

name came from; there is nothing in names anyway. We might as well be called the People's group, or the Woman's group—because we have in this group the only woman in parliament. Call us anything you like; the name signifies nothing. The fact of the matter is we are here, and we are here as a protest against partyism in Canada. I am not so sure that we have the best system of government obtainable. I followed the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) last Friday, and if I gathered what he was proposing, it was to the effect that a committee of this House representative of all the groups in this House should function as government. I am not sure that that would be a very bad thing for the country. Surely in the present situation it might be a way out of our dilemma. It is possible we may come perceptibly nearer to that proposal than we are at the present time. Personally I do not see any reason why we should be divided into two camps deadlocked as we are now. I do not see why there should be such a difference between legislation pertaining to our Dominion affairs and legislation pertaining to our municipal affairs. It has been my privilege to sit in a council chamber for some twelve years, watching the deliberations of seven men elected from nine townships and carrying on all the legislative affairs pertaining to those nine townships. There was no such thing as two or three groups or more; there was only one group of men elected by the people to represent them and carry on, and my ideal would be a similar situation for the Dominion of Canada. But it so happens that Canada has become steeped in partyism, and it is very hard to get away from it. As a matter of fact a Conservative outside of his party is very human in his make-up; a Liberal also outside of his party traditions is a very likeable person, but either one of them in party harness is an altogether different animal. The constituency which I have the honour to represent has said time and again that it is tired of partyism. A part of it provincially has sent forward a representative elected in a similar way to its representative for the Dominion House.

The population of my district is some thirty thousand. Let us look at the vote that was cast in that constituency in the last federal election. We had a three-cornered contest. The Liberal standard bearer was a very estimable gentleman. He had occupied the position of representative in our provincial House for eight years, and during four years of that period he held the exalted position of

[Mr. Carmichael.]

Speaker of the House. I would take it, then, for granted that when the people were expressing their opinion at the polls they certainly would be influenced his way if an estimable gentleman had any influence over them, and yet on October 29th last he received only 2,614 votes. The Conservative candidate received 1,218 votes, and the votes cast for the Progressive amounted to 3,631. The combined vote, therefore given the Conservative candidate and the Progressive candidate amounted to 4,849, or nearly two to one against the Liberal candidate. Now whatever interpretation anybody else might place upon that, I interpret it as a vote of want of confidence in the Mackenzie King government. My opinion is that so far as my constituency has expressed itself, that vote was a mandate against the Liberal government.

But when I come to the question of my personal attitude in the matter I find it very difficult indeed. I find that I am between the deep sea and a certain individual with an unsavoury name that I care not to mention, and I am not just sure which will be the better way to go.

An hon. MEMBER: Which is the deep sea?

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I am not certain whether the deep sea is in Ontario or Quebec. We have the Liberal proposals and they are very generous—in fact there has been held out to us almost all that could be offered, unless it were a turkey for Christmas; and western opinion is in favour of such a programme. On the other hand we have the amendment by the Conservatives, and the thought of majority rule; and there is the expression of opinion as given by this country at large and by my own constituency. Certain persons in the country—yes, and certain newspapers, and representatives or correspondents of newspapers—choose to throw out the rather small insinuation that the Progressives are thinking more of their sessional indemnity than of anything else. We have heard that stated throughout the country. Well, I should like to say to all such that the Progressives in this corner of the House can perhaps come back here with greater ease than any other hon. members. The constituency that I have the honour to represent, without, or with very little, organization and practically no funds, sent their member here

at a total cost of less than \$500,
4 p.m. nearly all of which they paid themselves. It is not a very difficult thing for a representative to enter parliament when the people come forward and put him here, and I am quite sure that what has been done already may be done in the