

mail will chase the man around until it finally reaches him. It does not pile up in the unit to which he was attached.

There are perhaps one or two other points I should mention while I am dealing with these matters. I would refer to only one point in connection with the remarks of the hon. member for Témiscouata. I do not want this house or this country to get any idea that Canadians form the majority or any large part of the fifth army. There are a certain number of Canadians attached to the fifth army, but that army is composed of British and United States soldiers, while the eighth army is composed of British and Canadian soldiers. I think the remarks of the hon. member, which would suggest that the British are not in this war in Italy, do a grievous wrong to a people who have been in this war from the very beginning, a country which has given more than any other country, I think, to help make success possible.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Are there no Canadians in the fifth army?

Mr. RALSTON: A few; one unit. At a time when Britain was short of everything she sent her men and her equipment to different fronts, though she could ill afford to do so. We Canadians are proud of the fact that the first Canadian division was in Britain and was the key of the force which was holding that citadel; but that citadel was not held simply by the Canadian forces alone. It was held because of the stout-heartedness and fortitude of the British people at that time, because of their willingness to run risks in order to see to it that the enemy was not allowed to come closer but was kept at bay on different fronts; I am thinking particularly of the Mediterranean fronts, in Greece, in Crete and in North Africa.

Then the hon. member for Lethbridge put certain questions which he wanted me to answer specifically and categorically. I only wish to say that in the first place I think the hon. member knows that the questions with which he was dealing were not germane to the items before the committee. There will be a time to discuss rehabilitation. In the remarks I made the other afternoon I was dealing with the effort which the forces themselves were putting forward in order to see to it that while men were in the army they were made as fit as possible to take up civilian avocations, and I was indicating the kind of machinery, the committees and the sort of administration being set up by the forces for that purpose. I only say to my hon. friend that if he will read the speech from the throne he will find

indicated there the scope of the measures which the government intend to bring down in connection with the matter of rehabilitation. As I said the other night, I am not in a position, nor do I propose to make any announcement with regard to the extent of that policy, but the measures will speak for themselves when they are before the house.

The hon. member for Renfrew South spoke of the pulhems system. I know what he said, and when he speaks in connection with a matter of this kind I regard what he says as being entitled to special attention. He said that more consideration should be given to the man's statement. As a physician of very long standing himself, I am sure that that advice comes from his own experience in diagnosing the condition of patients. I know nothing about it, but it sounds like common sense that attention should be given to the history given by the patient. I will also agree that that history has to be checked up, having regard to the clinical treatment.

The hon. member asked whether consideration had been given to an amalgamation of the medical services of the armed forces. Further consideration is not being given to it. It has been considered many times, and it is considered that that action would not contribute to efficiency or economy in personnel. Consideration might be given to a revision of the organization of all federal medical services when the war is over. But the special needs of the three armed services make it essential that the medical officers be trained in methods of examinations and treatment peculiar to the disabilities and personalities to be served.

Another point which the committee must consider is the geographical consideration contributing to the need for a separate type of service. For instance, air force personnel are widely scattered from military camps. You cannot make a combination of those services, because it is simply geographically and physically impossible to do so. In the field of hospitalization, and the common use of medical services, the duplication of services—and I think my hon. friend will agree in this—has to a large extent been successfully avoided by means of the wartime hospitalization committee. My hon. friend knows consultant and specialist services are used in common by all four medical services.

Then, he asked with regard to the report of the medical assignment and procurement board. There is a misapprehension with regard to that matter. The report which has been handed to the government, and to me, because I happen to be the minister through whom the board reports, is not a report of the medical assignment and procurement board, but is, as