

Dental Examining Board

haps it will serve to give everyone a clear picture. In Britain the general practitioner has been deprofessionalized, if we can use that term, into a prescription or pill dispenser and a filler out of forms. In the United States, there is no universal health insurance apart from those on welfare or over age 65. The cost to a patient for medical care is extremely high. Doctors' incomes are high and this has resulted in a great wave of dissatisfaction and litigation. In Russia, although their hospital standard is fairly good, most of the primary medical care is given by nurses or technicians, and although this is moderately good there is not enough high quality professional supervision.

We have heard a great deal about China and about some of their medical methods. There is no doubt about the beneficial results of diet and exercise. Recently in Canada the Department of National Health and Welfare brought out a report on the state of nutrition in Canada. Nutrition may not in reality be as bad as it sounds in that no comparative studies have been carried out in other countries. On the other hand, there is no doubt that a program of physical fitness and diet would be very beneficial to Canadians. I should like to sound a word of warning about adopting acupuncture as a big step forward. I think it has some useful value, but if we are not careful it could become another type of quack medical treatment or gimmick.

This is not exactly on the subject of this bill but I should like also to warn that physical fitness and diet alone will not prevent disease. They may help a few individuals to live a little longer but it will really remain for scientific knowledge to alleviate the multitude of illnesses which cannot be prevented. It will also be necessary to make sure that medical standards of excellence are continually raised instead of being allowed to deteriorate.

Finally, the main reason for bringing forward the amendments is simply that at least six provinces do not wish to include dental auxiliaries in this act until further study has been made and the wishes of these bodies have been fully explored. However, all provincial and federal dental bodies wish to see a uniform examination board structure so that dental practitioners and specialists can take that board's examinations and practise in any province in Canada. This embodies, of course, the principle of portability. In other words, I should like Bill S-7 to proceed to committee for discussion of the proposed amendments which would separate dental auxiliaries from the dentists so far as control of examinations is concerned. I think it should be recognized that the medical profession and their auxiliaries cannot be separated very widely. The same thing goes for dentists and their auxiliaries. It is my hope that this is one step only in the process of organizing the dental profession properly.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when one thinks of the professions and occupations that are represented in this House, it seems strange that we do not have a dentist. We have a number of members who are quite capable of pulling boners but no one who is able to pull teeth.

● (1720)

Frankly, this is a bill that contains a number of matters about which I do not claim to be knowledgeable, and I

[Mr. Railton.]

confess that one quick look at it, especially after listening to the remarks of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton), makes me feel that we should not be asked at this point, by any decision that we make, to give the bill full endorsement. However, I have no objection to its being passed so that it can be sent to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders, and I was pleased to hear from the hon. member for Welland that a number of amendments will be considered at that stage.

To begin with, I find an error right in the preamble. I do not want to suggest that their honours in the other place are not alert, but I find in lines 4 and 5 of the preamble in English the following phrase: "and it is expedition to grant the prayer of the petition". When I look at the French version I find, even from what I know of French, that apparently the phrase should be: "and it is expedient to grant the prayer of the petition". However, I am a little surprised that a bill should pass all readings in the other place, come here and still have that error in it.

I am also concerned about the fact that there is no reference in the bill to denturists. Even to mention denturists is to allude to the fact that there is some contention in this area. I should like to know what we are doing with respect to that. I notice that the bill makes frequent reference to provincial provisions, to provincial licensing and to matters of jurisdiction. I note also that the bill, in its main body, has five clauses which seem to make a new piece of legislation. But then clause 5 of the bill amends Chapter 69 of the Statutes of 1952. First, I wondered why there was no reference to the Revised Statutes of 1970, but I suppose Chapter 69 of the Statutes of 1952 was probably a private bill and therefore was not carried forward into the Revised Statutes of Canada for 1972. I am simply underlining the point that it seems to me there are some questions about this bill, and it would be wrong to suggest that if we let it through second reading at this stage we are giving it a final approval.

I understand that when it does get to committee, not only will there be amendments that the sponsors will seek to make but that representatives of the Department of National Health and Welfare will express their concern and may have some amendments to suggest. It is on that basis, namely, that we accept it as a reasonable request that the bill go to committee, that we are prepared that this be done, but I hope the bill will be given in committee a thorough examination and the exhaustive study that we, nonprofessionals that we are, are not in a position to give it here in the House. We all know about dentists; we have been to them and we know what they do to us, so we cannot but wonder what they are asking for in this bill. Perhaps that can be found out in the committee.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a couple of thoughts on the bill before us today, Bill S-7, which is being put before the House by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Railton). First of all, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Welland for bringing this bill forward. It has been on the order paper since early last spring, and I know that he has spent a great deal of time in consultations with the Department of National Health and Welfare, with provincial bodies and with the various groups which are included in this