

perhaps I should not state it. This man enlisted on November 3, 1941; he was examined by the medical officers, and they reported that he was found fit for category C2. Then I find this on the medical report:

Special remarks when category lower than A: "Well functioning artificial limb on mid-calf amputation of left leg."

I rather got the impression from the hon. member that the amputation was above the knee.

Mr. GRAYDON: I do not think he said that in so many words.

Mr. RALSTON: I rather had that impression. The file shows that this man was taken on through a misunderstanding on the part of the recruiting officer in Trail, British Columbia, who did not realize that in order to take on a man in C2 for special service he had to get the consent of national defence headquarters. That is the rule in connection with men of that kind who are recommended for particular jobs; special permission has to be given. Accordingly a letter was written on April 21, 1942, by the district officer commanding military district No. 11, in which he says:

Through a misunderstanding on the part of the recruiting officer in Trail, B.C., the marginally named man was enlisted in category C2 without prior authority having been attained from national defence headquarters.

Private ——— was categorized C2 by reason of amputation of the right leg, about lower third, as a result of a shotgun accident at the age of twelve years. It is however stated that he is in possession of a very satisfactory artificial limb. This man was attested on the 3rd November, 1941.

This man is employed as a wireless operator at No. 9 fortress signal company, R.C.C.S., and it is reported by the staff officer (signals) that he is quite skilled, and that it is in the public interest to retain his services in view of the definite shortage of skilled low category personnel of this type.

In view of the foregoing, may authority be granted to retain Private ——— in the service.

Steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence of the misunderstanding by which this man was improperly enlisted.

That file came to headquarters. It was examined by the medical officers, and on May 16 this notation was made by the director general of medical services:

Assignment of category C2 concurred in. There would seem to be no objection to this man continuing in his present employment with the disability as shown.

In the second letter coming from M.D. No. 11 this statement was made:

In view of the fact that the marginally named other rank is a tradesman, and is employed as

such, it is requested that this be taken into consideration and that his retention in the service be authorized, as there is a very serious shortage of tradesmen suitable for employment by R.C.C.S.

In a word, the man was qualified to be enlisted in view of his special skill for this technical job as fortress signaller, provided he had received the prior approval of national defence headquarters. That approval was not applied for by the recruiting officer. Later it was discovered that this approval had not been obtained; evidently somebody was checking up on the medical documents. Application was then made for approval of his enlistment. Representations were made that the man was skilled in signals and that there was a shortage of skilled low category personnel of this type, and approval was given to his retention in the service. Finally, as I say, his amputation was about mid-calf; that is to say, about the lower third of the leg. When I come to read it I do not think there is anything unusual about this at all. I think the complaint of the hon. member was that the man had not received some treatment in connection with the leg. I shall have that looked into.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Is it a fact that this man has applied for treatment and his request has been refused?

Mr. RALSTON: No; that is not shown here at all.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I understood the hon. member for New Westminster to complain that the man had been refused treatment.

Mr. RALSTON: That was what I said I was going to look into, but I think what surprised everyone was the fact that the man was enlisted. I wanted to have the file here, in order to be able to tell the committee the circumstances under which the enlistment took place. I shall inquire into the matter of treatment.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I would have no objection to his being enlisted if he is useful in the service of the country, but I would have objection to his being refused treatment.

Mr. JACKMAN: When the minister states that the application should have the approval of national defence headquarters, what is meant by "national defence headquarters"? Does that mean that the minister should himself, personally, approve the application?