

paramedical personnel. I appeal to the minister to give this matter his thoughtful consideration.

I also draw to the minister's attention that in Ontario people insured under medical plans are already being paid for treatment by physiotherapists, optometrists, chiropractors and others. If this bill becomes law we shall take away from people receiving such treatment something they already have. In other words, the bill will be backward looking and not forward looking; it will take a backward step.

Next I want to refer to oral surgeons. In my province—the minister I am sure knows this—oral surgeons are paid, under the plans in the province, only for the work they do in hospitals. This, I think, is wrong. I have talked to quite a few oral surgeons who have told me that in 95 per cent of cases they can do as good work in their offices as in hospitals under local anaesthesia with the patient's co-operation. Having oral surgeons treat patients in their offices will decrease costs. I submit that the field of oral surgery should be included under this medical plan.

I pointed out that in the Hall commission report, an excellent report as the minister will no doubt agree, it is said that optometrists must be included in the plan. The report recommends that optometrists who are qualified by training take a refresher course to brush up on a few contentious points. I suggest that course be at the expense of the country. Optometrists ought to be given a short course to make them proficient in those details of practice in which they are not quite proficient so they can do types of work they are not now doing. I say to the minister that it is paramount that optometrists be included in this plan, and the Hall commission report states that they ought to be. I am sure the minister has read that report.

I shall not detain the committee much longer, but before sitting down I move that clause 2 of Bill C-227 be amended by deleting paragraph (f) thereof and substituting therefor the following:

(f) "medical practitioner" for the purposes of this Act means any person lawfully engaged in the practice of rendering services to individuals in the field of the healing arts whose qualifications and entitlement to practise in the place in which such practice is carried on by him are recognized by the government of a province or by an association approved for the purpose by the legislature of a province;

Mr. MacEachen: May I raise a point of order on this amendment?

Medicare

The Chairman: Would the minister permit me to say a word? I shall then be pleased to hear him. I point out that we should be careful about the procedure to be adopted here since we already have a paragraph in this clause with an amendment thereto. Citation 397 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, page 282, says:

If the latter part of a clause is amended, it is not competent for a member to move to amend an earlier or antecedent part of the same clause.

The Chair will not object if this paragraph is discussed but before the amendment is put it will be necessary to look again at paragraph (d).

Mr. MacEachen: I raise an argument familiar to the Chairman and to the committee. I submit that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Simcoe East is out of order. Clause 2(f) defines a medical practitioner as follows:

—a person lawfully entitled to practice medicine in the place in which such practice is carried on by him;

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Simcoe East defines "medical practitioner" as any person lawfully engaged in the practice of rendering services to individuals in the field of the healing arts. We are aware of the implications of this definition from the comments of the hon. member. The effect is to define "medical practitioner" as including a whole range of additional professions such as optometrists, podiatrists, chiropractors, chiropodists, nurses, the whole range.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

● (7:40 p.m.)

Mr. MacEachen: If this amendment were accepted it would have to be considered in conjunction with paragraph (d). Paragraph (d) defines "insured services" as "all services rendered by medical practitioners", so that by this amendment we would effectively include within the scope of the bill services that are beyond the meaning of the resolution. What I am arguing, Mr. Chairman, is that this amendment raises precisely the same issue that has been raised on four previous occasions. The ruling on those occasions was to the effect that the amendments increased the meaning beyond the scope of the resolution. Obviously this amendment is defective for the same reason because it seeks to broaden the ambit of the bill beyond the scope of the resolution and beyond the recommendation from His Excellency the Governor General.