

have its assets confiscated by the government, and he outlined other serious possibilities for such companies.

It is my understanding that up to 12,000 companies have not yet registered, for a variety of reasons which are best known to the companies and which are also known to the government. Since today is December 15, what is the government doing to those federally incorporated small businesses in particular which have not registered? Will their assets be confiscated today, or is it the intention that one of the ministers will make a statement on motions, or some kind of statement, to inform these companies, which will be very anxious as to what the government's position will be with respect to this matter so that their anxieties and fears may be allayed? Is the government in a position to say something on this matter today, a very crucial date?

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I shall check on the question put by the hon. member and make sure that he is given an answer as soon as possible.

[English]

MR. CLARK—STATEMENT MADE BY MR. PINARD

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, on a very minor point of order, I believe there was an error in the apology offered by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard). He delivered an accusation against the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko) and directed his absolution toward the hon. member for York East (Mr. Collette). I think he will agree that he meant to absolve the hon. member for Edmonton East.

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I never wanted to accuse the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko). If I said York East (Mr. Collette), it was Edmonton East that I had in mind, but I never wanted to accuse him. In any case, no such accusation was implied in my answer. In reading my answer in today's *Hansard*, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) will note that I said "If I am not mistaken, . . .". I was indeed mistaken, and I simply corrected myself. I have too much respect for the hon. member for Edmonton East, whose motion on unilateral patriation of the constitution I supported, to accuse him in that way.

* * *

[English]

PRIVILEGE

MR. ROBINSON (BURNABY)—DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY—
STATEMENTS MADE BY MR. KAPLAN

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I have given notice both

Privilege—Mr. S. J. Robinson

yourself and to the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan). It concerns the question which I raised during question period today and it involves certain statements that were made by the Solicitor General to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, on October 30, and also on a number of other occasions.

The question of privilege concerns certain allegations which had been made by a number of prisoners at the Dorchester penitentiary following the tragic death of guard Bill Morrison and alleged violence which took place at the institution, specifically following that particular incident. I visited Dorchester penitentiary shortly after the incident, and both myself, members of the official opposition and, indeed, a member of the government party raised very serious concerns about the allegations which had been made, suggesting that it was only through the vehicle of a full independent judicial inquiry that we could get to the bottom not only of these particular allegations but of a number of very serious matters which had taken place at Dorchester Penitentiary over the past several months.

These include such occurrences as three hostage-taking incidents in the past eight months, one of them resulting in a tragic death of a prison guard at the hands of the IERT, the special team, the escape of four convicted murderers, the suicide of a prisoner, the allegations of widespread destruction of personal property of prisoners, and the substantiated allegation of shooting into the penitentiary gymnasium involving some 137 rounds of ammunition. It involves allegations of violence before the hostage-taking incident in which prisoners alleged they were victims of what was called psychological and physical torture. Finally, it includes the allegations of violence, of physical and mental torture immediately following the hostage-taking incident.

With respect to those allegations the Solicitor General on October 30, 1980, replied to questions by myself on the allegations, questions that following the hostage-taking incident, prisoners were stripped, forced to lie under their beds with their hands tightly handcuffed and their arms extended outside the cell bars, and that for a period of some five hours or six hours they were gassed and their hands were beaten. These are obviously very serious allegations. There were other allegations as well with respect to very serious acts of violence against individual hostage takers. In response to these allegations, the Solicitor General stated:

—I would be interested in holding a judicial inquiry only if an element of credibility were established in relation to that allegation. Otherwise the inmates would run our institutions—

The minister suggests that there was no credibility for the allegation.

At page 8:16 in the minutes of that committee meeting of October 30, the minister stated:

Now, you have referred to a number of specific allegations. You said that the inmates were stripped; that is true. They were stripped and they were searched after the hostage-taking incident ended. They were handcuffed so that the search could take place. Tear gas had been used in the institution during the entry to try to end the incident and capture the hostage takers, but there was absolutely no torture. Now, you say the inmates were beaten and gassed.