

Privilege—Mr. R. Stewart

what I said as any derogation of yourself is simply not stating the facts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I welcome very much the intervention of the right hon. member now as I welcomed the extensive conversation we had about this question this morning. I say it is typical of him that when differences have arisen there has always been this avenue of direct conversation about them. I think that stands the institution of parliament in the best of stead.

In the circumstances, the right hon. member and I did discuss the facts that he has referred to in respect of his motion. I remember the events very well. He had made a preamble in reference to his earlier conversation on that day with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson), and he introduced the motion in that way. When he introduced the motion he did not at the time indicate a seconder. I looked in the direction of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, which was, of course, entirely a voluntary movement on my part. Obviously I had no advance notice of the motion by the very nature of it. The Secretary of State for External Affairs perhaps felt put upon in the circumstances to nod in the affirmative, which he did, and I therefore announced that he was the seconder of the motion. That was, as I say, an action entirely of mine because the right hon. member did not mention a seconder at that time.

After the question was accepted by the House, put and carried, the right hon. member did, indeed, get to his feet to indicate that the seconder he had in mind was the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). However, at that point I had moved to the next person who was in the House ready to make an application and, therefore, the right hon. member's later intervention became a non-proceeding and was not in fact recorded in *Hansard*. Even now going back over it, I do not know in what way it could. However, it does point out a serious dilemma in that there are events of this sort, and unless given some formal recognition by the Chair they cannot be inscribed in *Hansard*. That is a very delicate situation.

I think the right hon. member has very fully explained that both he and the Chair were caught in a situation in the circumstances, which can happen in the quickness of the moment, particularly during the putting of these motions under Standing Order 43. I am pleased, as I am sure the House is, that the matter is entirely resolved.

MR. STEWART (COCHRANE)—STATEMENTS MADE BY HON. MEMBERS FOR THUNDER BAY AND TIMMINS CONCERNING REPRESENTATION OF CONSTITUENTS

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, it pains me to have to present this question of privilege today because it arises out of remarks made publicly and on television by two colleagues of this House. The matter goes, in my view, to the very heart of our representative democracy in parliament, and

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

it questions the ability of a member of this House to represent his constituency based on his party affiliation.

The crux of the matter is that the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) and the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner) have advised my constituents in the riding of Cochrane publicly that since I changed my caucus affiliation I can no longer represent them properly here. Furthermore, the population in the northern part of the riding was instructed that representations should be made to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, and the population in the southern part of the riding was instructed to address their problems and so on to the hon. member for Timmins.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Both those hon. members have now alleged they now have responsibility for the Cochrane riding.

This has served to confuse my people further. First, the redistribution of ridings had confused many of the people. This was complicated further by the postponement of the election. Finally, when I crossed the floor of this House and indicated my intention to continue representing the people of Cochrane constituency in the future, they at least knew then where matters stood. But immediately thereafter, when my two northern colleagues chose to make their statements, one can imagine the kind of confusion that was created in the minds of my constituents.

The danger of the remarks made is in the fact that they question the value of our system of government. According to these gentlemen, if followed logically, all the members sitting to the left of Your Honour represent no one. In other words, caucus affiliation alone would determine whether or not an MP represents his constituents.

On many occasions I have pointed out to my people that I did not believe in partisan politics once an election campaign is over, but rather that, once elected, I represent all my constituents whether they happen to be Liberal, Conservative, NDP, Social Credit or of no political affiliation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): I believe that is of the essence of our democratic system. The hon. member for Timmins was not elected by anyone in Cochrane riding, nor was the hon. member for Thunder Bay. I am their sole representative and I will continue to be until the next election and hopefully for many years to come. Neither of these gentlemen should be too concerned with the way the constituents in Cochrane will be looked after and represented, because for 11 years they have been quite happy with the service they have received from me. I do not need any help from them.

My argument is reinforced by precedents. I should like to cite a quotation from May's Nineteenth Edition at page 151 as follows: