

Mr. Butt I disagree entirely that the Chairman should have not only a vote, but the casting vote. I am a bit worried about the question of voting as far as the Chairman is concerned. I disagree also with Mr. Smallwood when he suggests that because Mr. Winter was a member of the Commission of Government it might be unwise to appoint him. In that particular case there would be no doubt at all about his impartiality, even though he has been a member of the Commission of Government. I can see that some people in that position would not be suitable, but I have no objection to the proposal of Major Cashin, provided we can consider the question of voting. The Chairman would be in a rather difficult position when debate gets a bit heated and he would have to think about his position as chairman, and also of how he is going to vote, not only in the minor matters, but in the main decision, which in my opinion takes all of any man's time. On the question of voting I would like to reserve our opinion for a little while longer.

Mr. Job I think it would be a distinct loss to the Convention if Mr. Bradley, for instance, was in the position of not being able to take part in the debates, and consequently in the voting.

Mr. Smallwood Mr. Chairman, the Speaker in the old days always had a private seat to the right of the official seat where he sat as chairman. In the old days, and in any parliament, the Speaker vacated the Chair and occupied his private seat and took part in the debate. I have seen and heard Judge Fox do it, and Mr. Winter and Mr. Penney (in 1919 when he was Speaker), and certainly I have seen them vote. They don't avail of their right to speak or vote on everything that crops up, but on vital matters, as elected citizens, they do avail of their right. I agree with Mr. Ashbourne. I don't see how he can give up his vote, but he should not give the casting vote.

Mr. Butt To be quite frank, although Mr. Bradley is here, I have come to almost wait for his opinion. I give such thought to it, and I hesitate to see him out of the position where he would be there, and to know his opinion on any matter that might come up.

Mr. Ashbourne I consider that every member of this Convention has been given by his people the power to vote, and whether he is in the Chair or whatever he is I don't think that vote should be taken from him. Rather than do that I think we

should give him more power commensurate with his position, and I don't advocate that that power be given him of the casting vote, but rather than take away his power to vote at all, my idea would be to give him more power, that is the casting vote, certainly we ought not to deprive him of his vote. The Chairman, Judge Fox, was appointed by the government and he could not have a vote, but if we elect a Chairman now we have a man that was elected by the people, and naturally if the people sent him here, they sent him to exercise a vote.

Mr. Vardy I entirely support the last speaker. I don't think it would be right to remove Mr. Bradley from his place on the floor of the assembly, but I can't see at the moment any more suitable person. I think it rests between Mr. Bradley and Justice Dunfield. I don't like to see Mr. Bradley removed from the floor, but at the same time I think he is the most suitable person, but I think it should be unanimous. I feel that Mr. Bradley should only use his vote under the most extenuating circumstances.

Mr. MacDonald Mr. Chairman, I think we have to forget that this is not the government, but it is a Convention. When a Speaker is appointed by the government he is entirely in favour of the government, although he tries to conduct matters as best he can, but his opinions are definitely in favour of the government. If we appoint a member of this Convention immediately this man is in an analogous position. If he casts his vote he will always be partial. I can't see how he can be anything else.

Mr. Smallwood There is no objection to his being partial so long as he is not partial between one member and another, that is in enforcing or not enforcing a given rule for or against a member, but there is no argument against a chairman being partial. If a man is a human being he is partial, he must have his own personal beliefs, but he must not use these to discriminate against any member. His only power is to enforce the rules. His own opinions are nobody's business but his own.

Mr. Ballam If we have the authority to put a man in as Chairman we can also put him out.

Mr. Vardy I think we have no power to appoint, only to recommend.

Mr. MacDonald I was not speaking of the Chairman being partial towards members, but