

July 7, without the slightest indication that there was anything wrong about this letter that had been written more than six months before, without any indication that the minister desired to discuss an important matter with him, and he was told that a letter had been written which was offensive and that if he did not resign he would be discharged and would receive no retiring allowance. As I said the other night, here is a gentleman of sixty-four years of age, a gentleman who has stood at the very pinnacle of his profession in Canada for many years, who earned for himself an international reputation in his calling and who brought credit to himself and to the Canadian government service—this gentleman finds himself faced, without any alternative, without any hearing, with the demand, "Write your resignation now—here is pen and paper, or you step out of here without a cent, dismissed and disgraced." I ask the Prime Minister very frankly, and I hope kindly, what man placed in that position would have forfeited all opportunity of the meagre pension that was coming to him and stepped out without any hope at all? He asked the minister—and I direct the Prime Minister's attention to this—"Will you give me twenty-four hours to think it over?" The minister says, "No, you will write it now or be dismissed." Is that the kind of treatment to hand out to any person, much less to one against whom the minister to-night says he has nothing except this letter, which we will discuss in due course?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; excuse me, I did not say that.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, I am at a loss to know what the minister did say, then. But never mind the minister; I appeal to every member of this House; I appeal to anybody who knows Dr. Torrance to say whether there is anything against him. Not a word, not a whisper; yet that was the situation.

But that is not quite all. While they were in this room together and when Dr. Torrance was absolutely refused an opportunity for a hearing, refused an investigation or even twenty-four hours to consider the matter, a discussion arose in this way: Dr. Torrance said, "Well what am I going to do about retiring allowance?" Now we have documentary evidence, and I am going to read it, that the honour and the word and the authority of the minister himself and of the Civil Service Commission was stamped upon an arrangement or agreement to give Dr. Torrance \$1,500 a year retiring allowance, the proper percentage of his last three years' salary. That was denied him, and the allowance was reduced to eight or nine hundred

dollars. And now let me read the letters—not selected letters carefully picked out here and there to boost the case of the minister.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I offered to read them all if hon. members would ask for them.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister offered us a lot of things. I myself directed his attention to one letter which he reluctantly read, contrary to what he had been reading before.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There was nothing in it but something about forwarding a cheque to Dr. Torrance.

Mr. STEVENS: It contradicted a letter the minister read previously. I am going to read some letters now.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If the committee is willing I will put the whole file on Hansard.

Mr. STEVENS: I will read them. I am going to indulge myself in that pleasure.

Mr. ARTHURS: Make sure of it.

Mr. STEVENS: It might be very nice to put the whole file on Hansard, but hon. members will probably not read every letter that is on the file. Now, I ask the House to be good enough to hear this case on behalf of Dr. Torrance. Dr. Torrance then wrote his resignation as follows:

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.

That was the understanding arrived at between the minister and himself, and it was the understanding upon which Dr. Torrance wrote and handed in this resignation. It was a written statement of a verbal agreement, a verbal agreement binding the honour of the parties to the agreement. I might as well read the rest of the letter:

In view of my service of over ten years and the fact that during that time I have received no increase in salary with the exception of forty dollars (\$40) at the reclassification of the service, may I ask that a gratuity of six months' salary be granted to me on leaving.

Then we have a letter from the minister to Dr. Torrance dated July 10:

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 7, and to advise you that the Civil Service Commission is being requested to take the necessary steps to retire you under the Public Service Retirement Act. I note your request to be granted a gratuity of six months' salary, and am requesting the authority of the Governor in Council for the allowance of four months' leave of absence with pay, your retirement to take effect from that date, which would be November 30, 1923. The conditions of retirement provide for a gratuity of two months' salary, which would make up the six months which you request.