

*Supply—Veterans Affairs*

to state that the commission admitted that evidence in my case was lacking, or omitted, from 1918 to 1928, and that was the reason I was not pensionable.

I replied that if they searched the hospital records they would find I had been treated for those complaints, but the board doctors had left it out in their reports. Now, if something is left out that would have given me a pension, is it not falsifying the records? If it is, then can you tell me why the commission states that the charges are not true?

I also submitted irrefutable documentary proofs of something omitted.

Vancouver.

A Witness.

How does that sound, following this commission? I will read another one in the *Vancouver Daily Province* of April 13, 1948:

Thanks Hospital Staff

Sir: I am one of the witnesses who protested against the practices of the Canadian Pension Commission doctors omitting items from my medical history and substituting statements which deprived me of pension for totally disabling injuries received in the services, and substantiated by two of the leading orthopaedic surgeons of this province, who are also D.V.A. consultants in this specialized sphere.

I wish to add my testimony before the recent Royal Commission which was given from a hospital stretcher under great difficulties, as my spine has been twice "cracked" in a successful major operation to straighten out my back, doubled over for many years past.

May I publicly repeat my thanks to the wonderful treatment services of the Shaughnessy Hospital both physicians and nurses, which I recorded in my evidence, and which was also emphasized by Walter H. Kirchner, M.C., D.C.M., in his evidence before the Royal Commission on my behalf.

Albert B. W. Crowhurst.

Shaughnessy Hospital.

The point is that the press reports have been so worded—I have them here, but shall not take time to read them—as to convey to the people the idea that Walter Kirchner's charges were against the medical personnel of Shaughnessy hospital, which was as far from the truth as possible, as will appear from what I have said.

Albert Crowhurst points this out. Here is another letter dated April 1, 1948:

The charges of Walter H. Kirchner, M.C., D.C.M., of the Combat Veterans against the D.V.A. administration concern the unlawful practices of the Canadian Pension Commission, and not the treatment services of the Shaughnessy hospital, the latter being over-emphasized in the press reports of March 20, 1948, to the exclusion of the former.

I was one of the witnesses before the Royal Commission on inquiry here and gave evidence proving my war disability rights had been outlawed by a false report inserted into the records by the pension medical examiner. In consequence, the expert medical evidence of three top ranking specialists unlawfully was

[Mr. Blackmore.]

ruled out by the Canadian Pension Commission. The House of Commons is now in a position to take action against the Canadian Pension Commission in the interests of all disabled veterans affected by these most unlawful practices.

J. V. Thom, M.M.

These are letters from some of the men. I ask hon. members whether in the light of such letters and other considerations as these, we can pass this whole matter easily by.

Here is another remarkable aspect of this McCann commission's behaviour: Apparently most of the evidence, if recorded at all, was recorded upon phonographic records. That evidence has never been transcribed. As I pointed out, the charge was made in public in this House of Commons by two responsible members, the hon. member for Acadia and the hon. member for Swift Current.

Right Hon. Ian Mackenzie's words, although they were somewhat vague and were not fully specific, would certainly convey the idea that there was to be a public inquiry which would provide evidence which every hon. member and the people of the country could have in their hands and consider, not a study conducted in a secret way with all the evidence recorded on records to which almost no one could gain access? How in the world could you have any kind of intelligible result from a commission conducted in that way? The evidence has been kept on the records in the possession of the McCann commission as its own personal property! Certainly that is not what the hon. member for Swift Current and the hon. member for Acadia asked for. One would have expected that the evidence would be given before a public inquiry and would belong to the public. I cannot escape the conviction that that is exactly what it should have been.

Again, we are told that none of the witnesses was sworn. We have the minister's own words for that, on June 14 in a statement in which he endeavoured to have the hon. member for Peace River withdraw his request for a copy of the evidence and proceedings of the McCann commission, appointed under the authority of P.C. 4980, made this statement at page 5151 of *Hansard*:

The witnesses were not sworn, and as a result they gave evidence over and above that which would have been required had they been informed that they were proceeding on a formal basis under oath. Some of the discussions at Vancouver were recorded on sound recording discs in order to assist the commissioner in writing his report on that phase of the hearing.

I must confess that as an ordinary man on the street that sort of thing is completely incomprehensible to me as being the record