

uity as provided in section 3 (1) of the Public Service Retirement Act 1920 as amended 1921, 1922 and 1923; and that furthermore because Dr. Torrance was retained as veterinary inspector by authority of order in council from the 1st March, 1906, and in view of the meritorious service rendered by him, authority should be granted to pay him a retiring annuity based on a service of seventeen years and nine months, under section 3 (6) of the said act.

Then there is a schedule giving his age, which I have already referred to, service, annual salary, average salary, two months gratuity and annuity on retirement \$1,512, and so on, and the order concludes:

By order of Civil Service Commission

W. J. ROCHE,  
Chairman.

M. G. LAROCHELLE,  
Commissioner.

Now we have this continuous story.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do I understand that my hon. friend feels Dr. Torrance should have been allowed what the Civil Service Commission suggests?

Mr. STEVENS: I contend first—and perhaps I should have substantiated this part of my argument but I intend to do it before I sit down—there was absolutely no ground for his dismissal; secondly, the manner of his dismissal was unwarranted and unparalleled for its crudity and for its almost—I was going to say—brutality having in mind the age of the gentleman; and I contend—

Mr. GAUVREAU: What about 1919?

Mr. STEVENS: And I contend further that inasmuch as this resignation was secured by a distinct verbal agreement with the minister—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister told us that the other day.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I deny that absolutely.

Mr. STEVENS: Well I will read the resignation again given under an agreement which should be observed. I say further that the meritorious services of Dr. Torrance are of a character, just as this order in council drafted by the minister himself or by his department sets forth, that wholly warrants the payment of the gratuity. Now let me read the resignation again. The minister may deny the agreement but I have it here in his resignation that the minister receives and acknowledges in writing, there is no gainsaying that:

I desire to express my wish to resign and retire under the Calder Act, understanding that I would now be entitled to a retiring allowance of fourteen hundred dollars per annum.

The exact figures were not worked out until later. Now I turn from that to what the minister says to-night and to the memorandum. The minister takes refuge in a certain position. The Prime Minister was not in his seat the other day and I regret that very much because I think we would have had a different story by now had he been here. The other day the minister stood up in his place and read a certain letter and said "I have had this letter in my possession for some months"—I think it was six or seven or eight months. He said "I was satisfied to retire him under this letter but I was looking for corroborative evidence, and I think I have corroborative evidence in my hands." And he held up a memorandum with a gesture that savoured of the melodrama. He of course was fishing but we did not fall for his bait. We insisted that he should not bluff this House. The minister said "It reflects on Dr. Torrance therefore I do not read it". What more mean, contemptible method of besmirching the character of a man than to hold something before the public and say "I have something here that reflects on his character but while he is at outs with me now I am so courteous and jealous of this man's reputation that I prefer to keep this secret, but I have it here". I say what more contemptible method of besmirching an innocent man's character than to do that. And what did we do? We said to the minister "You are not going to get away with a cowardly act of that kind. If there is anything wrong in the memorandum, if there is anything detrimental to the character of Dr. Torrance we want to hear it, and the world wants to hear it, in justification of his dismissal." And what did we get? We got a memorandum and the minister says "I would not have revealed these petty things if it had not been for the fact that my hon. friends opposite insisted upon it." Now let us review these things for a moment, let us look the situation over. The minister got a memorandum and denied knowing anything about it. He would not tell us who wrote it, he said he did not know who the writer was. In the memorandum it is stated that he used the frank of a deputy minister for his personal mail and the personal mail of his family. Every Monday morning he brought his mail to the office and handed it to the messenger to be franked, and the Postmaster General wrote to him asking him in regard to the matter. Now, we have from