

over fifty per cent of the votes of the electors of the constituency you might perhaps say that you were having an expression of opinion from one of the constituencies of Canada; but it is not even the majority of the constituency that is going to have the power to tell this man to give up his seat and go back to Assiniboia. I say, Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to those who believe in the principle of recall, that this important matter should be determined on the floor of this House. If a majority of the members approve of it and feel that its practice will be beneficial, all well and good; we can adopt it and crystallize it in the form of legislation. But until that is done, I certainly say that no group of people should be allowed to hold that power in their hands, for it is not in the best interests of the country at large that this principle, until at least it is recognized by a majority of this House, should be put into practice. Take the situation to-day in the province of Ontario. In the legislature of that province there is a combination of parties with a very narrow majority. The Drury Government may be giving to the province of Ontario the best legislation which that province ever received from any government, but it might run counter to the opinions of three or four groups of men in so many constituencies in Ontario, and with the narrow majority which the Government have at their command to carry on the administration, it would be possible for these three or four groups of people to call upon their members to resign their seats and thereby force an election upon the country. That I say is something that is to be deplored. It is in my judgment a reprehensible and dangerous attitude for any class of men to take. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), under existing conditions, is in actual fact not here as a member of Parliament but as a delegate of a particular group of men in a certain part of the West. I do not know whether it would be in keeping with the rules of the House for me to address the hon. member as "the hon. delegate from Assiniboia" rather than "the hon. member"—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS: If my hon. friend from Red Deer will suppress his temper—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The universal practice of this House has been for hon. gentlemen, when referring to other members in debate, to designate them "the

[Mr. Edwards.]

hon. member for So-and-So." My hon. friend is raising the question whether it is not proper to refer to a certain hon. member as "the hon. delegate." I submit, Sir, that that is a breach of the rules of this House.

Mr. EDWARDS: May I discuss the point of order for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may do so.

Mr. EDWARDS: According to the superior wisdom of the hon. member for Red Deer, it seems that I am out of order in even asking whether I might properly refer to the hon. member for Assiniboia as the hon. delegate from Assiniboia. Had I referred to the hon. gentleman as "the hon. delegate," my hon. friend from Red Deer might properly have raised his point of order; but I did not do so. I simply asked whether, under the rules of the House, I would be justified in referring to the hon. member as the hon. delegate for Assiniboia, and I fail to see that the hon. member for Red Deer has any ground for raising a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not understand the hon. member for Frontenac to refer to the hon. member for Assiniboia as the "the hon. delegate." Had he done so, the point of order raised by the hon. member for Red Deer would have been well taken. As the hon. member for Frontenac himself has declared in discussing the point of order, that he did not refer to the hon. member for Assiniboia in the manner suggested, there is no reason for interference by the Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member for Red Deer will be perfectly satisfied that he was out of order himself in suggesting that I was. I think the point I was making must have been clear to every hon. member, and certainly to the member for Red Deer, who is not slow in catching the point of an argument. The whole point I was endeavouring to make was that in view of the statement made by the hon. member for Assiniboia himself that he had entered into an agreement with a certain group of men in his constituency and was at their behest as to whether he should resign his seat or not, he was in fact a delegate of that group, sent to do certain work in this House. Under the rules I suppose I could not be permitted to refer to the hon. gentleman as the hon. delegate from Assiniboia, and yet the point in my argument was that he was not a