

*Canada Shipping Act*

the one relating to the designation by the minister of a doctor is worth examining again. I would like to examine it from two viewpoints. The first one is the relationship between doctor and patient. I suggest, since that is a professional relationship it is based, particularly from the standpoint of the patient, upon confidence in the man or woman who is looking after his medical problems. I suggest that for the ill seaman to have to go to the customs officer or to whoever's duty it is to point out which doctor is on the designated list, would have a very natural result. The poor, sick person thinks that the curing of his ills is in the hands of some government functionary. I suggest that this does raise a barrier, not in all cases but certainly in some cases, that is unfortunate and does not have to be there at all.

There is no good reason for adopting this course and I think there are several bad reasons why it is being adopted. I do not know why, even at this point, the minister does not reflect on what he is asking us to do in this legislation which otherwise, I suppose, merits support. It would be a shame if it had to be left to the institution of sober second thought down the hall to make a change which is, I think, very necessary. My point about the confidential relationship that has to exist between the person seeking professional advice and the person giving it is that there should be a freedom of choice by the person who needs professional advice. I say that that freedom of choice is at the very heart of the problem of the sick mariner.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The second point I want to make is that you are dealing with the international community when you are dealing with shipping, particularly when it is shipping over salt water. I realize that this bill is presented to us by a minister from a fresh water community, and is seconded by a minister who is also from a fresh water community. But these landlubber-minded gentlemen should not allow their vision to be restricted, in comparison with we who are fortunate enough to live by the salt water and who have the nobler and wider vision.

Many shipping crews now come from Taiwan or Hong Kong. Many of them come from Spain, and of course the other marine countries that are well known such as Norway, the United Kingdom and places like that. Liberia gets into the act too, but one does not call that a marine power; one calls

[Mr. McCleave.]

that a marine loophole. Panama is also in that category. The point I am making is that your ill seaman is not necessarily going to be speaking one of the two official languages of Canada. He may be speaking any one of 30 or 40 foreign languages.

He is ill, and he is taken to hospital in Halifax. There, somebody trots out the list of designated doctors for his treatment but in the yellow pages of the telephone directory he finds a doctor who is familiar with his language and to whom he can explain his belly-ache, his appendix problem or whatever it is. Sometimes, sir, it is very difficult to make a speech in view of the suggestions that come from one's own colleagues which never quite reach *Hansard* but which have a sort of paralyzing effect.

The sick mariner conceivably could have treatment from a doctor in the community where he is ill, who understands his language, yet he is forced to go to a designated doctor who may not understand his language. Therefore the whole probe of the illness, the symptoms and the like, has to be dealt with through an interpreter. I imagine that is the way it happens. Again, we have the ridiculous situation where you cannot have the proper professional-patient relationship for a man who needs help. Again, I plead with the minister to broaden his vision on this question. He is a professional man himself. In addition, he should bring a little bit of international thinking into this thing and see to it that the correction is made in this bill which otherwise, I gather, merits the support of the House.

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Mr. Speaker, I have about four points to make on this bill, and I hope they are not too disjointed. The first one is a general observation that it is bad legislation. It is the type of legislation that causes the watchers of Parliament to ask us questions, "Why did you do that, and why did you not do this? Didn't anybody think about this, or didn't anybody think about that?" Twice in the space of the last eight or ten months we have had the supreme courts of our country question certain laws, and I suggest they questioned them because the legislation was not properly thought out and indeed was bad legislation. In fact, this legislation is bad because nowhere in it is there provision for our mariners who may happen to be in a foreign port. We have taken a unilateral step. What are the bilateral implications of that? What are the multilateral implications of that?