

Supply—Justice

may learn while they are in the institution. Certainly work of that nature would be of great assistance in the rehabilitation and reformation processes that are necessary to ensure to the greatest possible extent that inmates, when they are released, have less chance of going back to the penitentiary than they have had in years gone by.

I support the idea completely. We should do as much as is humanly possible to ensure that inmates in penal institutions are employed in building new penitentiaries and all the other work connected with them. I would go beyond the thought of confining that sort of work to within the penitentiary itself. This might not be feasible in some cases because of security reasons in the case of life sentences of the individuals concerned, and so on, but there is a great field in penal institutions for inmates to be employed on public projects outside of the penitentiary itself, or outside of these penal institutions. In some of the institutions under provincial jurisdiction in British Columbia inmates are used in forestry work and in things of that nature, all of which is beneficial. They are performing the work while in the penitentiary, and the inmate is being assisted to fit into society more easily after he is released.

I hope the hon. member for Essex East was not trying to leave the impression that penitentiary inmates should be confined to doing menial work in their cells or to building benches and doing little repair jobs.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Of course not. What I was seeking to emphasize was not so much who did the actual job but who should be responsible for the project, whether it should be public works or whether it should be the Department of Justice. The extent of participation by prisoners is a matter that would obviously have to be determined in the context, but the main consideration was whether or not there should be in so far as possible, a decentralization. Can the minister tell the committee how many architects the Department of Justice has?

Mr. Fulton: We have four architects.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I suggest to the minister that he should look into this particular division. I do not quarrel with the department having architects or an architect. I would not want to specify what the number should be, but I am going to suggest to the minister that this does look like an unusually large number of officials. It may seem that in suggesting that I agree in principle with the department having an architect I am contradicting the position I took earlier with regard to greater centralization.

[**Mr. Howard.**]

Mr. Fulton: May I make a correction. There are five architects, one architect grade 4, three architects grade 2 and one architect grade 1.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I was just saying that I may have seemed to contradict myself in agreeing to this department having an architectural division or a division of architects when I had taken the position that there should be a greater centralization of these functions in the Department of Public Works. The minister mentioned that there were 10 penal institutions. When my hon. friend compares that with the number of institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Health and Welfare, for instance, he will see that the latter has many more buildings to be concerned with, large hospitals, Indian hospitals and other kinds of institutions, which I should think would run to well over 35 in number. That department has one architect, or perhaps two now.

The requirements in the case of an architect with respect to the building of a hospital are certainly much more complicated than in the building of an institution whose architectural design is not as important as its functional purposes. I suggest to the minister, in view of the charges of unnecessary expenditure which he and others made while sitting on this side, in view of the fact that they said they were going to economize, that the minister, though he is not a member of treasury board, could right in his own department even at this late date, having been in office now for 18 months—

Mr. Pickersgill: Two years.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Two years—seize this opportunity, in view of the suggestions made with the best of intentions by those of us on this side, to effect the economies which were widely proclaimed from one end of Canada to the other and which undoubtedly made a considerable impression on many people in this country. In the two years the hon. gentlemen have been in office we have had no example whatsoever of any major cut in expenditure.

It may be that the Minister of Justice could give his colleagues an example to follow. He has given them an example in other particulars. I suggest to him that this is another opportunity for him to strengthen the very great position he occupies in the present government. If he could establish himself as an economizer, as a ruthless administrator who none the less took into account the ends of justice, who knows but that one day, and perhaps soon, he might be minister of finance instead of being Minister of Justice.