

Mr. CANNON: I should not like to discuss the law outside my own province, but in Quebec the domicile of the wife is the domicile of her husband, and no other. So I doubt very much, even if we did pass this bill, whether the courts would decide that we could change the law of one province as regards domicile. I think there is more involved in this bill than the matter of jurisdiction.

Mr. THORSON: This bill merely confers jurisdiction upon the courts to grant divorce; it does not change domicile of the parties at all.

Mr. CANNON: But the jurisdiction of the courts is established on domicile. That is a question of civil law and should be left to the provinces.

Mr. THORSON: It is sought by this bill simply to give jurisdiction to the courts to grant divorce under the circumstances referred to in the bill.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall said bill be read a third time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Mr. RINFRET: Next sitting.

Mr. WARD: There is no amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no amendment, the bill may be read a third time now.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I move that the bill be now read a third time.

Mr. CANNON: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the sponsor of the bill would be satisfied to have it read a third time on Tuesday?

Mr. WARD: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, was I in order in moving that the bill be now read a third time?

Mr. SPEAKER: The sponsor of the bill himself says that it should be read at the next sitting of the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I have a right to move—

Mr. CANNON: Why do it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why should my hon. friend do it? It is so easy for me to speak for two minutes; why not wait and give a chance to other members of the house to register a vote on this matter?

[Mr. Thorson.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the house. But the bill could have been read a third time, there being no amendment.

The hour for public and private bills being exhausted, the house will now revert to the consideration in committee of the whole of the bill respecting the national parks.

#### NATIONAL PARKS

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. 135 respecting national parks—Mr. Stewart (Edmonton)—Mr. Johnston in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock section 7 had been declared carried.

Sections 8 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, before you report the bill I should like to ask the minister how much is being taken out of Banff park?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): In the Spray lake area—I suppose that will describe it sufficiently for my hon. friend—630 square miles; north and east of lake Minnewanka, 76.6 square miles—

Mr. COOTE: Would there be coal in that territory?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is mineral—in the valley of the Red Deer river coming out of the mountains, 290.7 square miles; on the Clearwater, which is a coal-mineralized area, 377 square miles; along the Canadian National railway off Jasper park, 435 square miles. Those are all the deletions in the Rocky mountains. Those sections will go into forest reserve.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Will they be included in the natural resources transferred to the province?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Before this bill passes may I say that I have not had a chance to give it full consideration, and I would like to revert to section 11. In this section the expression "national historic park", is used, and then the explanatory notes refer to historic sites. Are those historic sites set apart by the minister under some other statute?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, they will be set apart under this statute. Proposals of this nature will now have to come to parliament and be approved by parliament on the recommendation of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board.