

The CHAIRMAN: On the very grounds of modesty, I think it would be impossible to enforce, or begin to enforce, any such law in Canada. I know you could not do it in the Province of Quebec without a revolution.

Dr. STARR: No, I would think not.

The CHAIRMAN: And I think it is the same elsewhere.

By the Chairman:

Q. Dr. Desloges, of the Quebec Provincial Bureau of Health, Montreal, who was unable to be here, sent to the Secretary of the Committee a copy of an address which he delivered in Montreal at the Conference of Social workers of Canada, at McGill University, three or four weeks ago. He gives some very illuminating considerations on the subject. In a letter which he addressed to Senator Girroir, the promoter of this Bill, Dr. Desloges makes the suggestion that the words in the fourth line of clause 3, "because of venereal disease," be struck out, so that the clause would read:

"Shall be prima facie proof that a person has not venereal disease and is not otherwise mentally or physically unfit to be married."

He claims that if these words are stricken out the door is left open for an explanation for the man should be refused a certificate.—A. Quite.

Q. That it is not on account of venereal disease. It may be on account of mental or physical incapacity. Do you think that these words should be stricken out? As it is, it confines the whole impediment to venereal disease.—A. Of course there are other things that would make it wiser for them not to marry.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not happen to find Dr. Desloges' letter in this connection.

By Hon. Mr. Daniel:

Q. That would include epilepsy?—A. Yes, quite.

Q. There is one thing about protecting the doctor. Of course doctors are like everybody else: there are white sheep and black sheep in the profession, and in protecting the doctor in giving his opinion as a bona fide opinion, we might be protecting someone whose opinion was really not a bona fide one and was given just casually, so to speak, perhaps for the fee that was obtained by it. Is there any method in your mind of distinguishing?—A. No. That is pretty difficult. We suffered from that in Ontario during the prohibition regime.

Q. Of course such a case I presume, would be rare.—A. I think so.

Q. Very rare. The medical profession, as a rule, I presume, would give bona fide professional opinion with regard to a matter like this. Now, in the Wisconsin law they set the amount of fee that the doctor can charge. It is \$2.50, I think. Is it not?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes; I think in most of the States it is \$2.50, and there is provision for the indigent paying nothing.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL: Yes. That of course is paid by the State; although I do not see how a person who feels able to get married is unable to pay the doctor's fee for the examination.

Dr. STARR: Perhaps they are going on the principle that it is cheaper for two to live than for one.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL: But there is the provision that the Chairman speaks of, that in the case of an indigent person there would be no fee paid. That refers, I know, to the blood examination. Whether it refers to the other I am not so clear. Do you remember, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not remember.