

*Medicare*

intend to use it as a political football, for it must be remembered that this measure will be implemented only in a year and a half or even two years. Knowing the tactics of our friends opposite, I realize they are introducing a measure which they will try to sell to the people in the next election. This is why I think we should take our time to study this question thoroughly, especially since, as I have said before, we are dealing with a matter which is under provincial jurisdiction.

The present government claims that it wants to help the poor, fight poverty. It seems to me that by refusing to extend the scope of the act, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen) is going against the objective of the government. He says: We want to do everything we can to help those who are unable to get proper medical care, but at the same time, he claims that such and such a service, which is not clearly a medical service, must not be covered because if it were, it would increase the estimated cost of the plan.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is contradictory and the minister, instead of trying to rush this legislation through, should make use of all the necessary means in order that this legislation may benefit the greatest number of persons possible. And I agree with the members for Simcoe East and for Saskatoon (Mr. Brand)—who are certainly cognizant of the problem—when they say that we must insist in order to convince the Minister of National Health and Welfare to accept at least the amendments we are bringing forward, because our sole purpose in doing this is to improve the scope of the act. I am very sorry to see the minister restrict coverage under the act rather than extend it to a greater number of people. May I repeat that this is a very strange way to fight poverty.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would again ask the minister to consider these amendments which have but one purpose: to extend the coverage to as many people as possible. And, as I said, provincial governments surely have their say in regard to this legislation and they will definitely be disappointed with the terms imposed by the minister, for this field, in fact, comes exclusively under their jurisdiction.

[*English*]

**The Chairman:** Does this complete discussion on subclause (d)?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Subclause agreed to.

**The Chairman:** The committee will now proceed to subclause (f).

On subclause (f)—“*Medical practitioner*”.

**The Chairman:** When the committee was discussing this clause an amendment was moved to it by the hon. member for Simcoe East.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Chairman, if it is agreeable to the members of the committee, it might facilitate matters if you were to give a ruling on the point of order I raised in connection with the amendment moved by the hon. member for Simcoe East.

**The Chairman:** If there are no further comments to be made as to the validity of this amendment I am prepared now to make a ruling. The effect of the amendment before the committee would be to include those who are engaged in the practice of paramedical professions in the definition of a medical practitioner. I think this is evident from the statement made by the hon. member for Simcoe East as recorded on page 10459 of *Hansard* for Monday, November 28.

The committee will recall the amendment moved by the hon. member for Hamilton South, the effect of which would have been to include within the meaning of medical services the paramedical services. This was ruled to extend the purposes of, and to be outside the scope of, the resolution passed on July 12. This ruling is recorded at pages 10469-10470 of *Hansard* for Monday last.

It would appear to the Chair to be unacceptably inconsistent if the Chair having ruled the paramedical professions to be outside the scope of the resolution, were now to rule that those who practise those professions could be considered as coming within the meaning or definition of a medical practitioner.

May I refer the committee again to citation 246 (3) of Beauchesne's fourth edition:

The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down *once for all* (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

I might also refer the committee to May's seventeenth edition, page 551, paragraph (13):

Amendments or new clauses creating public charges cannot be proposed, if no money resolution or ways and means resolution has been passed, or if the amendment or clause is not covered by the terms of the resolution.