

tion made stronger. These insinuations are quite unfounded. There is not a tittle of evidence or proof in support of them. As I said before, there was not one of the six gentlemen who examined me that I had ever spoken to before in my life, and they knew nothing at all about me.

Just here I want to put on record a letter from Dr. H. A. Lafleur. Every man here knows Dr. Lafleur, of Montreal. I do not suppose there is a medical man in this House or out of it who would say that he is not a competent man to diagnose a case properly. When I took ill first, I went to Dr. Lafleur when I came back to Canada. I did not know what was wrong with me. The first illness I had was ten months after I enlisted. I had blood pressure. It was overstated in the examination of the first board, for which I am perhaps responsible. When I think I said it was 169 I should have said it was 159. The doctor put it at 170, which makes quite a difference. I went overseas and was nearly three months in England before I had any further trouble. Then I took what they call angina pectoris. The doctors seemed to confuse the two, the angina pectoris and the blood pressure, with arterial sclerosis. My trouble is angina pectoris. Dr. Lafleur wrote on January 9, 1918, saying:

Hon. George H. Bradbury,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Col. Bradbury:

Regarding your physical condition which I have had the opportunity of observing since April, 1917, I am of the opinion that the symptoms of which you complain for the last eighteen months or more point to angina pectoris, and I believe that this condition necessitates your curtailing your activities as much as possible. I would advise you to avoid particularly fatigue and physical exertion and worry and excitement of any sort. I consider that you should be relieved of military duties entirely, and that all you can safely undertake is attention to your business and your senatorial duties.

I have several letters here from the doctor and from the sanitarium, but I will not read them. As honourable gentlemen will understand, it is not agreeable to parade this matter before this House. I am doing it only to point out the true condition of affairs.

On February 4, 1918, Dr. Lafleur wrote again. I may explain to the House how I came to get this letter. After I was boarded in Ottawa—the board had Dr. Lafleur's letter before them—the board said: "He does not say whether he thinks your trouble originated with your work in connection with your battalion or not." I said, "Dr. Lafleur has told me that it did." I

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY.

asked him what caused the trouble, and he asked me what I had been doing. I said, that I had raised a battalion, and he said, "No doubt that is what caused your trouble." The board asked me to write a letter to him asking him to express an opinion. Here is what he says in his letter of February 4, 1918:

Hon. George H. Bradbury,
The Senate, Ottawa.

Dear Sir:

In answer to your letter of February 1st, I may say that I believe the trouble you are now suffering from—angina pectoris—had its origin in the physical exertion and mental worry attendant upon the raising, training and taking overseas of your battalion.

I want to put that on record because of the statement that has been made, that it takes at least a year, likely more, for trouble to develop.

There are one or two other statements made by Dr. Belton, to which I feel I must refer. Speaking of the board that had already examined me, someone asked him: "As a medical man would not you say that the men who had examined the man formerly and had passed upon his disability would be better able to say whether he was better or worse, on a subsequent occasion?" The answer to that question was "yes." The inference drawn from that was that I had declined to go before the same board, which is absolutely untrue. There was no suggestion that I should do so. Then, again:

Speaking for yourself, you see no reason why the medical board should not have re-examined Colonel Bradbury?

And the answer is:

Colonel Bradbury did object to that board.

I want to state most emphatically that that statement is not correct. I did not object, and he did not suggest that I should go before the same board again. The only demur I made was when he suggested that I should be examined by a board of consulting physicians—and even then I did not object; I just said that I would take it into consideration. Another statement he makes is that some Mr. Mills said that Colonel Bradbury had been a sick man for many years, and that in any further dealings he had in this matter no doubt that would be on his mind. Is not that a rather peculiar position for a man holding the office he holds to take, if he does not depend on his professional knowledge without taking what some one told him on the street?

I think I am justified in bringing this matter before the House, because there has