

Routine Proceedings

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, you chose to take my comparison between the behaviour of the students and the hon. member as if it were a defence of an abuse of the House of Commons. In reviewing the history of this whole terrible incident, this is not a singular departure from the pattern of this whole debate on an issue that was not raised by me but was raised by the hon. member opposite.

I put it to you, Sir, that even while I reject absolutely that anyone should come into this Chamber and abuse you, Sir, or this House, it seems to me that there is from your very own words a higher responsibility upon members elected to this place.

It is quite a different thing to have a rabble in the gallery and then have someone, who is in this House by virtue of what is supposed to be a respect for the integrity of this place, behave in ways that are unacceptable. I would put it to you, Sir, that an elected member in that member's seat should be held far more responsible than a rabble. It is because he brought unsubstantiated, self-created, gratuitous charges that I had to defend myself and then have it measured in terms of my word. The man stood in this House and lied—

Mr. Speaker: Now, just a moment. The hon. member has heard the judgment of the Chair which, as far as I am concerned, completely absolves the hon. member from any of the accusations, whatever they may have been, that were made. There can be no doubt about that. The hon. member and other hon. members have a chance to reflect on the exact wording of my judgment. The hon. parliamentary secretary has said he accepts that completely.

If the hon. member wishes to have the hon. parliamentary secretary say something more, there may be a procedure in which he can raise it, but the Chair cannot order the hon. parliamentary secretary to do more at the moment than he has done.

The parliamentary secretary has said that when he made those accusations, however unfounded they may have turned out to be, he did not do it dishonestly. The hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair now says that he lied. That is a very serious allegation and, if the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair wants to pursue it, he will have to pursue it according to the rules and at another time.

The essence of this was that there was a demonstration, which in my view, *prima facie*, is a contempt of this House. It was an argument about who might have known about it and who might have prevented it. That argument, while of course serious, and especially serious to the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair, and I understand that, is important and I am not diminishing the importance of it. I do not think the argument at the moment should take precedence over the fact that these kinds of demonstrations which some people in this country think are perfectly legitimate, are absolutely not legitimate. That is the fundamental point that has to be made.

• (1130)

Perhaps the hon. member and the parliamentary secretary would discuss their differences. If they wish to rise later on today I would be pleased to hear them. That might well be a more satisfactory solution than the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair says has evolved so far. I fully understand the position of the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair.

I would ask hon. members not to confuse the two issues. There is a paramount issue here and that is whether this place is going to be invaded by people, no matter how sincere their beliefs or otherwise who are going to act in contempt of it and disrupt it. I do not have to remind members who have a sense of history of what that did to a country that we now consider our friend and ally.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages, the government's response to 36 petitions.

[*Editor's Note: See today's Votes and Proceedings.*]