

city shall be responsible to the Board for the collection and payment of the amount so struck, without any deduction.’”

The CHAIRMAN thought it would be a great pity to insist upon a rate being struck, because it might tend to bring down the voluntary contributions. If the money came out of a general fund, the ratepayers were not so conscious of being rated. He therefore moved that the remit be deleted.

Mr. NORRIS (North Canterbury) said that in the Act of 1886 it was provided that the Board should declare what local authorities were liable to pay, and so on, and it further provided that all such contributions should be based on some uniform scale. That would be found in sections 26 and 27. There was no such provision in the new Bill.

The CHAIRMAN said he would make a note of that.

Mr. STEVENSON (Otago), as a country representative, thought the present mode of rating was inequitable, and he thought it was the duty of the Government to endeavour to devise some better method of rating. At present the land had to provide all the rates, although there was other property besides landed property. He felt inclined to move that the principle of charging land only with charitable-aid rates is inequitable, and that such rates should fall equally on all property. A person who had £20,000 in debentures did not contribute a penny.

Mr. TAPPER (Dunedin) said the time was fast approaching when charitable aid would be a charge on the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. STEVENSON hoped the Chairman would make a note of the point he had raised.

The CHAIRMAN said he would do so.

APPEAL BY CONTRIBUTING LOCAL AUTHORITY.

Remit from the North Canterbury Hospital Board: “Clause 39, subclauses (1) and (2): This Board considers that appeal should be made to Supreme Court instead of to Commissioners or the Minister.”

The CHAIRMAN thought the method suggested would be too expensive.

Mr. GALLAWAY (Dunedin) said this was a very important matter. Contributing bodies had been put to large expense when quite a small amount was in dispute between two bodies. Under the law a strong body could go to a smaller body and say “If you do not take it as we wish, we will go to law, and appeal.” There ought to be power to negotiate.

Mr. LOGAN (Maniototo) hoped some provision would be made to meet disputes of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN promised to place the matter before the Minister.

Mr. J. P. LUKE (Wellington) thought the less they had to do with the Courts the better. When there was a dispute between two local bodies he thought it would be a good thing for the matter to be referred to a Commissioner like Mr. Short, whose duty it was to apportion the cost of roads and bridges between the different local bodies which received the benefit. Mr. Short’s decisions in that connection had given the greatest satisfaction. He could not understand a remit of this kind coming down.

Mr. CRAWFORD (Wellington) had had considerable experience of the work of Mr. Short, and knew that his decisions as Roads Commissioner had been extremely satisfactory. It would be a good thing if these appeals also could be referred to him. He certainly did protest against such matters going to the Supreme Court.

Remit struck out.

MAINTENANCE AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SETTLEMENT.

Remit from the Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board: “That provision be made in the Act giving Boards power to recover cost of hospital maintenance out of the sums due to patients under the Workers’ Compensation for Accidents Act and its amendments.”

Agreed to.

The following remits were then taken into consideration together:—

(1.) *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 74: That this clause be amended to provide that, where relief is granted to a person who has resided less than twelve months in that particular district, the Board or Trustees may recover from the Board of the district in which such person has last resided for twelve months the entire cost of such relief.

(2.) *Waitaki Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 75: That the last clause be altered to read, “That the cost of maintaining such inmate (not exceeding a rate of eight shillings per week) shall be defrayed by the Board of the district in which the parent or guardian has resided for twelve months.”

(3.) *Stratford Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That provision be made in the Act for recovery of cost of maintenance from the persons treated by the Board which is liable.

(4.) *Ashburton and North Canterbury Charitable Aid Board*.—Section 74, relating to relief to persons from beyond a Board’s district, should be recast on the lines of a suggestion submitted to the Inspector-General in October, 1907, somewhat as follows: “Where any person who receives relief at the hands of a Board or the Trustees of a separate institution has not at the time of first receiving such relief therefrom resided for the period of one year in the district within which such Board or Trustees control the administration, the Board or the Trustees, as the case may be, may recover the whole cost of such relief from the Trustees or the Board of the district in which such person last resided for one whole year: Provided that during the time any such person is in a hospital or other institution or separate institution, or in receipt of outdoor relief in the district within which such person has taken abode, no such person shall be deemed to have been resident therein for the purpose of establishing settlement within the meaning of this section.”

(5.) *North Auckland Hospital and Charitable Aid Board*.—That patients treated in an institution beyond the district in which they reside shall not be a charge on the Board of the district in which such patient had resided prior to entering such institution, unless admitted on an order signed by the Secretary or a member of the said Board.