

*Privilege***BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, this being Thursday I would like to ask the government House leader what is the legislative program for the coming week and possibly for the next week also.

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, today we will be continuing with a motion respecting the Iraq invasion of Kuwait.

Tomorrow, which is Friday, we will be proceeding hopefully to completion of second reading on Bill C-74, the act respecting the Fisheries Act, and hopefully to completion of third reading on Bill C-37, the Canadian Heritage Language Institute bill.

If we get lucky and co-operative, we may even deal with Bill C-73, the bill respecting the dissolution of certain Crown corporations.

On Monday it is my intention to call for continuation of second reading of Bill C-78, the environmental assessment legislation.

On Tuesday I would hope to call—there are the usual caveats in terms of changes of plans—Bill C-84, the Petro-Canada bill.

Mr. Speaker: There are several members who wish to rise on points of order. Of course I will eventually deal with them. However, I have a question of privilege which must take priority.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

DISTURBANCE IN GALLERY

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, today I rise on a question of privilege specifically to argue that certain members of the New Democratic Party participated in an action which demonstrated a clear contempt against yourself personally and this House generally.

In my argument I will make a serious charge against a member of this House and will support this charge with a

motion as required by the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. I wish to remind members of the process that will follow my charges.

First, Mr. Speaker, you must determine whether or not there is sufficient evidence to warrant a committee of the House hearing the case and deciding whether there is guilt or not. Members should know, Mr. Speaker, you do not decide if there is a contempt but rather if it is possible that there could be a contempt. If you decide there is sufficient evidence, you rule that a *prima facie* case exists.

Following that ruling the House must decide on the question. It does this by dividing on the motion I will put before the House. If the House votes in favour of my motion, the matter is then referred to the appropriate committee which hears the evidence and decides whether or not a contempt was committed and what action should be taken by this House.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I will make the charge. I will ask you to rule that my evidence is *prima facie* and then to put my motion before this House.

My charge is this: that yesterday's demonstration in this House by a number of students was accomplished with the prior knowledge of the member for Windsor—St. Clair. I further charge that he did nothing to stop that demonstration and that he was in fact an accessory to this contempt against our Parliament.

My evidence is as follows. Prior to Question Period yesterday, the Sergeant-at-Arms of this House advised the government Whip of evidence a demonstration would take place. I assume the other Whips of the other parties in this House had similar prior knowledge. The question is: Why, then, did not the New Democratic Party attempt to stop the demonstration?

Second, Mr. Mark Molgat, Vice-President, External Affairs of the University of Ottawa Students Federation and one of the demonstrators ejected from this House yesterday, in the presence of witnesses said that the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair did know of the planned demonstration while it was still in its planning stages.

This I believe is *prima facie* evidence that the hon. member did know of the demonstration, did nothing to stop it and, by not stopping it, encouraged it; a contempt against this House.