

Mr. CROWE: Why is the province of Ontario exempted?

Mr. ROWELL: In this respect the Act is the same as it has been ever since Confederation. I have inquired with the view of ascertaining, so far as there appears to be any record, why Ontario has always been left out, and the reason that I have been given is that Ontario navigation is inland—lake navigation. This legislation so far has only been applied to ocean navigation.

Mr. CROWE: Does the minister think that seamen on the lakes do not get sick as well as seamen on the ocean?

Mr. ROWELL: That is true. I am willing to say that there may be an argument made for their inclusion, yet I doubt whether it is wise for us to change the law which has been in force since Confederation. Another reason given is that vessels plying on the lakes are usually near the home port or town of these seamen, who may be returned home in case of illness. I quite agree that that would not cover all cases, but those are the grounds which for fifty years have apparently influenced the policy of all governments in not bringing Ontario under the legislation.

Mr. CROWE: You could use the same argument as to vessels being near the home ports of the seamen in the case of vessels plying up and down the coast, which have to pay this tax.

Mr. ROWELL: There is one slight amendment I wish to make to this section. Subclause (4) says that "such duty shall be payable on each ship three times during each calendar year," but it does not specify on what occasions the duty shall be paid. To make the matter more clear and to avoid confusion I beg to insert after the word "ship" in the first line of subclause (4) the following words: "each time she arrives in any such port, but in no case shall it be oftener than."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish to say one or two words in reply to the minister, who in his explanation of the necessity for the increase of the tonnage due to 2 cents a ton, did not treat my argument quite fairly. I was not arguing that the American tax was imposed because of the 2 cent tonnage due here, and the minister knows I was not. I separated my argument. I knew perfectly well that the six cents a ton tax was applied whether we had a 1½ cents or a 2 cents tax here, and it was quite unnecessary of

[Mr. Rowell.]

the minister to enlighten me on that point. I was objecting to the increase to two cents asked for when there is no necessity for it. The minister told us that there was an administrative staff in Ottawa and that there were certain expenditures on hospitals. The same ground was traversed a few weeks ago and the minister was unable to give us any information as to the amount of these administration and hospital charges. My information is that the total charge included in these figures is for a certain gentleman by the name of Dr. Godin, a stenographer and one clerk. I am satisfied after an investigation that Dr. Godin's services are quite unnecessary because you do not need a medical man in charge of the work which can easily be done by any ordinary clerk. The medical work in the administration of this department is done in all quarters of this country by the hospitals and doctors there. Although Dr. Godin's services are retained as a medical man you will not use a medical man once in a season and probably not once in ten seasons. I am not saying this with any desire to embarrass the minister but I am quite sure that the minister was not alive to all the facts when the matter was first broached. This administration is such that it could very well be put in charge of a clerk and a stenographer. This year I am informed we have had an \$8,000 surplus and there is no occasion to increase this charge to two cents in order to cover the work of these officials. As my hon. friend has transferred this work to the Health Department he should leave the fee for another year at one and a half cents in order to see if it is necessary to increase the rate and then let the House know whether it is necessary. The minister rather implied that I was here taking a stand against the sick mariner and in the interest of the shipowner. He said that his intentions were to protect the sick mariner, to see that he was taken care of properly and he believed that the shipowners could very well afford to pay for it. I had no objection, nor have I now, to that position. My position is this: First, do not disturb these fees at all or, second, do not charge this fee but make shipping responsible for the care of the individual sailors just the same as the board of trade of Great Britain makes the shipping of Great Britain responsible. Under the laws of Great Britain British ships coming into Canada are obliged to care for their sick mariners. We are simply covering the same ground in so far as British shipping is concerned. I rather re-