

*Oral Questions*

try to answer in the question period. In any event, I do not have all the answers because I have not had a full briefing from the Foreign Investment Review Board on it. In so far as I understand the situation, it is a highly technical, legal one involving the ownership of the trade mark in a world-wide sense. It is this issue, along with the others the hon. member raised earlier, which are now being examined and hopefully later this week I will be able to provide him with more information.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF WHITE CONSOLIDATED'S REFUSAL TO CONVEY WESTINGHOUSE NAME—DATE OF DECISION

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice with respect to this same matter. It has been reported by the Minister of Labour that the justice department is involved in terms of looking at all the legal implications of the White refusal to convey the Westinghouse name, and that there are options being discussed. Can the minister advise whether he has in fact reached any conclusion as to the legal implications here, and can he give the House some indication of the options that are being discussed at this particular time?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I can simply advise the hon. member at this point that we are, as he has said, reviewing the matter.

**Mr. Alexander:** I think my colleague has brought before the House the urgency of this matter in terms of the 2,300 jobs and the GSW offer to purchase which expires on October 31. I would ask the minister then in the time he has had, is he now able to assure this House, the employees of Westinghouse and the Canadian people that there will be an answer by this government, and particularly by the minister before October 31?

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, if it is appropriate for the Department of Justice to make its views known to the Minister of Labour or the public it will do so before that date.

\* \* \*

### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING FEDERAL CRIME COMMISSION TO REPLACE QUEBEC PROVINCIAL COMMISSION

**Mr. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice, and I should like to congratulate the minister on his elevation to his new post. If he is not successful in the very near future in transferring legal authority to the province of Quebec to resume its very successful probe of criminal activities in that province, will he institute such an inquiry under his own jurisdiction?

**Hon. Ron. Basford (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I have indicated I think outside the House, that I was considering, in the event that our constitutional challenge was successful, ways of proposing such provincial bodies on an appropriate constitutional basis, and I am considering that.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

POSSIBLE APPLICATION OF CRIMINAL CODE TO INTERCEPTION OF CONVERSATION WITH MR. KISSINGER BY MECHANICAL DEVICE

**Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of Justice, but before doing so may I just take a moment to congratulate him on his new post. I am happy to see two former Ministers of Justice sitting beside him, so he will be able to get the necessary guidance.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Woolliams:** My question has reference to a reply by the Secretary of State for External Affairs to the distinguished member for Fundy-Royal regarding the reporting of a private conversation between the Secretary of State for the United States and one of our distinguished colleagues. The Secretary of State for External Affairs promised an explanation. Has the Minister of Justice reviewed Section 178(2) of the Criminal Code dealing with a possible offence whereby a private communication has been intercepted by certain mechanical devices and such conversation reported and disclosed, contrary to the Criminal Code which calls for a penalty of no less than a maximum of two years?

**Hon. Ron. Basford (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, I think the best thing would be to have the investigation concluded by my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, so we have the complete picture of what happened, as best we can, and then consider, as I will, the legal consequences that flow from that.

I should like to thank the previous speaker for his kind words to me and my two colleagues who sit next to me.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that it would not take much time to conclude the investigation. The report which I read in the *Washington Post* verified that there was a report of a private conversation heard over a mechanical device. I would ask the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, to look at the precedent set in the city of Calgary when a similar situation developed where a private conversation was reported by tape recorder and reported on the radio and in the press. Charges were laid in that regard as this was a serious offence infringing on the privacy of the individual under these particular circumstances.

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, I will direct the precedent to my officials.

\* \* \*

### OLYMPIC GAMES

REQUEST FOR ASSURANCE NO ADDITIONAL FEDERAL AID WILL BE GIVEN

**Mr. Otto Jelinek (High Park-Humber Valley):** Mr. Speaker, in light of the so-called anti-inflationary measures before this House, and in view of the fact there is speculation backed by some evidence that the over-all costs of the Olympics will now reach \$1 billion, will the Prime Minister advise this House whether the government has received either up-dated reports on Montreal's further