

*Medicare*

might have its own idea of what a medical practitioner is, do the words "all services rendered" include the help which any doctor needs from physiotherapists or chiropractors in treating one patient on any one specific occasion? I do not know how the minister will divide services. Are those words restrictive, or are they inclusive?

**Mr. Speaker:** I understand that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre wants to add to the argument. We have been proceeding in an irregular way in the last few minutes. I suppose the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg) should have been allowed to ask his question while the minister had the floor. The minister has now relinquished the floor. Perhaps he wishes to answer the question asked by the hon. member for Athabasca.

We might allow the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to contribute his wisdom to the discussion. I would think, having heard briefly from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I should be prepared to render a decision.

• (5:20 p.m.)

**Mr. MacEachen:** Perhaps I might refer for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to a comment made by the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Ryndard) on a statement I made last night having to do with the optometric profession. What I did suggest was that we might provide in this bill an option to the provinces with respect to the inclusion or exclusion of eye examinations performed by ophthalmologists. It would be optional to the provinces. This is what I had in mind.

The answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Bigg) is that the services insured, and in respect of which contributions are proposed, would be services provided by medical practitioners and not by any paramedical personnel.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** After your reference to me a moment ago, Mr. Speaker and after seven debates on procedure in the last two days, for the most part on essentially the same point, what is there left for me to say?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Knowles:** I hope *Hansard* is getting all the answers to my rhetorical question. The one I heard loudest of all was that I could sit down.

You told us at the beginning of this debate, Mr. Speaker, that you had read the debates of [Mr. Bigg.]

yesterday and the day before. You have now listened to this one for an hour and a half, and my obvious comment is that you would be a poor Speaker if your mind was not just about made up by now. What point is there, then, in my rising to express the hope that Your Honour will at least modify what I suspect may be your opinion?

I rise because I am anxious to obtain from you, even by way of an *obiter dictum*, a ruling on one particular point which has been raised several times during the last two or three days. It is one which I myself raised the other day in the course of one of these debates on procedure and it concerns the right of members in committee on a bill to propose amendments even though they may involve the expenditure of money, in cases where the government has not put a financial limit in the resolution preceding a money bill.

If Your Honour finds this amendment to be out of order on other grounds—and I trust you will not—I hope you will at least confirm for us what May says at page 510 of his 13th edition, and what has been carried forward into the third and fourth editions of *Beauchesne*. I refer to his statement that when a resolution preceding a money bill does not set a limit on the amount of money which can be spent under the bill it is in order, when the house is in committee on the clauses of the bill, to move amendments which may involve the expenditure of money provided they do not go beyond the purpose or purposes set out in the resolution.

I have admitted there are two separate concepts involved in all of this. One is the amount of money involved. The other is the question of purpose. If we get no more from this procedural debate, I should like to have Your Honour's opinion on our rights as set out on page 510 of May's 13th edition.

Like others who have spoken, I respect the rulings which have been made by the Chairman of the committee of the whole and I appreciate the attention which he has given to the various points we have made. But he did make one statement the other day on which, it seems to me, there should be comment.

As reported at page 10498 of *Hansard* for November 29, the Chairman had this to say in commenting on statements I had made regarding the right I have just been asserting:

This citation is similar to section 3 of citation 250 contained in *Beauchesne's* fourth edition—