

the details. But I must say to my hon. friend that, as far as I can judge, the situation is the other way round. I think the Royal Canadian Mounted Police is doing more to help the provincial and municipal police than the latter are doing in the way of mounted police work.

Mr. STIRLING: Would the minister kindly explain what this rather long paragraph of item 88 means, and particularly the latter part of it?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): This is the remission service, which is charged with the administration of the Ticket of Leave Act. Applications for tickets of leave come to that branch, and involve a very large amount of work. As far as the last part of the item is concerned, we are employing a few men of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to do some work which was previously being done by regular employees of the department. This we are doing on account of their special qualifications, and we have to reimburse the mounted police in the amount of their salaries.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That covers one part. It is the second item I notice on page 89 of the estimates, where the details are. One is \$1,600 for remuneration, the other is for reimbursement. Is there any distinction?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes. The reimbursement is to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So is the other. If the minister has not the explanation available, I am not going to pursue the matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec-East): I am unable to say what the distinction is between the item of \$1,600 for remuneration and the item of \$10,900 for reimbursement.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I notice that this \$1,600 is to be expended under order in council. I suppose it is just a sum, in special cases, for—

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): No doubt about that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): While I am on my feet, I might say that this \$1,600 must be some special remuneration which is doled out to the mounted police for special services, under order in council.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes, for assistance. I am sorry I have not any more information.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Who is the present senior advisory counsel?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): It is Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): One lawyer in the branch does the whole of the work?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes. The present private secretary is an officer of that branch, but actually he is not working there because he is acting as private secretary to the minister. He is a lawyer.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would the minister say whether in capital cases he reads the evidence himself?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Oh, yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like the minister to explain just how careful the department is in capital cases.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): In capital cases, of course, the officers of the branch are very, very careful and particular about that special part of their work. Not only one of the officers under Mr. Gallagher, but Mr. Gallagher himself reads the evidence and he underlines all the parts which ought to be called to the attention of the minister. In cases where it is the recommendation of the officers of the branch that the law should take its course, of course it is the duty of the minister himself to read the evidence and to convince himself that that is the report which should be made to council. When the recommendation is for clemency, I always read the parts of the evidence which are specially brought to my attention, but I do not feel under the same sort of imperative duty to read every word, to look at every comma of the evidence, because the recommendation is that the law should not take its course.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Is this the procedure which is followed also in connection with applications which come to the department for the parolling of prisoners?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON: That procedure is followed in connection with applications for parole?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Oh, yes. Everything comes to the minister after having been considered and studied by the officers of the branch, and after communications having been received from the various persons to whom they have applied for reports, more particularly the judge, sometimes the crown prosecutor, always the warden, as to what the conduct of the prisoner is, and, in some instances, the medical officer when the question arises.

Item agreed to.