

## GRANTS TO CANADIAN SKI ASSOCIATION

## Question No. 5,098—Mr. Matte:

1. Since 1974, has the Department of National Health and Welfare granted any money to the Canadian Ski Association and, if so, how much?

2. How much money did each province receive?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** 1. Yes, 1974-75, \$415,094; 1975-76, \$435,181.

2. The funds were paid to the Canadian Ski Association for such projects as coaching development, athlete training, national and international competitions and administration. It is therefore not possible to give a province-by-province breakdown of these expenditures. The only contributions paid directly to individuals are grants-in-aid designed to assist the better Canadian athletes who wish to continue both their educational and competitive careers. The following list indicates recipients according to province for the years 1974-75 and 1975-76.

CANADIAN SKI ASSOCIATION		
1974-75		
Newfoundland	Nil	
Prince Edward Island	Nil	
Nova Scotia	Scallion, Bryan	\$1,000
	Wilson, Joan	600
Quebec	Blackburn, Yvon	1,200
	Cloutier, Karen	300
	Cousineau, Alain	450
	Goodman, Russell	900
Ontario	Graves, Richard	900
	Kreiner, Kathy	600
	Oughton, Carolyne	600
	Podborski, Stephen	2,000
Manitoba	Nil	
Saskatchewan	Nil	
Alberta	Haining, Vanita	300
	Osness, Joan	1,800
British Columbia	Aiken, Gary	600
	Cooper, David	600
	Budwer, Douglas	1,124
	Miller, Esther	600
	Murray Wm. David	225
North West Territories	Firth, Sharon	1,000
	Firth, Shirley	1,000
	Lennie, Ernest	900
1975-76		
Newfoundland	Nil	
Prince Edward Island	Nil	
Nova Scotia	Wilson, Joan	600
New Brunswick	Nil	
Quebec	Cloutier, Karen	1,200
Ontario	Graves, Richard	1,800
	Podborski, Stephen	600
	Sjolund, Kurt	2,400
	Wilson, Gordon	300
Manitoba	Nil	
Saskatchewan	Nil	
Alberta	Nil	
British Columbia	Nil	
North West Territories	Firth, Sharon	1,000
	Firth, Shirley	1,000

## Medical Care Act

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## MEDICAL CARE ACT

## AMENDMENT TO LIMIT ANNUAL INCREASE IN PER CAPITA COST OF INSURED SERVICES UNDER MEDICAL CARE PLANS

The House resumed, from Friday, April 30, consideration of Bill C-68, to amend the Medical Care Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It was previously agreed and ordered by the House that the votes on certain motions were to be deferred until this time. Accordingly, in a moment the bells will ring to summon the members, it being understood, of course, that because the vote is a deferred one the bells will ring for 15 minutes.

Before hon. members are called in, I wish to tell the House that there has been discussion on more than one occasion as to the order in which the votes on the motions ought to be taken. The Chair had indicated earlier that it would prefer to take the votes on the motions in the following order: first motion No. 2, then motions Nos. 1, 3 and 4. There has been some discussion since that original proposal was made, and it is understood that a different order would be appropriate. Obviously, the discussions concerned only the first three motions; the amendment to motion No. 4 will have to be taken last. As for the other three motions, motion No. 3 would have the effect of striking out all of clause 1 of the bill, motion No. 1 would have the effect of striking out a portion of the bill, and motion No. 2 would have the effect of introducing a new phrase into a portion of the clause.

The Chair must therefore be guided by one of two principles. First, we could take the votes in such a way that, after taking one vote, we would obviate the necessity of taking others. This would put the Chair in the unenviable position of attempting to anticipate the results of votes, which I personally feel the Chair ought never to do. It seems to me that there is more virtue to the second principle, that is, to take the votes in such a way as to ensure that votes will be taken, rather than to obviate the necessity for the taking of votes.

In this instance, for example, if the votes were to be taken in the reverse order, if the motion calling for the abolition of the whole of clause 1 of the bill were to be taken first and affirmed, the other votes would never be taken. It seems to me that any member who has proposed a motion and had it discussed by the House is entitled to see it come to a vote. Therefore, the more sensible order, it seems to me, would be to take first the motion which introduces a new phrase into a clause, motion No. 2, then to take the motion which would strike out part of clause 1, motion No. 1, and, finally, to take motion No. 3 which proposes to strike out an entire clause. In that way, all members who have proposed motions before the House for discussion will be assured that they will come to a vote.

Therefore, pursuant to the previous order of the House, the deferred motions on Bill C-68 will now be taken. Call in the members.