

Supply—Justice

and what was said by certain members who now form the government when they were sitting opposite. The point that was made then, as I recall it, was that there was room for better co-ordination and centralization of the building activities with the purview of the Department of Public Works. But I do not recall that it was ever said that there should never be any other separate organization. If my hon. friend were able to find words that went that far I should be surprised. Therefore the fact that we continue to maintain in one case, on the basis of common sense and economy, a separate engineering and architectural branch does not, as I see it, destroy any general case that was made out on a former occasion.

Mr. Pickersgill: Does the minister intend it to be taken from his statement that contractors are themselves using prison labour on contracts, because that was the inference one would draw? That is the reason I rose to ask the question at that point.

Mr. Fulton: I appreciate it. If I did create that impression I appreciate the opportunity to correct it. No; what I meant was that where a contractor has a contract for a building, as soon as he reaches a certain stage, the walls are up and the roof is on, we then move inmates in to do other work within the building which is not part of the contract.

Mr. Pickersgill: I can understand that, but it does seem to me that it completely invalidates the minister's argument in so far as large structures being built by contract are concerned. The problem is precisely the same as it is in Indian affairs. You have a problem of small buildings, new buildings that are built largely by the Indians under the Indian superintendent, and you have the problems of maintenance, and so on, which it would be ridiculous to ask the Department of Public Works to do.

Then you have mainly schools. It is true that you have a program for building residential schools that was carried on for a good many years by the Indian affairs branch which, I agreed with Mr. Winters, was a mistake, and as fast as public works could build them—this was at a time of full employment and that, of course, lessened the possibility of doing it as quickly as it could be done now—these big projects were taken over.

When he was on this side of the house I think the Minister of Public Works said that everything should be done by public works. I think, given time, we can easily substantiate that; but we would not maintain anything so foolish. We would say that the minister has a complete argument as far as these small structures, such as piggeries and

things of that sort, are concerned, but when you come to letting a huge contract for \$1 million or \$2 million it does seem ridiculous that the government should have two sets of architects and engineers in two different departments. Actually, we now have more than that.

Mr. Howard: I should like to make one or two comments. With respect to the problem that has been raised in so far as the maintenance of a staff of architects and designers is concerned, I have no particular thoughts on the matter. Although it would seem that while the building of penitentiaries necessitates a certain type of architecture, a certain type of structure which is different from a public building or a wharf, or things of that nature, yet it would appear that there is a duplication and an unnecessary cost because of that duplication by reason of having this organization within the Department of Justice for the building of penitentiaries and other structures connected with them. If a saving could be made it should be transferred to the Department of Public Works. Whether this is so I cannot say.

I would like to make a few comments on the question of inmates working on the building of penal institutions and on their maintenance and repair. I hope I got the wrong impression from the comments of the hon. member for Essex East when he made reference to inmates building benches and building piggeries and things of that nature, and that inmate labour should be confined to this sort of thing. If I am incorrect I will stand corrected, but I do not think it should be left at that and that inmates in penitentiaries should be confined to doing the menial tasks or the minor little jobs of work that might be necessary in maintaining the penitentiaries themselves, or doing such things as sewing together mail bags for the Post Office Department or lesser jobs of that nature.

I think more and more effort should be concentrated on ensuring that inmates have every possible opportunity in the construction of major buildings, minor buildings, new construction and everything else in the penal institution; that inmate labour should be given every opportunity to participate in the construction of those buildings if for no other reason than that it would give the inmates an opportunity to become familiar with construction processes as they develop from time to time so that when they are released they may fit more easily into our economy and be able to perform some useful function in society by working in the construction industry or in some other trade which they