

Q. Then, in your opinion, in every case there would require to be a blood examination made of all applicants, both male and female?—A. Yes, quite so.

Q. You know the conditions of doctors all through the various provinces, and you know it is only in urban centres that it is possible to get a blood examination?—A. Well, no, not exactly. The various provinces now have laboratories, and blood can be sent to those laboratories.

Q. Yes, it has to be sent?—A. Yes.

Q. It is not available, by the ordinary physician?—A. No, not as quickly, perhaps, but still it can be sent by mail; it is done, regularly.

Q. But he cannot do it, himself?—A. No.

Q. So that an ordinary physician is not in a position to give a medical certificate?—A. Well, as a matter of fact, even in the urban centres, the physician does not do this blood examination himself. It is always done at a laboratory.

Q. But it is only in urban centres where facilities exist for doing it?—A. Yes.

Q. What we have to judge is as to the practicability of this law. Do you think it is practicable?—A. Yes, from the technical point of view—yes. But from the public point of view it is another matter.

Q. What do you think about the public point of view?—A. The Social Hygiene Council, which has undertaken educational work in connection with venereal disease for some years past has discussed this matter upon many occasions, more occasions than one. They have placed themselves on record as endorsing the principle of a medical examination before marriage. There is a feeling, however, that it will be easier to achieve the end which we desire if such medical examination is made to cover more than venereal disease.

Q. Yes, doctor, I was going to ask about that. Such as what?—A. Well, for example tuberculosis, mental deficiency or insanity.

Q. Take tuberculosis, for example: Would you advise that anyone who has a suspicion of tuberculosis in any organ of the body should be refused a marriage license?—A. No, I would not go that far.

Q. Well, where are you going to draw the line?

*By Hon. Mr. Bourque:*

Q. Yes, where do you draw the line?—A. I would say that you would have to decide that certain things would be an absolute bar.

*By Hon. Mr. Daniel:*

Q. You could not include tuberculosis, then?—A. I would not say that. I am not a tuberculosis expert, but I would say that a case of open tuberculosis might be considered to be a bar.

Q. When it is so bad that anybody can see it?—A. Yes.

Q. But you know, in a great many cases of tuberculosis it would appear to be latent, and often very difficult even for a specialist to discover?—A. Yes.

Q. Would you think that in a case such as that he or she should be debarred from being married?—A. I do not know; I would like to have Dr. Hincks' to back me up in that; I would not be so certain.

Q. Well, that is doubtful. Outside of tuberculosis, then, the disease you would like to include in a Bill such as this, would be mental deficiency?—A. Yes, I would say mental deficiency and insanity. My friend Dr. Hincks will have more to say about it than I have, but I would say that mental deficiency, insanity and syphilis would be definite bars.

Q. Insanity—you might include mental deficiency in that?—A. They are two different things.