

in the person of Doctor George Stephens, formerly of Winnipeg. Treasury board will not give approval to the construction of a hospital without the approval of that committee. The committee meets whenever the need for hospital accommodation arises in a particular centre. It considers what the navy has there, what the army has there, what the air force has there, what pensions and national health have there and also what civilian facilities exist. In the light of those circumstances it decides the most economical and soundest method of procedure. The idea of building on to an existing hospital is attractive from some points of view. Economically, so far as immediate expenditure is concerned, it is not sound, because the cost per bed is very much higher than the cost of constructing an ordinary hospital. There is also the fact that it is highly desirable that service personnel have an opportunity, as part of their training, to treat and serve the service personnel in the hospital. I know of one case down at Gaspé where we rent a floor of the hospital. There the service doctors, the army, navy and air doctors, the orderlies and everyone connected with the service medical units, have the opportunity of dealing with their own patients; it is simply a wing or floor of the civilian hospital. When that opportunity presents itself we are glad to take advantage of it, but I think we can say that this matter of hospitals has had a thorough going over, and I believe the committee can be well assured that during the past year there has been little duplication in regard to hospital accommodation.

Mr. GREEN: I realize that there would be difficulties in administering an addition to a civilian hospital, but does not the minister think that in the long run it would be far cheaper, far more efficient and far more beneficial to the Canadian people for the department to build additions, wherever that is reasonably possible, instead of setting up its own military hospitals?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend quite properly puts in the provision, "where it is reasonably possible or practicable," because each case is different. I remember one case where the training centre was two miles away from the hospital in town. It was suggested that we should build an addition to that hospital. This would have meant the continual use of gasoline, tires and oil running back and forth all the time to this hospital, instead of having perhaps a ten-bed hospital right on the premises; therefore we decided not to do it. There might be another case, such as Gaspé, where it would be possible. I

[Mr. Ralston.]

am not sure whether it is a success, and I say that because I am in absolute ignorance as to just how we are getting along with it. However, I think it can be said that it is sound in the interests of everybody concerned and having regard to post-war as well as emergency needs.

Mr. GREEN: Why was an addition not built at Victoria?

Mr. RALSTON: The deputy quartermaster-general is giving me this information from memory, but he tells me that his recollection is that we took over the normal school at Victoria. We spent about \$75,000 and provided in effect a 200-bed hospital. To have provided the same facilities in any other way would have cost between \$400,000 and \$500,000. It is a permanent building which can be used after the war.

Mr. QUELCH: Perhaps the minister would answer my question. I was at Hanna last fall and I visited the office of the special areas board and was shown on a map the area which had been taken over by the defence department. This consisted of several townships from which the farmers had been moved but the chairman of the board did not seem to know for what purpose this land was being acquired.

Mr. RALSTON: I may say to my hon. friend that I cannot tell him.

Mr. QUELCH: Perhaps the Minister of Munitions and Supply will know that.

Mr. RALSTON: I have sent out a note to find out if we have anything on it.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Is consideration being given to the building of chapels at the army camps? There is a rumour to this effect, and I do not know whether it applies to the army or the air force.

Mr. RALSTON: That is what I was speaking about, but I called them religious centres because they are used not only as chapels but as places where the men can go to discuss their private affairs with the chaplains. The list I have before me shows that none of these chapels has cost more than \$10,000, and they go down as low as \$7,550.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): What is the total amount that will be spent on the forty-two chapels? Will any camps be without chapels? Will the chapels to be provided be Roman Catholic or Protestant, depending upon the church affiliation of the chaplain?

Mr. RALSTON: The total amount of the contracts let for the twenty-seven chapels is