

Hon. Mr. DANIEL: That is what we want to find out,—Just how careful we have to be.

*By the chairman:*

Q. Have you read Dr. Desloges' letter to Senator Girroir?—A. Senator Girroir tells me that Dr. Desloges agrees with me that the examination should be of a general character—infected, more than venereal diseases.

Dr. Desloges is not here, but in a letter which he addressed to Senator Girroir, the promoter of the bill, on the 30th of April last he said, "May I take the liberty to suggest that the following words, appearing in clause 2, incapacity to marry in certain cases: Because of Venereal Disease, should be omitted. The clause would then refer to all those who are suffering with venereal disease, and who are mentally or physically unfit to procreate." Do you agree with Dr. Desloges' opinion?—A. That is reasonable, I think.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL: Read the clause of the Bill, as it would then appear, and Dr. Bates would understand it.

The CHAIRMAN: He refers to clause 2, which reads as follows: "No person shall be legally capable to contract marriage in Canada, who has venereal disease,"—and Dr. Desloges says, in his letter, that he would omit those words. He would strike them out. Then the clause would refer to all those who are suffering with venereal disease, and who are mentally or physically unfit to procreate. He does not appear to give us any concrete form for the clause. He gives his reason in a long paragraph I do not wish to read at this time; you may read it for yourselves.

The WITNESS: Does he say "and who are mentally or physically unfit to procreate," or does he use the word "or"?

Hon. Mr. DANIEL: I think he means that no person shall be legally able to contract marriage in Canada who is mentally or physically unfit to be married; I imagine he meant to say that. I presume he thinks venereal disease would be one of those things which would make him unfit, but it seems to me I cannot agree with him, that it would strengthen it—I think it would weaken it. As far as venereal disease is concerned it certainly would weaken it.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course we all regret Dr. Desloges is not here. He will not be able to come here; he is sailing to-day. But he says here, "A diagnosis cannot always be ascertained in cases of syphilis and especially in cases of hereditary syphilis, idiocy, imbecility, feeble-mindedness, epilepsy, etc., because in these latter cases the syphilitic origin cannot always be proven by the laboratory findings. In cases of hereditary syphilis the laboratory findings are not satisfactory, it often happens that the reaction is negative although the patient is a syphilitic." And he goes on to say that this is a question discussed by the whole medical world, and upon which scientists do not all agree. He says, however, "When after a careful medical examination, corroborated by laboratory findings, a diagnosis of syphilis has been made, all the physicians of the world are unanimous to forbid marriage."

The WITNESS: Yes, quite so.

The CHAIRMAN: "But it is not in all cases that the spirochaeta is in activity, and it happens quite often that a syphilitic presents no physical symptoms nor positive laboratory reaction."

*Hon. Mr. Schaffner:*

Q. Does he mean there that the only cases that might give a negative are those that are hereditary; does he mean that?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think so.