

Mr. MOTHERWELL: You have got to take the whole together. I never met the gentleman in my life.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister says to-night: "Oh, don't take one part of my statement; it incriminates me. Just take the part that does not incriminate me." But that is not all. Let us go a little further. My hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) was a little anxious to get proof—I am not surprised—so towards six o'clock he said:

Mr. Manion: Before the clock strikes six, may I make a suggestion? There were a number of letters that the minister did not have on the file. I presume that this matter will go on this evening, and I suggest that he bring the remainder of the file with him.

The excuse having been made that the file was not here.

Mr. Motherwell: The hon. gentleman means the letter from Dr. Mohler and the correspondence with Dr. Torrance? I shall be pleased to produce those.

I ask the Prime Minister to note this:

Mr. Meighen: And particularly, produce the evidence that Dr. Mohler expressed the opinion that we should not retain an official who would write that letter.

Mr. Motherwell: Oh, he would not put that on file.

Mr. Meighen: No, I do not think he would put it on file or on his lips or anywhere else, and never did.

That was Mr. Meighen's opinion at that time.

Mr. Motherwell: Oh, yes.

Mr. Meighen: It is merely a pipe dream on the part of the minister.

Mr. Motherwell: I will guarantee that there was not an officer in Washington in the department concerned by whom this was not a subject of conversation.

This is not a joke; it is not a jesting phrase. The minister says, "I will guarantee;" does that mean anything at all, or is it just a passing phrase of an indifferent character? Let me repeat it:

I will guarantee that there was not an officer in Washington in the department concerned by whom this was not a subject of conversation, and just of the nature I have suggested.

I cannot read the English language if I do not gather from this statement that there was a reflection upon Dr. Torrance on the part of Dr. Mohler. I do not know whether the Prime Minister was in the chamber when the letter from the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) to Dr. Mohler was read. The hon. member for Victoria City wrote to Dr. Mohler sending a copy of Hansard with the statements marked that I have quoted, statements which reflect upon the character and the standing of Dr. Torrance, a man whom I and every one who has ever had any-

[Mr. Stevens.]

thing to do with him hold in the highest regard. Dr. Mohler wrote back this letter, which I am going to read again because the Prime Minister is here, and I make no apologies for reading it the second time. It is dated May 20, 1924, and reads:

Dear Dr. TOLMIE,—Replying to your letter of May 17, I wish to inform you that the statements referred to in Hansard of May 16, 1924, page 2238, as coming either "through" me or "from" me are incorrect. I neither made such statements nor have I ever held such views. In fact, my opinion of Dr. Torrance is expressed in my letter to him of July 20, 1923, copy attached, and I have had no reason since then to change those views. You will note in that letter that I did express surprise but my letter shows clearly that the surprise was regarding the news of the change in the administrative head of the Health of Animals Branch. Likewise in my letter to Dr. Hilton of July 20, 1923, copy attached, I again state that "The farewell of Dr. Torrance to the members of the staff was read with surprise and deep regret." However, this expression of surprise with its context should give no one a basis for claiming "that they were astonished at Washington that we should keep in our employ a man who would write such a letter."

Neither is it accurate to say that all of the members of my staff knew about this letter of October 28, 1922, from Dr. Torrance.

I bring back to the Prime Minister's attention the statement of the minister that he would guarantee that every member of the staff knew all about this letter—and I intend to deal with that letter in a moment. Dr. Mohler says that is absolutely incorrect; then he goes on:

This morning I have asked seven of my division chiefs about their knowledge of this letter and of course no one had ever heard of it before, nor did they know the reason of Dr. Torrance's resignation. Two of these men were educated in Canadian colleges and one of them is a Canadian by birth.

Then he says further that this letter from Dr. Torrance was marked "confidential,"—the letter as I read it the other day in the House. He says that it went on his private file and that practically on one else read it. In the face of this letter from Dr. Mohler, in the face of this absolute denial, the minister dare not repeat his former statement, yet he fails in common courtesy, in common justice, to Dr. Torrance in not withdrawing that part of his remarks which are wholly without foundation. Not only that, but he stands in the House to-night and brazenly tells us he would take the same course again.

Now I come to another phase of this question. The minister a moment ago read certain letters. He selected—I am going to put it that way—certain letters in an endeavour to show the House that Dr. Torrance had been treated with a great deal of courtesy and consideration when he was dismissed. The facts of the matter are these: Dr. Torrance was called into the minister's office on