

Medicare

government more money not to cover optometrists. If you argue that the extra cost is \$18 million, one might argue about what that includes, because in my amendment I am not talking about the provision of glasses and things of that sort. I am talking about services performed by optometrists but services identical to those at times performed by medical practitioners.

Let us look at this point squarely in the light of what is said by the authorities. I should like to quote Beauchesne's third edition and May's 13th edition. It is argued time and again that a private member cannot move an amendment to a bill if it increases the expenditure of money contemplated in the legislation. I point out that no amount of money was mentioned in the resolution. There was no limit placed on the amount that would be involved in the bill. This becomes very crucial when one reads a citation or two from the authorities I have before me. First of all, Mr. Chairman, let us look at Beauchesne's third edition, citation 439. It is a long paragraph. I think I am doing no violence to it if I start in the middle. In fact, the first sentence or two that I read will be music to the minister's ears, but he should continue to listen:

No amendment affecting the purposes for which the grant is recommended by the crown can be allowed. The constitutional principle which vests in the crown the sole responsibility of incurring national expenditure forbids an increase by the commons of a sum demanded on behalf of the crown for the service of the state.

That is the part that is music to the minister's ears, but note these next words:

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.

Beauchesne at the end of that citation has the notation "M.510", which of course refers to May's 13th edition, page 510. Let me read a few sentences from page 510 of May's 13th edition:

As is subsequently explained, the constitutional principle which vests in the crown the sole responsibility of incurring national expenditure, forbids an increase by the commons of a sum demanded on behalf of the crown for the service of the state.

I am revealing, of course, the source of many of the things which Dr. Beauchesne put in his book. This passage from May's 13th edition continues:

This principle, however, is apparently disregarded when the recommendation of the crown is given to a resolution empowering the expenditure of

[Mr. Knowles.]

public money which, framed in general terms, places no limitation on the amount of expenditure to be authorized by the resolution. As the resolution sanctions, without any specific limitation, the application of money to be provided by parliament to certain purposes, when the clauses in a bill founded upon such a resolution are before the committee, the freedom of action sanctioned by that resolution can be exercised.

Please note further, Mr. Chairman:
The committee is not bound—

Let me read it again:

The committee is not bound by the terms of the provisions which the ministers of the crown have inserted in the bill; and any member may propose to increase the grants specified in these clauses or to extend the application of the provisions of the bill—

And please note the next clause:

—whatever may be the cost resulting therefrom, so long as the power conferred by the royal recommendation is not exceeded.

What was the resolution preceding the bill which this house passed? It has been read two or three times today, but let me put it on the record again in the context of this procedural discussion. This was the resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to authorize the payment of contributions by Canada toward the cost of insured medical care services incurred by provinces pursuant to provincial medical care insurance plans.

That is the resolution in its entirety; I have read every last word of it. There is no limitation in that resolution on the amount of money that can be spent for the purpose spelled out in the resolution, nor is there anything limiting the paying of that money to medical practitioners. I ask you, sir: Are we not clearly within the terms of what I have been reading from page 510 of May's thirteenth edition? Let me read again the key sentences:

As the resolution sanctions, without any specific limitation—

That is the case with regard to the resolution preceding this bill.

—the application of money to be provided by parliament to certain purposes, when the clauses in a bill founded upon such a resolution are before the committee, the freedom of action sanctioned by that resolution can be exercised.

That is where we find ourselves. We are in committee of the whole on the bill, a bill based upon a resolution that had the royal recommendation, as it is put in the United Kingdom, or the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General as we put it here. The freedom of the committee is clear; we are free to make amendments that may