

ment by any member of the House although the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) the other day stated that he had signed a resignation.

Mr. GOULD: I beg to differ from my hon. friend.

Mr. REDMAN: Well, he said he signed an agreement of that nature. He did not state the nature of the agreement and so we do not know what the nature of it is; or whether it is harmful or beneficial. But I am now discussing the problem itself as an abstract problem.

As the member for West Calgary (Mr. Tweedie) has said, a member elected to this House is not necessarily only the representative of his own constituency. I think it is his duty first to lay before Parliament the rights and claims and needs of his own constituents, just as any counsel would do on behalf of his clients. But that done, it is his duty, in casting his vote, to have regard to the best interests of Canada as a whole; if necessary, to compromise on the interests or needs of his own constituents if that must be done in order that legislation in the best interests of Canada as a whole may be passed. That is my conception of the duty of a member of a British Parliament. How would it be possible for a member who had placed in the hands of an individual or a local committee a signed resignation, to represent the best interests of the whole of Canada? Is it possible for that man to represent all his constituents? Could it even be said that he represents the majority who elected him? While the individual or committee who hold his signed resignation may at the time of the election have had the confidence of or have been in agreement with the majority who elected the member, it does not follow that a year hence or two years hence when new problems come up, new issues have to be faced, this individual or this committee will be in agreement with the majority who elected the member. So that logically, by a process of reasoning to which there can be no answer, the only person or group of persons whom the member who has submitted a signed resignation can be said to represent are those who hold his resignation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have arising in this country new sorts of political parties, and I think that the question of "signed resignations" in relation to these new parties should be discussed. It would be extremely dangerous for political parties the

basis of whose organization is a policy which they believe to be in the best interests of the country, to use this signed resignation. That being true it is exceptionally dangerous when the signed resignation is used in the case of a political party whose basic principle is the betterment in their view of an economic class. I think we must accept the principle that that is the basis of the new political parties that are arising. We may also conclude that members of an economic class party must of necessity legislate in the interests of that economic class. It may be that they will legislate at some time in the interests of all the people of Canada, but on the other hand it may be that the interests of their economic class will be opposed to the interests of all the people. If that be not true, then why do they organize as an economic class? Surely that argument need not be pressed further.

Now, if we have as members of this House representatives of political parties the bases of which are certain economic principles for economic classes, the committee or individual holding their signed resignations is bound to think solely along the lines of these economic principles. They are not here like the ordinary member, to hear the opinions of other economic classes; they are not here to hear the opinions of the representatives of other parts of Canada. They are away at a distance; they are naturally full of the ideas entertained by their own class, and they will restrain the free action of their member here under threat of filing his resignation with the Speaker if he does not fulfil their orders and act in accordance with what they consider to be the interests of their economic class.

But what are the other classes of this country to do? It may happen that this new formed economic class may have control of the Government of this country although the majority of the people may have voted against them as we see in the province of Ontario to-day. Who is going to take care of the other economic classes? Who is going to take care of the interests of the majority of the people if we have here groups of members who dominate the Government, who have left behind them in the various constituencies of Canada signed resignations and who have to act in exact accord with the local and class viewpoint, of the individuals who hold their resignations?

You may ask, why, in the past we have never had such legislation as that pro-