

cost of, the construction of a number of projects, installations or facilities on Canadian soil.

The arrangement under which this programme has been effected is of a purely wartime character. It is not contemplated that the contribution which the United States is thus making to the common defence will give that country any continuing rights in Canada after the conclusion of war. Indeed, with regard to most of the projects that have been undertaken in this country by the United States, agreements have already been made which make the post-war position completely clear. An example with which hon. members will be familiar is to be found in the text of the exchange of notes providing for the construction of the Alaska highway.

In order that there may be no possible doubt as to the principles to be followed in the post-war disposition of the various defence projects to which the United States has contributed, the permanent joint board on defence recently recommended that the two governments approve a formula which would state these principles in clear terms. The formula which was proposed by the defence board was examined by the two governments and was approved by both. It has now been embodied in the exchange of notes I am about to table.

An examination of the notes will make it apparent that the agreements with the United States do not prejudice in any way Canadian post-war liberty of action. I ought to add that I am informed by those most directly connected that with respect to these projects, not only is Canada free from any post-war commitments, but that we have not at any time been asked by the United States to enter into such commitments.

The terms of the exchange of notes will make it clear that should Canada undertake to contribute to the joint defence by constructing installations or facilities in Alaska or elsewhere on United States territory, the same principles would reciprocally apply.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the Prime Minister if he intends to have these notes printed? How will they be distributed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It might be advisable to have the exchange of notes printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* of to-day. A similar statement is being made at Washington this afternoon. That was my reason for being anxious to make to the house to-day the statement which I have just made.

Mr. MacNICOL: May I ask the Prime Minister if what he has said in reference to the Alaska highway applies also to the road-

way being built from Peace River to Providence? The United States at the moment are building a roadway north of the Peace river through a place called Notikewin to Providence, on the Mackenzie river. Does the same agreement apply? When the war is over will they retire from there also?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It applies to all projects, which relate to the war, which the United States installs or constructs in Canada during the period of the war.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF CANADA

EXTENSION OF TERM OF OFFICE FOR FOUR YEARS FROM JANUARY 7, 1940

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, to amend an act respecting the Chief Justice of Canada.

He said: The purpose of this bill is to extend for four years from January 7, 1940, instead of for three years, as had been provided, the term of office of the chief justice.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

DIVORCE

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF 1930—JURISDICTION OF COURTS IN PROVINCE OF MARRIED WOMEN'S DOMICILE

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, to amend the Divorce Jurisdiction Act, 1930.

He said: This bill has been on the order paper now for two sessions under public bills, and as public bills have not been dealt with for the past two sessions it remained as it was. Before introducing it two sessions ago I discussed the bill with the late minister of justice, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, and after considering it he pronounced it proper legislation and legislation that should be passed.

As the Divorce Jurisdiction Act stands now, an applicant for divorce must bring the action in the province in which desertion takes place. For instance, if a British Columbia man marries a girl in Ontario, takes her back to British Columbia, and there deserts her, she may be obliged to return to her home in Ontario. She has the evidence which would entitle her to a divorce but she must go back to the province in which she was deserted in order to bring action. The proposed amendment will enable the applicant to bring action in the court of the province in which she is domiciled, provided that she has lived in that province for two years or more.