

*Oral Questions*

**Some hon. Members:** Order, order.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):**—that the coroner's inquest had the mandate of looking into the causes of death of the prison guard, not of looking into any allegations of brutality, of shootings or any of the other allegations which have been made about Dorchester.

My supplementary question to the Solicitor General is this. The minister knows that the correctional investigator heard very serious allegations made by a number of prisoners of beatings, indiscriminate use of gas, destruction of personal property. Will the minister confirm that a number of these allegations have indeed been substantiated? Will the minister tell the House, in view of the fact that the rule of law does not stop at the prison gate, what disciplinary action or other legal proceedings have been taken against the guards involved in these very serious offences?

**Mr. Kaplan:** I would want to see the exact allegations that the hon. member is referring to. A number of allegations were made by inmates at Dorchester which I am satisfied were false, because I have seen reports about them. Some kinds of allegations can never be established one way or the other; others are being looked at now by the inspector general. I have not had a report from him on some of them. I will have the report within the next few days. If any of them can be substantiated, appropriate action will be taken.

\* \* \*

**PETRO-CANADA****INQUIRY RESPECTING EMPLOYMENT OF OFFICIAL BY  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES**

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and has to do with the participation of the senior vice-president for finance of Petro-Canada in the preparation of the budget. I wonder if the minister can amplify his answers of yesterday and tell the House of Commons whether Mr. Joel Bell, the official of the Crown corporation which benefited by the budget, during the period that he was with the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, was drawing salary or any benefits from Petro-Canada, including the prospect of future re-employment by Petro-Canada?

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, I have made some inquiries following the question yesterday of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Bell was not involved in the preparation of the budget. He was on loan from Petro-Canada to work on the acquisition program of the Government of Canada, and that is part of the energy program. He was on loan as a consultant from Petro-Canada. He continued to receive his salary from Petro-Canada and he worked for my department, in the preparation of the energy program, on the acquisition program of the Government of Canada.

**An hon. Member:** Which is part of the budget.

**Mr. Clark:** Madam Speaker, what we have admitted here is that the energy program which was presented as a major part of the budget of Canada was prepared by an official of Petro-Canada, which was the principal beneficiary of that budget, at a time when that official of Petro-Canada was being paid by the Petro-Canada company, which was benefited by the budget he helped prepare. That is a clear conflict of interest—

**Mr. Nielsen:** Gross.

**Mr. Clark:**—far more serious than the Walter Gordon transgressions of some 15 to 16 years ago. Since the minister knows that Petro-Canada is involved in several joint ventures with private companies operating in Canada and outside Canada, can he tell the House of Commons whether any of those companies knew that the senior vice-president for finance of their partner Petro-Canada was involved in the preparation of the energy portions of the budget prior to or during the participation by that official of Petro-Canada in the preparation of the budget?

**Mr. Lalonde:** Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that, contrary to the situation when his party was in office, when the office of the minister of energy, the presidency of the party and several other positions were occupied by former employees of Imperial Oil, we consider that Petro-Canada belongs to the people of Canada.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lalonde:** We consider that Petro-Canada, as always—and it has been stated quite clearly—is an instrument of policy of the Government of Canada. As far as the role of Mr. Bell is concerned, he was there as a consultant to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in the preparation of the acquisition section of the energy program. The program itself was developed by officials of the department and approved by cabinet. The Minister of Finance developed his own budget with the Department of Finance and with his own colleagues. That is the whole story, and I am afraid that the Leader of the Opposition has it all upside down once more.

● (1500)

**Mr. Clark:** Madam Speaker, I take it now that the position of the government is that the energy program was not a part of the budget. If the energy program was not a part of the budget, why was it presented as part of the budget?

**Mr. Lalonde:** Madam Speaker, I indicated that Mr. Bell was a consultant to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in the preparation of the national energy program, which was made public at the same time as the budget and which my hon. friend has had an opportunity to read.