

our present law adjust itself to the provisions made by Nova Scotia with regard to their reformatories. I may say that the provisions which they have adopted are, so far as they modify existing conditions, mainly with a view to assimilating their system with the systems prevailing in other provinces. This subject of reformatories is dealt with in different parts of the existing statute dealing with each of the provinces, and from time to time as a province finds it desirable to make certain modifications we modify our Act accordingly. This Bill is exclusively for that purpose and, as I say, is the drafting of the provincial authority itself.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—repeal:

Mr. McMASTER: Is there any provision for supervision over children who are indentured as provided by this section?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. Subsection 9 provides:

The Superintendent of Neglected and Delinquent Children for the Province of Nova Scotia shall, subject to the laws of the Province of Nova Scotia, exercise and maintain supervision over every child after its discharge from a reformatory institution under the provisions of this section.

I would take it that that would apply to the child while he is in the custody of persons to whom he has been indentured.

Mr. McMASTER: I did note that clause, but I was doubtful whether that applied to a child under indenture, because it seems to me the child had not been discharged when it was indentured.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman will turn to sub-clause (c), he will see that power is conferred upon the Superintendent of Neglected and Delinquent Children to order a child's return. I think that infers his power to supervise. From past experience, I know as a matter of fact, that the superintendents of this and similar institutions do exercise supervision and control. If they, who have that duty, find that these provisions are ample to enable them to carry it out, I think we may safely accept their view upon the subject. I would be a little loath to modify what they find perfectly sufficient, and I think it is a perfectly justifiable inference, from the fact that the superintendent has power to order the return of a child, that he must be in a position to inform himself on the subject. Furthermore, there is to be remembered just what the hon. gentleman has pointed out, that during that

[Mr. Doherty.]

period of time the child has never been discharged. He is in the custody of other people; but he is subject to be returned and, I should say, necessarily under the supervision of the authorities of the institution to which his sentence is still in full effect.

Mr. McKENZIE: I can assure the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) that the practice is as has been explained by the minister. The superintendent has full control over those children and looks after them very carefully.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not doubt that everything is done in the best possible way, but it seemed to me that there should be no doubt about the matter. The children who are let out in this way, are, as a rule, very kindly looked after; but some distressing instances, exceptional, I must say, have occurred, and it seems to me that the law could not be too specific in providing for a regular supervision of homes in which children under the care of the State are placed for their own benefit. Might I direct the minister's attention to subclause (e) which reads:

Any wages reserved in any indenture under the provisions of this section shall be paid to such child or to some person for such child's benefit.

That is delightfully vague. I do not quite know who is to be the judge as to what person shall be entitled to receive this money for the child's benefit. Perhaps practice has made the matter less objectionable than it appears at first sight.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should take it that the superintendent or other person in charge would see to it that the money went to a suitable person. I would rather not undertake to modify this, for an additional reason, that, with all respect to those who have asked us to enact that provision, I am really very strongly of the impression that that provision, being a provision with regard to the manner in which people sentenced to a reformatory institution are to be dealt with, and being a matter of dealing with their property, the provincial legislature was perhaps more competent to decide than we are. We properly ought to deal with the criminal end of the matter, and this coming to us from what really rather strikes me as the proper authority to decide what shall be done with the property of persons and particularly of persons in their own provincial institutions. I would hardly feel called upon to modify it, and my view would