

chance. I said that if his offence was serious enough to force his resignation, his resignation should not have been asked for, but he should have been dismissed outright. But when the minister saw fit to ask for his resignation he should at least have treated Dr. Torrance as a gentleman and as a man should be treated.

Mr. STEVENS: Dr. Torrance wrote a letter to the Acting Director General of the United States, and I ask the House to look at it in the proper perspective. Canada was negotiating for the lifting of the embargo in Great Britain. The British authorities were suggesting to the Canadian authorities, "Now, if we admit your cattle into Great Britain we think you should lower the period of quarantine in Canada against British cattle which you import in some numbers, thoroughbreds and breeding stock". But there is a third party to this. Our regulations are more or less harmonious with those of the United States. Both the department in the United States and the department in Canada have been working in harmony; and so the minister directed Dr. Torrance—I think I am correct in this—to ascertain from the Director General of the United States what their attitude should be if the department found itself forced to lower the period of quarantine, and I have here the letter which the minister says warrants the dismissal of Dr. Torrance. It was marked "confidential" and was sent to Dr. Mohler of Washington. The letter reads as follows:

I am strongly of the opinion that quarantine regulations should be based upon scientific knowledge of the diseases against which we desire protection, of the conditions surrounding the traffic in animals, the freedom from disease of the country from which the cattle are exported, and the time occupied in ocean travel. If political considerations are to be introduced into the consideration of the question of quarantine it places the scientific advisers of the respective governments in a very anomalous position, and I feel that where we have to undertake the responsibility of carrying out any regulations that are made we should also have a decided influence in the planning of these regulations.

Let us pause there. This is the gist of the whole thing. This is where the minister takes his stand on the subject. Dr. Torrance says he had no idea of suggesting party or political influence of any sinister character. He was referring to the political pressure of the British government upon the Canadian government. Now were there not some grounds for that? Ample grounds. The British government were being asked to remove the embargo. We know that for years every conceivable opposition was put in the way. We know that the British farmers, agriculturists and breeders objected to it and

fought it right down the line, and Canadian shippers were very much disappointed. But a time came when the British government felt that they had to do something. It was due to Canada to do it. There was some justice in Canada's claim, and they said to Canada, "Give us something which will be some compensation at least to our own people;" and they asked us to lower our quarantine regulations. That is the political consideration referred to, and I ask the Prime Minister in all fairness, would not the fair reading of this indicate that as a most sensible interpretation? Let me ask further, having in mind all this correspondence between the two departments of these two governments, and having in mind the question of the British embargo, the other end of the matter, what political considerations of a local or partisan character could possibly enter into it? There is no room for the suggestion. But as a matter of fact there were sound grounds for the political interference of the character I spoke of. He says in this letter:

It is quite possible, however, that a suggestion may be made that we should modify our quarantine so as to reduce the time of detention, and it is with regard to this possible demand that I would like to have confidentially your opinion as it affects the relations between the bureau and the Health of Animals branch. We have always felt that we were under agreement not to alter our quarantine regulations without previously notifying you of our intention, and we have received from you the same consideration.

Then he says:

I am strongly of the opinion that quarantine regulations should be based upon scientific knowledge.

I have read that portion. There is nothing wrong with that. Is that not perfectly sound? I have not the letter in consecutive form. I am just reading the paragraphs quoted in Hansard. He says in this letter:

I feel that where we have to undertake the responsibility of carrying out any regulations that are made we should also have a decided influence in the planning of these regulations.

There is nothing wrong about that. Who should plan the regulations, if it were not to be done by the scientists employed by the different governments? Who is qualified to properly perform the regulations other than the Director General whose qualifications from that standpoint have never been questioned, not even by the minister? Let me pause for a moment to say that Dr. Torrance was dealing with this question as he was instructed to do by his minister. The only possible excuse the minister has for taking a political view of it is the word "political" inserted in that letter. If we can put on that word an interpretation consistent with the letter itself