

*Inquiries of the Ministry***ROYAL FAMILY****CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION RESPECTING MARRIAGES**

On the orders of the day:

Taken together, all these violations admittedly have led to the dangerous situation confronting us all today. Through its membership on the commission Canada has consistently attempted to have this point of view recognized, in the hope that the commission's assessment of the responsibilities of both sides for bringing about the present situation might contribute to the reversal of the trend of military events, with one violation by one side leading to a further violation by the other. Our discussions with regard to this problem in all its aspects have taken this situation into account, and these matters were included in the conversations I had in Moscow.

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would take it from the minister's reply that Canada has made formal objections to the Soviet union concerning the supplying of these arms to North Viet Nam?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I said that in my conversations these questions were discussed.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): In the light of the admission by Secretary McNamara, which I read or heard yesterday, that there has been only a trickle of troops moving from North Viet Nam to South Viet Nam since last June, can the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us, or is he ready to inquire, why the bombing of North Viet Nam was not only continued but was intensified, despite the fact that there was only this trickle of movement?

TRANSPORT**INQUIRY AS TO GOVERNMENT POLICY RESPECTING CROWNSNEST PASS RATES**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): I had a question for the Minister of Agriculture but in his absence I will address it to the hon. gentleman's parliamentary secretary. Does the parliamentary secretary agree with the government's policy to eliminate the Crowsnest pass rates?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. McIntosh: I will rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Agriculture be in the house this afternoon to protest against the elimination of the Crowsnest pass rates?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will have to wait a few minutes to find out.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): I do not know whether the Prime Minister is in a position to answer this question. It has to do with the Royal Marriages Act, which has been in existence since the early part of the 18th century and is long out of date. In view of the expected and anticipated application of Lord Harewood to marry again after a divorce has been secured from his wife, and the difficulties inherent in the continuation of the necessity of obtaining the Queen's consent to such marriages, is consideration being given by Canada, in respect to the Queen of Canada, and by other commonwealth countries to the abrogation of this law, now in effect but totally archaic having regard to present conditions?

Right Hon. L. B. Pearson (Prime Minister): I am not aware of such consideration being given on a commonwealth basis, though it may have been discussed by certain departments of commonwealth governments. I will be glad to look into this matter to see whether there has been any development and, indeed, whether this particular act still has application in parts of the commonwealth other than the United Kingdom.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Am I not right in saying that imperial acts are in effect unless abrogated or limited, amended or suspended, and that this act, which was in operation at the time of confederation, would affect Canada in that our sovereign in Canada would be subject to the law as it now is?

Mr. Pearson: That might well be the situation, but I should like to look into it further.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORTATION**PROTEST BY QUEBEC RESPECTING FEDERAL LEGISLATION**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Transport. As the minister left his seat a few minutes ago, I shall direct it to the Prime Minister.

Has the federal government received a letter from the Quebec government protesting against the encroachment of Bill No. C-231, an act to define and implement a national