

services. That is the effect of the resolution and of the bill which will be based upon it.

With respect to the suggestions made by my right hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) as to the agreement between the city of Ottawa and the Dominion of Canada with regard to the park area, I wish to thank him for the information he has conveyed to me. I may say that I have studied the correspondence pretty carefully and have obtained information from every other available source that would throw light upon those negotiations. There is no formal agreement, but I think the objects and purposes are fairly and completely disclosed by the correspondence. As I interpret it, the construction or rebuilding of a city hall in that area would be a violation of the spirit, and I think of the letter, of the correspondence. I may say that this act and this agreement have no reference whatever to that question, but I shall be pleased to study it from every standpoint and to give careful consideration to the suggestions made by my right hon. friend.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury): Does the minister desire to amend the resolution?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes, the date should be changed from June 1, 1930, to July 1, 1930. It is July 1 in the bill.

Mr. MANION: I beg to move the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Did I understand the minister to say that certain terms of the old agreement were not required in the new agreement which is being entered into? As I understand the resolution, it simply authorizes the renewal for one year of the previous agreement, and I take it that is all the bill will provide for.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): My hon. friend is perfectly correct in that assumption. As I pointed out, it is a question of the payment for this year of \$100,000.

Resolution as amended reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Stewart (Leeds) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 80, to authorize an agreement between His Majesty the King and the corporation of the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES ACT

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 72, to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury) in the chair.

On section 1—Roman Catholic females may be sentenced to reformatory instead of prison or gaol in Nova Scotia.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under the present law, so far as it relates to Nova Scotia, a transfer from a prison to one of these Roman Catholic homes shall take place only under the direction of the provincial secretary of Nova Scotia. The new section provides that it shall in future be left to a judge of the supreme court, or a judge of the county court within his jurisdiction, to make such transfer. That is the only change in regard to Nova Scotia.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Roman Catholic females.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This section merely provides that any woman convicted in the province of New Brunswick may be sent to one of the homes of the Good Shepherd. In the former act it was only within the city and district of St. John, and they wish to have that restriction removed to make the section apply to the whole province of New Brunswick.

Mr. JACOBS: Does that mean that crime is extended from St. John to other parts of New Brunswick?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Imprisonment in the Good Shepherd reformatory.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This section is drawn to make it conform with a similar provision in the act respecting Nova Scotia. There were discrepancies between the two sections. With the enactment of this, the same provision will apply in both provinces.

Section agreed to.

Section 4 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.