

the ballot paper, and this resolution is clearly in that category. It is obviously restricted. You can only have two in an alternative, and this resolution is alternative in its character. "Choose ye", this resolution says, "between this form and that form." To read it in any other way would be, of course, completely senseless. Is it not an attempted interference with the prerogative of the British government to determine what shall and what shall not be put on the ballot paper? Obviously if there is to be a duel, a showdown between two forms, that is a recommendation that no others be submitted. It is only within the power of the British government to say that no others shall be admitted. It is not within our province.

I draw these matters, sir, to your attention. They are for your consideration. They are your responsibility and not mine. For my part I am here to vote for those forms which I think should be submitted to the people, and to refuse to vote for those forms which I consider should not be so submitted; but I have no right whatever, under the Convention Act, to ask the British government to keep any form off the ballot paper, either directly or inferentially, and that is the effect of this resolution. As to the forms of government for which I shall vote, the form which I shall support at the referendum, that is an entirely different question. I am not bound to disclose my political views to this Convention, or to anybody unless I so desire, and I shall not do so this afternoon.

I have only to say in conclusion that I favour the submission of both Commission of Government and responsible government to the people, but I do not favour a resolution which attempts to exclude everything but these two; and that is what this resolution does attempt to do. I consider that it is framed, not to put the two forms it mentions upon the ballot paper, so much as it is to keep all others off. I shall vote against the resolution, sir.

**Mr. Hollett** Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak to this motion, so ably proposed by Mr. Gordon Higgins K.C., and also very admirably seconded by Mr. Reuben Vardy. I might say, sir, at the outset, that I agree wholeheartedly with this motion made and I shall attempt to prove in a few moments why I believe it.

There are one or two things I would like to mention, and the first is that I have been very greatly impressed by the spirit of the debate on this motion and secondly, very greatly impressed

by the quality of the various speeches which have been delivered. There is just one thing I want to say in connection with the remarks made by my friend Mr. Keough, yesterday I believe. Mr. Keough apparently wishes to establish himself and Mr. Newell as the two people, alone of all this Convention, whose wish and desire and hope is for three square meals a day. So far as I can gather they are convinced that the other 42 or 43 members of this Convention don't give a tinker's cuss as to what happens to the man on the bill of Cape St. George. Both Mr. Keough and Mr. Newell are workers in the co-operative movement, and I therefore cannot understand either of them thinking that nobody else in this Convention cares for what they term the underdog. He said yesterday, and I quote as nearly as I can, that "If the fisherman or the poor farmer or the poor whatnot in this country could obtain his three square meals a day, little did he worry as to the man at the seat of government getting away with a draft." Now that is a very false philosophy, and I am surprised that any man who is supposed to be a leader in a co-operative movement should ever express it. "If you can get your three square meals all right, don't worry about the fellows who are ruling over you." That is the opinion expressed by Mr. Keough, and Mr. Keough is a friend of mine, and I sincerely hope he made a mistake and said something he did not intend to say. It is an absolutely false philosophy that you are going to make dumb, driven cattle of our people, or any other people. Is that all you want, to be fed and left alone like animals? I sincerely hope not, and I hope Mr. Keough and Mr. Newell will tell the people that in addition to being fed three square meals a day, and a mug-up at night, in addition to that they will teach our voters to think, and that they have to take an interest in the men that they send to rule over them. I hope they will not forget that....

Now, I had planned and had set out to prove the very thing, the very statement which has just been read by my friend Mr. Bradley. Some of the things which Mr. Bradley said I do not agree with, but I shall endeavour to prove that Mr. Bradley is absolutely correct, and that is that once having recommended these two forms of government, to do any other would be *ultra vires*, and I shall endeavour to prove it. First, I am going to speak from a text — not scripture — and I want to quote