

Civil Government—administration of justice—salaries, \$146,224.37.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the explanation of the increase of \$4,075.62?

Mr. DOHERTY: The increase is attributable to statutory increases and to provision for one additional messenger.

Mr. GRAHAM: The first item in this is the deputy minister's salary, \$10,000. Will the minister explain why his deputy gets \$10,000?

Mr. DOHERTY: This is the third year that this salary of \$10,000 has been provided. It was considered that my deputy earned this salary. Any one who is familiar with the remuneration ordinarily received by a lawyer of the standing in his profession of Mr. Newcombe, giving his entire time and services, will readily recognize that the amount allowed here to him is fully justified. I hardly think that we could expect to get the services of a man like Mr. Newcombe for less.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister in his Estimates is asking for \$4,075.62 more than last year. Is it intended to expend this amount, or will it form part of the \$30,000,000 not to be used?

Mr. DOHERTY: The increase is attributable to statutory increases and to provision for one additional messenger, so that I have no doubt it will be spent. I think the gentlemen will collect their statutory increases.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister understands readily that the staff of his department has been increased very materially since he became minister, not in the lower grades, but by good strong men. I think the Solicitor General works pretty hard. He has been made a member of the Government so that, as a matter of fact, the Department of Justice has now two members of the Government. I do not suppose this one gentleman is deputy to these two members. If he were, I could see why he should receive more than another deputy, but I presume he is the deputy only of the Minister of Justice and not of the Solicitor General. The Government will have to adopt one of two principles in reference to deputies. I am not criticising the very able gentleman who is Deputy Minister of Justice; I agree with a good deal of what the minister has said, but this question of the salaries of deputies has always been a trouble with Governments and it is getting chronic. It

started in easily. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has a deputy; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has a deputy; the Minister of Justice has a deputy; the Minister of Railways has a deputy. You cannot convince these deputies that they are not working just as hard as men can work. The ministers must find it a little difficult every time they are making up their Estimates to have one deputy getting \$10,000, another \$8,000, another \$7,000, while the statute says \$5,000.

Mr. CROTHERS: You gave us a bad example in your time.

Mr. GRAHAM: When I was Minister of Railways I had a gentleman who was Chief Engineer and deputy, and he got not quite but approximately the salary of both, because he occupied the dual position. When he left the department and two officers were appointed, they were put on the statutory basis, and the Deputy Minister of Railways got \$5,000, the amount named in the statute. There is a difficulty which is not easy to settle. Possibly the solution might be found in following the course which has been taken in Great Britain, where even ministers' salaries differ according to the labour they perform. I would not like to go through this Government and pick out the ministers who should get more, though that would be more popular than to pick out those who should get less. But there certainly is a difference in the labour performed by the heads of the departments, though it should be remembered that each head of a department has joint responsibility as a member of the Government, a responsibility which the deputy minister does not bear. There is no question that the responsibility of deputies, as well as the work they have to perform, varies. The statute which fixes \$5,000 as the salary for each deputy is honoured in the breach every year. I think it should be understood that the harder-worked deputy ministers will be paid more and the statute fixing the deputy's salary at \$5,000 might well be wiped out.

Mr. HAZEN: The statutes give some deputies \$5,000 and some deputies \$6,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course, the whole thing is statutory, because these Estimates are put in the form of an Act of Parliament, but I mean the salaries fixed under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. HAZEN: The salaries of the deputies are fixed by statute. For instance, the