

other motion covering any other form of government. In that connection, before I come to deal with the form of the motion itself, rule 39 says, "In discharging its duties to make recommendations to His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom as to the possible forms of future government to be put before the people at a National Referendum, the Convention shall include in its report to the Secretary of State for Dominions Affairs the opinion of each several member of the Convention as to the form of government which in his opinion should be put before the people, together with any preference which he may choose to express as between one form of government and another." The rule therefore requires the Convention to express or record the opinion of each and every member of the Convention as to the form or forms of government which in his opinion should be put before the people; and secondly, shall also record any preference which he may choose to express (he does not *have to*) as between one form of government and another. In other words, this rule requires the Convention to record the opinion of each and every member of the Convention on the form or forms of government which he thinks should be included in the referendum. Now the question is whether or not the motion in its present form prevents the very thing that rule 39 requires to be done. That is to say, could any member or members express their opinions upon any forms of government other than the two referred to in the motion? I do not know how you feel about this, Mr. Higgins, but I feel the motion quite definitely confines the Convention to recommending the two forms of government covered by your motion, and these two forms only.

Mr. Higgins I do not think so.

Mr. Chairman Frankly, I am not too sure on that point, because if it did, it would be *ultra vires* to rule 39 — if you confined discussion to these two forms of government only.

Mr. Higgins It has not done so, so far. It certainly has not confined discussion on the motion that will come up.

Mr. Chairman The question I am concerned with is whether or not the adoption of this motion would preclude discussion on the next motion.

Mr. Higgins I did not see why it should.

Mr. Chairman If the motion does, I do not think I can accept it. I must accept the motion on

Commission of Government and responsible government. I must do that. But I will not accept it to the exclusion of any other form of government, in view of rule 39 which says "the opinion of each member on *any form*" — as I see it, it may be union with Soviet Russia or anything else — if he chooses to express his opinions, then it is the duty of the Convention to record his opinion together with any preference he might have as against other forms of government, and the form or forms recommended by him.

Mr. Hollett Could I point out that rule 39 is a mere rule of procedure adopted when we started business in this House, it has nothing to do with section 3.

Mr. Chairman It has everything to do with it. Section 3 lays upon us the duty of section 4, which says we "shall make rules and by-laws governing our own procedure and they shall not be altered except by two-thirds majority of the members of the National Convention."

Mr. Crosbie Well, if two-thirds agree that confederation with Canada be discussed besides Commission and responsible government, why waste time arguing about it? Another thing, when I first came in here I understood we had a political economist — where is Professor Wheare?

Mr. Chairman I do not know.

Mr. Crosbie Neither do I. He is supposed to be here to guide us on forms of government, and since he is not here I think it is up to us to make up our own minds what to do. I would not be a party to any motion to preclude discussion on any other form of government in this Convention. We are wasting valuable time.

Mr. Bradley If I may explain?

Mr. Chairman If you will — I am in deep water here.

Mr. Bradley Not only is the point which you have taken, one which is well taken — I want to point out to this Convention again what perhaps I did not succeed in explaining very clearly this afternoon — but this resolution of Mr. Higgins is one which definitely asks the people of Newfoundland to choose one of two forms of government, no other is mentioned. Now, if that resolution is adopted, obviously the question which is to be put to the people of Newfoundland is, "Which of these two do you choose?" That is the question. That is the recommendation which will go to the Dominions Office, and if the