

Supply—Justice

than half a billion dollars, and up to the present time, whenever I have been present since 1957 when the estimates of any department have been under consideration, I have asked this one question.

Mr. Bell (Saint John-Albert): One question?

Mr. Pickersgill: We have yet to have from any minister one single example of any waste and extravagance in any department, such as hon. gentlemen opposite were so fond of talking about, in the two years they have been in office. I simply wanted to underline that point again.

Mr. Fulton: You see, Mr. Chairman, we in the Department of Justice have not been a big building department so we did not build the printing bureau but if it had been under my administration I would have been able to indicate to the hon. gentleman the type of example of waste and extravagance that has been eliminated.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. gentleman does a good deal of building in his department. If I am not mistaken, he does do a good deal of building throughout the country. Would the hon. gentleman tell me of any extravagance in the building done by his department?

Mr. Fulton: My department does not do a great deal of building. I do not know what the hon. gentleman has in mind. There are some penitentiaries under construction and we will be able to discuss them under the penitentiaries item if my hon. friend wishes.

Mr. Pickersgill: I notice that the minister is evading the question.

Mr. Fulton: The matter can be discussed at the proper time.

Mr. Roberge: In the details on page 216 there is an item for publication of departmental reports and other materials and there is an increase of \$20,000 over last year. What is this for?

Mr. Fulton: I am sorry, I did not hear.

Mr. Roberge: On page 216 there is an item for publication of departmental reports and other material and there is an increase of \$20,000 over last year. What are these reports and other materials?

Mr. Fulton: This arises in the main from the desire to fulfil a recommendation of the Fauteux committee report that there be a program designed to inform the public with respect to certain features of the then existing penitentiary and reform system and with respect to certain of the programs which the committee recommended should be instituted. I would refer my hon. friend to

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

page 13 of the Fauteux committee report where is contained their recommendation with regard to public information in connection with probation, and page 51 of the report which contains their recommendation with regard to a public information program with respect to parole. It is in implementation of these recommendations that there has been included an item of \$20,000 for the purpose of a public information program.

Mr. Roberge: I have a further question. Is that campaign under way?

Mr. Fulton: The preliminary steps have been prepared, but the program has not been worked out in detail.

Mr. Howard: I should like to make one other comment under this particular item concerning a matter which has intrigued me for some time. I refer to the fact that there are two cabinet ministers in the same department both, I assume, on a par with each other in so far as seniority is concerned. If the minister is concerned with saving money, then action could be taken on this matter. My remarks have no connection whatever with the person who presently holds the post of Solicitor General.

In looking back over the years, in talking with one other gentleman who held that particular post and in talking with members of this house who have been here many more years than I have, I cannot help but come to the conclusion but that this is a completely superfluous cabinet position. In so far as the duties of that particular office holder are concerned, and so far as matters under his jurisdiction are concerned, they are practically nil. This means that the cabinet post of Solicitor General is an unnecessary one and a costly one, at least to the tune of \$17,000 per year plus the payments to whatever executive assistants there may be in the Solicitor General's office. I would have no hesitation whatever in suggesting—as I say this has nothing whatever to do with the individual who now holds the office—that here would be a prime way to start cutting expenditures and saving some money by eliminating the post of Solicitor General.

The Minister of Justice could perform the functions of the Solicitor General. I am quite sure that the Minister of Justice does now participate in many of the recommendations made by the Solicitor General. I, for one, think this is a cabinet position that is on a par, in so far as value is concerned, with the cabinet ministers without portfolio, except that the payment is a little bit higher.

Mr. Maloney: Mr. Chairman, I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to make a few remarks in respect of some problems