

*Medicare*

Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard). I am afraid that perhaps this is the aspect of the discussion on which certain members concentrated rather than on the strict procedural standpoint.

I have before me the decision which was reached by the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees which refers to the amendment in respect of subclause (f) of clause 2 of the said bill. Since this decision will be quoted in posterity, perhaps it should be complete and therefore I shall read the amendment:

(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;

The Chair referred to citation 246 of Beauchesne's fourth edition and to paragraph (13) of May's seventeenth edition. He ruled the proposed amendment out of order on two grounds, as I understand it, but mainly because it extended the purpose and objective of the resolution adopted by the house on July 12 last. I will not read the resolution. It was cited by hon. members.

The argument advanced by the hon. member for Kamloops is a very strong argument. I assure him that since yesterday, along with some of my advisers and colleagues, I have spent considerable time wondering whether perhaps he was not right in his interpretation. It is in many ways a borderline case. He has made a very logical argument; but what puzzles the Chair and makes me suspicious is that perhaps, in spite of his apparent logic, there might be something wrong with the argument he has advanced and that which has been suggested by other hon. members. I refer to the fact that in this way the hon. member for Simcoe East would have achieved exactly the same result which has been desired by other hon. members in moving amendments which were found to be out of order.

My understanding of the bill, as it has been discussed to this point, is that the scope of insured medical services is limited by the resolution, and that by proposing to amend the definition of medical practitioner what we would be doing in effect would be to amend the definition of insured medical services. Indirectly, the result would be to extend the scope of insured medical services.

I realize this is the argument which was advanced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. MacEachen). I took it down as he was speaking. It is very close to the

[Mr. Speaker.]

conclusion at which I was prepared to arrive. I think again I should remind hon. members of the citations which have been cited previously. The first is citation 246 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 so its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) stated, it may well be that the resolution does not specify the amount of money. Perhaps the resolution should have been drawn in such a way as to place a financial limitation; but actually it did not do this. If the decision of the Chairman had been based exclusively on this, the appeal might be in order. I understand, however, that his decision was based mainly on the point that the resolution must be considered as having set once and for all the objectives, conditions, qualifications and principle of the bill.

This is, of course, very limited. Hon. members say this is unfair and in a way restricts the right of the opposition to move amendments which may be desired. This is the argument advanced by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) who said that a restrictive interpretation of the rules has the effect of limiting the right of opposition members to move amendments. That possibly is the result of interpreting the rules, but certainly the Chair has to be guided by precedents and must rule on procedural matters even though the result might be substantially unpleasant.

In arriving at the conclusion I am reaching now slowly, I was guided of course by the comments made by the hon. member for Simcoe East when he showed his hand and said:

Accordingly, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition intends to move, at the appropriate stages in the committee discussion, a series of amendments to the bill which would carry into effect the principles I have outlined. This will involve the following amendments: An amendment to clause 2(f) to ensure that paramedical services carried out by qualified personnel who are authorized by the provinces to render services in such fields as dental oral surgery, optometry, which has been forgotten entirely, psychology, physiotherapy and other related fields, will be covered if they are included in a provincial medical insurance plan.

This obviously would be the effect of the amendment. As I have said, in an indirect way it would achieve what apparently our rules do not permit us to do directly. It is, therefore, my duty I believe to confirm the