

*Medicare*

involve a larger expenditure of money provided they do not go beyond the purposes set out in the resolution. But because the resolution did not specify a maximum amount of money, I submit that we have this right.

As the minister knows, as the government knows, as the House of Commons knows, and as you, Mr. Chairman, know, many resolutions which the government brings in do take the precaution of putting a dollar figure in the resolution, so that there is in the resolution either an over-all, aggregate figure or a dollar figure in per capita terms, per item, or what have you. Let me read it again. We are in the position that "the committee is not bound by the terms of the provisions which the ministers of the crown have inserted in the bill."

This is what the minister has done; he has introduced a general resolution that has no ceiling and no limit. He has put in the bill a definition of "insured services" which satisfies him. But it is left to us, on the basis of May's 13th edition, to do as it is said here:

• (9:10 p.m.)

—and any member may propose to increase the grants specified in these clauses or to extend the application of the provisions of the bill, whatever may be the cost resulting therefrom, so long as the power conferred by the royal recommendation is not exceeded.

It seems to me that these points might have been made with respect to either of the two other amendments. However, it might be argued with respect to them that they went farther, that they went beyond medical services into the general arts of healing and so on. However, here we are staying within the concept of medical services, of services which are performed by medical practitioners. Surely that makes a difference. In addition, we are exercising a right accorded to us by the government when it failed to put a money ceiling in the resolution preceding the bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the rulings that you have made on the broader amendments I submit that this one is different, that it meets all the conditions of the citations I have read, and that Your Honour should find this amendment in order.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I want to make a very brief reply to the argument made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, especially with respect to his reliance upon May's 13th edition, page 510. Of course, the gist of the argument which I have made on all three amendments is that the terms of the royal recommendation have been exceeded in the amendments which have been put forward.

The same deficiency exists in the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

Before I elaborate upon that point may I read one sentence from May:

This principle, however, is apparently disregarded when the recommendation of the Crown is given to a resolution empowering the expenditure of public money, which, framed in general terms, places no limitation on the amount of expenditure to be authorized by the resolution.

The operative expression is "framed in general terms", and the resolution is not framed in general terms. If it had been framed in general terms the chairman would have found the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Hamilton South in order because his amendment was framed in general terms.

It read "and such other health and paramedical services as may be included". If the resolution were framed in general terms it would admit of this amendment because it is framed in specific terms. The chairman ruled that it did not meet the requirements. May I say that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has argued that the committee is not bound by the terms of the provisions which the ministers of the Crown have inserted in the bill, and of course this is what May has said, "so long as the power conferred by the royal recommendation is not exceeded".

The essence of the issue is whether the power conferred by the royal recommendation is exceeded in these amendments. The first amendment was ruled out on that ground, because it dealt with the health professions in general while the resolution deals with medical services. The second amendment moved by the hon. member for Kamloops was deficient for the same reason, and now we are asked to accept, because of a difference in word structure, that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has overcome this deficiency. All I wish to suggest is that if this amendment is held to be in order then every other profession can be substituted for the word "optometrists". Certainly if this amendment is in order that can come about, and clearly the effect will be to exceed the power conferred by the royal recommendation because every single health profession can be included by amendment. In other words, the generality of the amendment can be demonstrated by having the amendment read as follows, "and services rendered by any member of the health professions" instead of the word "optometrists".