

To: Dr. Leong Che Hung
 Legislative Councillor
 Medical Functional Constituency.

CB(2) 2796/98-99(04)

**A PERSONAL OPINION BY AN HKDA MEMBER ON
 ANCILLARY DENTAL PERSONNEL
 (LEGCO'S MEETING 13 SEPTEMBER 1999)**

Enclosed please find relevant comments to information provided, please refer to whoever will attend the above meeting esp. Dr C.H. Leong.

1. HKDA (dental practitioners rep.) & ADP are not "opposite" in relation to ADP registration. HKDA urge the Government to properly address all queries including grandfather clause (e.g. Chinese Medicine case - suitability to apply in this situation?), training (eg. Government prepared to fund all appropriate training of ADP, including on the job training such as subsidy to employer or taxation provision/allowance for employer), career prospect for all ADP post registration (eg. Ensuring no existing ADP will lose his/her job because of the registration process).
2. HKDA stance has always been - all ADP should be under the jurisdiction of the existing Dental Council as all classes ADP worked under the instructions or direct supervision of comprehensively trained dentist - ONLY ONE SET OF DENTAL ORDINANCE (ie DRO)
 => Best way to protect public health
 [additional benefit: ADP more economical to register]
 [more cost-effective]/ [government easier to manage]
3. Comparison to U.K. GDC recently proposed ADP registration can only be justified if HKSAR Government plan to have similar National Health Policy of U.K. : extensive use of ADP aim to economise the NHS dental service provision.

Conclusion:

HKSAR government should have comprehensive review of dental services (public/private) provisions including (but not limited to) the supply/demand of all types of dental personnel (eg fully trained dentists, ADP & any other personnel in relation)

Prepared by Dr David C.W. Ho (contact No. 2389 8516).