
The House sat for some minutes in private.

The Speaker stated that Mr Casino and Mr Cunningham were off the Island. They were excused. Col. Moore was still ill. He had not had any word from Mr Cowell, and would write to him.

The satiation of his house. It would be extremely difficult for the farmer to make a full and accurate return of his income, and it would also, obviously, be very difficult for the boarding-house keeper. It would be very difficult, if not impossible, for the assessor to find out whether the return made by the farmer be accurate or not, and it would also be difficult in the case of the boarding-house keeper. In view of these facts, the Committee are of opinion that the boarding-house keeper should be assessed on the same basis as the farmer. In view of the remarks that were made by the hon. member for South Douglas, Capt. Moughtin, at our last sitting, I think it is necessary to remind the House—I thought every person was aware of it—that any man, boarding-house keeper or farmer, who makes a return of his income and convinces the assessor that the return is correct, will pay in accordance with that return. That is not mentioned in these recommendations, but of course it is clearly understood.

Mr Quine: Would lie in order in moving the insertion of a new clause, or should I propose it as an amendment? If this is the proper place, I am ready to move it now.

Assessing on Rentals.

Mr Cormode: We had better get through the Committee's recommendations first.

Mr Quine: Would lie in order to move the insertion of a new clause, or should I propose it as an amendment? If this is the proper place, I am ready to move it now.

Mr Cormode then moved the adoption of recommendation 13, as follows:

That the same be applied to the proprietors of boarding and lodging houses.

Mr Walton seconded.

Mr Quine: My position in regard to this clause is that I follow the note which the two hon. members for North Douglas have added to the report of the Committee—namely, that I am against the principle, but if it is applied to one class, it should be applied to the other.

Capt. Moughtin: It is understood that if
a farmer is assessed at double his rent, the boarding-house keeper is not also to be assessed at double his rent, whether it is right or not. He is to have the option of being assessed on his profits, I know, but it doesn't follow that both are to be assessed at the same rate. (Voices: "No.")

Mr Crennell: I think it will be apparent, as the hon. member for Peel has said, that the boarding-house keeper's profits are necessarily linked to a certain extent, in the same way as the farmer's are, and I hope the House will readily accept this proposal. I have several times expressed my views in favour of extending this arrangement in every direction possible, to save persons from making returns. Indeed, so often have I expressed this desire that the hon. member for North Douglas, at the last sitting, commented somewhat harshly on my repeated statements to that effect, declaring that I had failed to find any other business except that of the farmers, to whom this could apply. That is not so. This clause shows that the Committee recognise that there, at any rate, one other business—we cannot discover a third—to which the same principle may be extended. The Committee readily agreed to this proposal, and I trust the House will do the same. It is quite clear that in this case also, the rent is to be a basis only, and that the taxable sum may be a single rent, half a rent, one-and-a-half rents, two rents, three rents, whatever it may be, and that Tynwald should have the power to adjust it. As the hon. member for Peel has already told the hon. member for South Douglas, it doesn't at all follow that if the farmer's taxable sum is fixed at two rents, the boarding-house keeper will also have to pay on two rents. In the same year, it may be only half a rent. The two things will be adjusted according to the information at the disposal of the Tynwald Court at the time, and according to the regulations come to by the Court.

Mr J. Qualtrough: If there is to be a regulation of that sort, there will need to be a provision in the Bill. This is a fixed scale that the rent is to be the basis, and if the taxable amount is to be double the rent, there must be a clause to say so, giving Tynwald the power to levy it.

Mr Cormode: We will see that that is put in.

Mr J. Qualtrough: If you accept this as a basis, it will be one rent, and not two
work, really of what the man's income is, and this comes much nearer. The hon. member is quite right in saying that on the other side of the water, if the man sends in no return, the assessor may take the basis, as near as he can get it, of the man's takings to decide what have been his profits.


Relief of War Losses.

Mr Cormode: I beg to move clause 14 of the Committee's recommendations as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Losses by War</th>
<th>Relief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any amount</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-fifth</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-third</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-half</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relief of War Losses, 1918.

There are two questions involved in this recommendation. The first is whether persons who have been affected specially by the war deserve special consideration, and the other is whether the scheme recommended by the Committee is a good one, or the best the House can devise. I don't know that very much can be gained by arguing on the first question, because the view that any individual would take of it depends upon his sense of fairplay, and no amount of argument will alter a man's sense of fairplay. It seemed quite clear to the whole Committee, all except one, that these persons do deserve relief. It is quite clear that a man who has a big burden in the shape of a loan pressing down upon his shoulders, is not in so good a position, has not the same ability to pay, as the man earning a similar income who has no burden at all. And our view is that people of this class should be allowed to discharge this liability at the rate of one-fifth part of it per year, but that in any case they should have the thing over and done with at the end of ten years. If a man pays one-fifth, and can show it, he won't have to pay any Income Tax on that fifth. If the pays one-seventh or one-tenth, or whatever the proportion may be, and shows that he is paying it to discharge liabilities incurred purely through the war, he will have relief from paying tax on that proportion. In regard to the method of giving relief, I don't know that there is anything that came before the Committee that caused us more anxious consideration.

We looked at it from every conceivable standpoint. Certain persons who are affected put a scheme before us which we thought was not a good one, because it was giving to them unlimited power, almost, to do what they thought right, rather than what we thought those in authority would consider the right thing in the interests of the country. I hope the House will take the view that people like these—now we are all suffering from this calamity, but some are suffering more severely than others: none of us are responsible for bringing it about, those who are suffering in the greater degree no more than those who are suffering in the lesser degree—that these people should, in the general interests of the community, have the relief suggested.

Mr Gurphey seconded, reserving his remarks.

Mr Gurphey: As my name is in the Committee's report as being against this recommendation, I may say a few words, though otherwise I would say nothing. We need money for the purposes of government, and we know now, more than we did when the Committee sat, that we need all money we possibly can get. The co-operative societies were intended to be exempt, the local authorities were intended to be exempt, and this morning it has been decided that the hoarding-house keepers shall be put on the same level as the farmers. Whether that is right or not, I have not sufficient knowledge to say. I do believe that the farmers being taxed in this way is fair: I don't know about it in the case of the hoarding-house keepers. But, seeing that all these classes are proposed to be exempted, I felt that it was hardly fair to the Island to exempt these people also. I thought that if we were going to make all these exemptions, it would be just as well to wait and all be exempted together. On the second day of the sitting of the Committee, I was not present, as I was off the Island, but on the first day the town members were all for it, and we two...
country members, Mr Cowell and I, were against. A person with a boarding-house of the rent of £100, say, may have managed, in one way or another, to keep from mortgaging the property at all, to keep from borrowing from the bank or from his own friends. But he can prove a loss of £100 per year for five or six years, so long as the war lasts. For ten years he will be entitled to deduct a certain amount of his income from tax. It seems rather a trifling thing, when you come to look at it. Suppose a person has a boarding-house rented at £150. I presume that, with the exception of a very few houses in Douglas, that would be tip-top rent. Seeing that they are not taxed on the first £100, they would have £50 on which to pay. The hon. member for Garff has reminded me that if they have children the taxable sum would be less. But on £50, at the rate of 1s in the £, they would have 50s to pay. One-tenth of that is 5s. Is it worth doing? In the case of houses rented at £300 or £900, you could say something for it; but they are very few. It looks very fine in print to say how much a man may deduct on an income of £600, but there are very few men in the Island with an income of £600. From £150 to £290 is what most Manx Income Tax payers would have. Taking the case I have just mentioned, the man would be relieved of a payment of 5s, and I think it is not worth reducing the revenue for the sake of letting the individual off to that extent. That is the view I took in committee, and that is the view I hold still.

Mr Crennell: I think the speech of the hon. member for Michael is somewhat unfortunate from his own standpoint. He is anxious, as we all are, to get all the money he can out of this tax, and then he enumerates certain exemptions that have been made, and which he assumes are going to mean a great loss to the revenue, and amongst them he puts the arrangement come to by this House with regard to the farmers' assessment. Does he not see that he is giving his case away? But those who supported, intelligently, the clause with regard to the farmer's assessment, assume that there is to be no loss.

Mr Crennell: That is what I hold, too.

Mr Corr: The hon. member prefaced his statement by saying he was out to get all the money he can. But, he stated, the co-operative societies are exempted, and the farmers are exempted, and the boarding-house keepers are exempted, and if we do all that, we shall have no money. He suggests that the arrangement come to with regard to the farmers is going seriously to reduce the amount to be received under the Act.

Mr Curphey: I mentioned the co-operative societies and the local authorities, and then I mentioned this arrangement of the farmers. I distinctly said in my speech that I didn't think the farmer's arrangement was unfair. The hon. member for Ramsey holds me up as saying that the farmers are going to gain something; I didn't say so.

Mr Crennell: The hon. member distinctly mentioned a number of exemptions made, and the result of which would be a reduction of the yield of the tax, and among them he mentioned this.

Mr Curphey: I explained it.

Mr Crennell: He explained that he was in favour of it.

Mr Corr: We know what the hon. member means.

Mr Crennell: He explains it now, and we know what he means. And I think the same. But his speech certainly was calculated to give the impression that this was one of the alterations made which would seriously reduce the amount of the tax. There was no other object in mentioning it, because his argument was that these exemptions would reduce the amount of the tax. With regard to the co-operative societies, it has been pointed out that it won't make a sixpence of difference whether they are included or not. It is only a question of convenience. The hon. member agrees with me that the arrangement made with regard to the farmers is not going to reduce the yield, and, if the same principle is applied, there will be no reduction but possibly an increased return from the boarding-house keepers. The exemption of the local authorities, to which the hon. member objected, has not been carried. So, the net effect of the alterations made by the House in the Committee's report, up to date, has been to increase the return rather than to reduce it. So far as this particular clause is concerned, I do think that members, if they will approach the matter with a desire to be fair, will realise that immediately after, or during, this unprecedented war, in view of the fact that some classes of persons in the Island have been tremendously affected by the war, it is reasonable to treat this
as a special occasion, and to treat their losses as different from ordinary losses incurred in ordinary years. The Committee, as the hon. member for Peel has said, after very careful thought, felt, and I believe the House felt, when the matter was before us on the second reading of the Bill, that such cases called for special treatment, for a time, at least, if it was possible. The scheme suggested seems to offer a reasonable relief to these people, but the relief is not to extend beyond ten years. If they haven't wiped out their losses in ten years, they must make the best of it. It may be, of course, that they will get them wiped out in five years. The Committee did not think it reasonable that these people should deduct the whole loss in one year, but that they should have the right to deduct not more than one-fifth of the loss annually, and I feel sure that the House will agree that persons in that position deserve special consideration.

Mr. J. Quaintrogh: The thing is not quite clear to me, and I would like to ask a question of the Committee. The income mentioned in this clause is £600, and the loss by the war £2,000. Does that mean that the man is to be reimbursed for his total loss through the war? I observe that, though the Committee were so anxious to make provision for those who had lost through the war, they made no provision for imposing excess profits tax on those who have gained through the war. I cannot see that that is at all right. I shall oppose the clause unless it is shown that it is only to apply to people with a small income, or to people who have lost their income, and gone into debt. I feel the hardship that has been described, but I see the difficulty of working a clause like this.

Mr. Quine: I oppose this. It is so very indefinite. Suppose a man's income was £3,000, and it falls to £2,000. That is still a very big income, and yet you are going to allow him £1,000 on which he need not pay Income Tax. I cannot see that that is at all right. I shall oppose the clause unless it is shown that it is only to apply to people with a small income, or to people who have lost their income, and gone into debt. I feel the hardship that has been described, but I see the difficulty of working a clause like this.

Mr. Quine: The point just mentioned by the hon. member for Rushen is really the one that has caused me to reserve my remarks. It struck me, after this clause was drawn up, that there was some indefiniteness about it. I don't think it was ever intended by the Committee that "war losses" should be counted as the difference in a person's income because of the war—that, say, if a man had £500 before the war, and £200 while the war was on, £300 would be loss. I don't think that was intended, though I can see how the House would read the words "liabilities incurred by the war," would be nearer the meaning.

Mr. Quine: That is what we intended.

Mr. Cowside: That was the intention, as I gathered from the standing of the Committee. I think that when this clause is drawn up in the Bill, this could be made quite clear, and I can assure the House that, so far as I am concerned, and I feel sure I can speak for the whole of the Committee, what is meant is definite losses from capital, not losses from profits or income.

Capt. Moughtin: I cannot understand how this is going to work in a place like Douglas. Take one of the big hotels. Before the war, in reasonable times, the place was paying a big dividend. Now, in such a case as that of the Alexandra Hotel, the place is closed. Take The Palace and Derby Castle. That company was earning lots of money before the war. Are they to be allowed to deduct one-fifth of their income, in the year after, for the money they have dropped? Take the Gasworks. The price of shares in that company is a very good index of what the dividends are, and it has run down enormously. Is a man who has shares in the Gas Company to be allowed to deduct one-fifth in his next year's income?

Mr. Curphey: Certainly.

Capt. Moughtin: There will be nothing left in Douglas to tax, then. Take the case of the builders. Houses at present are practically unsaleable. If we are out to get money, if we must get money by this Bill, what are we to rely upon? If this clause is agreed to, there should certainly be taxation of excess profits. Some people may have done well out of the war, like our farmer friends, while men of business have gone down. Take the publican; he is ruined. ("Question.") If this privilege is allowed, it takes away almost everything that is taxable.

Mr. Canister: I would like that persons who had really been hardly hit by the war should be assisted, but the wording of this clause seems a little vague. It means that people who may have an immense income,
but who chance to have lost some of it during the war, are to receive the benefit of a deduction from the amount of their Income Tax. If it was stipulated that a man whose income is below a certain amount, say, £200, should be relieved, I would agree with it; but a man might have an income of £2,000 or more, and get the benefit of this. A man with more than £200, even if he has lost during the war, is in a much better position, surely, than the man who has gone to fight for the country, and is not within reach of paying Income Tax at all. I think that is an unfair position, and unless the Committee are prepared to stipulate the income up to which the people are to be allowed this deduction, I shall have to oppose the clause.

Mr Quine: I would suggest that the clause be held over until it can be re-drafted.

Mr Cormode (replying): I agree with the last speaker that the wording of the clause is vague, and what I had in my mind, and what I think the whole of the Committee had in mind, was the case of persons who on account of the war have been compelled to borrow sums of money. Persons, for instance, who have taken advantage of the loan scheme of the Government, and are bound to pay back at a specified rate. And there are others in practically the same position. We don't intend to give relief to people in good circumstances, even though they have suffered greatly through the war, but to people who have been placed in this unfortunate position that just to keep things going, and hold on to their property, they have definitely to borrow the money. And the new era that will dawn after the war with that load on their backs. If anybody can suggest words that will convey definitely what I have explained, I would be very glad to accept them, and I think the whole Committee would. But we can watch very carefully, if this clause is carried, and is embodied in the Bill, that the relief shall be limited strictly to persons who have incurred crushing liabilities through the upset of the war. It is a point that will have to be carefully guarded; we all recognise that. There is no precedent for it. We questioned Mr Clark very closely on the point, and he could not give us any information, but he was quite sympathetic with the idea. Suppose we say, "Persons who can prove that they have incurred liabilities as the outcome of the war." Will that do?

Mr Callister: I think that no man who has an income of over £2,000 should be relieved even to the extent of one-fifth.

Mr Cormode: The idea of the Bill is that a man should pay in accordance with his ability. If a man has incurred debt during the war to borrow a big sum of money, he doesn't want to have that hanging round his neck all his days. He may be able to earn £500, as soon as the war is over. You may have another man who has not had to incur any debt because of the war, and he also earns £500. Under the Bill as it stands, both these men would have to pay the same amount of tax.

Mr Quine: There would be a deduction, because he would be paying interest on the sum borrowed, and that would not be taxable.

Mr Cormode: Yes, but he would not have a chance of wiping off the burden of the debt.

Mr Quine: Clause 11 would cover that.

Mr Cormode: Clause 11 only balances the losses and the gains during one year.

Mr Quine: If he pays an instalment of the capital charge, that reduces his income.

Mr Garside: The assessor would not accept that.

Mr Curphey: Suppose we take two cases. One man, by his industry and thrift, has saved £100, and the other has not. Both have had a loss through the war. The man who by his frugality has been able to get along without borrowing, will get nothing by this clause; but the man who has gone into debt will get relief—a very trifling amount of relief, it is true. But the principle is not right; you should treat both men the same.

On the motion being put, Capt. Moulltin said: Some of us object to the wording of the clause. If it is put in this form, we are bound to it.

Mr Cormode: If members accept the principle, we will take very good care to put matters right in the Bill.

Mr Quine: If you hold it over and re-draft it, the clause will be safe.


The Income Tax Bill.
Mr Cormode: The man claimed against will pay that much less.

Capt. Moughtin: But suppose he has to pay nothing?

The Speaker: The assessors will have to pay the costs. There is nothing in the point at all.

The recommendation was agreed to.

Mr Cormode: I think that we are all agreed about 15. Under the Bill that comes to us, any applications against a decision of the assessors of Income Tax had to be made to a judge of the High Court. With all due respect to our judges, it was felt that they were not the right persons to come to a conclusion on questions that will be raised on these matters, and it was thought that one would do better if we followed the example of other countries, and appointed business men for this work, retired accountants, and men of that sort.

Mr Clark was questioned on the matter, and his opinion was that, though the judges might be good men in other respects, they were not the men for this job.

Mr Crennell seconded, and it was carried.

Costs of Appeal.

Mr Cormode: No. 16 also is not a controversial matter. It is purely a matter of fair play.

"Where Income Tax payer is brought by assessor to Court of Review, and statement previously submitted to assessor is confirmed, the Court shall allow him reasonable costs as against the assessor."

Mr Cormode: It just follows the usual transactions in the law courts, when a man wins the case he has not to pay the costs.

Mr Crennell seconded.

Mr J. Qualtrough: What are "reasonable costs"?

Mr Crennell: The Court will decide that.

Mr Quine: The only difficulty I have in this case is that the Court of Review is not a Court of Justice and may not be able to properly adjust the costs. I am not saying that is so or not, but only asking if that is so, as it is only a Court of Review, and not a Court of Justice, will this Court have the power to fix costs?

Mr Curphey: We are giving them the power.

Capt. Moughtin: How are they going to get costs out of the assessors?
in the Isle of Man, and if we start on false lines we will never be able to resist the claim of the Treasury and get back on right lines. I am satisfied that the course I am advising is not only the right one, but the only right one. One newspaper published in the Isle of Man states that members are acting the part of hypocrites in this matter; that we are making a show in favour of Income Tax and deliberately inserting this proviso to prevent Income Tax coming into being. As far as I am concerned, that statement is an absolute lie. That is all I think it necessary to say on that point. We have no right to give away this right. Our Home Rule does not amount to much at the very best, but if we have not this right, then it will be the greatest shame on the face of the earth.

Mr W. Christian seconded.

Mr J. Quutlrough: I just want to say a word about this matter. It is said in the Press and by some people that the House of Keys are only making a show of old age pensions when we contend for this principle and this right, but that is not so. If you look into the history of the Island you will find that the Imperial authorities are bound to allow the demand we are making. If they really claimed the right to control the expenditure of the proceeds of Inland Revenue, they should have done so in the first instance, and that was, as far as I can learn, when Tynwald levied a rate on the real estate of the Island for the upkeep of the Lunatic Asylum. At that time the Imperial authorities should have made a demand that the proceeds of that tax be paid into the general revenue and the cost of the Asylum paid out of that general revenue. The precedent was then set that Tynwald had control over Inland Revenue, and the Imperial authorities must be guided by that precedent now. They have no right whatever to claim any control over any direct taxation imposed in the Isle of Man. They have not a shadow of a case. We want to make progress, and impose direct taxation so that we can get old age pensions and other useful reforms. It is only fair and just to the old people that we should try and get something for them. We do want to make progress, and it is not right that that desire should be scotched by the Imperial authorities. Take the Island's past history. Does that show that we are not competent to deal with our own financial affairs? Take the time when the Island incurred a great debt, in the time of Governor Loch, to provide buildings, piers, and harbours for the Island. We borrowed £600,000, which we made good by interest and sinking fund. Are they afraid that we will act like a lot of children or schoolboys, and run into debt that we cannot pay? It has not been the habit of the Island to undertake work we could not pay for, and, therefore, why all this bother? I think, Mr Speaker, that we must stand for our rights, because if we lose that, we lose everything. More than that, we have no right to give away the privileges and rights of the people of this Island. I may say that the record of the Manx Government shows that we are quite as competent as the Imperial Government to deal with financial affairs. I consider that the Imperial authorities have to some extent been led in this matter by the Department, by some gentlemen in the Home Office, and I believe that, if the whole position was put before the Home Secretary himself, as some of the people of the Island could put the matter before him, that he would be bound to admit the justice of our claim. I hope that no member will consent to our giving this right away, or otherwise I can see a time in the future when money levied under direct taxation, and which we may want for old age pensions, or some such matter, being spent by the Imperial authorities without our knowledge. I hope that the Home Secretary will never give way on this important point, a right which affects everyone on the Island.

Cpt, Moughtin: What position will we be in if this clause is to remain in the Bill, as, if it does, we will not be able to vote any money without his Excellency's consent? His Excellency will still have a veto behind him. I must say that I am not lawyer enough to say where it is all going to lead to, but I am afraid it will lead to the abrogation of our Home Rule. Even if the clause is in, we will not have any more control than at present, as we cannot spend a shilling without the consent of the Governor and the Treasury. If the money we raise is simply to go into the Accumulated Fund, what is the good of it? I would like some hon. member who is better acquainted with the circumstances to explain the matter to the House. At the present time the Governor has full power to deal with all monies from whatever source they come, and we cannot spend one single item without his consent.

The Income Tax Bill.
Mr Creneell: According to the Old Book, which we all read at times, "No man goeth into warfare without sitting down and counting the cost." We prepared for this battle months ago, and agreed to take up our stand, the hon. member included, and we knew what the cost would be.

Capt. Moughtin: I voted against.

Mr Creneell: Only one member of the House—the hon. member for Michael, Mr Cuphey—has consistently opposed this matter: the hon. member for South Douglas voted for the adoption of this clause. We counted the cost, and realised that this was a right for which we must contend, as it strikes at the centre of our Home Rule. Personally, I would rather have annexion than an emasculated, absolutely useless Home Rule. This clause goes to the root of things, and unless we stick to it we will be in an infinitely worse position than we were in before. We will tax ourselves heavily, and it is not merely a question that we have to get the Treasury consent before we can spend the money, but we are in a far, far worse position. They can spend it without our consent. Could there be anything more fundamentally opposed to the idea of modern tax-ation? I do not know what the cost will be, but, whatever the cost, I hope that we will resist to the last. I hope that the House will be as strong now as they were when the question was first raised.

Mr Quint: I want to impress on the House the very serious position we will be in, if we raise this money and place it in other people's hands to spend. We need not fear the Governor's veto, because, if that is increased unduly the House can always refuse to vote other taxes. In this case we could not do that, as the money will already have been spent. If we do not insert this clause, we will be raising money and handing it over to other people to spend without consulting us at all. That is a state of things which the House will never consent to.

The recommendation was carried unanimously.

Recommendation 18 makes "that the year, for the purpose of the tax, be from April 1st to March 31st."

Mr Cornode: We have now got to the last clause. This makes our financial year, for the purpose of Income Tax, harmonise with the English financial year.

Mr W. Christian seconded the adoption of the clause, which was carried.

WAR MEASURES RELATING TO COMPANIES.

Mr Cornode: There are a couple of Bills about registering companies, and so on. I do not suppose we shall have any great talk about them. If it is necessary to pass them, I think we can do it now. I suggest we take those Bills up—Agreed.

The Companies (Foreign Interests) Bill (from the Council) for second reading.

Mr Carine, Mr Garside was asked to move the Bill.

Mr Garside: I do not think there is anything contentious in either Bill. I have not looked carefully at the one my colleague, Mr Carine, has taken up, but I think the three Bills which have come down to us should go through together. I beg leave to move the second reading of a Bill to prohibit the alteration, except with the consent of the Lieut.-Governor, of Articles of Association or regulations which restrict foreign interests in companies and for other purposes connected therewith. Under the conditions which exist at present, when we need to take great precautions against any alien interest which might injure us in any way, and knowing that this Bill has been put in operation in England, it will need no words of mine to commend the Bill to the House for second reading.

Capt. Moughtin seconded the motion, and it was carried.

On clause 2,

Mr Garside: I move that clause. I think it will be very apparent to the House, without further explanation, that if there were any restrictions on the Articles of Association before the war, it would not be politic, in the circumstances of the war, that they should be removed easily, and, therefore, this provides that it cannot be done.

The clause was agreed to.

In clause 3, verbal corrections were made in lines 6 and 20.

Mr Garside, in moving the clause, said: I think it will be very apparent to the House, without further explanation, that if there were any restrictions on the Articles of Association before the war, it would not be politic, in the circumstances of the war, that they should be removed easily, and, therefore, this provides that it cannot be done.

The clause was agreed to.

In clause 3, verbal corrections were made in lines 6 and 20.

Mr Garside, in moving the clause, said: I think it will be very apparent, again, that it would not be politic to allow changes to be made in the operations of a company, because that they might go in some dubious ways, and work in a way that would not be for the good of the nation.

Clause agreed to.

Mr Garside: I think I ought to move that there should be added a clause 4,
exactly as there is in the other two Bills: “This Act shall come into operation when the Royal Assent thereto has been by the Lieut.-Governor announced to Tynwald, and a certificate to this effect has been signed by the Lieut.-Governor and the Speaker of the House of Keys.

The Secretary: That is in this copy. It was added in the Council.

Clause 4 passed, and the Bill was read a second time.

Mr Garside moved the second reading of a Bill to provide for the disclosure of certain particulars respecting the directors of companies.

Capt. Moultini seconded, and it was carried.

On section 3,

Mr Garside: I think it will be apparent that it will require more looking up on the part of some companies, but the main intention is that there shall be no companies formed but what the Governor knows everything about it, not alone as to the title of the company, but as to the directors and all the operations. I think the time is at hand when such should be the case. I beg to move that this clause stand part of the Bill.—Agreed.

The Bill was read a second time.

REGISTRATION OF BUSINESS NAMES.

Mr Walton: I beg to move the second reading of a Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the registration of firms and persons carrying on business under business names and for the purposes connected therewith." This is an Act as essential as the other two Bills we have just read, and in many senses perhaps more so. We have all read, since the war commenced, of the peaceful penetration of the German into many business concerns in England. This is to provide in future against the foreigner entering into any business firm and being a member of that firm, and helping to carry it on without the public having any knowledge that there was any foreigner in the firm. This Bill makes it clear that all such firms who carry on business by means of names which are not identical with the real names of the owners must be registered, so that anyone dealing with that firm will be in a position to know that, although the firm may be named Brown, Jones & Co., it is Mr Hildesheimer who is the main man in it. Then they will be able to know whether they are dealing with English people or with foreigners, and this Bill provides for that purpose. I beg to move the second reading.

Mr A. Christian seconded.—Carried.

The Bill was read a second time.

The House adjourned to 2.45 p.m.

On the House resuming after lunch, the Standing Orders were suspended, and the Bills dealing with Aliens' interests in Registered Companies, Particulars as to Company Directors, and Registration of Business Names, were read a third time.

ADULT SUFFRAGE.

The Speaker called on Mr Crennell to move the second reading of the Adult Suffrage Bill.

Mr Crennell: I don't think it will be necessary to take up any time in moving the second reading of this Bill. The House will be aware that within the last few weeks we discussed the principle on a motion of which I had given notice, and, by a large majority, the House accepted the principle of this measure, which is precisely what the House will do in voting upon the second reading this afternoon. There may be clauses in the Bill which members don't entirely agree with, but that does not come up upon the second reading. I would like to emphasise that the vote on the second reading is precisely equivalent to the vote which we have already given—that is, that we are in favour of the principle. I might remind the House that, on a former occasion, five years ago, or rather more, when a similar motion was submitted, it was carried by a substantial majority, and then, when it came to the second reading of the Bill, I said distinctly what I have said to-day, that no fresh principle was involved, but that it was simply a case of repeating the former vote. But by some chance or mischance, a number of gentlemen voted the opposite way to that in which they had voted on the motion, and the second reading was lost. I made it perfectly clear, when I supported the motion some weeks ago, that I considered that an impossible attitude for anybody to take up, and that if members wished to vote against the second reading, they must of necessity vote against the motion that was then submitted. Inasmuch as
that motion was carried by a very large majority. I feel satisfied that no arguments are needed to convince the House of the desirability of carrying the second reading.

Mr Cormode seconded.

Mr Southward: I am certainly in favour of part of the Bill, but there are certain clauses in it that I cannot see my way to support, and I shall oppose them when the time comes. At a meeting of the electors of Ayre recently, I said I was in favour of Adult Suffrage, but thought that the registration of voters should be on a different scale in the case of elections to the House of Keys than in the case of elections to the local authorities, and I find that the hon. member for Ramsey, in this Bill, has made provision for it, and that removes my objection to unlimited Adult Suffrage. So far as the abolition of plural voting is concerned, I shall certainly vote against it.

Mr Garside: I should like to move, as an amendment, that the Bill should go to a Committee. While I am in favour of the principle of Adult Suffrage—

Mr Cormode: On a point of order, we must take the second reading before we can appoint a Committee.

The Speaker: That is so.

The motion was carried without dissent.

Clause 5 of the Bill reads as follows:—

Every person (male or female), who is of full age, and not subject to any legal incapacity, and who is on the 12th day of May, 1919, or on the 12th day of May in any succeeding year, and has during the whole of the twelve months preceding the 12th day of May, 1919, or on the 12th day of May in any succeeding year (as the case may be) had his usual place of abode in this District, shall be entitled to be registered as a voter in an electoral district, and, while registered, to vote for a member or members to be returned for such electoral district.

Mr Crennell: I beg to move that—

I wish to see that here, but I would go to 25.

Mr Cormode: Now is the time for the motion of the hon. member for North Douglas. We should settle that point first.

Mr Garside: I think that before we go through the clauses, the Bill should go to a Committee. When the electorate is being changed to such a large extent, I think that Adult Suffrage should, of necessity, mean a lot of other changes. I don't think I need go into details, but I will refer members to what was done in England on the same lines. Immediately that a Bill of this description was brought into the English Parliament, it was referred to a Committee, and not to an ordinary Committee, but to a special Committee, special in an unusual degree, called the Speaker's Conference. The Speaker himself took the leading part in that Committee, and acted as its chairman. The Committee's work involved the re-grouping of constituencies—Redistribution—and it also recommended the principle of Proportional Representation, which has a good number of advocates up and down the country. I don't say that we should go on the same lines as those, for I believe that the scheme has its advantages and disadvantages, but I do think that, when the electorate is to be at least doubled, and some constituencies will be affected more than others by the change, we should consider the whole subject of the representation of the people as the one time. I don't want to enlarge upon the subject, but I have the justification that when this important matter was before the English Parliament, they referred it to a Committee, and many of the recommendations made by that Committee were considered as very, very important, and are now in operation. Proportional Representation, which was a very debatable subject, while it did not pass, has been put in a permissive form, and, you might say, is being experimented with, and the Commissioners, I believe, have power to say that certain districts shall try it, though it is not applicable to the whole of the country. I believe it is being tried in one of the Liverpool constituencies, and also in a large country constituency near my late home. On those grounds, I move that the Bill be sent to a Committee, to consider the whole of the matters relating to the representation of...
the people, including the regrouping of constituencies, if it is so desired.

Capt. Moughtin: I second that. We have had many examples lately, even in this House, of the difficulties of part of the electorate, if I may so put it, being represented. At the present time, the urban constituencies, according to the number of the members of the House, are misrepresented—in numbers, if not in quality—and I think it is a very convenient time, when a measure of this sweeping nature comes before the House, that the question of Redistribution should be taken in conjunction with the rest. As the last speaker said, it has been done across the water, and why not here? If members want to do justice to the whole Island, and to all the electors, let the two questions go together, and let us see how it comes out.

Mr Crennell: I think that, if the whole subject matter of the Bill, and a great many other questions, too, is to be referred to a Committee, the motion should really have been made before we came to this clause. But that is perhaps through inadvertence, and I don't want to take advantage of it, so long as it is clearly understood that it is not a question of referring this one clause to a committee, but of referring a number of questions that have nothing to do with this Bill, though they may have a bearing upon it. For instance, there is the question of Redistribution. Members must clearly understand that the carrying of this resolution means sending not only this Bill, which deals purely with the question of Adult Suffrage, to a Committee, but also the whole question of Redistribution.

Mr Curphey: Why so?

Mr Crennell: Because the hon. member for North Douglas has said so, and that is his motion. It is perfectly clear that that goes outside the scope of this Bill. There is also the question of Proportional Representation, and possibly the question of the alternative vote or the second ballot. The whole electoral system of the country is included, as I understand it, in the motion submitted. That is a very big order. I don't personally see that the one necessarily hinges upon the other, and I think, say, I am sure, that the House is in favour of the principle contained in this Bill. The provisions of the Bill are very simple, but, this proposal tacks on to it, and necessarily binds up with its fate, these other questions. If the hon. members for Douglas wish to tackle the question of Redistribution, it should be taken on its own merits. I am not saying that I am opposed to it; my view is simple upon Redistribution. I have never pressed for it in this House; it is not a crying question with us in the North, I think; but I believe that if it is introduced, it cannot be logically resisted. But I do think that we should not mix it up with a plain, straightforward Bill of this kind. If the House wish to send this Bill, and this Bill only, to a committee, well and good. But I don't think there is any need for it; the provisions of this Bill are so simple that the Committee could do nothing to enlighten us on any of its points. So long as the House clearly understands that the proposal is to appoint a committee to consider and report upon anything and everything connected with the election of the House of Keys that they can think of, well and good. Personally, I don't think the House is ready for that just now; I am not. I am prepared to consider Redistribution fairly and reasonably, if it brought forward, but I don't quite see that we need to tack it on to this question, and I hope the House will go on with this Bill.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I am ready to amend the Bill in any form that may be useful, but I am not in favour of bringing in a fresh subject into a Bill of this sort. You will always find that when you fill Bills with controversial matters, you make the passing of them difficult, if not impossible. I had a proposal in my mind which I would have submitted to the consideration of the House, and which I thought was compatible with the Bill, but I thought that, sooner than endanger the passing of this Bill, I would withhold it till another occasion. The point I wanted to raise was that all elections should be on the one day. The Bill provides that only one vote is to be cast by each person, and I think that if we had all the elections on the one day, it would make the work of electing the House of Keys much easier. We might have a general holiday, and take all the elections on that day. But I did not want to introduce that proposal in this Bill, lest I should bring matters into collision with the principle which the Bill embodies, and I avoided bringing it forward. I am very much more against making Redistribution a part of the Bill—

The Speaker: Will the hon. member please confine himself to the point of
whether or not the Bill should go to a committee.

Mr J. Qualtrough: The amendment is that the Bill should go to a committee, and the suggestion is that it should be an instruction to the committee to consider this subject of Redistribution. I think I am quite in order in arguing on these lines. I wish to contend against introducing an element of discord into a simple Bill, which is only a matter of justice to the people of the Isle of Man. The Bill provides that every person shall have one vote, and then the members for Douglas say, "Beside that, we want Redistribution." But that is a different subject. Years and years have gone on, and the Insular Press has laboured and laboured this subject, and have done all possible to edify the public upon it. I don't say that I am against it, but I say, Let it be taken as a subject in itself. If the hon. members for Douglas, even at this late stage of the legislative session, introduce a Bill dealing with Redistribution, I am prepared to give my time in considering it. I hope the House will not more wisely than to refer this simple Bill—as simple as a.b.c. it is—to a committee, in order to introduce foreign subjects. You will venture upon a difficult voyage if you do, and the end will be that the Bill may not pass.

On a division there voted:—For the amendment to refer the Bill to a committee: Messrs Garside, Moughtin, and Crennell—3. Against: Messrs Kitto, Callister, Dalgleish, Curphey, Corlett, A. Christian, Southward, Anderson, Walton, Kerruish, W. Christian, J. Qualtrough, A. Qualtrough, Quine, Cormode, Crennell, and the Speaker—17. The motion was lost.

Mr Anderson: Before that is put, I notice, in looking through the Bill, that no provision is made for young soldiers. I think you will find that at present we have a number of young fellows of the age of 18 serving with his Majesty's Forces, and I think it is only right and just that they should be included under this clause. I move that.

Mr Crennell: The amendment of the hon. member for Michael, Mr Corphrey, takes first place.

The Man-Power Bill.—Income Tax—Control of the Revenue.
A new Income Tax Bill, putting our ideas into proper legal phraseology. His Excellency was very willing to do so, but of course he was keenly interested in what the House had done on the question of control, and as soon as he learnt that the House had decided to adhere to its view, he said he would write immediately to the Home Office, and report what had taken place, and he did not think it advisable to go on with the redrafting of the Bill until he had received a reply, and that matter settled.

Mr J. Qualtrough: I don't think the Bill should be delayed because of that. There are several alterations yet to be made in the Bill, suggestions that we made during the discussion.

Mr Curphey: There is no good coming here discussing all the points in the Bill if the Treasury won't agree. It is far better to have that matter settled out of the way.

Mr A. Qualtrough: Could not we get some old age pension scheme, or something of the sort, to spend the money we get it?

Mr Walton: Would you get permission?

Mr A. Qualtrough: No permission at all, but spend it as soon as it comes in.

Mr A. Qualtrough: I now beg to move that all boys serving, or who may hereafter serve in his Majesty's Forces on land or sea, should have the vote. We have, it is well known, a lot of young fellows of the age of 18 at present with the Forces, and if they are fit to fight for the country, they are entitled to vote. It won't make a very big difference in one sense, because, when the war is over, these boys, if they are then 18, will only have three years to run before they are 21, and entitled to vote under the Bill.

Mr Cennell: What age do you propose?

Mr Anderson: All boys over 18.

Mr Cennell: You get men in the Forces long before that. The age is 15 in the Navy.

Mr Anderson: That is not my intention. I will put the age in at 18, if you wish.

Mr Corncede seconded.

Capt. Mounthtun: In most countries, the qualification to vote is the papers from the military authorities to say that you have served with the colours. The obligation for military service commences at 18, and you have to put in two years, and fit yourself for the defence of the country, before you are allowed to have any voice in its government. Is there any reason why that should not obtain here? That would bring in all the lads at the Front. Let the production of the discharge paper, or entry paper, or what you will, be the proof of the qualification to vote.

The Secretary: I will draft the clause on the lines of that in the English Bill.

Mr W. Christian: Is not the age in the English Bill 19?

Capt. Mounthtun: It is 18 for entry into the army, but 19 for service. But lots of lads have a military age of 19, and what I may call a registered age of 16. Many a lad of 11 has joined the army.

The amendment was carried.

Mr Garside: I have another amendment to make, by way of addition to what is already in the Bill. It is to come at the end of clause 5, as follows: "Provided that no person shall be allowed to vote who has claimed exemption as a conscientious objector, and has refused to do work of national importance." I think the sense of the country will be with me when I say that anyone who has refused absolutely to do his rightful duty as a citizen, has no right to vote in the government of the country. He has no right to have all the privileges that others have fought for. I don't think, if I were to speak for an hour, I could say more than that.

Mr W. Christian seconded.

Mr A. Qualtrough: If you include all the clergyman in the Island, I will vote for it.

(Laughter.)

Capt. Mounthtun: Make it all the clergyman of military age, and I will second it.
Mr. Quine: I do not object to disfranchising them for five years or so, but I think this present proposal is rather strong. Suppose a young lad of 18 is so misdirected—I am not with the conscientious objector at all—by the age of 30 he may have been converted, and hold a different opinion, and see that his former view was entirely wrong, and I don’t think he should be penalised all his life. I am quite with the hon. member if he will limit his proposal.

Capt. Moughtin: The mistake the hon. member speaks of doesn’t bring the man back to serve. He has simply got out of serving, and he can alter his mind when he wants to gain something by it.

Mr. Cormode: I hope, if we are to exclude these men from the right of voting, we are going to exclude them from the obligation of paying taxes. If you are going to treat the man as if he were not a man, but a beast of the field, be logical and just. It has always been an axiom in every country that if a man has to contribute, he should be entitled to the same privileges as other people that are compelled to contribute. According to the Bill as it stands, you may be a criminal double-dealer, you may be a rebel, and still you can come along and vote; but if you are a man who holds an opinion that differs from men, and have the courage of your convictions, you are to be treated as a rank outsider, as something altogether below the standard of manhood. I have had in my pocket for a long time, in anticipation of this debate, a verbatim report of a speech made on this subject by Lord Hugh Cecil. If I had thought this matter was coming on to-day, I would have prepared a passage from that speech that would do good to narrow-minded individuals like the mover of this motion and others to have to read them. But it would take too long to read the whole thing, although it is a most luminous, convincing statement of the whole question, which no open-minded man could read without great advantage. However, I will spare the House, seeing that I cannot quote the whole of it, and it would be doing violence to the speaker to quote part of it. How many of these men have we in the Island? I suppose we have half-a-dozen, and here we are to pass an Act of Tynwald to hold up these half-dozen individuals, and say they are not to have the privilege of voting in the election of the men who are going to make the laws that will govern their lives. It is a poor, petty thing, and I hope the House won’t accept it.

Mr. Qualtrough: I oppose it on other grounds. We are introducing into the Bill subject matter that is very doubtful and questionable. I think that the closer we keep to the subject matter of the Bill, the better for the Bill, and the better for the Island. It is an attempt to curb a man in his opinion. What else is it? The man may honestly hold certain opinions, but because he holds them, he is to be disfranchised for life. However much sympathy we may have for the winning of the war, for volunteering and soldiering, and the rest, we must have respect for the opinion of the man who is honest in his abhorrence of bloodshed. Let us take the Bill as it stands, we shall have plenty to deal with then.

Mr. Wallen: There is one little point that the hon. member for Rushen overlooked, namely, that the motion refers to men who have “refused to do work of national importance.” And that is the part of these men’s conduct that we seriously object to. A man may have a conscientious objection to taking life, but that he should absolutely refuse to do work of national importance, is beyond my comprehension. If, in this time of stress and strain, a man be found who says that he will not fight or work to help the country then I have not the slightest compunction in saying, “Very well, you shall not have the right to vote.”

Mr. Crennell: I don’t think I can be charged with undue weakness for the conscientious objector, so far as the present war is concerned, but I don’t at all agree that this is a wise way in which to endeavour to impose punishment on these individuals. On the contrary, it would be highly calculated to elevate them to the position of martyrdom, almost. The hon. member for Peel has already pointed out that for long years it has been recognised that persons should not be called upon to pay taxes without having a voice in the imposition of those taxes, or to obey laws without having a voice in the making of those laws, and logically, if you are going to refuse any man his share of these rights, you should relieve him from the responsibilities also. That is one view. While I have very little sympathy indeed for these men who have both refused to serve in the war and to do work of national importance, it must be remembered that the...
State has recognised that they are entitled to escape military service, under certain considerations, as it has in the case of men who would suffer great hardship if called up. A man appears and pleads that he would suffer very serious hardship if he were called up, and that is one of the legitimate reasons recognised by the State why he should not be called upon to serve. You might just as well argue that, because that man escapes his duty, therefore he should not be allowed to vote. Conscientious objection is recognised by the State as a reason why a man should not be called upon to serve, and so long as that is so, it seems absurd to penalise a man for advancing that reason. Of course, I am aware that, as the hon. member for Carfr has pointed out, this motion affects only persons who have refused to do work of national importance. But in that case the half-dozen persons referred to by the hon. member for Peel would dwindle down to one or two, and is it befitting the dignity of the House, and is it desirable, that these one or two should be elevated to the position of martyrs for their opinions? if any large number were involved, it might be worth discriminating against them, but, under the circumstances. I think the best thing we can do with these misguided, miserable individuals is to let them sink into obscurity as soon as possible, rather than keep them for the rest of their lives, or even for five years, in a special position of their own, notorious if not celebrated, persons whom the State has thought fit to make a special discrimination against.

Mr Southward: I have very great sympathy with the amendment of the hon. member for North Douglas, but I feel that I cannot vote for it if there is to be no limit. In civil life, if a man commits a crime, or any offence against the law of the land, a certain penalty is attached to it—so many years' imprisonment, it may be—and then he is free. If the hon. member would specify a period of disqualification, I would be prepared to vote for it.

Mr Anderson: I also would like to vote for the amendment, but, like my colleague, I think there should be a fixed limit. It is going too far to condemn a man for life, and if you make the period five years, I will support it.

Mr Dalgleish: I rise to sympathise with the individual called the conscientious ob-

The clause as amended was passed.

Clause six provides that every person entitled to be registered as a voter shall be registered in the electoral district in which he has his usual place of abode for the three months immediately preceding the first day of the month in which the list of voters is prepared.

Mr Crennell moved the adoption of the clause.

Mr Curphey: Will not the hon. member explain the object of the clause?

Crennell: Where a voter has property in more than one district, the clause provides that the voter shall be registered at the place where he lives.

The Speaker: Why not give him the option? Suppose I do not reside in the district which I represent, I may want to vote there.

Mr Cormode: Suppose we hold it over till we deal with the next clause. The whole thing is dealt with by clause 7.

Mr Crennell: We might take clause seven before six.

Agreed.

Clause 7 provides for the abolition of plural voting.

Mr Crennell: The question is whether a person shall be limited to one vote. That is the generally accepted principle all the world over where Adult Suffrage comes in. It is so, I understand, under the new law which has just come in in England.

The Speaker: I think there a man can elect where he shall be registered.

Mr Crennell: He cannot vote in more than one place.

The Speaker: I agree with that, but he ought to be able to make his own selection.

Mr Crennell: I think that one man should have only one vote. If the House did not want men to be equal before the law, and all to be entitled to the same rights, then they should strike out this clause and retain the vote for ownership and property. If the House approved of the clause it would abolish double voting. It may happen that under our present law a man may have a vote in every sheading and every town in the Island, and it has been argued that he ought to have that right because he has large interests and is a man of wealth. It may often happen that the wealthiest man may have all his property in one district, and, therefore, he would only have one vote, whereas a man not nearly as wealthy, who has his property in various districts, may have six or ten votes. So that plural voting does not give votes to property and wealth as such, if that is the intention. I think we ought to follow the example of the rest of the world, and allow one man one vote, and not allow one man to have two, four, or five times the elective power that another has.

Mr Cormode: I second this clause. The object of the Bill is to give votes to human beings, not to farm-houses or to property of any kind. The Bill provides that each man and woman should have one vote, that all should be equal, and this clause carries out that principle.

Mr Callister: I rise to oppose this clause. I do not think it fair that a man who may have all his property and interest in one sheading should have no influence or control in the electoral choice of the sheading. This Bill conveys great privileges to a good many men and women who have not had them before, but at the same time I do not think it is right that we should do away with rights and privileges which people have enjoyed for so many years, as is suggested in this clause. It will have a tendency to make a man hold tight to what he has got, and prevent speculation. If a man speculates in the country, and has an interest in a sheading, that man should have the privilege of a vote in that sheading.

Mr Corlett: I also oppose this clause. Take the man with property in a town and in the country. For property in the town you want one representative, and for property in the country another, and why should not a man have a vote for a country representative? I oppose this clause.

Mr Southward: I think that the hon. member for Ramsey should have been satisfied with the sweeping changes which he suggests in the other parts of this Bill, in the voting power of the country. Plural voting, he has told us, is always abolished where Adult Suffrage is introduced, but we in the Isle of Man are not in the same pos-
tion as they are in England. Here we levy taxes on the real estate of the Island, the Asylum and Highway rates. These rates come before Tynwald, and it is only fair that the rights of property should have some safeguard. Now, the hon. member in his second reading speech, said that it would not be fair to give people a vote who had not a stake in the country a voice in the election of local authorities, for the reason that the people who had to pay should have a voice in choosing their representatives. The same argument applies in this case, because in Tynwald we as a body levy rates on real estate, and it is only fair that this remnant of power should be left in the hands of property owners. I think that it is patent to every member of this House that if a man has, say, £1,000 worth of property in a sheddin, he is an asset to the country, and we should recognise his position. All property is liable to be taxed by this House or by Tynwald, and I think that the argument of the hon. member should apply that those who pay the poor should call the tune. In this case, I am out against this clause, and I hope that the House will see its way to vote against it.

Mr Curphey: The idea of trade unionists is that capital should not have any return for its outlay, and that all the profit should go to the producer, as they call him. (Laughter.)

Mr Cormode: Where do you get the authority for that?

Mr Curphey: That is the idea of trade unionists in England, and the same idea seems to be in the heads of the movers of this clause. They think that a man with £10,000 worth of property in a sheddin should have no vote, and that capital does not deserve any consideration whatever. But surely it is more entitled to a vote than boys of 21. Capital should have a vote, especially seeing that we tax capital.

Capt. Moughtin: I must say that my sympathies lie against giving a person of 21 a vote and at the same time taking it away from the man who owns property, especially when we levy taxes on property. We tax property to keep people when they become poor, to educate people, and sometimes for the feeding of the children, and you propose to take away that vote while conferring it on any adventurer who has no stake in the country, and when he gets his country into a mess, can simply put on his hat and coat and leave. Is that class of man to have the same rights as the man who has been frugal, reared his own children, and has a stake in the country? There is very little danger of him going away and leaving other people to pay for his mess. It is said that all men are equal. That might be so for purposes of the war, but who is it you select for officers and leaders? Is it the trade unionist or labour man that you ask to lead your army?

Mr A. Qualtrough: No. Some brainless fellow with one eyeglass. (Laughter.)

Capt. Moughtin: Yes, and the fellow with the eyeglass will stick it when the other will run away. Property has as much right to a voice in the government as have boys and people who have nothing, who can, with a 7s 6d ticket to Liverpool, some morning close the deal. Is that the sort of thing to encourage in a small community?

Mr J. Qualtrough: The whole speech of the hon. member is a defiance of the rights of property, but we are legislating for men, not for property. Property in this or any other country can always protect itself. The member represents the people of South Douglas, and they are not all property owners who elected him to the House, but people. (Capt. Moughtin: I think it was property owners.) If we were framing a clause to deal with local authorities, property should be represented, but local authorities are not legislators. They did not make the laws, but are governed by laws, and levy taxes, and spend taxes, and in that case where property pays the taxes it is right that it should be represented. If some of the arguments of hon. members were to be carried out to a logical conclusion, then only property owners should be represented. Why should a man have a vote who does not pay Income Tax? It will only bring in men who do not pay to harass the Income Tax payer. The only proper conclusion for us to come to, if we are legislatting for people, is to give to one man one vote. Property will always be fully represented, no matter who is returned to the House of Keys.

Mr Quine: I wish to support the clause. I think it is just another step that we are taking in a right direction. Many years ago it was said that a man who had not property, or who was supposed not to have property—because it was entirely fictitious—of the value of £100 a year could not
represent the people in this House. I know a case where a man had not one farthing's worth of property, but property was put in his name to the value of £100 a year. That property qualification was done away with. The same arguments for its retention were used then as are used today—that, if this was done away with, the interest of property would not be attended to properly, people would tax it, and do things in a way that was not a benefit to property. I do not think that protection is wanted. If you read the newspapers, it is notable that this House is loth to levy heavy taxes on property, and the House has been elected without the safeguard of property qualification. There is another point, if this is not carried out, and we continue as we are at present, it restricts to a certain extent the choosing of certain men as their representatives. There are two great drawbacks to a man coming to this House—that he cannot afford the time and cannot afford the expenses of an election. The expenses of an election consists mostly in the hire of motor-cars to bring voters to the poll, and those are more necessary to bring out voters than any other purpose. Therefore, you must get a man to say he will stand, and, first of all, can he afford money to spend on the election. The cost of an election is running motor cars, most of which are employed in getting out electors living in other shadings; they are engaged in running men in from a distance. I know more about my own shading than any other, but I know it is the same in some other shadings. Now, I would support this clause. Certain people have said that a man without property can go away and leave everything, that is God will carry him off the island. They talk as if these wealthier men had made this property. They have not; the property will remain there. They cannot take it away; they never created it nor put it there. It is there, and will be safeguarded and properly protected by these people. I support this clause.

Mr Crevenell: It seems to me there are two ways of dealing with this question of voting, and our present system is not only a compromise between the two, but it is an illogical compromise. One way, of course, is to say, as has been said by several speakers, that this assembly represents people, not property, and that people—counting heads only—shall vote for members, that a man should have a vote to say what wealth should be represented here, that a man should have a vote according to his material stake in the country. Now, if that system is adopted, obviously, in order to give logical effect to it, the voting ought to be graded, according to a man's stake. That principle is adopted in a limited company. If a man has one or five shares, he has one vote; if he has 100 shares, he has more votes; and if he has 500 shares, he has more votes still. It is so arranged that a man shall have voting power according to his monetary stake in the concern. Now, we don't adopt that system at all. In many cases, a man with an immense stake in the country will have only one vote, while a man with a very much smaller stake in the country may have two, three, or five votes. So the compromise is quite illogical. It was logically carried out there would be something to say for it, but it is not. It is purely a haphazard sort of arrangement which I think would satisfy nobody—neither the parties who believe in manhood representation, nor those who believe in stake-in-the-country representation.

Mr Southward: If we follow out the logical conclusion of Adult Suffrage as mentioned by the hon. member for Bushell, we would legislate for brains. Then a man 21 years would have one vote, and a man of 25 two votes, because the latter has more intelligence or common sense.

Mr Crevenell: Is it always the case? I certainly should not say it. I know some gentlemen who had more brains at 21 than they had at 25. The assumption in the Bill is that when a man reaches 21 he has reached his full development. He may get more experience, but he has reached such a stage that he is entitled to exercise the full powers of manhood. Now, it is said property should be safeguarded because this House, amongst its other functions, possesses the power to rate real estate. That is so, but it has also been pointed out that this House has always been very careful in imposing these rates. But what about personal estate? This House has power to impose taxation on personal estate, and has been engaged in doing it to-day. What is going to safeguard those people? They have only got a single vote. A man may
have £20,000. We are proposing to tax him, but he will only have a single vote. Why should a particular form of wealth be protected in this extraordinary way, when it is not at all considered necessary in the case of other forms of wealth? It has been suggested, too—as I understand the argument—that this clause, if carried out as in the Bill, would stop speculation: that a man would put on his hat and go away. I do not know whether I am rightly viewing the argument—that he would fly away altogether and it would stop his speculative instincts. How many men in the history of the Isle of Man have speculated because they were going to get a vote in the House of Keys? They speculate to make money. I don't think it will drive the speculators away, if we say we won't treble their votes for the House of Keys.

Mr Crennell: I would like to say this decision will considerably alter the Bill, and I would suggest that we should adjourn at this point, and, if the House will allow me, I will go through it and see what changes are necessary. I take it that is the wish of the House to re-insert the existing law for the qualification vote, and all alterations in the schedule I will endeavour to make accordingly.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC CONTROL.—REFERENCE TO A COMMITTEE.

The next business was the consideration of the Liquor Traffic (Local Control) Bill, and a motion thereon by Mr Southward.
Mr Conside: I submit the hon. member is in order in the line he has taken, because this House has not expressed any opinion in favour of compensation. Therefore, he is clearly in order in saying this is not a question that should be submitted to a committee at all.

Mr Qualtrough: The only consideration that can be made in regard to compensation is what has been done in England in the 1904 Bill—either that, or red-handed to suggest that a tax, as has been suggested by the hon. member for North Douglas, be levied on the Isle of Man to compensate them right away. Well, I do not suppose anyone will run his head against the wall to do anything of the sort. Then the next best thing is what I came to again in the 1904 Act—that is, there was to be a reduction, and a reduction of redundant houses was to be made, and the houses remaining were to be levied on to form a compensation fund to pay the man who lost his licence. I showed in my introduction to the Bill that the moment you compel licence-holders to pay for anything more than the right to sell, you create a vested interest, and the laws of this country will not allow any vested interest, whether it be liquor or anything else, will not allow a man's property to be confiscated or annihilated or abolished or taken from him. There you are up against a stone wall. The liquor sellers in England to-day have a right to hold their property, that is the grant of the licence. They have just the same right to a licence and the re-grant of a licence as they have got to hold to the bricks and mortar. Then, if a reduction is to take place, to make it operative and give free-will to the people, the moment you make it operative and allow the publican to have vested interest, you cannot take away that interest without compensation. Then the question is who is to pay for it? Who is to pay for the last house or the last houses? Now, I want to make it clear to the House that the country has never yet taken the responsibility of compensating anybody. The State has no right to compensate. If you bring that forward, then it has a right to compensate every man who has made his sacrifice and given his life for the country. You must take the first things first. The great claim is by the man who has given his time and business to the country, and there are thousands who have given their lives and will give their lives. Compensate them first. Let the State do that, and then, if it can, compensate the publican. I will agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Ayre. But I know it is an utterly impracticable thing—a thing which will never be done, and I think it is a waste of the time of the House. It is attempting to destroy the Bill. I am satisfied if such a clause is put in the Bill, I will take no further responsibility for the Bill. You are thrusting a mill-stone on our little Isle of Man against that reform if we link on compensation. What has been done in America, in Canada? If they had tampered with it and taken into consideration the question of compensation in that country, there would not be one dry State yet; whereas, nine-tenths, if not the whole, of Canada and the whole of the States is dry territory. If we want to make progress, we are just tampering with a thing which is going to stop it for all time. I hope the House will consider the Bill as printed, and amend it as the House may think proper; but if we attempt to take up the question of compensating the liquor-sellers there will never be progress in our day.

Capt. Moughtin: The last speaker threw out a challenge that if anybody would provide any scale for doing away with these hotels or licensed premises without putting it on the revenues of the country, he would accept it. I am given to understand that no further away than Scotland they have passed a law with a time limit. There is no reason why, if a committee of this House is appointed, that should not be taken into consideration. There may be a small difficulty where there is one house, if you cancel the licence or passed a vote of the inhabitants of that district. There is a certain moral compulsion to vote in a certain direction at certain times. Who is going to compensate that man? You could not put a tax on Ramsey to compensate a man down at The Level. If the inhabitants of a district say a particular house is not required, the Committee should recommend that this man should be given fair notice, to stop all speculation in those premises, and after a certain date that licence would not be granted. In Rio, when slavery was abolished, they did not put down 20 millions to buy them out, but they simply said from now onward every man born in the country shall be free and at the lapse of a certain number of years all slavery shall be abolished. There
is nothing to prevent that being done in the Isle of Man without any injustice to anybody. We ought not to say because a man has invested in a legitimate legal business we should try and rush him right off the earth. It will be for the committee, if appointed, to take all these things into consideration and deal as honestly with the public as we would with the farmer. You cannot turn off a farmer at an hour’s notice. You must compensate him for his lease. A man has to prove it is for the benefit of the community before he is given a licence or before he spends any money on the fitting up of the premises. Surely you do not want to treat him worse than anybody else. I shall support the appointment of the committee to take into consideration the whole scheme and see if some scheme satisfactory to everybody can be adopted which will do no injustice to anybody.

Mr. Cormode: The hon. member for Ayre is very fond of referring Bills to committees, but I think he has not clearly grasped what the meaning of our rule on this subject is: he always introduces quite foreign matters. Our rule is quite clear that on the second reading a Bill may be referred to a committee—that is, the House must approve the principle, and then it may send it to a committee to work it out. The hon. member wants to bring in the question of compensation by a side-wind. I think the House should first decide whether it is in favour of compensation. The House has not decided that yet, and let it be decided in a straightforward way. If the hon. member thinks there should be compensation, he will have an opportunity to introduce a motion or a clause, and if the House accepted that, and he was not clear in the details, he could then move that it be referred to a committee. That is the proper way to proceed. Let us settle the principle first. Apart from the question of compensation, I do not think he made any case whatever for a committee. He said we wanted all the information we could get. I have known a number of Bills introduced into this House, and I can safely say I never knew any Bill introduced in connection with which so much information was given by the mover as was given in this case. He took I do not know how many hours—I would have been satisfied with less—still there was a great mass of information. If you want to stuff the country with information, just take the hon. mem- ber’s speech and you can go on for weeks and have plenty to give the people. There are some Bills—and this is one—where the principle is praecociously everything. There may be questions whether districts are to be rated and as far as, but the House can decide that. We do not need to send a member of men on a roving commission; we have a little sense here ourselves. I submit we are not going to have this question of compensation sent to a committee until we approve of the principle of compensation, if we do that—I myself hope we never will do it.

Mr. Corlett: The hon. member for Peel said the House had not agreed to the principle of compensation, and the House might not be in favour of the principle of compensation in the mind of the hon. member for Ayre. He may wish to have publicans compensated on the same lines as in England, that they should all contribute to a fund, and if any of them lose the licence, then from that fund they get compensation. I do not think this House would have any objection to such a plan as that. I do not see why we should have a committee on it. That is the way they do in England. If there are too many public-houses in a district, and a licence is taken away from one, that man gets compensation.

Mr. Clucas: I am not going to detain the House many seconds. It has just occurred to me that there are two ways to deal with this Bill. One is to refer it to a committee, where it can be thoroughly investigated; the committee can go into the whole subject, and find out where compensation can be got from. That is the course I should recommend the House to adopt. The other course is to deal quickly and surely with the Bill, and vote it out on the third reading, and let it lie dormant for the next twenty years. At the same time, as the matter has gone so far, and as so much eloquence and brain-power have been expended on it, I think, in fairness to the House, it should go into the hands of the committee to report thereon in due course.

Mr. Quine: I oppose the committee. I think the member in charge of the Bill is perfectly willing that a time clause should be inserted. If the House requires that, it can be done without any committee, and the question of money compensation will not arise. The hon. member in charge of the Bill is perfectly willing to a certain clause being inserted—I do not say any clause—and I think that would be a very
Mr Garside: The hon. member for Rushen, Mr Quine, has put rather a different phase on the question to what has appeared before, but I think he spoke his own mind, and not that of the father of the Bill. The father of the Bill has had ample opportunities of telling us what he would do. As has been remarked by the hon. member for Peel, he took a long time in introducing the Bill, and he had ample time to give us all possible information, if he had wished. Not in the whole of that time did he ever suggest what his colleague now suggests, that he would provide for a time-limit. What I had to make my mind upon was the information before me, and I had made up my mind to support the motion for a committee. In the Bill as it stands, under certain conditions which might arise at any time in any district, a man might have to leave his house on very short notice—perhaps as little as three months. When he has invested capital in the house, is that fair? If a person is carrying on a business under licence from the Government, and if he conducts his business properly, he has had no reason to think otherwise than that the licence would be granted in the following year. To bring about such a sudden change, and to provide no compensation, does not seem at all feasible nor equitable. Some form of compensation will have to come into operation, or else grave injustice will be done. The form which that compensation should take, would have to be decided by the information at the disposal of the committee. Whether by compensation from the State—of which I don't think I should approve—or by a levy on the trade, picking out the worst houses, or those that are least needed—which I think is one of the best methods—or by the method which has been mentioned now, giving a time-limit after which this Bill should come into operation, remains to be seen. On these grounds, it will be my duty to vote for the motion proposed by the hon. member for Argy, Mr Southward, that the Bill should go to a committee.

Mr Quine. May I make a slight correction. I did not suggest that my colleague would put a time-limit into the Bill, but that he would agree to one. He may not be in favour of it, but he is willing to accept it if it is proposed. The hon. member for North Douglas took it that I meant that he was willing to put it in himself. There is a slight difference.


The motion was carried.

Messrs Cowell, Southward, J. Qualtrough, Carside, and Walton were nominated to act on the committee, and their election was agreed to.

The House then sat in private, and adjourned at its rising until Tuesday, May 14.