

should like to make it quite clear that I am not claiming that this particular pensioner will not receive satisfaction, because I referred the case to the department and am assured that it will receive sympathetic consideration. What I wish to show is that this case could never have arisen if the principle were fully established and accepted that pension is payable as of right.

The background of this case is that of an officer in the Seaforths who received a stomach wound which cut him up very badly indeed, to put it mildly. After a long period of hospitalization, he has eventually been able to get around and about. But I think all hon. members will appreciate that a man who was wounded in the stomach, particularly in the lower portion, is in a precarious condition. His health is generally very much below standard; although he may have spells when he is comparatively well, he is likely at any time to feel again the effects of his wound. In a case such as this more than in any other it becomes important to establish that the pension payable to him as a result of his disability shall be payable as of right, shall not be subject to review and reduction from time to time and then, later on, perhaps be restored to the original amount.

What happened in this case can be seen, I think, if I read some of the extracts from the letter written by this man. His case was taken up and he was given 100 per cent pension. He says in his letter:

... as soon as the fuss had blown over, last July to be exact, my pension was reduced to eighty per cent. Rather ironically notice of the reduction was handed me while I was still in bed recovering from the operation I had had on the pelvic wound.

In other words, between the time of his review—at which time it was decided that his pension should be reduced—and the time when he received notification, his old symptoms had broken out again and he had actually had to go back to hospital to have an operation as a result of that wound. It was while he was still in bed recovering from that operation that he received notification that his pension would be reduced. He goes on to say:

Regarding the practice of steadily reducing one's pension, I feel that this policy is contrary in many respects to the whole purpose of a pension for the pensioner is left uncertain as to where he stands and being unable to count on its continuance all feeling of security disappears and plans for settling into a steady job have continually to be revised... With all the data they have amassed during the many occasions that I have been medically examined apart from the many months spent in hospital, it should not be necessary for me to appeal and go up again before yet another board... I

fail to see why the benefit of the doubt should not be given to the pensioner instead of this everlasting gnawing and nibbling until he finally has no fight left in him and gives up in disgust.

Again I should like to say that I have hope that this particular case will be adjusted satisfactorily. The point I wish to make is that the situation which the pensioner has described and the feeling which he has expressed could never have arisen if the principle were adopted and adhered to that a pension awarded as a result of disability following from a wound received in action should be granted as of right, paid as of right, and should not be subject to any reduction or to constant review.

Mr. TUCKER: I understood the hon. member to say that he took that case up with the department and is having it looked into.

Mr. FULTON: Yes, I have hopes that this particular case will be satisfactorily adjusted. I refer to it because I feel that it affords a very good illustration of the point I am trying to make.

The third subject I should like to refer to this afternoon is that of the occupation army, with particular reference to its relationship to the field of foreign affairs. In view of the statements which have been made recently in the course of the debate on this subject, I think we should look closely at the history surrounding the formation and withdrawal of Canada's army of occupation, because the statement that our forces were withdrawn because they were kicked out is entirely at variance with the statements of two other cabinet ministers on this subject. In fact, the whole history of this matter is one of contradiction and of reluctance or inability to give information as to the policies behind first, the formation of the occupation army and, later, its withdrawal.

I take the time to refer to this matter because I think it is extremely important in the light of the background it forms to Canada's position in foreign affairs, particularly with respect to the representations which we have made that we should have a larger voice in the formation of the peace treaties, mainly the terms of peace with Germany and Austria. The house is familiar with the arguments which were put forward, and I shall refer to them in passing, to fill in the background to my remarks; they were to the effect that if we still had an army of occupation in Europe it would put us in a much stronger position when we come to demand that we shall have a voice in the settlement of these peace treaties, because we would be able to say, "We are taking part now in the policing of Europe and in the insurance that the fruits of victory, not