

line.

Mr. Chairman Anybody else desiring to say anything?

Mr. Crosbie If we appoint somebody from the Convention, under the act, that Chairman will have no vote. Is that correct? In case we appoint somebody as Chairman what about their vote then? Would not the Chairman of the Convention be in an awkward position? He would not be allowed to cast a vote, and he would not be able to take part in debate. I understand the Chairman can't take part in debates.

Mr. Cashin The custom has been in the past for the Chairman of the committees to be allowed to leave the Chair and take part in the debate if he wanted to. If he wanted to take part in a debate he could ask someone else to take the Chair while he took his part.

Mr. Jones Would he have a vote?

Mr. Cashin Yes.

Mr. Hillier I consider it quite a responsibility. How would they be chosen? Would it be a matter of proposing and seconding and being carried, or would it be a secret vote?

Mr. Cashin Mr. Chairman, I hope you don't think that I am expressing myself too much, but in ordinary parliamentary procedure the Speaker was usually proposed by the Prime Minister and seconded in the House by the leader of the Opposition, and was elected unanimously. If we decided to elect a man to become Chairman who is a member of this Convention, I think, sir, that no member would take the job unless he had the unanimous backing of every member, and if we can't arrive at that decision then the only thing to do is throw it back on the government, and let them appoint someone from the Court or elsewhere. I am prepared to take the chance and suggest that this Convention suggest to the government that the act be amended to cover the appointment of one of our delegates as Chairman, and that delegate would undoubtedly retain his vote. No man here would want to be Chairman and lose his vote. After all he is elected by the people and would want to vote on a matter of vital importance.

I move that this Convention suggest to the government the changing of the Convention Act, and that Mr. Bradley be appointed Chairman of this Convention. I think Mr. Bradley is capable of the job, and he is a lawyer, etc. I make the

motion that Mr. Bradley be appointed Chairman, and that the government be asked to change the act to cover it. The clause in the act regarding a judge of the Supreme Court could be amended accordingly.

Mr. Ashbourne I don't think it would be right to deprive any member of the Convention of his vote, and my idea would be to have him give a casting vote. I see no reason why we should not have a member of our own Convention as a Chairman. I feel sure that in the person of Mr. Bradley we have a man well fitted for the position, a man who occupied the position of Attorney General of Newfoundland, and I would like it very much if the decision could be unanimous.

Mr. Job I would like to support that, but unless the Convention is unanimous there is not much that we can do.

Mr. Smallwood Is it the idea that we leave it to the government to appoint Mr. Bradley?

Mr. Cashin Yes, they amend the act.

Mr. Smallwood I have no objection to that. On the point of a Supreme Court judge, if Mr. Winter appoints himself to the bench, as he has every right to do, we will have on the Supreme Court bench two judges who were ex-commissioners, one the Chief Justice and the other Mr. Winter himself. It seems to me that it would be wrong to have as Chairman of the Convention an ex-commissioner, an ex-member of the government which, amongst other forms of government, have to be reviewed by the Convention. That leaves only one Supreme Court judge, namely Judge Dunfield. He, in addition to being a judge, is chairman of the Housing Corporation, a very large outfit which takes up just about every spare minute of his time when he is not doing court work, and I have heard a rumour to the effect that it is these two difficulties, first that two of the judges would be ex-commissioners, and second that the only remaining judge is also extremely busy apart from his court work, which promoted in the government the thought that perhaps the wisest thing to do would be to repeal the clause requiring a Supreme Court judge to be chairman. If we look around the town and around the country to find someone who is capable of being Chairman, and in addition to being capable, willing and with the time to spare to be Chairman, the woods are not exactly full.