

Privilege

Third, several of the passes used by the students to enter the gallery were signed by the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair.

Yesterday after Question Period two NDP members, while outside the House of Commons, laughed about the demonstration and said within earshot of a member of our staff that the Canadian Federation of Students had asked the NDP to raise the question in this House. I believe that is further *prima facie* evidence of their participation in this contempt.

My final piece of evidence is a poster that was hung at the University of Ottawa for several days prior to the demonstration taking place in this House. The poster reads as follows:

October 17

1. Petition on 3 per cent tax on loans at SFUO.

That stands for the Student Federation of the University of Ottawa. It continues:

2. NDP critic asked questions on 3 per cent tax issue. Leave for Question Period from SFUO at 2.15.

Of course at the bottom of the poster, which I will give to the Table, is a big print saying: "Revolution".

The evidence, I believe, is more than sufficient for you to rule that a *prima facie* case does exist and that you, Mr. Speaker, should allow the House to divide on the following motion:

That the entire matter of the demonstration held in the public gallery on Wednesday, October 17, 1990, during Question Period, and the *prima facie* evidence that the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair had prior knowledge of this demonstration be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

In conclusion, I wish to refer to yesterday's *Hansard* at page 14280 where the Leader of the New Democratic Party said the following:

—I should not have to say that as members of Parliament we do not condone that kind of demonstration. We have never condoned that kind of demonstration, and we should not have to say we dissociate ourselves. It should be assumed that members of Parliament do not appreciate that kind of behaviour from the gallery.

I agree with the words of the hon. member. It is most unfortunate that her words were not acted upon by members of her own party.

The evidence before you today is I suggest, Mr. Speaker, too compelling to suggest that yesterday's demonstration and the involvement of the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair in it to be anything like a pure

coincidence. I believe we do have a *prima facie* case of contempt against this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair): Mr. Speaker, I should have thought that the events that occurred here yesterday, both in the gallery and across the aisle, constituted a sufficient embarrassment to this House without having to hear what I just heard.

I do not think there is anybody in this House who would accuse Howard McCurdy of having been extremely, meanly partisan—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McCurdy: —and behaving in a way that is inconsistent with the obligation of members of this House to represent it both in action and in demeanour in an appropriate way.

• (1510)

Let me say that the ridiculousness of this charge is to be demonstrated, at least in part, in terms of my particular status. Anybody looking at me knows that if I had half a brain I am not expected to adhere just to those standards that are observed by the rest of the members, but my behaviour better be bloody well superior.

I tried to pay attention to what was said. First, the member indicated that the Sergeant-at-Arms informed the government House leader that there was going to be some kind of demonstration yesterday. I am aware of one single fact. Our House leader was not informed. Nor was any other member of this caucus informed. No member, including this member, was informed or was aware of it. It is alleged that there was an announcement at the University of Ottawa that this member was going to pose a question on student matters yesterday.

As it happens, I was not in Ottawa until roughly 10.30 yesterday. At this stage there was no question asked for in our caucus and no question approved, to be posed in respect to student issues. It was not until approximately 12.45 that the issue of a question posed in respect to students was even entertained. That would be long after, I presume, the announcements were posted at the University of Ottawa.

It is true that when I was previously a critic for youth and post-secondary education the students could depend upon me to pose questions at times when it was pertinent to do so. It was certainly pertinent to do so on National Student Day. That the caucus agreed that I