

Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 18th instant, re the retirement of Dr. F. Torrance, I have to advise you that Dr. Torrance was appointed a veterinary inspector under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, by order in council of March 1st, 1906, appointment to be effective from January 1st, of the same year.

From the Auditor-General's reports, it would appear that payments made to Dr. Torrance during the period of 1906-12 were as follows:—

This was the period that was under dispute, the period which Dr. Torrance thought should count in working out his annuity. The rest of the letter indicates the length of time he was employed between 1906 and 1912, when he became Veterinary Director General and continued as such up to his retirement. The letter points out that in 1905-6 he received in payment of his services \$339.29 as salary and expenses, period not available. In 1906-7 he received \$150. In 1907-8 he was not employed, and in 1908-9 he was not employed. In 1909-10 he received \$150 salary for ten days' work. I assume it is all based on a rate of \$15 a day, so that it is easy to figure out the length of his employment on that basis. In 1906-7 at \$15 a day he would have been employed ten days. There are three consecutive years in two of which he was not employed at all and in one of which he was employed for only ten days. Then in 1910-11 he got \$60 in salary, and that was apparently at a lower rate, for some reason, for it covered a period of six days. Then in 1911-12 his total salary and expenses amounted to \$172.70, period not available. From August first, 1912, up to the time of his retirement was the period of continuous employment, and the Auditor General and the Audit Board took the ground that only that period could count, because during the previous years his service was of an intermittent nature. In view of the fact that in two of those previous years he had not been employed at all and in one of them for only ten days, I do not see how anybody could strain his generosity to the extent of calling that consecutive employment. That may be a matter of difference of opinion. But so far now as I understand justice and continuous employment I feel that the Auditor General was perfectly justified in taking the ground that the whole period could not be regarded as continuous employment.

Mr. TOLMIE: Was the intermittent nature of the employment not due to the lack of disease at that particular time? Was he not that class of veterinary who worked under fees rather than on general salary, being engaged only when there was work for him but still being in the employ of the department all this time, his name appearing on the files at Ottawa as a regular inspector?

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have no information of that nature. Such information as we have just came to us incidentally; it is not on file. He was busily employed at the Agricultural College at Winnipeg, but we have no information that there was no disease prevalent and that that was the reason he was not employed. He was paid on a per diem basis; we have one or two on that basis yet, but not very many and that is in cases where the amount of work to be performed is so small as not to justify an annual engagement. The veterinary is just employed on a per diem basis as some outbreak occurs, whether it is glanders, T.B., or whatever it is, and I presume Dr. Torrance was employed the same way. Of course, a man on a per diem basis must be employed before he is warranted in getting the pay. If Dr. Torrance had got an annuity based on seventeen years' service, as I first recommended, I think I would have had far more difficulty in defending that than I would have in defending what he has got based on the estimate of the Audit Board and the Auditor General. I scarcely think, Mr. Chairman, that the point that the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) brings up would affect the case.

Mr. MANION: I asked the minister when he began to read his file what he based his statement upon that Dr. Mohler had condemned Dr. Torrance's action. That was the impression that he left with the committee, if he did not state it in so many words.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would prefer not to be discussing Dr. Mohler. He is not a resident of Canada. We have his communication. I have already read one letter, and there is nothing to be gained by unnecessarily repeating it.

Mr. MANION: But the minister did not hesitate the other day to make that statement. He certainly left the impression with the committee—and I think the statement is here on Hansard—that Dr. Mohler had condemned Dr. Torrance's action, so I do not see why he should be so particular about it now.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend recalls the incident the other day. I had been asked by an hon. member, I forget whom at the moment, if I had any additional reasons. The question was, why did I wait six or seven months before Dr. Torrance was retired? Well, I was busy, the session was approaching, in fact, the session was on during part of that period, and I was willing to let matters run on and see if Dr. Torrance would