidence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I want to continue by make one or two

**April 3, 1979**

points with respect to the statements made by the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher). He started off his remarks this afternoon by saying that the NDP are the masters of the big lie. That is repeated just now by the member opposite for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman). He says that it is a lie about free medicare. He says that it's a lie in the election campaign that was conducted, repeated again by the member for Estevan again today.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments of the PC Party on this matter of the lies, as to where they really stand on the question of doctor participation . . .

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — . . . the extremes of this government.

**MR. SNYDER:** — Oh shut up!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I can't continue. I'm going to have to sit down.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! Order! Order! I'm going to ask the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) to please maintain order. I've been very patient. I've heard the member calling out from his seat several times. I don't mind a little bit of it, however, I don't think the member has the right to continue to interrupt the debates of the House. I just take this opportunity to warn the member. Mr. Attorney General.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much but I can honestly say that I just can't hear the remarks that I make because of the noise . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I say to the hon. member, you may not want to hear them, some may. If you don't want to hear them please don't prevent the others from hearing them. Why don't you leave the Chamber, but please let me finish my remarks for the ten minutes that I have to make them. I listened to yours very patiently and very carefully. I listen, in fact, to all the opposition members in this area without any disruptions. We're talking about a very important issue. That is to say, doctors and the status of negotiations with respect to doctors. What I say is behind the motion is the survival of medicare, Mr. Speaker. That's my conclusion based on the remarks made. I'm saying that's an important issue which deserves the attention of all the members of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — It deserves the consideration of the members of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I don't know why the PCs are reacting with such absolute disruliness and disorderliness as they are in this particular matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that they are doing this because they know . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — What is the point?

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — The Attorney General, a few moments ago, attributed a statement to me, which I must refer to debate last year in the House where the hon. member for Saskatoon Nutana (Mr. Robbins) stated, under questioning, that a family of

four pays \$459.89 as hidden tax for health care. The minister, Mr. Robbins, stated that was a fact under questioning. I suggest that the member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) has attributed a wrong statement to me.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'm sorry, I wasn't paying attention to the debate at that point, so therefore, I cannot comment whether there has been a breach of privilege or not. I'll take the matter under consideration and review it. If I find there is a prima facie case for breach of privilege (which is a very serious matter) I shall bring the matter back to the House.

Mr. Attorney General.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is the sixth or seventh time. It gives me a little chance to collect my thoughts, I guess, and keep on going, because to keep on going is what I intend to do this evening, Mr. Speaker, until I finish making my point on this important debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the points that I was making tonight was credibility, and how important credibility is for an opposition party or for any political party. The people of Saskatchewan, the members of this House, when you tender this resolution or any debating issue, have got to be able to believe that what you say you say consistently, you say with a philosophy that you've got credibility. Mr. Speaker, we saw the spectacle of the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher). I am sorry the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) is leaving the House. The members for Swift Current and Thunder Creek are two of the most well known proponents and advocates of deterrent fees. Today in the course of the debate, the member for Thunder Creek tried to repudiate remarks which are on the record respecting his position on this question of the delivery of services in the legislature in the province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to reiterate again that which is on the record of this House. I heard them personally because I was here both times on a very similar debate, Mr. Speaker. That was a debate relating to doctors, relating to the costs of the medicare scheme of which doctor's were a large charge, relating to the question of hospital expenses and also relating to the medicare and hospitalization charges. I heard that member twice while I was sitting here in my capacity as House Leader tell this Assembly and tell the people of Saskatchewan that the concept of universal medicare — in fact, in one of those speeches, he said your concept of universal medicare, referring to us — had failed and that sooner or later a user pay concept and a user pay philosophy would have to be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Swift Current and the member for Kindersley do not believe me. I tell the member for Kindersley that he should look at the Hansard of April 12, 1977. If he doesn't believe April 12, 1977 he should look at Hansard dated March 14, 1977. If the member for Kindersley still doesn't believe me I ask him to take a look at the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of September 28, 1978 where the article refers to the member for Swift Current talking about deterrent fees. There is the proposal that was

put to the question period. Answer the question, yes or no. Ham, referring to the member from Swift Current, said simply referring to deterrent fees – personally, yes, politically, no, Mr. Speaker, and I quote. There is endless documentation and papers available for documentation to this House as to what is behind this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Now I say, what is behind this resolution is this well known PC position on medicare. What is behind this resolution is an attempt to fulfill those words which I have drawn the attention of the House to, Mr. Speaker. There is no better way to fulfill it than to undermine the confidence of the public in what is going on with respect to the negotiations between the SMA and the Minister of Health in the Government of Saskatchewan at this particular time. None whatsoever. Why wouldn't the PCs take that position, Mr. Speaker? They have taken that position in every other province where they are presently in government. They have taken that position in New Brunswick, in Ontario, Alberta and Manitoba. They have taken that position without fail attacking the basic medicare structure and the basic payment of doctors everywhere that they have assumed office, Mr. Speaker, in Canada. Why wouldn't they try it right here in Saskatchewan by the guise of this resolution which is what they have been doing? Because that is exactly what this resolution is asking us to do and the words that have been said with respect to that resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. members of this House to consider this fact. In 1962 when the doctors were on strike there was a negotiated settlement to that strike. One of the aspects of that strike was something called the Saskatoon agreement. That is how the doctors came to terms with the government and they returned back to work. One of the aspects of that Saskatoon agreement related to the right of the physician to, in effect, translating it in my terms, direct bill or mode 3 billing. Now listen to what the opposition has been saying to us all day. They've been saying that because we have not knuckled in or not agreed to the doctors demands – because that's what the collective bargaining process is about, not agreeing and arriving at a settlement – somehow we've got to do something about that Saskatoon agreement because those doctors are direct billing. They're saying that direct billing is creating, in their words a deterrent fee. Now the only way you can remove the direct billing, Mr. Speaker, is to take a look at the Saskatoon agreement. I ask the hon. members of the PC Party, is that what they are telling the Saskatchewan Medical Association that they stand for; is that their position? If the answer is, as the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead) says, no he does not want the Saskatoon agreement modified, namely that the doctors should have the right with respect to mode 3 billing, then what's the other side?

Are the PC's telling us if that's the case, that in order to alleviate the mode 3 billing, the Government of Saskatchewan should settle with the doctors, regardless of whether or not the government in the interest of the public purse, thinks the settlement is a fair settlement or not. Is that what they're saying? Because you can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. You're either going to be able to say that the mode 3 billing doesn't exist, by which case some agreements are going to have to fall by the boards. If that's not the position of the PC Party, tell me it isn't. If that isn't the position that they're advocating, then the other alternative is to settle and settle at a price that the doctors want to settle. Is that what the PC's are asking the members of this House to accept?

Mr. Speaker, the position is riddled with contradictions which are massive and basic. The member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) in his question period, related to this motion today, said come on get on with the job of settling. The member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver), the Leader of the PC Party, in his question period takes a different approach,



about the expenses of government. His resolution takes a different approach, talks about the undue expenses, talks about the undue harshness of the present situation which exists. Mr. Speaker, the opposition can't have it both ways. They've got to tell the people of Saskatchewan where they stand on this question of medicare fundamentally, where they stand on this question of doctors' billings fundamentally, where they stand on the right to bargain collectively, doctors and government, fundamentally. Do they want to take away this process of negotiation that we're embarked on now? Do they say that we should be negotiating in public? Do they say they have brought credit to themselves and to the process by going through an entire day long attack on the negotiations in process that we've seen today? Is that their position?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order. I'll ask the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) to contain himself. You have an opportunity to get up and debate this issue just like every other member. He's interrupted the debate two or three times now, and I don't want to have to warn him again.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I was saying before I was interrupted by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman), on the question of negotiations, which is the essence of this resolution, what would the opposition have us to do? I would like . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Settle it.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Settle it, they say. They say settle it. I say to the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor), settle at any cost.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I'm not saying at any cost.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Now, Mr. Speaker. Hear what the member for Indian Head is saying. He is saying settle, but don't settle at any cost.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Right.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — At what cost do you want us to settle? Do you want us to settle at what we think is the fair and the proper cost to the public purse or do you want us to settle at any cost? This is a collective bargaining situation, Mr. Speaker. He sits from his position and yells settle. Anybody can yell that. I want them to settle. I wish they would have settled a long time ago. I don't like the Mode 3 direct billing operation any more than anybody else does. I think it's a very small percentage who are using it but to say to the Government of Saskatchewan that in order to eliminate Mode 3 either by legislation or by a settlement, we should settle, without giving us some indication of how to settle it, what the position of settlement is, I say, Mr. Speaker, is irresponsibility of the highest order with the PCs have outdone themselves on.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) says, negotiate. We've been negotiating. We've got the conciliator, Judge Muir, whom the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski) has talked about. He's in the process right now delicately trying to mediate a situation. What do we see in this legislation, Mr. Speaker — a day long attack by the PCs right at the most critical time of those medications and conciliation efforts.

**April 3, 1979**

**MR. LARTER:** — I've seen the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) sit here for six months . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — They didn't do it a month ago, Mr. Speaker. They didn't bring this motion forward a month ago. They didn't bring forward this question period a month ago. Oh no. This House has been sitting now for over a month and they didn't bring it. They bring it now when the public press says about Judge Muir's conciliation and mediation efforts. They bring it now and they say the didn't mean those remarks they said about deterrent fees. They bring it forward now and they say the didn't mean those remarks about the universality of the medicare system falling down. Mr. Speaker, I say they brought it in now because they wanted to do damage to the delicate balance of negotiations.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Why do they want to do that? Because they want the fundamental body of medicare damaged. They never have believed in it and they never will believe in it, Mr. Speaker, that's the absolute crux of the matter.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, this is a fundamental debate not only for doctors' salaries. Mr. Speaker, it's more than a fundamental debate. It's amore than just the doctors' salaries as this motion indicates for Saskatchewan. This is a medicare motion, Mr. Speaker. All right the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) says I'm the House Leader to them all. Mr. Speaker, on private members' day the members' order is not ordered by the House Leader. I can't be blamed for that and I want to say the House Leader doesn't sit in the PC caucus and determine what question period strategy is for the PCs either. You could have raised it before today but you didn't, I tell the member for Indian Head. You didn't raise it in question period and you picked on the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski) all day long during the entire period right at the time when Judge Muir handed his report in and I say no other reasonable conclusion can be made except that you want to damage the negotiation process and that's got to be the conclusion that's inevitable here.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, that's because of the two central themes of my remarks tonight. One, credibility. If they think the member for Thunder Creek is going to fool anybody with his deathbed political repentance that he doesn't mean what he said about deterrent fees twice last year, he has no credibility. If they think that they are going to tell the people of Saskatchewan that by introducing this motion, somehow they are the protectors of medicare, Mr. Speaker, they have no credibility. Mr. Speaker, they have no credibility because this motion, like almost everything that this opposition has done in this House, is riddled with these contradictions. That is the best point that I wanted to make tonight. The second and last point I want to append to this motion, Mr. Speaker, is this. Forget about the credibility of the opposition. The PCs will come — the PCs I want to tell them for sure will go. The PCs arose in three and a half years and Mr. Speaker, we are seeing them go in three and one-half weeks since the House has been sitting. They come and they go.

The second point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is medicare and the doctors' negotiations. I say this resolution was a dastardly attack on what this government has

been trying to do on negotiations. It is an attack on medicare. It confirms my conviction that they want medicare dismantled and I want to say to the PCs that we are not going to let you do it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I am going to say to the PCs that no matter how much you criticize, how much you attack the Minister of Health (Mr. Tchorzewski), how much you may be supporting the doctors or whatever you want to raise, bringing up these facts without tabling them, in you attempt to discredit medicare, you are not going to do it. You are not going to dismantle medicare.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, this motion is more than just Saskatchewan medicare, more than just doctor payment. This is a national debate, Mr. Speaker, and we have seen the classic confrontation between the two political groups, the two groups who think in this area right now, right here in this Saskatchewan House. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned, on May 22 the people of Canada will hear what is being said in this House by the PCs on medicare and on this resolution.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You bet.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I want to say that they will remember the words from Swift Current (Mr. Ham) where he personally supports deterrent fees.

**MR. HAM:** — I am refuting that statement, and the member should look it up and see what it says.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Read it to him again.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to read it again. I simply say that the people of Canada on May 22 will know who stands where with medicare and the proper negotiations of doctors and which provinces are promoting the continuation and the expansion of medicare and which provinces are not. The PC provinces, or if you will, the NDP Saskatchewan province, and I think the answer will be absolutely crystal clear. Mr. Speaker, this is too far, too an important debate, far too important a debate to let go tonight. I am sure all members want to get into this. I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:19 p.m.