

them as I did when I said them in the heat of anger and in the heat of the moment.

I felt a deep sense of anger on October 11 because I felt we had reached collectively such a firm understanding and such an important understanding about dealing with something very important.

When we open the Parliament of Canada Act, it is the one piece of legislation that in statute form sets us all apart from everybody else in society. It is a piece of legislation that deals only with the Parliament of Canada and the parliamentarians who serve either in the Senate or in the House.

We are unavoidably and inescapably involved in a question of conflict of interest from the moment we start until the moment we conclude our business. Those of us who serve on an actual committee, given that responsibility on behalf of the other members of the Chamber, feel that pressure more perhaps than do all members.

In the final analysis, we have to vote in an atmosphere where we have that conflict because the act itself determines how we are to be governed. The act itself talks about our financial compensation, our use of resources and all of these things.

It is something that I felt we had collectively agreed to work on collectively, which is a slow process. Sometimes if governments are supposed to be responsible for something, they can do it more quickly. When we are trying to reach 100 per cent consensus in this place with 295 potential people in the House of Commons and ultimately with the Senate on something as central to our existence as that act and its relationship to the reputation of our institution, it is something we should be very careful about making comments.

These are comments which any of us believe to be untrue, on any side of this House, and which reflect discredit on individuals and ultimately on this institution. In that atmosphere, they are very serious indeed.

If the delay in arguing this question of privilege could perhaps accomplish a return to the tracks of all the members of this House in bringing about a successful resolution of these matters on behalf of the Canadian people in this democratic institution, I for one am prepared to be a little patient, provided that the war does

### *Privilege*

not continue either inside or outside the Chamber, in terms of talking about it, until we have either agreed to disagree or agreed that we have something to agree to.

I would just like a response to that. Mr. Speaker, if you are willing to have an answer to that and if there is a preference to proceed at this time, I am quite prepared to do that.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I am not certain what the hon. member for Calgary West was referring to in a number of those questions, but I want to make very clear that regarding the opening of the Parliament of Canada Act in an effort to resolve some concerns that members and other have, we have indicated from the very beginning an interest in co-operating as much as humanly possible and working together as a team in an effort to resolve this issue.

I want to say that at this moment, that same motive exists and hopefully will exist into the future. I have discussed this matter in the last hour with our one representative on the committee, and I can only say that he indicated an enthusiasm in continuing working in a co-operative effort to resolve what is obviously a concern of members of Parliament in a way that we can all support, hopefully a consensus of agreement, and that is our goal.

I want to preface my remarks by saying that at the outset. Also, I want to say that over the past number of days my friend, the member for Calgary West, has made a series of allegations and has claimed that my behaviour personally has infringed on his privileges as a member of Parliament. He has condemned me both on the record in the House as well as in the committee.

• (1540 )

With the indulgence of the Chair, I would like to reply to at least some of his comments in the following way.

I think it is only fair that having heard from my hon. friend, the government Whip, for nearly half an hour of House time, that I be permitted at least a few moments to respond to the allegations that he has made. I will briefly summarize my understanding of the hon. member's concerns and I would like to address each of them briefly, yet separately.