

Inquiries of the Ministry

evidence that they have acted in the Canadian interest in the matter of expansion or transfers. I would hope that with regard to the Oakland franchise they would take action to demonstrate to me and to the people of this country that they are concerned about hockey in Canada and about having more than two National Hockey League teams in Canada.

My colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, has a Task Force which may well recommend some action with regard to the National Hockey League. The Economic Council of Canada will soon be reporting on the Combines Investigation Act and recommending amendments to that act. I hope that by the time I have to deal with amendments to the Combines Investigation Act the governors of the National Hockey League will have demonstrated to me that they need not be included within that act or in some other national or bi-national regulation of professional sport.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION

**H.M.C.S. "BONAVENTURE"—ALLEGATIONS
REGARDING OVERCHARGES IN
REFITTING**

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that aspersions have been cast on the involvement of members of the public service, more especially those associated with the Department of Defence Production, in the refit of H.M.C.S. *Bonaventure*, can the Prime Minister inform the house what action the government intends to take in this regard?

Right Hon. P.-E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the incident to which reference is made. I will have to look it up.

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said he is not aware of this incident. If he would read today's newspapers he would find statements—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member can only ask questions; he cannot give facts to the house.

Mr. Coates: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, a most important matter that casts reflection upon every civil servant in this country has been bandied about not only in the Canadian press but in the international

[Mr. Basford.]

press, and the Prime Minister informs this house that he is not even aware of it. Surely to goodness—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a question of privilege. It may be a subject of distress to the hon. member but it is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Coates: It is not distress, Mr. Speaker; it is complete frustration.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Although the question was put to the Prime Minister, having regard to the information just given by the hon. member and the fact that this matter is within the knowledge of the Minister of Justice, would he be prepared to say whether an investigation is now being carried out by his department in reference to these serious charges? If there is such an investigation taking place, have any charges been laid to date against anyone, including Canadian officials or other citizens or people in other lands?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this matter was recently brought to the attention of the Canadian public—

An hon. Member: Not all of it.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —as a result of a court case in western Germany. The Prime Minister was out of the country at the time. Allegations of fraud involving certain defence contracts made with Cardinal Engineering and Machinery Company Limited of Montreal were investigated by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and referred to the Department of Justice as long ago as August of 1965. Pursuant to that, on January 12, 1966, a member of the R.C.M.P. swore out an information against Remus Rodaru and Cardinal Engineering and Machinery Company Limited. The information contained some 13 counts of defrauding the government of Canada of various sums of money contrary to section 323 of the Criminal Code.

In late August of 1966 the prosecution was terminated by the local crown attorney, it falling, of course, under the administration of justice within the provincial sphere, largely because of difficulties in obtaining evidence from Germany that would support the case. In that regard, evidence from a man, Erhardt Junkers, was regarded as necessary but it was found it could not be obtained in an acceptable form.