

Dominions Office is to implement that resolution which we pass in that form, then they must put that question to the people of Newfoundland: "Which of these two forms do you choose?" Now, having voted by a majority to ask the British government to ask the people of Newfoundland that question, how can we in common sense introduce a third? If we were to adopt another resolution to bring in a third form of government, then we destroy the original motion which has been carried. It is a complete negation of the motion which we carried first. How can we ask them to choose between two and then place a third on the ballot paper? It is completely senseless. Not only is that so, but the effect of the passage of such a resolution would be in fact to confine the decision of this Convention to two forms, and we could not add another without first rescinding the first resolution. Here we have a resolution adopted by this Convention to place two forms of government as alternatives before the people of the country. How can you add a third, without rescinding a prior resolution? It is a complete negation of the prior resolution. In order for Mr. Smallwood's motion to be in order, we would have to rescind Mr. Higgins' resolution if we adopted it. I made the second point in connection with our duty under the Convention Act to recommend (and if I misquote will someone please correct me) to the Dominions Office or the British government forms of government to be submitted to the people of Newfoundland. Am I correct there?

Mr. Chairman Possible forms of future government to be put before the people at a national referendum.

Mr. Bradley It gives no right to the Convention that we shall submit thus and such forms of government to put before the people of Newfoundland; it gives us authority to recommend certain forms to be submitted, it gives no authority to say thus and such shall *not* be submitted to the people of Newfoundland, and the effect of this resolution is clearly to exclude the laying of any other form of government before the people. It is wholly within the province of the British government itself to say what shall not be set before the people of Newfoundland at the referendum. They have authority to throw out any recommendation that we may make. We have no authority whatsoever to make a negative recom-

mendation, none. There can be found no such power in the Convention Act. There are the plain words: "to recommend forms of government to be submitted", not to recommend that any particular forms they dislike shall not be submitted. That is a matter for the British government, not for us.

Mr. Crosbie I agree with Mr. Bradley, but being a layman and not a lawyer, what I want to know is why we discussed this resolution for four or five days, and at this point this question arises?

Mr. Chairman It was raised this afternoon.

Mr. Bradley I can give Mr. Crosbie some light on that. Possibly I am at fault. As you know, for the last two months I have not been in the pink of condition. When Mr. Higgins made his first resolution, or gave notice of motion before the Christmas vacation, I had read the resolution and was frankly of the opinion that it was entirely outside our province and should not be received. When I returned, some eight or ten days late, after the Christmas vacation, I was informed that Mr. Higgins had withdrawn his motion and substituted another one which was, in effect, to place Commission government and responsible government upon the ballot. With that resolution, in substance, I was in complete accord. I did not bother my head any further about it. I did not even bother to read the resolution. Yesterday afternoon I was sitting here at my desk and the order paper was here, and quite by accident I picked it up and read it. As soon as I read it I saw where, in my opinion, it was completely outside our jurisdiction to receive any such resolution or vote on it. I drew it to the attention of this house at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Crosbie I agree with Mr. Bradley's explanation. From my point of view, we are 45 men here, and I do not think any one of us wants to railroad anything through. If there is, I do not want to be a party to it. I know that one or two members are sick, but the members present can settle this thing between ourselves. I do not think anyone here is trying to block any form of government. After all, as I said, we had a political economist — he was over there where Mr. House is now sitting — he stayed here a week or ten days and we have not seen him since. I am not a lawyer, but to me it is just plain ordinary sense for us to settle this discussion. I think we can settle the question and go on.