

**Mr. Chairman** So that I can correctly anticipate you, I will remind you that the duties of the National Convention are set forth in section 3 of the Act.

**Mr. Hollett** I was just going to quote that.

**Mr. Chairman** I do not wish to disturb your argument — you are giving me considerable to think about. What I would like to know is what connection there is with any legislation outside the Act — what jurisdiction it would have under section 3? How are forms of government limited within section 3, bearing in mind the expression employed is “to make recommendations on possible forms of future government?”

**Mr. Hollett** You can have responsible government back, or some measure of responsible government back.

**Mr. Chairman** How do you delimit the expression “possible forms” — why not 62 or 52?

**Mr. Hollett** It is not stated by law; it is in the Letters Patent.

**Mr. Chairman** No, I will have to construe your remarks in the light of the act constituting the National Convention. What they do outside is of no concern to me. My only duty will be to concern myself with the interpretation of the National Convention Act.

**Mr. Smallwood** Point of order. My point of order is that every word uttered by Mr. Hollett to this moment is *ultra vires* under the Act. He is not entitled to argue at all in this matter, except upon the basis of the National Convention Act which is the only authority we have in this Convention.

**Mr. Chairman** I rule now as a matter of law, and from which any member is entitled to seek a declaratory judgement in the Supreme Court if he likes that this Convention has absolutely no right, no jurisdiction, no power to review the Letters Patent. The legislation passed by the Commission of Government does not come within the purview of this Act. By accepting election and serving under the National Convention Act you are precluded and estopped by your conduct from raising anything outside the Act. What you are entitled to think or do as private citizens, quite obviously no limit can be placed upon that.... I rule definitely that this Convention has absolutely no jurisdiction whatever to review in any sense, shape or form any legislation outside the scope of the National Convention Act; and it is outside the National Convention Act unless and

until it is incorporated by reference into the Act.

**Mr. Hollett** I hope someone is taking account of the time. When I set out to speak I told you I was about to try and prove that if Mr. Higgins' motion had contained any more than two forms of government, then the Convention Act would have been *ultra vires* to the Letters Patent, 1934.

**Mr. Chairman** There is no connection between the two. I am not concerned with your interpretation of the Letters Patent of 1934, I have nothing to do with it. I am concerned with the carrying out of the Convention Act. Anything else is completely irrelevant to my purpose. You are not going to review the Letters Patent, and as far as I am concerned you are not going to review the conduct of the British Parliament. What you choose to do outside this chamber, there is no limit to your views, you are free to express them as a private citizen. I would remind members that there is a limit under section 3 to what you will review here.... Anything else is completely irrelevant, illegal, invalid and it is *ultra vires* to the section to which I refer.

**Mr. Hollett** I am not asking for your interpretation of the section.

**Mr. Chairman** I do not want to be cut off, and I do not want to be spoken to sarcastically when I am making a ruling on a point of law. Your only redress is to seek a declaratory judgement, and unless and until you obtain a declaratory judgement reversing my opinion, I am not prepared to brook any argument.

**Mr. Hollett** I cannot even mention the Letters Patent?

**Mr. Chairman** You have no right to review them.

**Mr. Hollett** I told you, sir, if you will bear with me, that I was not asking for an opinion...

**Mr. Chairman** I rule that the point of order was well taken; you are dealing with matters that are of no concern to you as a member of the National Convention.

**Mr. Hollett** I take it that it would be of concern to consider whether I, as a member of this Convention, can do something which is repugnant to the law under which we live. The Convention Act is in existence by reason of, and only by reason of, the Letters Patent 1933.

**Mr. Chairman** As far as I am concerned the National Convention Act is the result of the Commission of Government's exercising the legislative power which was conferred on it by the