

### *Dental Examining Board*

(d) in the month of January, 1974, be at the rate of \$2.20 per barrel.

3. That crude oil for the purpose of the said measure be defined as

(a) any crude oil or other hydrocarbon or mixture of hydrocarbons recovered in liquid or solid state from a natural reservoir in Canada, and

(b) any natural gasoline or condensate resulting from the production in Canada, processing in Canada, or refining in Canada, of gas within the meaning ascribed to that expression by section 80.1 of the *National Energy Board Act*.

and includes any hydrocarbon or mixture of hydrocarbon that is produced by extraction from oil sands and is not on October 1, 1973 a refinery oil product within the meaning of section 24 of the *National Energy Board Part VI Regulations*.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to private members business. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Lefebvre) indicated a moment ago there is agreement as to the order of business to be considered. The first item stands in the name of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton).

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

### THE NATIONAL DENTAL EXAMINING BOARD OF CANADA

#### MEASURE TO ESTABLISH NAME, EXPAND POWERS AND OBJECTIVES

**Mr. S. Victor Railton (Welland)** moved that Bill S-7, respecting The National Dental Examining Board of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Railton** moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I not only have to thank you, sir, but also the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Grier) whose time I have borrowed. I hope today's business will not take too long. I just wish to say that Bill S-7 was initiated in the Senate. I am simply the sponsor of the bill. The bill received first reading, second reading and went to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders. It was duly amended by certain motions which were brought before the committee and reported to the House.

As the bill states, it is simply to change the examinations of dentists and dental specialists in order to have uniformity throughout Canada so the standard will be kept high and there will be portability. The deletion of dental auxiliaries was done by motions or amendments which I will present with the bill. I ask Your Honour's permission to have third reading of the bill.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

**Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton):** Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to speak very long on this bill, mainly because I can now accept it as amended. It is a much better bill than the one approved earlier by the other place and sent to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

It was my pleasure to sit on that committee for my party, and to take part in the examination of Bill S-7. I expressed concern at that time over some of the provisions of the bill that would place what I considered to be excessive authority in the hands of the Royal College of Dentists of Canada and in the hands of the National Dental Examining Board.

In the original bill, it was intended that the National Dental Examining Board, with the approval of the Royal College of Dentists, would be vested with the authority to examine dentists, dental hygienists, dental assistants and auxiliaries to dentistry. These examinations would be given to determine the acceptability of such people to gain licenses, without which they would not be able to practice their professions.

The powers implicit in that wording were unacceptable on at least two counts. First, such powers would be excessive and I would be apprehensive of the tendency of people who hold excessive power to abuse that power. In the second place, some of those professionals listed in the category of auxiliaries to dentistry come under the jurisdiction of the various provincial licensing agencies.

I could not agree to this transfer of responsibility and authority from provincial to federal jurisdiction unless I could see written approval from each of the provinces to such a transfer. Some provinces tend to take their jurisdictions very seriously, and rightly so. I do not see how we could contribute to good order and stability in the dental profession by creating ill will between provinces and the federal government over which has licensing jurisdiction throughout the profession. If there are to be changes in this process, it must be done through negotiation, not by legislation.

I mention these things, Mr. Speaker, not because there is a danger in the present bill that such authority will be granted to the National Dental Examining Board, but because it had been in the original bill, and obviously the originator of this bill had such blanket authority in mind. By mentioning this, I served notice that I would oppose any move in the future to use this legislation as a door opener. It would be very easy for someone to propose an innocent-appearing motion to amend the legislation that would result from the passage of this bill. We often deal with bills in this House that seek to make a simple amendment to existing legislation, and they are rarely defeated.

The clause in the original Bill S-7 sought to have auxiliaries to dentistry included with dental practitioners for licensing purposes, and when it was in committee I raised the question of denturists and asked if they were considered to be auxiliaries to dentistry. I learned that they were in fact considered as such. However, as the bill now stands, with these amendments and the word 'auxiliaries' being deleted, we in this party will lend support.