

Naval Department—the statute provides that there shall be a deputy minister, whose salary shall be \$6,000 a year. And I think the same is true of some other departments. I have the two departments under my charge and the salary of the deputy of one is fixed at \$6,000 and of the other at 5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that the Naval Service Act is a case where the salary was “slipped over,” because a deputy with technical knowledge was required. But every year we are over-riding the Civil Service Act by these estimates, and I think the time has arrived when statutes ought to be passed fixing the salaries of deputies in the several departments. Then, the man appointed to the position would know exactly what he is to receive, and there would not be this friction and discussion every year.

Mr. ROGERS: There is no violation of the statutes by the passage of the Estimates; and the amounts here are the same as last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, and the same as the year before. But the fact remains that we have a general statute declaring that the salaries of deputies shall be \$5,000, and to that we make exceptions every year. It might cause a little friction at first to have the matter understood and fixed, but it would be better in the end.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I presume that nearly all the employees of the department are lawyers?

Mr. DOHERTY: The lawyers in the department are: Mr. Newcombe, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Chisholm, Mr. Coté, Mr. Bill, Mr. McGillivray, and Mr. Plaxton, Mr. Beauchesne has just left us.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Under Item 316 of these Estimates there is an appropriation of \$13,000 for “expenses of litigated matters conducted within the Department of Justice.” Does this money go to these gentlemen beyond their salaries?

Mr. DOHERTY: This is for necessary expenditure in this litigation. You have to print your factums, you have to pay such disbursements as the court requires, and so on. This is an item that has been voted year after year. The expenditure under it last year was \$5,997.60, and the year before that \$6,665.47. The amount varies necessarily year by year, and it is

[Mr. Hazen.]

not possible to estimate it with accuracy in advance.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would this include lists of costs that might be made up and taxed, or would it be limited to amounts paid for printing and so on?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is for expenses of litigation conducted in the department. The amount expended would indicate that it is not used to pay fees.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Suppose a suit is carried on by the Department of Justice; there will be solicitors' costs of say, \$500; and these are incurred in the performance of work by the officials of the department. Would that be paid out of this item of \$13,000?

Mr. DOHERTY: If the work is carried on by an official of the department we do not pay him solicitors' fees.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is for disbursements?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. KYTE: The report of the Auditor General, Volume IV, page 4, shows three items charged by the Justice Department as fees paid to lawyers for the preparation of legislation, as follows:

Preparation of Legislation (\$1,570.50.)	
Lafleur, E., Montreal, hotel expenses at	
Ottawa.....	\$109.40
O'Connor, W. F., Halifax, services 17 d.	
at \$40; travelling expenses, \$131.10.	811.10
Surveyer, E. Fabre, Montreal; services	
15 d. at \$40; travelling expenses \$50.	650.00

In view of the statement made by the minister that he has eight lawyers in the department, and considering also that we have a Solicitor General, and a Parliamentary counsel, with two legal assistants, one would imagine that sufficient legal knowledge would be found in the combined staffs of the Minister of Justice and the House of Commons to make it unnecessary to go all the way to Halifax to obtain the services of a lawyer—who, apparently, was brought up here—at \$40 a day, and also two lawyers in the city of Montreal.

Mr. DOHERTY: The item that the hon. gentleman refers to arose in connection with the examination of a large number of questions which it became necessary especially to look into just at the time of the outbreak of war, and these gentlemen's services were retained for that work. At that time Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister, was in attendance before the Privy