

is that the persons who render these services, that is medical practitioners, be the kind of medical practitioners who are recognized by provincial governments for the purpose of provincial medical care insurance plans as well as for other purposes. So, I submit that the words of the amendment do not for one moment take us beyond the scope of the resolution. The resolution envisages that the medical services, and those who run them, shall be the kind set out in provincial medical care insurance plans. I submit to you, as a matter of logic, that no provincial government or provincial legislature would licence to practise under a provincial medical care insurance plan any persons whom they did not define as medical practitioners within the scope of the wording we have used in this amendment. That is the first ground of my submission.

Without going over ground which has already been covered, I would ask Your Honour to consider the fact that in the resolution the words "medical practitioner" are nowhere defined. They are not even mentioned. The bill recognizes that these words require definition. It would seem, therefore, to be altogether within the authority and scope of this committee to substitute its own definition for the one submitted by the minister. The minister must have chosen his definition arbitrarily, because no definition is contained in the resolution. As I say, the words are not even mentioned. So he brings forward a bill on behalf of the government in which he says, in effect: "This is what we think. This is how we think "medical practitioner" should be defined."

Surely, it is open to us in the opposition to say: "We do not agree. We think the words should be defined in some other way." Unless we clearly carry the matter beyond the scope of the resolution, we are surely within our rights. But we have not done that because, first of all, there is nowhere in the resolution any definition of "medical practitioner" and, in the second place we say medical practitioners are those recognized by the provinces. We are, therefore, within the scope of the resolution since the resolution contemplates an insurance plan which is pursuant to provincial schemes.

I would refer, in addition, to the dictionary definitions of the words in question. The authorities were quoted during the course of the argument yesterday, and I will not repeat what was said then. But when they are making definitions, which is what this clause does, we are surely entitled to rely on the authority

of dictionaries when putting forward what we believe to be the true and proper definition.

Finally, I propose to deal with the citation to be found at page 207 of Beauséne upon which the Chairman has relied. It reads:

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.

There is no reference here to the amount of the charge, so the citation is not applicable to this aspect of the present situation. It can only be applicable with respect to the object, purpose, conditions and qualifications. Let us consider this aspect.

What are the objects and purposes—the two terms appear to be virtually synonymous. The object and purpose of the resolution is—

—to introduce a measure to authorize the payment of contributions by Canada towards the cost of insured medical care services—

That is the object and purpose, not to introduce a medical care plan as defined *de novo* by the federal government.

—incurred by provinces pursuant to provincial medical care insurance plans.

The purpose of the resolution could not be more clearly stated. What, then, are the conditions and qualifications imposed by the resolution? They are that the costs to which the federal government is to contribute must be incurred by provinces pursuant to their own plans, not incurred by provinces pursuant to a plan which the minister defines as he chooses. That is not what the resolution says. It says "cost incurred pursuant to provincial plans".

• (4:20 p.m.)

All the amendment says is that for the purpose of the provincial plan the province would have the right to say who are medical practitioners. How can it be said to be beyond the conditions of a resolution submitted by the crown? It cannot, sir. Let us consider again the position in which we are in if the amendment is ruled out of order. It makes nonsense of the bill. I submit very seriously that it is your responsibility, sir, to avoid making rulings which make a proposition inconsistent with itself. If you are to rule that this parliament cannot say that contributions will be made in accordance with the terms and conditions laid down by the provinces or that the contributions cannot be made for costs incurred by practitioners qualified for the purpose by the province, then you are, I