REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF
HOUSE OF KEYS

Douglas, Tuesday, February 3, 1970


APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE

The Speaker: Miss Thornton-Duesbery has asked to be excused.

BILLS FOR FIRST READING

The Speaker: Bills for first reading.

The Secretary: Coinage (Manx Crowns) Bill — Mr. Devereau; Beer (Repayment of Duty) Bill — Mr. MacDonald.

INTERPRETATION BILL— CONSIDERATION OF COUNCIL AMENDMENTS—AGREED

The Speaker: The Interpretation Bill for consideration of Council amendments. I call upon the hon. member for Middle, Mr. Spittall.

Mr. Spittall: Mr. Speaker, members will realise that most of the amendments proposed by the Legislative Council deal with the definition section of this Interpretation Bill. I do not think there is anything really contentious about it. I think the fact that the Council had the advantage of the presence of the Lord Bishop, has resulted in certain alterations, in what I might call the Ecclesiastical definitions. The members will remember that the Keys inserted in the definition of "coin," "of the Republic of Ireland." The Council have thrown that out, because they felt that if that was kept in then it would mean more, on more occasions would one have to put a special interpretation of coin into a Bill than if it was left out. I think probably rightly, they felt that as far as legislation was concerned "coin" was more likely not to be concerned with the coins of the Republic of Ireland. You will see a new definition of printing there, which includes letter press, gravure, lithography, office type set, electro-static photocopying, photostat or similar processes properly processed and washed. It does not include typewriting. I understand this is because these are the sort of forms of printed reproduction, which are difficult to make alterations to by hand. I do not think there is anything... on page seven delete the definition of the "passing of this Act." This is because in the past, the expression has perhaps been incorrectly used in another sense and therefore it was felt that it might be confusing if it was laid down as one sense in this Interpretation Bill. I beg to move.

Apology for Absence. — Bills for First Reading. — Interpretation Bill—Consideration of Council Amendments—Agreed.
Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, clause two on page two, line six, the definition of Bishop of Sodor and Man, substitute the following "Bishop of Sodor and Man means the Lord Bishop for the Isle of Man and Sodor, and of Sodor and Man." I was under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the Bishop of Sodor and Man, this title was given, many may years ago because it was sort of a definition between the Northern Islands meaning the Orkneys and the Faroes, places like that and the Southern Islands meaning the Hebridees and places like that. I wonder what they mean by saying the Isle of Man and Sodor. That is the Isle of Man I take it and the Southern Islands, which no longer have anything to do with it. "Of Sodor and Man", what does that exactly mean? I mean after all if it is an Interpretation Bill, surely it must be able to be interpreted.

The Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak?

Mr. MacDonald: On that last remark of the hon. member for Glenfaba, I myself have been puzzled over this. I think it would appear that a mistake was made, when the present Lord Bishop was before the Crown, because I can find nothing in the past, where we have got this Sodor of Man. It has always been the Sudreys and Man of Sodor and Man, and to have this and Sodor of Man, Man was never part of the Sudreys.

Mr. Callister: Could it be the Isle of Sodor?

Mr. MacDonald: There is no such thing.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Middle to reply.

Mr. Spittall: I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am a little puzzled too, but I can only assure hon. members, that this was a definition which I suspect has been sorted out pretty carefully by the Vicar General.

The Speaker: I will put the question to the House, that the House agrees to the Council amendments? Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it.

CONSUMER PROTECTION (TRADE DESCRIPTIONS) BILL—THIRD READING APPROVED.

The Speaker: The Consumer Protection (Trade Descriptions) Bill for third reading. I call upon the hon. member for Douglas West, Mr. Devereau.

Mr. Devereau: Members will remember that the clauses of this Bill, were started by the late Mr. Kelly and I was asked to take the remainder of the clauses. In each of the two sittings in which the clauses were discussed, they were taken individually and very well thrashed out. The Bill is primarily for the protection of the consumer; this means for the protection of everyone, against fraudulent description of any goods offered for sale, be it house property, motor cars, land, any goods of any kind offered by advertisement or otherwise. There are defences included in the Bill, protecting sellers against wrongful accusation. This is a very necessary Bill and should be given the support of the House. I have pleasure in moving the third reading.

Mr. MacLeod: I beg to second and reserve my remarks.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker I would just like to say that during the second reading and the clauses stage of the Bill, I did endeavour to create some debate, so that possibly the public would be aware that this Bill was going through the stages required to make it law. I was very astonished therefore to learn this morning that persons trading in the Island, in Douglas particularly, were not even aware of the title of the Bill or even the nature of it. When I said it was in fact to receive its third reading this morning, they could not grasp why it had not had the publicity which one
would think, that a major step forward like this, in purchasing and in selling deserves and warrants. I hope, therefore, that the Bill receiving its third reading in this House, where most of the debate has taken place, will possibly receive the same amount of searching criticism in another place, and that the press also will give space to the very important features of the Bill. I think it is important to recognise that while the Bill seeks to protect the consumer, it should not become law, unless the penalties and its requirements are given publicity. All too often in the past, people have been charged with committing offences, that they were not aware of. We all know that ignorance is no excuse for a breach of law, but I do think that when a Bill like this, which is a major domestic and trading revolution in legislation, takes place in the Isle of Man, that the public should be informed and one way of doing this is through the press and another is by means of Government insertions in local papers.

Mr. Irving: And trade associations doing their jobs.

Mr. Bell: Yes, well it is not every person who is a member of a trade association. The big combines, of course, who operate in the Island will be fully conversant with the measures contained in this Bill. The smaller people who sell crockery and such like things may not be fully conversant and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that maximum publicity could be given to the effects of this Bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr Speaker, very shortly, I fully support the Bill. I agree entirely with what the hon. member for Douglas South, has just said. I think it is most important, that the people on the Island do in fact fully understand the implications of this Bill. I would think it would be a very good idea if a poster of some type, could be brought out, to be available in the local centres, town halls etc. where people could study the implications of this Bill. There is one other point Mr. Speaker I would like to bring to the attention of members and that is, that in this present Bill, I find at the beginning again, despite an assurance I was given by the learned Attorney-General, that they are still using this word the Imperial Parliament. I was promised this would never be used in a future Bill in Tynwald, as the British Government have already said they are no longer an Imperial power. We are still getting this and I would like in the future the Attorney to delete such references and have the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Devereau: Mr Speaker, I thank the hon. members for the remarks they have made with which I too fully concur. I think that the publicity given to the passing of this Bill was quite the normal amount of publicity, as far as mention being included in the papers, but it would be quite impossible I think, for the Press to devote so much space to a Bill as to make the public fully aware of all the provisions of a Bill of this nature. I think the majority of our public in the Isle of Man were made aware of the necessities, the obligations under this Bill when the English Act was passed. When this Bill went through Westminster some 18 months ago, much publicity was given to it in the English Press and indeed since then publicity has been given to cases of infringement, under the terms of the English Act. I hope that in the Isle of Man we will not have many cases of infringement, under the terms of the English Act. I hope that in the Isle of Man we will not have many cases of infringement. I hope that people will be made aware of the necessary obligations under this Bill. I feel as a tradesman in the Isle of Man that most of the people who offer goods for sale are doing it in good faith. Those who are not doing it, will be warned with the publicity that this Bill may get after this debate and will be careful that they act in a proper manner.
The Speaker: The question before the House is that the Consumer Protection (Trade Descriptions) Bill be now read a third time. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Bill read a third time.

TOURIST PREMISES (COMPENSATION FOR TENANTS' IMPROVEMENTS) BILL—CONSIDERATION OF CLAUSES AND THIRD READING.

The Speaker: Now as we go on to number five on the Agenda, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a slight error here in the third column. This Bill should be for further consideration of clauses and third reading. That was the way I intended it to appear and perhaps I can explain the position by saying, that when we last dealt with this measure we had reached and disposed of clauses 1 to 7; clauses 8, 9 and 10 were moved as a block. There were some questions upon which the hon. member in charge of the Bill wished to be perfectly certain, in relation to the authenticity of his answers, and asked for deferment, but as the Bill was a somewhat urgent one in his view, considered it advisable to put down further consideration of clauses and third reading. This has, however, been omitted and I apologise to the House for this. It does mean that we are still dealing with clauses 8, 9 and 10. I accordingly call upon the hon. member for Middle to clarify the position in relation to those clauses, and proceed to deal with remaining clauses of the Bill.

Mr. Quayle: Mr. Speaker we had in fact virtually completed consideration of clause 8. 9 and 10 when two distinct points emerged which at that stage I had not the answer to. The first came from the hon. member for Douglas West. Mr. Devereau concerning changes of tenancy and relationship with the landlord and the second point came from the hon. member for Rushen, Mr. Crellin, concerning the position of tenants, particularly of residential premises, which held public house licences. Subsequent to getting the copy of the debate I did consult the Attorney-General who wrote to me to this effect. "You spoke to me yesterday with regard to the above Bill and referred me to the debates of the Keys starting on page 534. The very point raised by Mr. Devereau was also raised by me with the legal advisers of the Home Office. They suggested to me that if the difficulties were real they could be cured by the insertion of a definition of landlord or by an amendment of the definition of tenant. I accepted this suggestion and am satisfied that the definition of landlord and the words "for the time being" in the definition of tenants covers the position. My proposals were submitted to the Home Office on the 12th April, 1969, and as I have had no word of dissent from them I can only assume that they agreed that the amendments are satisfactory, as indeed I am sure they are." I trust that covers Mr. Devereau's point. On the point of the hon. member for Rushen, the Attorney-General does go on to say, "Mr. Crellin raised the point of the ordinary little pubs." In fact he raised rather more than that. "Such premises are not under the ambit of the Bill unless they are also residential." The letter finishes there, but I would go on to say that I am advised that this Bill, far from weakening the position of a tenant of a residential premise, which also has a full public house licence is, in fact, will now enjoy a greater degree of protection than previously. Before he had no protection at all, at least under this Bill; where it is residential he will have the protection of this Bill. I know this procedure is slightly unusual, sir, but I wanted to answer these two specific points and if any other member has any further points I will reply as normally.
The Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to either seek further clarification or speak on these three clauses?

Mr. Bell: A simple point on the new definition of landlord, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. member in charge assure the House that this new definition which has been concocted between the Home Office and the Attorney-General's Office, will this fit comfortably with the new Interpretation Bill, where landlord is described?

Mr. Devereau: Mr. Speaker, a point is not very clear in my mind, although I may be a little stupid on this, but the point I was anxious to have made clear was in cases where the tenant has made the agreed improvements at his own expense and where the tenant now sells the ingoing adding to the price obtained the cost of the improvements— I believe this is quite normal practice. They sell their ingoing at a valuation agreed between the incoming tenant and the outgoing tenant. What I want to have made clear is whether this new tenant is in a position at the end of his tenancy to claim from the landlord pro rata compensation for the improvements. It might be quite a considerable sum of money, because sometimes these houses change hands very rapidly. A tenant may be in a house for only two years, and in that two years he has spent £3,000 for £4,000 on the house and then due to circumstances he has to leave and he sells to a new tenant all this improvement. Now the new tenant at the end of his tenancy, is he able to claim from the landlord the cost pro rata, there will be depreciation and so forth, according to the number of years that he is in the house, is he able to claim from the landlord the money which he has in fact paid, not to the landlord or for the improvements, but to the previous tenant?

The Speaker: Do you wish to reply, sir?

Mr. Quayle: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the point of the hon. member for South Douglas, Mr. Bell, my hon. colleague has checked the Interpretation Act, the most recent one, it does not mention landlords in fact. On the point of the hon. member for West Douglas, Mr. Devereau, I think I can only refer to the speech of Mr. Simcocks, the member for Rushen, at the sitting of the House on the 16th; the germane portion being "If an improvement of a structural character or even other improvements are carried out by a tenant of his landlord's property, then the added value to the property becomes vested in the landlord. The landlord gets the benefit of it. It is for that reason the tenant becomes entitled to compensation from the landlord. It would seem to me therefore, when the tenant assigns the ingoing of his business to another tenant all he assigns is what he the tenant owns; the goodwill of the business and the chattels which he uses. In connection with it the improvement of the property remains vested in the landlord who. I would think would at this stage compensate the tenant for, as it were, the unexpired value of the capital improvements which the first tenant carried out on the landlord's property, and that the second tenant therefore would not be in any way entitled to any further compensation from the landlord." I think that is the true situation, sir.

The Speaker: It has been proposed and seconded that clauses 8, 9 and 10 stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Will you proceed with the remaining clauses, sir?

Mr. Quayle: Clause 11, sir, deals with making Rules of Court to cover this procedure. I beg to move it stand part of the Bill.

Mr. Burke: I beg to second.

The Speaker: Is that agreed, hon. members?
It was agreed.

The Speaker: Clause 12.

Mr. Quayle: Clause 12. Mr. Speaker, is the ascertainment of price on exercise of option to purchase in certain cases. It lays down how the purchase price and how the option shall be valued and I would say, tied in with this, is the schedule. I beg to move, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Burke: I beg to second.

The Speaker: It is proposed and seconded that clause 12 stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Clauses 13 and 14, sir.

Mr. Quayle: Clause 13. Mr. Speaker, is the Interpretation Clause. The only point I would make over and above that which herein appears is the definition of tourist premises, which, according to the Bill means residential hotels, private hotels, inns, boarding or guest houses, lodging houses, holiday hostels and youth hostels. It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, with the type of development we are now getting, we could usefully add to the definition, if it is practical so to do, holiday camps and chalets, because certainly this is the sort of development we are going to get. I think it should well be covered. If the House so agrees I would be quite prepared to accept an amendment in that direction. I beg to move that clause 13 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. Burke: I beg to second.

Mr. MacLeod: Mr. Speaker, sir, with regard to 13(i), works of a structural nature within the grounds—now has the tenant to get the permission of the landlord before he makes any improvements? Or can he make improvements without asking for the landlord’s permission? If he gets the landlord’s permission to do it, are there certain clauses written into it to say that he will be indemnified if the work is not finished?

Mr. Crellin: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to come back briefly on the question of what the Attorney has spoken about as being small pubs. So far as I am aware there are inns that are registered or have been registered as inns.

Mr. Quayle: Are registered as inns.

Mr. Crellin: Are registered, I see. Now I want to be absolutely sure that in the case of small licensed premises who do in fact have residential accommodation, that they are within the scope of this Act. They may be small little pubs, as the Attorney says, but in fact their situation is different; their legal situation is different from normal tourist premises. If you go anywhere in the Isle of Man you will find that there are hotels which he would call little pubs, but in fact, if you go to the south of the Island, the Albert, in Port St. Mary takes quite a considerable number of visitors; the Bay View, in Port St. Mary, which is one of the old inns, it does take quite a few visitors; the Station takes quite a few visitors, but these are small little pubs, if he wants to call them that. I want to be absolutely sure that they are included within the scope of this Bill and that there are the necessary safeguards with regard to their legal position.

Mr. Spittall: Mr. Speaker, whilst I agree in principle with the mover’s type of amendment, I just wonder whether it is wide enough what he suggests. I would perhaps think that something of the order of adding at the end, “self catering holiday premises”, would cover all these holiday camps, blocks of holiday flats, chalets and the lot.

Sir Henry Sugden: Mr. Speaker. I have two points; one is the inclusion of inns, touched upon by the hon. member for Rushen. What worries me just a little is that if we include the word...
inn, we may possibly open up some chance of abuse, whereby an ordinary pub, may I say, comes in under this Act by making available one single bedroom for residential purposes. I think we have got to be just a little careful about that, and I would very much welcome a little comment by the hon. mover as to what safeguard to avoid this abuse can be made. The other point is this, to include holiday camps. What is a holiday camp? I have sailed around the coasts of Scotland and Northern Ireland and have seen the most dreadful disfigurement of lovely coastal scenes by what I feel could be termed holiday camps, caravan sites, and all sorts of tawdry little flimsy buildings put up which last a couple of years and then some of them fall down and they form a very real disfigurement. Now that is something which I personally do not want to see in this Island. Can the Local Government Board control such erections? I do feel we must be very careful to avoid having this Island spoilt like so much of the country over the water has been.

Mr. Devereau: Mr. Speaker, I am fully in favour of the suggested amendment that the mover of this Bill has put to the House, but I do not think I can agree with the hon. and gallant member for Middle's idea, that it should be so all-embracing, as to suggest self catering holiday establishments. That might leave the gate open for an undesirable type of accommodation, but I think that the hon. chairman of the Tourist Board's suggestion that it should include holiday camps and chalet development is a good one. The increase, I understand, in the West Country's holiday traffic has been almost entirely due to this type of accommodation. We do not want to put anything in any Bill that will lead to diminution in the trade of our normal guest houses who are already established and have all their money invested in that project, but I think the development of chalets that would have to be approved and on approved sites is a coming thing and one that should gain the approbation of this House and of the Island generally. We have got to be in a position to increase the intake of people to the Island and with the present cost of building hotels, this is one method in which it can be done. I fully approve for my own part the development of approved chalet sites for summer visitors and I think the development of holiday camps, which is again very well controlled by the Local Government Board, is a good thing. I would therefore move the amendment that this, perhaps the Secretary of the House would word it for me, but I would like to see an amendment that holiday camps and chalets shall be included.

Mr. Callister: Mr. Speaker, I am in full agreement with the principles and purposes of this Bill, but I am rather disturbed arising from the debate that has taken place as to what might happen. Is it possible—what I would say first is that this was intended for the provision of accommodation for guests; (i) for instance, sir, for improving the amenities for guests. Not for small pubs or some shack here and there which might cash in on this to get improvements for the landlord. If this can be controlled to the effect of improving premises which are taking in visitors to any appreciable extent then I am all with it, but I am beginning to be a little doubtful of the extent of this Bill, as to who might cash in on improving their premises for say, a small public house in the country.

The Speaker: May I ask hon. members in considering this clause to think about the position in relation to chalets and tenants, as compared to the other properties named in the clause and their relationship with tenants. Will you proceed, sir.
Mr. Irving: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that this Bill applies only to premises affording accommodation to tourists. Now the Bill refers to the 1961 Tourist Premises Improvement Act and I would have thought it desirable that we should stick to the same definition of the tourist premises in this Act as we have done in the 1961 Act. Therefore I would like to move that the existing definition of tourist premises be deleted and the following put in from the 1961 Act, and that Act says—"tourist premises means residential hotels, private hotels, inns, boarding or guest houses, lodging houses, holiday camps, holiday hostels, youth hostels and camp sites." Therefore I beg to move that, that definition as in the 1961 Act should be inserted in this Act.

Mr. Radcliffe: I too would support the amendment to this, because I feel from the Local Government Board's point of view of planning the powers that we have, we have all the control that is necessary for this development, and I am certain that at the present moment considerable interest is being shown throughout the Isle of Man in the establishment of chalet development and I think it is important that this should be included. There is only one point that, perhaps the hon. member—Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the amendment which has been put and . . .

The Speaker: Which one, sir?

Mr. Radcliffe: The hon. member for East Douglas—that the definition of the 1961 Act be substituted. I am really at a loss, I thought for a moment I was reading the wrong Bill from the debate going on, talking about a lot of Government money going in and all the rest of it. This is, surely a procedure Bill where, if the occupier who is the tenant of the premises. wishes to carry out certain improvements and he wishes after he has carried them out, to seek some form of compensation from his landlord, that he first gets the landlord's consent to doing it, and if this consent is unreasonably withheld he may apply to the Court who may give it. Nothing about Government money or planning, It is merely setting right something which has been wrong in the Island for a long time. It is not going to give the existing tenants who have carried out the alterations any right to compensation, they need not think they have. It merely sets up new procedure where before they embark on internal or structural alterations, if they have a hope at all of getting something out the landlord, they must first get the landlords consent or the consent of the Court, and it is as simple as that. I cannot see where planning comes into it or all this—in favour of this. It is purely machinery and it is high time we had it.

The Speaker: Now I have not had a seconder yet to Mr. Devereau's amendment.

Mr. Radcliffe: I will second it Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Devereau: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on Mr. Irving's amendment. I would be prepared to support that but it does not include the word 'chalets.' Camp site is not a chalet site and I feel, as the chairman of the Local Govern—
ment Board has said, the development of chalet sites is an important one for the future and I feel that consideration should be given to that.

Mr. Irving: The 1961 Act does not mention them.

Mr. Devereau: In the 1961 Act they were not thinking about chalets.

The Speaker: Now the hon. member for Middle to reply.

Mr. Quayle: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I too am in this difficulty on chalet development. Mr. Speaker, because this is obviously going to be the development within this Island. Now we already have a scheme in Castletown which I hope is off the ground. It appears to be but let us hope. Now let us take such a scheme at Glen Wyllin or wherever it may be and it is a chalet development. Let us say it is built by a firm of developers whose interest is return on their capital, so in will go a tenant. Now the beauty of this Bill is that, that tenant can carry out improvements and if he breaks his lease he has got some chance of getting some money back from the financial owner. For the one object of improving, not disgracing the countryside — the whole object of this is to improve. Now, again, to reply to the hon. member for North Douglas, to cash in, to improve small pubs. I cannot see anybody 'cashing in' as Mr. Bell has said, and I think if a tenant has security and I am sure my hon. friend subscribes to this view, in fact I know he does, he wants tenants to have security. The basis of this Bill is security for the tenant, full stop. Mr. MacLeod, of Glenfaba, says, what happens if he does not have the landlord's permission. Well of course on any major work he would obviously be rather silly if he did not have the landlord's permission — if there was a deadlock between the two he has got the right of appeal to the Court. but, here again, it is to give both parties to any particular deal, some security — that is the whole object; I do not think there is much else — I beg your pardon, Mr. Crellin asked — were inns in — I would say inns are in without any question.

Mr. Callister: What is an inn?

Mr. Quayle: An inn? An inn is a place with a public house licence which provides accommodation. It is the old traditional way, that a traveller was permitted to put up, eat and drink and sleep.

Mr. Callister: Could he get accommodation at every inn in the Isle of Man?

Mr. Quayle: If he cannot get accommodation it is not an inn.

Mr. MacDonald: One bedroom will do.

Mr. Quayle: The definition is that it has to have accommodation. Now regarding the amendments, sir, I must say I favour the hon. member for Douglas East putting this in line with 1961 Act, but it does leave out 'chalet development' and how are we going to get this one I do not know, unless we add it to the 1961 definition. If Mr. Irving would agree to that.

Mr. Irving: May I have your permission, sir, to add the words 'and chalet developments.'

Mr. Bell: And your seconder. I concur.

The Speaker: I am awfully glad. I hope you know what you are concurring to. As far as I can see we have little variation between these amendments at this stage.

Mr. Devereau: I do not think there is a variation, sir. I think with the consent of the seconder of my amendment, I will be prepared to withdraw it, because I think both the amendments now mean more or less the same thing.

The Speaker: Is the House agreed to the withdrawing of that amendment?
It was agreed.

Mr. Quayle: Therefore may I now move that the clause stand as part of the Bill.

Mr. Radcliffe: Could the hon. member possibly clarify the position because I must admit that I do not think in my experience of planning that this matter in (i) is covered. I only want to help to get this Bill working satisfactory and I do not think at the moment, as it stands in my interpretation of the Act, that this is correct.

Mr. Quayle: Well, sir, I take the point on planning, it has to be the owner of the property or someone who proposes to buy the property, at the moment. Now if we take this — work of a structural nature within the grounds of tourist premises — surely this is talking about a thing like a swimming pool. I would imagine, or possibly an annexe building, and I would think if the tenant would obviously do this in cahoots with the owner and that, surely covers the point. After all he has to either agree with the owner or go to the Court.

Mr. Radcliffe: The owner would have to put the application in? The point I was trying to clarify — I do not want to labour this — if the owner puts the application in and he builds it how is the tenant going to claim compensation?

Mr. Bell: It would not come under this Bill, if the owner had made application.

Mr. Radcliffe: I just want to be sure that the member in charge of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is satisfied it will sort itself out in time.

The Speaker: Now we will proceed to vote on the clauses and the amendments. It has been proposed and seconded that the clause stand part of the Bill. To that, I have an amendment from the hon. member for Douglas East and I will ask the Secretary to read this amendment out, so that the House may be clear about what it proposes.

The Secretary: Tourist premises means — 'residential hotels, private hotels, inns, boarding or guest houses, lodging houses, holiday camps, holiday hotels, youth hostels, camp sites and chalet developments.'

The Speaker: I will put the amendment to the House. Those in favour please say aye. Against none. The ayes have it. I will now put the clause in its amended form. Those in favour please say aye. Against none. The ayes have it. Clause 14 and Schedule please, sir.

Mr. Quayle: I beg to move clause 14, Citation, and commencement, and the Schedules.

Mr. Burke: I beg to second it.

The Speaker: It is proposed and seconded that clause 14 and the Schedule stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say aye. Against none. The ayes have it. Third reading.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask permission to suspend Standing Orders to take the third reading.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

If was agreed.

Mr. Quayle: I formally move, sir, the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. Burke: I beg to second Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: It is proposed and seconded that Tourist Premises (Compensation for Tenants' Improvements) Bill 1969, be now read a third time. Those in favour please say aye. Against none. The ayes have it. Bill read a third time.
REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (FRANCHISE) BILL—
CONSIDERATION OF CLAUSES.

The Speaker: Now hon. members we come to the Representation of the People (Franchise) Bill and I call upon the hon. member for Glenfaba, Mr. Anderson, to deal with the consideration of the clauses.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to note that it was on 15th March, 1968, that leave to introduce was granted in the House, almost two years ago, which just shows how long these matters take. Anyhow we are here to-day to consider the clauses and of course as everybody in the House is aware, in the meantime the amendment to the Representation of the People’s Act in the United Kingdom has taken place, together with a lot of other amendments to that Act, also responsibility in other spheres has been placed on this group, and actually on younger members. I understand, there is an amendment to the main clause of the Bill, being put forward by the hon. member for Peel, which no doubt will be considered by the House. I would think that in the early near future many of the other aspects of responsibility given to the younger group will have to be considered by the House, to bring them properly into line with that of the United Kingdom. It is a very short and very simple Bill, Mr. Speaker. Clause one deals with the entitlement to vote at the age of twenty and, to that. I understand there is an amendment which the House themselves will decide about, but I move that clause one stand as part of the Bill. Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Seconder?

Mr. Canister: I second sir, and reserve my remarks.

The Speaker: Thank you. Would you care to move the amendment at this stage.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that in clause one, line 19 for the word 'twenty' we should substitute the word 'eighteen.'

Mr. Corkish: I beg to second.

Mr. Devereau: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, the mover of this Bill, said that the Act had been passed in the United Kingdom. reducing the age for voting to eighteen. Is there not some confusion here. I understand that the Law Reform Bill has been passed which gives people certain powers at eighteen, but I was not certain that this Bill had gone through.

Mr. Crowe: I think, Mr. Speaker, when we did consider this Bill on the last occasion that it was postponed for a certain time and I really thought that, that was to enable if possible, the mover of the Bill to find out from youth organisations and from youth if they were in favour of a Bill of this type. I do not know what has been the reaction of members of this House. Have they been in contact with young people or not in the meantime. I have, personally, asked quite a few and the response that I have got has not been very encouraging for me to vote for this Bill. I may have been unlucky in those I have contacted and it has been mentioned to-day that in the United Kingdom the age limit has been reduced to eighteen. Now whether we should slavishly follow England, just because they have done something, I would like to be really informed by the House if they have had indications from persons of this age group that they are in favour of this measure.

Mr. Callister: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we are doing the right thing. I would like to know what the criterion is of one's ability and capacity to vote. I know some young people of 16 who are intelligent enough and responsible enough to vote. I know of some people of 61, to reverse the figures, who are not capable of intelligent voting.
Mr. MacDonald: Some at 65 are not.

Mr. Callister: I was reversing the figures from 16 to 61.

Mr. Simeocks: How about 79?

Mr. Callister: Or 79 and I — from my experience and contact with the public, the young people themselves are not in a majority very keen to have this responsibility. I understand that in certain schools in the Isle of Man, an interest has been endeavourd to have taken place and there has been practically no response whatever. Now if one could assess in some other way one's capacity and ability to vote, I would really consider it, but just to say that everybody of 18 years of age can vote, to my mind is a dangerous thing. One will trot out I suppose, the fact that there is conscription for military service at 18 and other legal benefits for youths under 21, or 20, but are they comparable with a knowledge of what is good politically for the country. After all politics is the science of Government.

Mr. Irving: If the voters were so intelligent there would be a Labour party in the Isle of Man.

Mr. Callister: Definitely. Because this is inevitable. The Labour party policy is inevitable — one can see that year after year, but I wonder whether this is not merely pandering, as an electioneering stunt in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Quayle: The Labour Party would not do that.

Mr. Callister: Every political party does it, and I am not sure which are the worst, because I would say that members of this House do it. You pandere to the public for what you think they like and what they suit, not what is good for the country, but promise somebody in a remote village in the Isle of Man a letter-box, or something like this.

Mr. Eell: Or a mermaid.

Mr. Callister: Or a mermaid and you will get his vote.

Members: Why not?

Mr. Callister: I know that the legal age of maturity is 21 and I know a great many people over 21 who do not even take the trouble to vote. Are we going through some, just some crisis or some gimmick, to appeal to the young people, perhaps to the young ladies to go about naked?

Mr. MacLeod: That would be an idea.

Mr. Callister: Would not it be an idea?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, they are doing that now.

Mr. Callister: Well, they are getting very near to this now and if one were to produce something that would appeal to the children, who are immature, to put a Government in here, after all a Government is elected here of people, I hope, who first of all are leaders, not to be dragged and pushed about by the public. We should be intelligent enough to realise that when a member is elected to this House he is intelligent enough to consider and have real concrete views as to what is good for the Isle of Man. I wonder whether we are merely walking into something without proper consideration. This is a very serious matter. I would hope that one day we could come to an intelligence test for the public on voting and then we might get a really good Government.

Mr. MacDonald: You might get nothing.

Mr. Callister: No you would really get somewhere. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have expressed exactly what I mean without wasting time in using more words on the question. I feel that maturity does not come to a very large proportion of children under the age of 21 so far as Government is concerned. I know it did not with me. I had the Representation of the People (Franchise) Bill—Consideration of Clauses.
of Man, if they consider them to be inferior to those in the United Kingdom and those in Northern Ireland. I think these young people in the Isle of Man are quite capable. Mr. Speaker, of voting at 18 and having lots of other responsibilities at 18, and I think for any member of the House of Keys to be reactionary and say, “Well, they are not capable”, then all I can say is that our educational system, which we pride ourselves on, is failing, and that I do not believe. I believe our children are, although the hon. member said they are not capable in lots of ways of thinking for themselves. I fully believe and I think most of this House will agree with me, they are fully capable at the age of 18 today of deciding right from wrong.

Mr. Callister: To manage business.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not talking about business. I am talking about voting.

Mr. Callister: Oh yes we are talking about business, very serious business.

The Speaker: The member for Rushen.

Mr. Crellin: Mr. Speaker. I do not think I have spoken on this amendment and it is an amendment about which I feel very strongly. What the hon. member for Peel has just said is, of course, hard fact and it has got to be looked at. So very frequently when we are hacking out legislation we tend to imagine that the conditions which existed when we were children exist today. We disregard the fact that over the past 20 years childhood has matured to a tremendous extent with the prenatal care, ante-natal care of children, the elimination of whooping cough, scarlet fever, diphtheria, a large number of diseases with which children between the ages of babyhood and school age were afflicted. These things have been eliminated and consequently the child at school today, starting school, is much more capable at four years old than we were at five years old. We have got to face this because this is hard fact.
Mr. Callister: He is still learning.

Mr. Crellin: Moreover a child today of 16, and this can be cited, examples of this can be cited by children of members here present, children are much more self-reliant, they can go out into the world. We have cases of girls going again to Canada, the United States, taking their place in society, acting as completely young and responsible adults at the age of 16.

Mr. MacLeod: Very few.

Mr. Crellin: Very few, but in our days there were none.

Mr. MacLeod: Oh yes there were.

Mr. Crellin: There were none.

Mr. MacLeod: What about Mary Slessor, one of the greatest missionaries that ever walked the face of this earth.

Mr. Crellin: The point is that the child of 18 today is no longer a child. In our days to a certain extent she was, apart from the fact that somebody has said, I will not go over it, with two bitter wars they came face to face with mature adult reality.

Mr. MacDonald: With reality.

Mr. Crellin: And we had in the last war group captains of 21, men in a tremendously responsible position to which they responded with energy, gallantry and skill. When we think of legislation, I always like to think that here in the Isle of Man, instead of lagging behind the United Kingdom forever and a day, we can show a little enterprise and be a little bit more forward-looking. I see no reason why we should wait always for the lead from the United Kingdom to do something which we know will be inevitable and we have allowed already the United Kingdom to steal what is virtually our thunder in this respect. We should have considered this Bill, with its amendment, a long time ago. I do not believe that there are any modifications from majority. I believe that we say now — we face the fact that a man today and a woman today at the age of 18 is a much, much more a responsible citizen, and this is undeniable, a much more responsible citizen than they were 40 years ago. They have tremendous capabilities, they have tremendous potential and they have a whole life of responsibility which is not placed upon them until they are 21.

Mr. Callister: They have neither the knowledge nor the experience.

Mr. Crellin: To deny young people the responsibility is to ask for delinquency. I am a great believer in placing responsibility upon shoulders that are capable of bearing it and I believe that legislative responsibility is one of the responsibilities which a child should take at an early age. I believe that political awareness, the knowledge of how to live together, of how to associate and have relationships one with another, is a thing which cannot be started at too early an age, and I believe that at 18 a child is much more capable. You may call him a child — but a person is much more capable of taking decisions, of using judgement in a much more mature manner than they were at 21 in our day. Therefore I strongly support the amendment to reduce the age to 18.

Mr. MacLeod: Mr. Speaker, I was one of the committee that was investigating this matter, and we sent out circulars to people asking them for their views but the only people who bothered to comment were the National Union of Teachers, who really were not in favour at all. We had a letter from the Board of Education which I have here, and I see at the very start they have engraved the shield, the MacLeod coat of arms, and they have put a crown on top of it. (Laughter.) I would respectfully ask the chairman of the Board of Education to remove the crown.

Mr. Kneale: If it is a MacLeod shield it deserves to be crowned. (Laughter.)
Mr. MacDonald: It is the wrong crown, though.

Mr. MacLeod: "Your letter of the 24th March, Representation of the People (Franchise) Bill was submitted to a public meeting of the Board of Education. There were 24 members present out of a total of 29, and four members commented on the Bill, and the amendment concerning the voting age being reduced to 18. Mr. Keggin indicated that he felt that there would be difficulty if the Isle of Man was different from England and he would therefore support the amendment. Mr. Livesy and Miss Williamson also indicated their support to the voting age of 18. Miss Cowin said that the proposed reduction to 20 was a gesture and she felt that this reduction was all that should be approved at the moment. The chairman of the Board, Mr. Kneale, indicated that as he was a member of the House of Keys Committee to which the Bill had been referred he did not propose to comment but he did put three questions to the members present and at a show of hands six indicated that they preferred the status quo, five indicated that they supported the reduction to 20 and 11 indicated that they would support the age of 18." Now the member for North Douglas spoke not so long ago about people being responsible. People knowing how to vote. We have here the Education Authority, the Board of Education, a body of responsible people, who have been voted in by the general public to hold this responsible post and here they cannot even agree amongst themselves as to what age they would like the voting go to.

Mr. Crellin: This is democracy, surely.

Mr. MacLeod: I know it is. We have Mr. Callister saying that people should have responsibility as regards to voting. I take it that when he comes to the poll the people who vote for him are being responsible people and the people who vote against his policy are the irresponsi-
have never been in the House of Keys—they do not even know what the House of Keys it.

Mr. MacDonald: Half of your constituents do not.

Mr. MacLeod: That is true, but only half voted for me you see. (Laughter.) Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I think I would rather wait and see how the debate goes. (Laughter.)

The Speaker: The hon. member for Rushen, Mr. Simcocks.

Mr. Simcocks: Mr. Speaker, the hon. and gallant member for Peel has referred to some reactionary opinions in respect of this Bill, and I am bound to admit that my reaction to this Bill was indeed reactionary. I feel that unless there is a very good and compelling reason for altering the law, it is a pity to tinker. Therefore the Bill as printed which would have reduced the age from 21 to 20 seems to me to have very little indeed to recommend it and I felt that there was no good reason for changing the law in that way. I believe that strictly within the boundary of this Island, there is probably very small reason indeed for altering the law again. But we must regard what the position is on the other side of the Irish Sea. We can not close our eyes to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the age in the United Kingdom is going to be not 21, not 20, but 18...

Mr. Anderson: It is now.

Mr. Simcocks: And that seems to me, however much my natural reactionary reaction... might regret it, sir, the fact is that we are bound to face the fact that the age in the United Kingdom is 18. For that reason I propose this. That I am not prepared to accept the Bill as it stands; to my mind it is either 18 or nothing, and I propose therefore to support the amendment which will reduce the age to 18.

Mr. Vereker: Mr. Speaker, in actual fact the hon. member for Rushen, Mr. Simcocks, has just made the very point that I was going to make which I support whole heartedly. To my mind also, this Bill is completely ineffective, in just reducing the voting age from 21 to 20. It would have far more meat in it if it had 18. The hon. member for Michael, Mr. Crowe, asked for members' views as to their experience in discussing young people and their attitude on this. I have also been disturbed at the lack of interest from various sections, and especially one night when I was present at a service, gathering of young people which included law students, nurses, etc., and we discussed this very question, and it was incredible how many of those—what one would think normally intelligent students,—categorically stated that they thought they were not fit until they were 21. But even so I would say that perhaps by reducing the voting age to 18, we might in effect create their interest to vote at such an age, and this is why I would support the amendment to reduce the voting age to 18. But there is another point I would like to ask the hon. mover. I cannot see why no change is proposed with respect to local authority and Corporation elections. This just does not make sense to me. If you are going to reduce the voting age, whether it be 20 or 21, what is the difference in denying those people a vote at a local election where it might be very much more important to take an interest in their own locality and yet you propose giving them the more important one of electing a member. I would be prepared. Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment, that this should also embrace local authority elections and Corporation elections, that their voting age should be included in these elections down to 18.

Mr. MacDonald: I would second that.

Mr. Bel: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this...
The Speaker: I am sorry, the hon. member for Middle. I was just thinking of the implications as to the method of drafting it.

Mr. Spittal: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will support the amendment by the hon. and gallant member for Peel. But I would remind members that in this Country we do not, as they do in some Countries, have compulsory voting. I believe that by reducing the age to 18, those people between the ages of 18 and 21 who do take an interest and who can be encouraged to take an interest, will vote. There are many— and I am sure this is happening now in the United Kingdom. From what I have heard, of people who are not really interested in getting themselves on the register of voters. The ones who take no interest at that age will not bother to vote. It is the ones who will take an interest, and they will vote. Therefore I will support the hon. member for Peel's amendment.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker: this is not a new issue— votes at 18. The hon. members, who have spoken in favour of it are using the example of the United Kingdom legislation, and this parity. Now if it is just parity, well it does not wash at all with me. If it is a question of individual rights and the ability of the people to vote, I wonder why the House rejected this same measure in 1964?

Mr. Burke: A different House.

Mr. Bell: Not altogether a different House. They intuitively rejected it. And this is the basis of the voter; it is not a question of their age, it is a question of the experience they have acquired through life and they are intuitively able to make a vote for good or for ill, it matters not. But I believe that by the age of 21 they have crossed at least certain thresholds on the hard road of life: they have crossed certain thresholds. Many more they have to cross. I wonder. Mr. Speaker, why this very contentious subject, and only contentious because it is raised in the House. The public have not asked for it. I am a member recently re-elected to the House, recently re-elected to a local authority, there is a bye-election in Ramsey tomorrow, there will be a public meeting in Ramsey this evening, there has been press coverage on the Ramsey bye-elections. This has not been an issue.

Mr. MacDonald: It has been raised.

Mr. Bell: This has not been an issue. This House, Mr. Speaker, elected a Committee to go into this matter, to see not only that justice was done to the provisions of the Bill and the amendment, but also, possibly, that an injustice should not be done. And the Committee, as the hon. member for Glenfaba has said, took great pains and sufficient steps to acquaint the people of the Island with the intent of this Bill. And it has to be said publicly, Mr. Speaker, that even the hon. member who sponsored this Bill was almost in tears in the Committee Room because of the very lack of support from his own district. I well remember his standing and asking permission to introduce the Bill and then other preliminaries which follow, and it was because he had been approached by a body.

Mr. Anderson: You were not in the House.

Mr. Bell: He had been approached by a body of young people. The young farmers, the good speakers, and the very people that caused him to think about this were not sufficiently interested, let alone to go to the Poll on a windy, rainy day, let alone that, they were not even sufficiently interested to write to the committee and say— We are in favour or we are against. Now the House has had the report on this. The report was debated almost violently on the floor of this House and there has still been no response from that. Mr. Speaker.
Mr. MacDonald: Going to blow the House up!

Mr. Bell: Representation of the people for the people. Much has been said about the duties and responsibilities of the young people. There is the same duty and responsibility on the elected member, to spend the time on the legislation which is required to make the community more prosperous and more comfortable and secure, and what-have-you. It is certainly not part and parcel of our duty to spend so much time blindly pursuing some gimmicky item which the public have demonstrated in the most effective way that they can demonstrate, their complete disinterest in the matter. From parents — their complete disinterest, the greatest demonstration of public disinterest there has been in the last 500 years in this Island! The greatest demonstration of disinterest. No person is interested in this Bill, except the sponsors and one or two supporters. It would be wrong to support this, when the youth of the Island themselves do not want it, nor their parents. I am not voting for the Bill, I am not voting for the amendment. If the hon. member in charge of the Bill had been able to manufacture some support, even manufacture some support, I would have given more thought to this Bill. It is a remarkable thing, Mr. Speaker, that even the member in charge of the Bill could not have manufactured support. He could have filled this Gallery today with 20 young persons if he had wanted, if he had thought about the Bill, if he wanted to have some effects from the ... ( Interruption ). The hon. member in charge of the Bill was not even sufficiently interested to put some strength behind it. And if the young people are not in favour of it and he has no time to even think about it, I am sure I am not voting for it.

Mr. Burke: Mr. Speaker, this a most serious matter, and it deserves a great deal of serious consideration. When the matter came before the British Government, I cannot imagine that members of Parliament went into their constituencies or attempted to call meetings to get 20 people to express their views. No doubt it had gone into committees, and so on, and a great deal of consideration was given to this. And here we are in this House today dealing with an amendment that the age should be 20, rather than 21. Quite frankly, I think we are rather ridiculous to consider that; one should either consider 20 or 18. So we consider 18. So we consider the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peel, Mr. MacDonald. If we do not do this what will be the effect? There are many young people — and I have been engaged in youth movements and so on, and I would say that there are young men of 18 years of age who give matters a great deal of thought. In the Isle of Man, perhaps, they are not in a position to express themselves in debating societies, and so on, in the political youth movements which exist across the water. There is the Labour League of Youth, the Young Socialists' League, the Young Conservative, the Young Liberals, and no doubt many of them are under 21. And they take a great deal of interest in politics. Of course it might well be said that there is greater interest taken in politics in the United Kingdom than there is in the Isle of Man. Perhaps there are more meetings held, perhaps the electorate are of the opinion sometimes, even across the water, that there is no need to vote. It has been said — the hon. member, Mr. Edward Callister said that a person may not have the same intelligence to vote at 61, he was reversing the age, 16 to 61 or something, and that is quite true. Now what is going to be the position here? Are we going to be backward? The United Kingdom are giving the vote at 18 so let us take an example. Supposing there is a young Manxman, he has gone over there perhaps with his parents at the age of 14 and he becomes aged 18 and he is entitled to a vote in the United Kingdom.
and when his family come back to the Isle of Man he is aged 20. but you do not allow him to vote. The United Kingdom Government considered he has sufficient intelligence to vote for a Member of Parliament but you are suggesting that until he is 21 in the Isle of Man he has not got sufficient intelligence to vote. I would say that the young people should be given all the encouragement possible to take part in the political life of this Island. They are the future, they are the future citizens, they are the men and women of the future, whom we older ones may rely upon. Now in this report which we all have, the evidence submitted by the National Union of Teachers to the committee on the age of majority under the chairmanship of the hon. Mr. Justice Latey, and I quote one paragraph, well in the introduction actually: "A good deal of public debate has taken place in recent years on the rights, responsibility and irresponsibility of those in late teens. The National Union of Teachers welcomes the establishment of your Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Latey, as an attempt to draw from this debate, concrete proposals on the legal status of such young people. One of the strongest motives for such an examination is the confusion that reigns in the minds of the young themselves over their standing in law. As one schoolgirl put it to her headmistress, who assisted in our enquiries: 'Up to 14 you have a half fare, you can marry at 16, drive a scooter at 16 but a car at 17, buy an alcoholic drink at 18 and you cannot vote until you are 21.' You see, so many of them consider it an injustice. Now in this Report, it gives varying views on this, and that is quite possible. If you go into any community and pick certain groups and you get different views, but it does not say that because they are different that you must accept one. "Now in various views expressed, many of those under 21 consulted, seemed to be of the opinion that to lower the age of majority in the particular case of marriage and financial contract to 18, would be to confer full adulthood at that age. We believe that your Committee should clarify in its finding, the exact relationship between the legal age of majority, in relation to specific privileges and the general issue of adult status." This is important in this Report. "It is our belief that the popular concept of 21 as being the age of adulthood, stems more from social customs and practices rather than from the state of law." Now it has been said — and I suppose it is suspected — that various political parties across the water have introduced certain laws, etc., for their own benefit. But is anybody going to say that because in the United Kingdom they have the vote at 18, that any particular party is going to benefit from it? People are realising that at the age of 18 there are many young people who are adventurous. And I would support this, that they should have the vote at 18, and I fully expected the hon. mover of this amendment to make quite a long speech, and as he often does, trace back history and tell us why, he has told us once before I think, the age of 18 was decided upon; it had nothing to do with voting.

Mr. MacDonald: Why 21 was chosen?

Mr. Burke: Why 21? Yes, why 21? No doubt he will tell us again. But there is no doubt about it, there are many young people of 18 years of age who would take an interest in politics, and have every right to vote for the Government of their choice. I do not think there is any real reason at all why they should not be given this opportunity in view of the fact that their counterparts in the United Kingdom have the same opportunity and the same privilege, and I hope they will all use it when they get it, in the best interests of this Island.

Mr. Kneale: Mr. Speaker, listening to some speakers you would imagine that all people under 21 were irresponsible, and all people over 21 were responsible. Well this is not so. There
is no age group which can claim a monopoly of irresponsibility or responsibility. To say the least of it, some of our over 21's are a little dim. and when you talk about irresponsibility well then, look at the television any night and see the irresponsible behaviour that is going on throughout the Country, and it is not only the young people that are leading them. Youth is impetuous and easily led and it is some of these people who are using young people to do the dirty work for them. Now then, the lack of interest, I would not support any change in the present situation if there had been no change in England, because I do not think it will make one ha'porth of difference whether we pass this Bill or do not pass it. The Island will not be shaken. The lack of interest that is shown, well this is so. I have gone round on the young people — I am continually in touch with them — and the majority of them are not interested at all in getting a vote. There is a few are, there are others, as soon as you suggest it to them, they almost run away at the very thought of it. But this lack of interest — again, is that solely with the young people? You try and whip up any cause at all, try and whip it up, and see how many people you get attending a public meeting. You go round and ask people, ask them what they think about the Common Market, and as somebody suggested they thought it was the one down on the quay.

Mr. MacDonald: They tell you it is your job to sort it out. (Laughter).

Mr. Kneale: The only time you get any approach from an adult who has got the vote now, is when he has got a personal interest. We all know this. (Hear, hear). So that is how much interest the majority of people have got. Now the "Examiner" endeavoured since our meeting and since we allowed this thing to virtually lie on the table for six months, the "Examiner" tried to whip up interest among the young people. That failed. So far as interest is concerned, it is quite obvious that there is no interest at all in this Bill. But that is no reason why we should not have an alteration now, and I intend to support the amendment to 18. Mr. Callister refers to young people not having any business sense. I would point out the number of young people that have gone out and bought a guitar and made a million out of it, and many of these have been under 21. There was one remark that Mr. MacLeod made, reference to the College of Further Education and the voting. This was quite true, this is what did happen, but I must point out that this was in 1963/64, when we were dealing with it before, it was somewhere round that period and it was prior to the Bill, the Report, coming to Tynwald at that time.

Mr. MacLeod: Have you been back since and asked them?

Mr. Kneale: No, I have not been back to ask them as a group, but have asked individuals and they say that there is still no interest in the business. I think we could talk at length on this, and come to no conclusion at all on it, and as far as I am concerned I am going to support the amendment.

Mr. Kerruish: Mr. Speaker, like other hon. members who sat on this Committee, I have to acknowledge a certain amount of disappointment at the response from the public generally, and the young people in particular, during the time when that Committee sat. The same applies for the period that has elapsed since this House deferred consideration of this measure for six months. But sir, having said that, I would add that I do not consider this to be the over-riding consideration. I feel there are two particular factors that influence me in going fully behind the hon. and gallant member for Peel, in the amendment he has tabled this morning. Now sir, firstly, the Island at the moment is involved in the preparation of a case for presentation to the Royal
Commission on the Constitution, which will ask for greater powers for this Island in many important aspects of its affairs, I feel, sir, it would be completely illogical for a Government who makes such a claim to countenance a situation which acknowledged that its young people were inferior to the young people of the United Kingdom. Let us face the fact, that at the present moment people of 18 years of age in the United Kingdom can exercise the franchise. I feel, sir, that our position in front of the Royal Commission on the Constitution would be severely damaged, if we publicly acknowledged that we think that our own people are inferior to the young people in the United Kingdom. (Hear, hear). On that count I feel, sir, there is a very strong case for supporting the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Peel. But, sir, there is another consideration, probably an even more pressing one that compels me to support the amendment. It is this. We have to acknowledge that since this Bill was last considered by this House, very important legislation has been passed by the Government of the United Kingdom, relating to the age of majority generally. The Family Law Reform Bill imposes upon 18-year-olds a tremendously increased measure of responsibility, in regard to important things such as marriage, contracts, the making of Wills, and in many other aspects of their civil responsibilities. That is law. That Statute came into effect on the 1st of this month. Now, sir, the hon. and learned member for Rushen can probably enlighten us much better on this particular point, but I feel it is certain that we have to introduce considerably more legislation relating to 18-year-olds, if we are to preserve a reasonable position between ourselves and the United Kingdom. I feel quite certain that the measures before the House this morning is but the first of important legislation relating to 18-year-olds.

Mr. Callister: Start on taxation.

Mr. Kerruish: I feel sir, that it is certain that before the present year expires we will see further legislation relating to this particular subject, in order to bring our law into line with the law in England, or grave difficulties could arise in the realm of the law and of contracts and business generally. I think that is inescapable. And, sir, if we are to accept that a young person of 18 is qualified to marry without any parental consent, to enter into contracts, to make a Will, to exercise many other civic responsibilities, I think we have to acknowledge equally, sir, that they are perfectly qualified to exercise the vote. Now, sir, I think as a matter of interest it is worthwhile looking at certain comments made in the Committee's Report. There are certain figures cited on which it is interesting to reflect. It would rather appear that if we are to agree to the age being reduced to 18, the total number of voters in the Isle of Man, will be increased by about five per cent. against a total voting number at the moment of the order of 40,000, a decrease to 18 would increase the voters by approximately 2,000. It is a number that is not likely to influence fundamentally the political fortunes of the Island. There is another point, I think, worthy of interest. It is this. That whilst we would reduce the voting age to 18, the average age at which a young person would vote would in actual fact, in practice be about 20½ years. If we are to accept that the average gap between General Elections is five years, it would suggest that at the moment with the age at 21, the average age at which a young person first exercised his vote is somewhere round about 23½, whereas if we are to reduce it to 18, it would mean that on the average the vote would be getting exercised for the first time at an age of approximately 20½ years. I feel, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, that the young people of this Island, who have
reached that age are perfectly capable of using the vote sensibly. I feel that this is but one of many steps we will have to take in increasing the responsibility of the 18-year-olds. I sincerely hope, sir, that the amendment tabled by the hon. member for Peel will merit the support of at least a majority of this hon. House.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I was just with my first remarks, about to emphasise this last point made by the hon. member for Ayre which is ever so important. That at the moment a person not 21 but just a few months... his birthday is just a few months after the Election, in fact they could be 21 on the Election and not be on the Register and they could be 26 before they vote at all. This is the most important point that I have to make, on getting to my feet. I would here sort of come to the rescue of the younger generation. I know there is an element of long-haired fellows who get all the publicity, but I do want to point out to this hon. House this morning, that there is an element in our younger generation today, that has shown a greater responsibility and thought for other people, than possibly has anybody done in any other generation. When you think of the number of young people who are going overseas and giving two years of voluntary service in the under-developed Countries today—that has never happened in any previous decade to my knowledge. And there is an awful lot of them under 21. There is a young lady back in the Island now to finish a course who has just given a voluntary service, and we cannot feel that these are irresponsible people. I believe that there is by far the majority of our younger people in that category. I know from my own experience and my own family that the best way to harness somebody who has endless energy, is to throw responsibility on to them. And I could elaborate what that has meant to me, and the burden it has taken off me of responsibility over the past couple of years. I know when I was a teenager I was anything but responsible. I was in more trouble than any member of a very big family, but I remember my father doing exactly the same thing with me, saying—you have got to see to that, that is your end, and I was put to it. I think it was the best thing that was ever done to me in my life. I do not know what would have become of me, only that he gave me an awful lot of work to do and it did help to keep me under somewhat. But I do say that and that without any sort of fear of contradiction, that I am certain that by far the greatest majority of our young people today are very, very responsible people. And not only that. But take some of the 18-year-olds into this Court today—I know they have had greater opportunities than most of ourselves have had, but they have a far, far wider knowledge of the developments in the world in the day and age which we live. than many of us have.

A lot of people have said about all these later responsibilities, I have mentioned in this Court before, being sent as a magistrate round to collect votes of people who were far, far gone on the other side and from whom I refused to take votes because they were completely past knowing and being responsible for what they were doing.

Mr. Beet: It is not up to you to qualify them as voters.

Mr. Anderson: Well, when they did not know one from the other—they just had not a clue—I said, do you really want to do this? I am sorry, we would rather not be bothered. Well look my dear, I am not going to bother you, and I did not. And it is completely wrong to do so. I would say that even if I go up to Mannin, and I do not want to you know, sort of talk about the misfortunes of other people...

The Speaker: I think I must rule the hon. member out of order here. I think we are on the wrong tack completely, it is not relevant.
Mr. Anderson: Well I think that it is important to know that these are as responsible as any other section of society. This is the point that I am making.

Mr. Callister: Are you supporting the amendment?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, I am now supporting the amendment in view of what has been said by some of the other members of the opposition. I am now wholeheartedly behind the amendment, because I feel that in view of what has been said, that I have come down right on the side of the younger generation. I want to thank the members who have supported ... I have made notes on that. Actually, most of what has been said has been answered by others ...

Mr. Vereker: What about the local authorities.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, I would accept that actually, Mr. Vereker, and I think it would make it less complicated from the point of view of electoral rolls and so forth. I think it would be much simpler and much better and I would welcome that amendment. I beg to move, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bell: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, is the amendment in respect of local authorities before us, and in what form, because I would understand it to be very complicated.

The Speaker: The amendment is not at all complicated, but it will come on clause 2, not clause 1, and I have the amendment which the hon. member has provided for me here, to put before the House at the appropriate time. As it is we have the resolution that clause 1, stand part of the Bill, to which I have the amendment in the name of the hon. member for Peel. Mr. MacDonald, which has been circulated which is for the words “twenty years” substitute the words “eighteen years.” I will put the amendment to the House. Those in favour of the amendment please say Aye. Against, No. A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:


Against: MacLeod, Callister, Bell.—3.

The Speaker: The amendment carries, 19 votes being cast in favour, 3 votes against. I will now put the clause in its amended form to the House. Those in favour please say Aye. Against, No. The Ayes have it. Now clause 2. I call upon the hon. member to move the clause.

Mr. Anderson: Clause 2, amends the present legislation, the Representation of the People Act, and it changes the age of majority, it would now change to 18 instead of 20. I beg to move and would welcome the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Castletown.

Mr. MacDonald: I second it.

The Speaker: Now hon. members, I have received from the hon. member for Castletown an amendment which reads as follows:—Clause 2. After the words ‘Section 1’ insert the words ‘Sub-section (1) of Section 2 and subsection (1) of Section 3.” After the words “Isle of Man Board of Education” insert the words “and members of local authorities and the Corporation of Douglas.”

Mr. Crellin: Is the Corporation not covered by “local authorities”? The Speaker: The amendment has been drafted in consultation with the Secretary, who has produced the appropriate Corporation Electors’ clause, which is clause 3, of the Representation of the People (Registration of Electors) Act, and I am assured that this amendment, as I have read it to you, will have...
the effect, as the hon. member for Castletown desires, of extending the voting to young people, who wish to vote on local authority elections, and that will include the Corporation.

Mr. Bell: Does the 1895 Act need amending, Mr. Speaker? Is that not effected?

The Speaker: As far as I am informed this will be the effective procedure to carry out the wishes of the hon. member for Castletown, and this is the amendment I have received. Do you wish to speak on your amendment any further?

Mr. Vereker: No, I do not think so.

Mr. Bell: I would like to speak on the amendment to the clause, Mr. Speaker. In the United Kingdom where they have now reduced the voting age to 18, they have also made a provision in the electoral roll revisions, that a person who expects to attain the age on a certain date, that this roll would be qualified for, may have their name entered. Now in the last debate we have just had on clause 1 much was said about persons who are qualified by age, but because the election occurs after the persons are of age they are not on the list, they are not eligible to vote. It would therefore seem that unless clause 2, with its amendment is going to make provisions for persons who would be qualified to vote at a certain date to be entered on the list, and that their birthday was going to happen then . . . If there was an election on the 20th February when a person was going to be 18 on the 18th February and the list was drawn up, it would seem to me that that person should have the same right of voting as if he had the age . . . If I could say it this way, more concisely, at the moment the qualifications to vote, is because you are entered on the list of voters and what this House is now seeking, is that the qualifications to vote will be, that the person has attained the age at that date. Therefore it would appear that further amendment, if the House was of this wish, a further amendment would be necessary so that persons who would have attained the age of 18 should be entered on the list during that revision period. It would seem that the House would favour such a move to keep us in line with England. That is what we have heard on television from Ministers of State speaking; that many persons who will be eligible to vote in the next election, have not had their name put on and their birthdays have gone by. I would hope that the House would be guided on this. Maybe the member in charge of the Bill would be au fait with this. I hope I am correct in what I say, if so. I would like to move an amendment that persons attaining the age of 18 before this period also be on the lists.

The Speaker: Can I have your amendment in writing, please?

Sir Henry Sugden: Mr. Speaker, I have one point really on the clause. Surely we have got to amend the age of 20 years — the final two words — to that of 18, or is that automatic following the passing of clause 1?

The Speaker: No, sir. I have notice of a further amendment in the name of the hon. member for Peel which has not yet been moved, which will do this.

Sir Henry Sugden: Another point was this: I think we have got to consider this point raised by the hon. member for South Douglas, Mr. Bell, very carefully. It is our system in the Island to compile the register of voters on, I think, the 12th of May of each year. If we are going to do what he apparently wishes us to do, and that is somebody becoming 18 on the 30th August or any other date can then apply to the Assessment Board to have his name put on the voters list. That means there are going to be continuous alterations and amendments to that voters list. Is that not going to produce great administrative
difficulties? I would welcome the views of a member of the Assessment Board on this.

Mr. Burke: Mr. Speaker, I think if this Bill does go through eventually that we should take notice of the experience in the United Kingdom with regard to notifying people of a certain age that they must fill in a form and make application.

Sir Henry Sugden: Surely we cannot wet-nurse everybody.

Mr. Burke: It is not wet-nursing. They have done this across the water and they have notified people, and it was even on television reminding them to make application, so keen are they to get their vote, that they send our forms for them to fill in in order to be placed on the electoral roll. So let us benefit from their experience if we are going to do the job properly.

Mr. Faragher: Mr. Speaker. I favour this generally, this is the amendment now, but I feel it is rather premature in this sense. If you have youngsters of 18 voting at local authority elections they must be responsible people and they will aller who goes in to represent the district; the member that they vote for possibly. but as the law stands at the moment supposing I was a lad of 18 and I had to get married, could I apply to— (interruption) —if I approached a local authority, could the local authority give me a house under 21 years of age, as the law stands at the moment.

Mr. Bell: No.

Mr. Faragher: Well until such time as it is permissible for—

Mr. Devereau: That is the family Law Reform Bill.

Mr. MacDonald: They do in Peel.

Mr. Faragher: They may do in Peel. (Interuption.) This amendment is rather premature and until such time that they have powers at 18 years of age then is the time to bring this in.

The Speaker: Hon. members, we have now of course the amendment in the name of the hon. member for Castletown and we have notice of an amendment from the hon. member for South Douglas. It is a complicated affair to produce the amendment that the hon. member requires and I wonder if you would bear with us by adjourning at this stage so that the hon. member will have the opportunity of devoting some time during the lunch hour to its preparation.

Sir Henry Sugden: May I just ask a question before we adjourn? I indicated that the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Douglas, Mr. Bell, it might possibly cause expense to the Assessment Board. Is this a case where he should have the approval of the Finance Board to put forward such an amendment? (Laughter.)

The Speaker: I too will think about this over the lunch time. (Laughter.)

Mr. Radcliffe: Before we adjourn, sir, with reference to the South Ramsey Compulsory Acquisition Bill, I have a plan of the area which I will put, with your permission, in the members' room on the table, so that if anybody wants to get au fait with what the suggestions are for this area, they will be able to look at it in the lunch time.

The Speaker: Right then, hon. members, we will now adjourn until 2.30 p.m.

The House adjourned for lunch.

The Speaker: Now when we adjourned we were giving consideration to several points; one which concerned the Chair was the question from the hon. member for Ramsey, as to whether or not the proposal which was to come from South Douglas would need approval by the Finance Board. In my opinion, no. Now has the hon. member for South Douglas his amendment ready for presentation?

Mr. Bell: I find now, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to table an amendment
in the form I desired. The time schedule between the Bill being passed and the effective date, there will have been a complete new revision of the voters list, one which is going on at the moment and what I hoped to have embodied in the Bill would in fact be covered by the new revision.

The Speaker: So there will be no amendment other than, that is, the amendment in the name of the hon. member for Castletown. Does any other hon. member wish to speak on the second clause or the amendment proposed to it? If not I will call upon the hon. member for Glenfaba to reply.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, there is very little to reply to. The amendment put forward by the hon. member for Castletown, as I have said, is acceptable to me. It would cover the House of Keys election, Education election and local authority elections. It would be much simpler from the point of view of the electoral roll and I would wholeheartedly accept that amendment.

The Speaker: Now hon. members, the clause has been proposed and seconded. To that clause I have the amendment which I read out earlier to you and which extends the voting rights to local authorities as well as to the Board of Education as provided in the clause. Are you clear on the amendment or does anyone wish to have it read again? Is it all right to go on? In that case I will put the amendment to the House. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Now before asking the hon. member in charge to deal with clause 3, we have the rather unusual position of having to make consequential amendments to clause 1 as a result of our decision on clause 2. If the House would agree to this course being followed, the Secretary will suitably amend clause 1 to provide where it says "The age at which persons shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the Keys and non-Tynwald members of the Isle of Man Board of Education, local authorities and the Corporation of Douglas." A suitable drafting amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move an amendment to line 28, clause 2, that for the age of 20 years we substitute the age of 18 years.

Sir Henry Sugden: I beg to second.

The Speaker: Does the House agree to that amendment?

It was agreed.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, could I beg the indulgence of the House, as this has spread over a long time and in order to get it into action I propose the suspension of Standing Orders to take the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. Burke: I beg to second.
Mr. Devereau: I would like to oppose the suspension of Standing Orders on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Members have made the point this morning that this is important legislation. I think the importance of this particular legislation may be exaggerated, but the importance of legislation that will follow, the Family Law Reform Bill, which was mentioned by the hon. member for Ayre this morning, is very important to our young people. I would like to be sure that our young people are really prepared for the responsibility that will come to them with the passing of the Family Law Reform Bill — the entering into contracts, the buying of property, the ability to marry without parental consent and all the other things contained in that Bill. I think the passing of this second reading and clauses will gain a lot of publicity for this Bill, but I think that we could by taking the third reading at another time perhaps get views through the medium of the Press and other means, we could get the views of the young people on whether they are prepared and whether they want the responsibility which will come to them when we pass another Bill at another time. I feel that this is one Bill that can well wait for another day for a third reading.

Mr. Bell: I would like to support the very sensible argument of the previous speaker. There is a lot to be said for reform, and during even this lunch recess, Mr. Speaker, lots of members have expressed themselves more conversant with the ramifications of law reform in respect of equality for younger persons. Even during the lunch recess when we were discussing with the Attorney-General here, and the Secretary of the Assessment Board the question arises now of a certain anomaly we have created here today by now, on this very form, where the voting lists are compiled there is a part for jury service and this is all part and parcel of the Family Reform Bill. I understand that from what was said on the Family Provisions Bill some time ago, when I pointed out that we were leap-frogging over other legislation and getting out of step that we should wait. I think, because the Attorney has now said this afternoon that the Family Reform Bill is well on its way, and there are big hurdles to overcome, the Bill should be before us very soon, so I think we could tie it all up. By deferring the third reading, it would not harm the intent of the Bill and would make better legislation all round.

Mr. Creer: Mr. Speaker, I am of the same opinion as the last two speakers. Today we have amended one of the clauses there to include local authorities and the Corporation. I think the public should know first before the third reading comes along that we have amended it.

Mr. Irving: Mr. Speaker, I was going to say more or less what the hon. member for Middle, Mr. Creer, said. I am wholeheartedly behind the Bill but I oppose the suspension of Standing Orders. I think that one of the main reasons for having the delay between the second and third readings is that the public might be informed of what we have been doing. Now this is particularly important today, because the Bill now contains a major amendment which has never been discussed by the public before, and that is the extension to local authorities. I do hope that it will go no further today.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker what the last speaker said is not quite correct, because certain local authorities have in fact already discussed this and recommended that this should in fact be done.

The Speaker: Are you ready to vote, hon. members? The question before the House is that Standing Orders be suspended to enable the third reading of this Bill to be taken. Those in favour of such a suspension please say aye, against no. The noes have it.

Representation of the People (Franchise) Bill—Consideration of Clauses.
The Speaker: We come to South Ramsey (Compulsory Acquisition) Bill, and I call upon the hon. member for Ayre, Mr. Radcliffe, to take the second reading.

Mr. Radcliffe: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the explanatory memorandum of this Bill, I would just like to give the hon. members the background of why I have asked for this Bill to be introduced. The provision for the transfer of the properties owned by the Ramsey Town Commissioners in the South Ramsey Redevelopment Area to my Board are included in the Ramsey Town Bill of 1970, which is now before the House of Keys. This transfer is very necessary to enable the Local Government Board to carry out a policy in terms of the resolution of Tynwald of the 18th June, 1963, which approved the sale by the Local Government Board of land in the area to private developers who are prepared to develop such land at their own expense subject to conditions to be laid down by the Isle of Man Local Government Board, and in accordance with schemes acceptable to the Ramsey Town Commissioners, and provided further that the development is approved by the Local Government Board. It is extremely important that the Board should be in a position to sell the land to the three developers who have submitted detailed schemes at a very early date. One of these developers is ready to start work and in fact has commenced work on a temporary show building on the promenade frontage. It is felt by the Local Government Board that the present short Bill will give the Board all the powers it needs for the moment and by reason of its short and concise nature should, with the help of the hon. members, pass through its various stages and become law much sooner than the Ramsey Town Bill, with all its very necessary and extensive provisions for dealing with the extension of the boundaries. I therefore have prepared the South Ramsey (Compulsory Acquisition) Bill which, in actual fact, is merely sections 41 and 42 of the Ramsey Town Bill, 1970, which have been extracted for the purpose of speed. I beg to move.

Mr. Spittall: I beg to second, Mr. Speaker, and reserve my remarks.

The Speaker: Does any hon. member wish to speak on the Bill?

Mr. Bell: I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that several members of the House will be aware of the difficulties that the Board have faced and which the developers are facing, but I think it is important in the public interest that the public should be acquainted with why we are giving our support to compulsory purchase. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member in charge of the Bill has taken possibly a little too much for granted in expecting us all to be au fait with the difficulties they have. I think when legislation is brought in to give an authority compulsory purchase powers, a better case should be made other than that some developers have started to build a show house. This, in effect, is all that the hon. member in charge of the Bill has given to the House. I support the Local Government Board in their aspirations for the betterment of Ramsey, but I also represent some section of the public community and they expect me to be publicly informed of what the impediments are to acquiring the property through the properly recognised negotiating procedures. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the second reading, but I would hope that when we take the clauses, the hon. member in charge will be explicit so that we can with all honour take this very extreme step in giving a Government and a
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Mr. Creer: Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this Bill, but I think it is about 18 months to two years late in coming. I believe, honestly, that the Local Government Board has been leaning over backwards to try and get these people to agree to a price to sell this derelict property. I think that this Bill is at least 18 months too late in coming.

Sir Henry Sugden: Mr. Speaker. I have something to say which rather bears out what the last speaker. I think, has said. On 21st January, 1964 I asked the hon. chairman of the Local Government Board among other things, "Will Your Excellency please state when the Acts required under Part II of the Housing Act, 1955 will be instituted and by whom? If it is not proposed to proceed under this Act will you say what procedure is to be adopted in order that all concerned shall be given an opportunity to make any representations they wish and to be informed definitely whether or not the place where they reside or work will in fact be demolished and if so the terms of compensation to be paid." Now the then hon. chairman was the hon. member for Council, Mr. McFee, answered. "Action is not contemplated under Part II of the Housing Act, 1955, which refers to clearance and redevelopment of areas by local authorities. and further the draft provisional order with a map of the South Ramsey area has been prepared. After discussion between the Planning Committee and other authorities the Order and map will be published and then all interested parties will have the right to put forward their views and later a public inquiry will be held and the views put forward by interested parties will be heard and considered. When the Order is made by the Local Government Board it will be sent to Tynwald for approval and interested persons will have the right to put their views before Tynwald. And further the Board is aware of the need for an early public inquiry and will act accordingly." I understand that in fact the plan referred to was only lodged at the Rolls Office on the 15th January, 1970. What I feel, and I feel very hardly about this, Mr. Speaker, is that all this could have been avoided and everybody would have known in the area exactly where they stood, what they could expect and we would not have . . . we could have avoided having the few owners hanging out; because, I certainly know of one who is not so much hanging out, I believe, over the price of the property concerned, but merely — it happens to be rather a good property — but merely where is she or he going to live, that is the problem. It is an individual who does not want, and why should not he or she, she does not want to go and live on a very congested housing estate such as the Lezayre housing area for which I give all praise to the Local Government, but she is an individual or he is an individual who does not want to do that. I feel very strongly indeed that the Local Government Board, and it is not the present Board, really have dragged their feet over this and the residents in the area could have been better treated and one might well have saved a considerable amount of expense in the whole operation.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I rather sort of take exception to the hon. member for Ramsey, Sir Henry Sugden’s remarks and the treatment of the members in this area. I would say that the Board has not just bent over backwards but his former hon. colleague, being a member of that Board knew the situation in which many of these people were placed and he put a very good case forward on their behalf. I feel that they have not just bent over backwards, they have almost stood on their heads to help many of these people. And what rather concerns me is that these houses
in Lezayre Road in this very lovely area are not quite good enough for somebody to come out of this, shall we say it is a tip really, virtually a tip that is in South Ramsey at the moment. We have engaged professional valuers. I would not like to stand up in this Court and say how much we have gone beyond those valuations to try and meet the requirements of these people concerned. I agree with the hon. member for Middle, Mr. Creer, that this should have been done two years ago, because some of the prices being asked for this slum property are out of all proportion to the actual value of that property. I know that these are difficulties that arise when somebody is in a house which is only worth £100 or £200 and it is a house and a home as far as they are concerned, but the Board has had a rehousing programme and they have certainly done all that could ever be done by anybody to bend over. There were certain people in the area — well we just could get no agreement and the whole scheme has been held up. It is not just the concern that some contractor is starting on the site. It is the completion of a scheme; a scheme started by Government long before I was in it, a scheme which was very necessary for the redevelopment of this area. The only tragedy is that this has looked such a terrible tip for such a long time over so many years and had this been done long ago I am sure that steps could have been taken much earlier to have the place tidied up and put back into shipshape.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I support the Bill but I would like to ask the chairman of the Local Government Board one question, and that is what has been the total cost of purchasing the properties in this area? He may not be able to give me this answer today, but possibly at the third reading, I would also like to know the cost per unit.

Mr. Kneale: Mr. Speaker, I would support the views that have been expressed by the hon. member for Glenfaba that these people have had ample warning and here it is six or seven years since the plan was put before Tynwald and they knew we were proceeding with the clearance of this area. If they are now faced with the expense of finding a house at present day values I would say that is their own fault. If they would have got out and looked for property two or three years ago they would have got one for half the price now. If they are faced with any additional expense, I say it is their own fault.

The Speaker: Do you wish to reply, sir?

Mr. Radcliffe: Mr. Speaker, first of all in reference to Mr. Bell's remarks regarding further detail. I think the main point at issue here, and I think I spelt it out clearly at the time, was that it is extremely important that the Board should have the title and the ownership of this land in South Ramsey clarified so that they can proceed to sell the land to the developers. At the present moment, I did mention the fact that one developer was now erecting a show flat and show shop, that developer is prepared to proceed immediately with the full development once he gets the legal right and ownership of the land. My Board at the present time, unfortunately, are not in a position to be able to give that, because apart from the property that we do not own, there are still little pockets of back yards, old gardens that are in that area, that nobody seems to be able to define who is the rightful owner. Until we get a Bill of this kind passed to define the ownership, this is the main object of getting this ownership defined so that we can proceed to negotiate and make a definite agreement with these developers to proceed with the development. I too am rather surprised at the remarks of Sir Henry. I personally, let
me put this outlook on this case, I have negotiated within this South Ramsey Development for three years with the owners of these properties. I would say, with very small exception, we have got on extremely well. We realise that, as Mr. Anderson has said, there are people living in houses in that area that were quite suitable to them for the rest of their lives. We asked them to move and it meant that even if they moved into a Local Government Board house they were expected to pay possibly £2 10s. 0d. to £3 per week rent, whereas in the past they had been paying maybe 15s. or £1, or possibly they owned the old property and had not to pay anything. We realise all these difficulties. We have negotiated to the best of our ability and I would say without a word of doubt that I do not think you will meet anybody in the South Ramsey area who will lodge a complaint against the Local Government Board for the final prices that have been paid to them for their properties. We have now come to the stage where we have six properties and the lady that Sir Henry referred to, I certainly would say that she owned one of the best properties in South Ramsey without a doubt. It is an exceptionally good property. As a matter of fact I have spent a considerable amount of time trying to persuade our planning staff and the developer in that area, if it was at all possible, to include this property in the new scheme. They say it is physically impossible and this building will have to be removed. But it is without doubt an exceptional building and exceptionally well maintained. The lady, however, through her advocates, asked what I suppose could possibly be said to be a fair price for the property in today's market, but apart from the price they said that the lady in question did not want to move at all. They would sell the property on the understanding that she could remain there till she died. Well, gentlemen, you realise the position that we are in in wanting to develop this area and we feel that having gone along as far as we possibly can and made no progress on this specific case, the only thing to include it with the others for compulsory purchase. The others, for your information, are the Old Swan Hotel, where we had the Government Valuer value it and the difference between the Government Valuer's valuation and the valuation required is so extensive that we felt there was no other alternative but to go for compulsory purchase. Then there is also a large garage on the promenade, a garage in Victoria Road, two old premises in Maughold Street that, although we have been able to trace the owner in England, he refuses even to answer letters. This property as a matter of fact is demolished. It has been valued — (interruption) — the only way to get it down was to proceed along these lines. As a matter of fact these, 48 and 48a Maughold Street, are now down. The other is a plot of land again in Approach Road, where there is difficulty in negotiating the final price. So we are in a cleft stick if we wish to see South Ramsey develop, neither of the developers at the top end of the town can develop until we own these properties. This is essentially why the Bill is introduced in its form and why we wish this hon. Court to give us support to get on with the job.

Mr. MacLeod: Mr. Speaker, in his reply the chairman of the Local Government Board said that some developers had started to build a shop and a house. Is he building this shop and house on land that they do not own? Is this some land he is going to go for by compulsory purchase?

Mr. Radcliffe: As a matter of fact this land is in the area that has been given by the Ramsey Town Commission's to the Local Government Board. We own the land and the building that is now being put on it is being put on with planning permission on a tenancy basis. Could I just answer Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Speaker. I could not exactly give
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the total cost. I would say that agreement was reached with Ramsey Town Commissioners for the purchase and demolition up to a sum of £300,000. Ramsey Town Commissioners were responsible for £150,000. We have reached the £300,000 and any further negotiations for the Ramsey Town Commissioners’ part in this scheme will have to be negotiated with them. I could not possibly give him the unit cost because there are so many variations on the type of building and what we have paid for them, that it would be practically impossible without going into great detail in explanations as to unit costs.

The Speaker: The question before the House is that the South Ramsey (Compulsory Acquisition) Bill be now read a second time. Those in favour please say aye. against no. The ayes have it. Clauses, sir.

Mr. Radcliffe: Clause 1. Mr. Speaker, authorises lands and hereditaments in South Ramsey now owned by the Commissioners to be vested in the Local Government Board. The streets and the sewers naturally will remain the responsibility of the Ramsey Town Commissioners in the normal way. It is only the land and the buildings which are transferred to my Board. I beg to move.

Mr. Anderson: I beg to second.

The Speaker: It is proposed and seconded that clause 1 stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Clause 2.

Mr. Radcliffe: Clause 2 of the Bill is intended to give the Local Government Board a full and sufficient title to all the property in the area. This provision is necessary because, while every care has been taken and is being taken to purchase all property it is possible that the owners of some of the smaller courts, yards or private easements through the passage of time have been lost sight of. It is for this reason that clause 2 is included. I can assure hon. members that this is normal procedure in cases such as the present. All these properties to date have been acquired both by the Ramsey Commissioners and my Board by private negotiations and I would like to say how much my Board appreciate the willingness of the owners who have negotiated with them for the sale of the properties. The Board is well aware of the concern that has been occasioned by people having to sell their properties. This has been done, however, in the best interests of the town and the community and my Board has tried to be fair and treat all cases as humanely as possible. It has now come to the position where about seven or eight property owners are not prepared to accept the prices offered by the Board, although in most of the cases the Board has offered more than the amount assessed by the valuers. It now comes to the point where the Board must apply for compulsory purchase powers to be made available. I beg to move.

Mr. Spittal: I beg to second.

Mr. Bell: Was that the clause 2 speech or a clause 3 speech?

The Speaker: It would cover both. (Interruption.)

Mr. Creer: Mr. Speaker, there is one question there. In this Bill the Ramsey Town Commissioners are hardly mentioned at all. Now all this land is going to be taken over by the Local Government Board. compulsory powers, what little it is left, the land they have already got there must be vested now in the Local Government Board. does not Ramsey Commissioners come into this at all? Are they going to pay this £100,000 out and get nothing back at all, just the rates?

Mr. Radcliffe: Mr. Speaker, if I could reply to the hon. member, this was all agreed by the Ramsey Town Commissioners before this scheme ever started.
Mr. Devereau: Have the Ramsey Town Commissioners no powers of compulsory purchase similar to the Douglas Corporation?

Mr. Radcliffe: No, sir. This matter was taken up by the learned Attorney with the Ramsey Town Commissioners and it was pointed out that if the Ramsey Town Commissioners wished to have compulsory purchase for the development of the area themselves, they had that power, but to take compulsory purchase to hand it over to a government board who were then going to sell it to another private developer, was not within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Callister: May I just ask the chairman this question? Now that we have the dual management of Ramsey through compulsory purchase would the chairman of the Local Government Board consider doing the same thing in Douglas and develop Douglas particularly with regard to Chester Street and Wellington Square areas? (Hear, hear.) It might be a good idea if——

The Speaker: You are out of order, sir.

Mr. Callister: I am asking what he is going to do for Douglas.

The Speaker: Well, I am telling you that you are out of order, sir. The question is that clause 2 stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Clause 3.

Mr. Radcliffe: Clause 3, Mr. Speaker, refers to the compulsory acquisition powers within the Bill. This power is, of course, additional to the normal powers of a Board of Tynwald which as I have said are not adequate to the present negotiations, purely because we are buying an area within a town to sell to a private developer. I beg to move, sir.

Mr. Anderson: I beg to second.

Mr. Bell: It is on this clause that I must dig my heels in. I said on the second reading would the member in charge give the House and public a clear idea of why we have had to leave the proper democratic path and move to this all-powerful, dictatorial, compulsory purchase legislation. Now a lot of people will still believe in the Isle of Man, that we are living in a democracy. And believing that, Mr. Speaker, they are still prepared to concede to us the rights and powers to pass legislation of this nature giving compulsory powers, but they would expect us to be informed and for they also to be informed in a public debate of why this has to be. I ask this and I apologise for having to repeat what I said, but the member in charge of the Bill has failed to give good reason why we should pass clause 3. I was hoping that he would have said that the person who wished to die in the house was a mere 21 years of age. It may be that the person who is in this house and who has a wish to die in it may be 70 or 80 years of age. I think it is relevant, Mr. Speaker. He may also have informed the House and the public that the developers for whom he wishes to acquire this land are as real in substance as the homes of the people he wishes to displace and has displaced. I think it is the right time for him to say that there are a queue of developers with cheques written out for the land. It amuses the member for East Douglas that I should ask on behalf of the people who are to have their premises taken from them by compulsory powers that you substantiate the claims that these powers are necessary. It has not even been substantiated in Tynwald Court, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed developers are even in the financial position to proceed with the development. The hon. member in charge of the Bill has referred to one developer who because they are in such a hurry have started to build a show house. He has not made it clear to this hon. House whether the need for this Bill is holding up this development or some other developer. There are three development areas. He has not even said — and we should be told and
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the people in Ramsey should be told and the people in Kirk Michael should be told — the reason why we have been asked to give this power.

Mr. Crowe: I think they know in Kirk Michael! (Laughter.)

Mr. Bell: This is power. I think they should be told that this is a real development that the Local Government Board have such unbounded confidence based on fact that these developers are financially sound and that they can carry out this development. I would like to be assured, Mr. Speaker, that if I am to support legislation to pull down the sticks and stones of some person living in Ramsey, which may be the effect for hastening their death or bringing on illness through worry, I know not the age of this person, I can just as well dwell in fantasy as the sponsor of the Bill—

Mr. Radcliffe: You are doing that this afternoon.

Mr. Bell: Well certainly I am entitled to if the member in charge of the Bill will not give us facts and wants to leave it to our imagination. Am I not entitled to let my imagination run to a logical, only a logical fantasy?

The Speaker: Perhaps we are realising why the Town Hall curtailment is a reality! (Laughter.)

Mr. Bell: It may well be, Mr. Speaker, but I still feel that compulsory purchase is the last resort, and that we should be given proper factual information why in this House we should support the Bill. I know it will still require an Order in Tynwald to give it effect. I can also surmise that this is merely the big stick being wielded to say you will now agree or we are going to Tynwald with these powers to take you over. It is still reckoned to be a democracy. They have only got to start a war and call people to come and defend their country against the type of tyranny that is contained in this legislation.

Mr. MacLeod: Quite right, quite true.

Mr. Bell: This is tyranny where a person cannot sleep peacefully in their own dwelling in their own country. Now I accept, Mr. Speaker, that there are times when the good of the community must override the interests of an individual or a small section of the community, and I imagine this is one of the circumstances when this should be so, and I have asked for the facts to substantiate this claim.

Mr. Radcliffe: You will get them.

Mr. Bell: I have asked on the second reading for them. I have not had them. We are on clause 3 which could not be a better time, and I have still not had it. It is not sufficient. Mr. Speaker, for us to have confidence in the members of the Boards, and say: we know he will do a good thing, he is not a bad fellow. Well we are not, or should not consider ourselves as a mixture of friends and colleagues. We are a Government and when we create precedents following Governments will follow them. I feel most strongly that a proper case and all the facts and figures should be put before the public why we need this repugnant step.

Mr. Callister: Mr. Speaker, it would occur to me that the reason why compulsory purchase here is necessary is because Ramsey Town Commissioners have been dragging their feet. It was obvious that Ramsey needed development and that this particular area was necessary and I believe in the fact that the Government should have the compulsory powers to purchase these properties under compulsion and to develop the town. I could make a comparison of this with Douglas. I happen to have been a member of the Douglas Council for six years, and the development of Douglas was under consideration then from Loch Promenade to Finch Road and the South Quay. And the reason we got every time, which was merely an
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Mr. MacLeod: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I thought we were discussing Ramsey, not Douglas.

The Speaker: The hon. member, I am quite sure, was in order until he came to the stage of criticising the dodo or the Douglas Council, or whatever it was! (Laughter.)

Mr. Callister: I am making a comparison.

The Speaker: Yes. I accept your comparison, but please leave the Council out of it. I do not think they come in.

Mr. Callister: But the very reason, sir, is that they did not want to develop any more than Ramsey want to develop. They do not want to spend the money, they do not want to raise the rates. They do not want Douglas to develop. Their excuse is now, it is, when we are buying it house by house, when the owner is ready to sell we will be able to do it then. It might go on for another 25 years. And I think that the powers of compulsory purchase of property that needs demolishing and developing should be supported by this House. I would support it on this occasion. I am not supporting the next clause.

Sir Henry Sugden: Mr. Speaker, I rise in defence of a much maligned body to which I once belonged, the Ramsey Town Commissioners. Now I was in at the inception of the arrangement between the Ramsey Town Commissioners and the Local Government Board, and we made an agreement with them which has been discussed years ago in this House, and that was made, that agreement was made because the Ramsey Town Commissioners realised that they had not got, shall I say, the ability or possibly the facilities to carry out this very considerable project. We have a town surveyor with no staff, and it was quite clear certainly to me as a member of the Town Commissioners at that time that trying to go it alone ourselves would have led to a very great delay indeed. The Ramsey Town Commissioners started buying the properties for clearance in this area, I think I am right in saying in 1938 or it may have been 1938, 1936, and we have continued, the town Commissioners continued doing it to the best of their ability, financial ability, as and when they found it possible to try to buy property.

Mr. Callister: That is a shocking admission.

Sir Henry Sugden: No. Why? Why is it shocking?

Mr. Callister: Not capable of developing Ramsey?

Sir Henry Sugden: We have not got the facilities.

Mr. Callister: Oh, yes, you could get those.

Sir Henry Sugden: At an expense.

Mr. Callister: Yes.

Mr. Burke: Can anybody join in this argument?

Sir Henry Sugden: At expense that would have been quite unendurable to the rates of Ramsey. Two or three pounds would have gone on.

Mr. Callister: A good investment.

Sir Henry Sugden: Well, it might have been a good investment.

Mr. Callister: Well, this is not.

Sir Henry Sugden: Well, that is a matter for your opinion. I do stand up in this for the Ramsey Town Commis-
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sioners. As I have told you I did ask a question in January 1964 when we were told plans would be lodged. We are not the only ones that have perhaps been a little slow about this matter.

The Speaker: Do you wish to speak, hon. member for Peel?

Mr. MacDonald: Could I ask one question, Mr. Speaker, please?

The Speaker: Yes, why not?

Mr. MacDonald: Could I ask the chairman — I remember seeing very fine plans. Mr. Speaker, laid before the House of all the developments that were to take place in the South Ramsey area. In fact I think we had a model for these skyscraper blocks. Could he tell me what has started and if anything is going on?

Mr. Radcliffe: What has started?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, what has started with these skyscraper blocks?

Mr. Radcliffe: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. MacDonald has actually put his finger right on the spot with reference to Mr. Bell. Mr. Bell said, "The hon. member in charge of the Bill has not told us why they want to have this compulsory purchase." Now I was always of the impression that Mr. Bell was a reasonably, sensible, intelligent young man — (laughter) — I am beginning to wonder this afternoon what is the matter with him. Prior to my coming into this House in 1963, this House along with the Legislative Council in Tynwald approved a scheme for the development of Ramsey. Now every time I pick up the local Press we are being accused of not proceeding with the Ramsey development. The position, as I have already told you time and time again is that we cannot sell the land to the developers until we have the authority to sell it to us by this Court, and we do not own it. Now as far as the compulsory purchase is concerned, I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Bell that compulsory purchase is the last resort, and I have said this time and time again and I have tried to live up to what I state. I, for one, am not prepared to pass the buck to anybody, Ramsey Town Commissioners or whoever it may be. We were given a duty to perform as the Local Government Board, in Ramsey, and we intend to do our utmost to get that development started and completed. But we cannot hold up development if we find ourselves after having purchased possibly . . . I am not sure of the exact number, but shall we say somewhere round about 200 properties in Ramsey — there are six people in little pockets on the area saying: we will not sell to you unless we get our figure. Now I wonder what the Finance Board's attitude or even the attitude of all the members of this House would be if we said to these people: all right, we are quite prepared to give you all you want for your property regardless of the fact that the Government Valuer say this property is only worth £X. And that is the basic problem of what we have got to sort out. Are you going to tell us give these people all they want for their property, or have we got to negotiate in a sensible businesslike manner to get the property? And until we get a decision from you as to whether we are going to have this power to get these properties or not these developers cannot start.

Mr. Callister: An official valuation you pay them and no more.

Mr. Radcliffe: Well, we cannot do this. I am working entirely on advice from the Attorney-General on how we must proceed to acquire these properties, and this is laid down in this Bill, and if you are not prepared to accept the Bill I am very sorry to say that we cannot make any further progress in the purchase and demolition of Ramsey.

Mr. Bell: What was the woman's age which you spoke about?
Mr. Radcliffe: The lady in question is not a very young lady. That does not come into it as far as I can see. The business is... the property is there and we have to have it, and as far as the housing of the lady is concerned I quite see this lady's point when she says she does not want to live in Lezayre where she has been offered a house. She will get valuation, even on our valuation for the property that will build her a new bungalow where she could live in any other part of the town she wishes to live in.

Mr. Bell: Well why not get on with it and complete it?

Mr. Radcliffe: Is not that what I am asking for today? (Interruption.)

Mr. Bell; Want to shoot her.

Mr. Radcliffe: There are no other points, I do not think, that were raised that require answering. Sir Henry did mention the fact of the Ramsey Town Commissioners. Apart from a few small differences of opinion we have had with the Commissioners I think at the present moment we are negotiating with them very satisfactorily and they are all trying to do their utmost to get this development, which after all was a resolution in Tynwald to develop this town, and all I wish for is this Court's support in getting this Bill through.

The Speaker: It is proposed and seconded that clause 3 stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Clause 4.

Mr. Radcliffe: Clause 4, Mr. Speaker, of the Bill authorises the Local Government Board, to deal with all the lands and buildings within the area, and to sell or let all or any of them and impose conditions or restrictions on the sale or letting. Clause 4, subclause (a) provides that "if the Board is unable within two years of the Bill becoming law to sell or let on satisfactory terms the Board may itself develop in the area." Clause 4, subclause (b) sets out that "any transaction must be with the agreement of the Ramsey Commissioners but provides that the Governor shall determine any dispute which may arise between the Board and the Commissioners." I beg to move clause 4.

Mr. Spittall: I beg to second.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I accept everything that the chairman of the Local Government Board has said because I was aware of it, but I do not accept the provisions of clause 4(a) and (b). I think the introductory... the main part of clause 4 is relevant and necessary to the Bill. I mean, having given the power to acquire one should also give the power to sell the land or let the land to the developer. But I do not think it is part and parcel of the intention of the House this afternoon to permit the Local Government Board to enter into re-building South Ramsey itself which would mean that for ever after the taxpayer of the Isle of Man would be paying for the development of Ramsey, that Ramsey would become a non-functioning authority altogether, and that other authorities throughout the Island — whether they be Douglas or other small districts — would expect the same. I do think that the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) are completely unnecessary at this period of time for the effectiveness of this Bill, and if the Board are sincere in embracing the responsibilities of the local authority within their Board's or Tynwald's own budget, I think that this should be a matter of what is flesh for one should also be for the other, and would require more time for debate in another place. The hon. member for North Douglas has been mentioning this question about the development requirements of Douglas. I wonder if the member in charge of the Bill rejects what I am saying, whether we are to infer that he intends to create a precedent knowing that Douglas would make a claim, or some other local authority would make a claim to be
similarly treated. I do feel, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, that the dilemma that the Board find themselves in in respect of the moving the development on a pace can be effective with the deletion of subclause (a) and subclause (b), and I would on behalf of the House ask for the concurrence of the member in charge of the Bill in order that he could have unanimity on the other provisions of the Bill to give effect to it. I move that subclause (a) and (b) be deleted.

Mr. Corkish: I second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Callister: Mr. Speaker—–

The Speaker: The hon. member, Mr. Devereau, caught my eye, sir.

Mr. Devereau: I was quite prepared to follow the hon. member for North Douglas because I really wanted to hear what he had to say in one respect, but I cannot find myself in agreement with the hon. member for South Douglas. I think that this clause is quite satisfactory so far as it goes. I am pleased that the agreement has to be made with the Commissioners over the sale and over the development of this land. But the point I am not in agreement with is that at the end of the paragraph (b) "and in default of agreement shall be made or done as the Governor may determine and in such manner as he shall think fit." I think this should devolve on Tynwald to agree to this, and I would like to move an amendment to this effect that "and in default of agreement shall be made or done as Tynwald may determine."

Mr. Callister: Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to wonder where we are getting with our local government in the Isle of Man. Is Ramsey to cease to be a functioning authority?

Mr. Creer: Yes.

Mr. Callister: It is?

Mr. Radcliffe: Who said so?

Mr. Callister: Well Mr. Creer, the hon. member for Middle, says so.

Mr. Creer: They did years ago.

Mr. Callister: They did so years ago?

Mr. Creer: Yes.

The Speaker: If you indulge in these chatty little conferences across the floor, no wonder you get misleading ideas. Can we have the Chair addressed, sir, on matters relevant to the clause.

Mr. Callister: I always understood sir, that although I was not staring at you while I was speaking, I may be looking round the Court, but I was speaking to the Chair.

The Speaker: Sometimes I wonder about it, but proceed.

Mr. Callister: I wonder where we are getting with respect to Ramsey. Not only will Ramsey have dual local authority control but they are already at a difference with the Local Government Board in the development of Ramsey.

Mr. Radcliffe: Not in the development of Ramsey:

Mr. Callister: Oh yes.

Mr. Radcliffe: Oh no.

Mr. Callister: So far as you have gone they may have agreed with what you have done, but I still do not know what is going to happen in Ramsey, and I doubt very much if many of this Court do. But what I object to is this. That the Board will now become a sort of private landlord to sell and let property and do what they like with parts of the property of Ramsey.

Mr. Anderson: Good Socialist policy.

Mr. Callister: That is not Socialist policy.

The Speaker: I am giving you a policy, whether it is Socialist, Communist or whatever, but it is this. When
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the House is sitting no member shall
speak or whisper so as to interrupt the
business of the House. I think it is quite
a good Standing Order and I think we
had better pay some attention to it this
afternoon. There is a danger that this,
which is rather an important Bill, might
get so misconstrued by suggestions and
counter-suggestions that are completely
misleading going across the floor, that
we will lose the substance for the
shadow. So please let us confine our
debate to relevant matters with one
speaker addressing the Chair and the
House at a time without interruption.
Hon. member, thank you.

Mr. Callister: Thank you for your pro-
tection, sir. (Laughter.) I am not pre-
pared as a member of Tynwald respon-
sible to the taxpayers of this Island, to
give the Local Government Board all
the rights and powers of a local landlord,
and in contradiction to the Ramsey
Town Commissioners, as a functioning
authority, to do as they please with parts
of Ramsey. I also agree with the hon.
member for Douglas West, Mr.
Devereau, that the power should not rest
with the Governor, to determine in such
manner as he shall think fit, what is to
be done. This is a matter for Tynwald. I
cannot say anything more than that, Mr.
Speaker, and . I am dumbfounded at the
way that Ramsey is being developed, and
bought and developed, and this atmos-
phere of confusion, and a lack of know-
ledge of exactly what is taking place
and what is taking place in the future.
Much as I admire the Local Govern-
ment Board for its work; I think they
do very well, but I would remind them
of a fact, that the Housing Act of 1955,
makes them the responsible body to this
Court, for everything that every local
authority does, and instead of seeing
that Ramsey is being developed, and
bought and developed, and this atmos-
phere of confusion, and a lack of know-
ledge of exactly what is taking place
and what is taking place in the future.

Mr. Vereker: Just one question from
the mover. Under this clause if the
Board, the Local Government Board is
holding the lands and buildings could I
ask are the Local Government Board
paying the rates to the Commissioners,
or do they get the rates themselves as in
other places?

The Speaker: As Tynwald by Resolu-
tion determines. The hon. member for
Peel.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I agree
with the hon. member for Douglas
South to a certain extent on this. I am
rather amazed in 4 (a) — the last three
lines — this little piece that “the Board
will satisfactorily carry out any pro-
posed development scheme . . . the Board
may itself carry out such development.”
Mr. Speaker, I am rather worried about
this, because I can see this going on for
ever. I can see, as I have seen up to now,
large areas of flattened land with
developers coming and going. I remem-
ber, I think it was a firm called
Booilushag who were going to build a
large block with a huge tower, I do not
think they have started yet. I am rather
worried, like the member for Douglas
North, that the Local Government
Board will find itself committed to pre-
paring itself and paying for the re-
development of South Ramsey. They can
do this and I do not think they should
be allowed to do this, because I think
Government itself committed Govern-
ment, to complete demolishing South
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Ramsey and clearing the area, and I think aiding in the re-development. But I can not see that Government should go in, Mr. Speaker, and rebuild the whole of South Ramsey if necessary; otherwise as the member for Douglas North has said we may as well abolish the local authorities and let the taxpayer, the central taxpayer pay for the lot, and go into all the towns in the Island. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I know at the moment in Peel, they are faced with a tiny area of re-development and they have found that to develop it in the way it should be developed it is going to cost about £7,000 per house. And Peel like Ramsey can say — We can not afford to do this, let us hand it over to the taxpayer, he will do it for us, he has done it in Ramsey. And this does rather worry me, this 4 (a) — the final three lines. It means that we are setting a precedent for Central Government going in and completely out of central taxation build houses and properties in a local authority area, and I think if we set this example once I can not see how Tynwald can deny the same rights to Douglas for the re-development of the whole of the back Strand Street area, Castletown, Peel and any other town or village in the Island.

Sir Henry Sugden: Mr. Speaker, may I remind members of this hon. House, that it is only really a comparatively short time since, in another place it was agreed that this land could be sold to developers for the price of 1s. per yard. We agreed that and told the Local Government Board to get on with it.

Mr. Callister: I did not.

Sir Henry Sugden: Well, possibly there were some exceptions, but why are we trying, it seems to me, to go back on that? We have already told the Local Government Board to do this very thing. All that I see that (a) stipulates is that if private developers are unable to start within two years, and I thank goodness, that a time limit is in fact specified, all that it is really, is that the matter will then come back to Tynwald. Because the Local Government Board can not go on spending their money, without Tynwald's authority. So Tynwald has the control over it all. If private developers fail to get started. Subsection (b) is, I feel, just a matter of detail. Does it matter who decides a difference of opinion — provided somebody does. I do hope the full clause will be accepted.

Mr. Crowe: Sir Henry has really said quite a lot of what I was going to say. Some of us are talking this afternoon, or have been talking about local authorities or the Local Government Board, going to take the work that would mean more responsibilities in the towns and villages of this Island. Now this is a decision of Tynwald. This is a decision of the Manx Government, that South Ramsey would be re-built. Now if the developers were not coming forward, Government accepted responsibility for this work. Now possibly this would mean, that if someone did not come forward and do the work, Government would have to spend the money and do it ...

Members: No, no.

Mr. Crowe: That has been accepted. That has been accepted. There is no doubt whatsoever about that. If this is a precedent, it certainly could happen in other parts of the Island, but certainly this was the intention, this was the agreement. There is no doubt whatsoever about that. Now as far as (b) is concerned, in this, the Governor taking any decision here — this is really nothing. It is only when the Local Government Board and the Commissioners cannot agree on selling a bit of land, or leasing a bit of land, or any proposal as far as development is concerned, then the Governor steps in and makes a decision. Whether it is the Governor or Tynwald or the Manx Government,
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it does not matter. There is not very much to it—anyone. But the Governor would be the responsible person, and would take some responsibility off Tynwald. I see nothing wrong with (i) or (ii). I think they should be left in the Bill.

Mr. Corkish: Mr. Speaker, I am a bit concerned about this clause (a). Now what is going to happen Mr. Speaker, if the Corporation in Douglas cannot get a developer to develop Chester Street? Will the Government step in and say—We will do it for you? Is that going to be the position?

Mr. Crowe: It is up to Tynwald.

Mr. Corkish: Yes, but will Douglas get the same privileges and the same priorities as what Ramsey has got?

Mr. Kerruish: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House is making unduly heavy weather of what I regard as very necessary enabling legislation as far as the Local Government Board is concerned. Now, whether we were in favour of the South Ramsey scheme or not, and I would remind this hon. House, sir, that when that really tremendous scheme was piloted through Tynwald, by the hon. Mr. Speaker, only four members of that Court voted against it. There is no, disputing the fact that Government is irrevocably committed to carry out, to see through the South Ramsey Development Scheme. It did not only commit itself to the rebuilding of the area if private enterprise could not be found capable of carrying out that exercise, it also committed itself to building at least 150 houses. Now the bulk of those 150 houses, has already been built by the Manx Government, and we are committed to hand over those 150 houses to the Ramsey Town Commissioners, and extend the Town boundary, so that they can be handed over to it. Now what happens as far as Douglas is concerned, is entirely for the future, but it seems to me that the outline, the principles and even some of the finer details of the South Ramsey scheme are beyond dispute. In order that Government may fulfill its obligations, it seems to me that it is very necessary a this point in time, that the Local Government Board should be vested with the powers which are called for in the Bill, which is at present before the House. I think it is altogether unjust, to the Board, which has had its very heavy task thrown into its lap to restrict its actions at this stage. If Government is going to fulfill its obligations, and if the Board are going to be permitted to carry out the work that it is bound to carry out, this Bill must go through. I sincerely hope, sir, that the Board under the chairmanship of my hon. colleague's predecessor and Mr. Radcliffe himself, have put in a tremendous amount of work in this particular project. I think it is only right and proper, that they should be equipped with the powers they require, in order to see this project through. I sincerely hope, sir, that the measure before the House will merit and receive the full support of this hon. House.

Mr. Callister: I would like to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

The Speaker: I am afraid you would be out of order. Standing Order 74 provides "no member may speak twice to a question except in explanation or reply, or having spoken may subsequently move an amendment to the same question."

Mr. Creer: Mr. Speaker, I am going to support clause 4 as it is printed. Earlier in the Bill we gave the Local Government Board all the powers, the compulsory powers and now we are trying to take the teeth out of them, that they are not allowed to develop the place. I think that this clause should stay as printed. In (b) where it says "of agreement shall be made or
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done as the Governor may determine. I cannot see anything wrong in that at all, because the Governor would
go to Executive Council in any case.

Mr. MacDonald: He might not. That happened over Grand Island.

The Speaker: The hon. member to reply.

Mr. Radcliffe: Mr. Speaker, basically the majority of the points put forward, or the arguments put forward this afternoon has been on the fact that if Ramsey is assumed to get these benefits that every other town within the Isle of Man has a right to come in and claim the same benefits. I think we must bear in mind the fact that we are working under a resolution of Tynwald. Tynwald agreed to do a certain thing and we are working under the instructions of Tynwald. Without the powers now to complete the instructions of Tynwald we cannot get on with the job. I am sure no hon. member of this Court who has visited Ramsey during the last year or two years would like to see Ramsey promenade, if this is part of an Island that is interested in tourism, to remain as it is for any longer than necessary. It is essential that we have the powers not only in the first section of clause 4, but definitely (a) and (b) as well. I have no objection to accepting the amendment put forward by the hon. member, Mr. Devereau. If you wish to have it to Tynwald, I have no objection whatsoever to that amendment. I would object to any alteration to sub-clause (a) because if you will cast your minds back you will remember when this South Ramsey development started in the first place, the recommendation to Tynwald was to build maisonettes within South Ramsey and after a long debate in this hon. House, or in Tynwald, it was stated at that time that if these suggested maisonettes were erected it would not be very long until we would have a second South Ramsey and another area ready for demolition. What they were interested in was trying to get first-class tourist accommodation plus first-class residential accommodation in this area, and the Board after a considerable time were eventually able to get three developers who would go along with this suggestion. I am at the moment confident that these developers intend proceeding. All I can go on is the plans being submitted to the special Planning Committee. Mr. Bell himself who has spoken this afternoon against . . . this is a member sitting on the special Planning Committee . . . God help Ramsey if this is the attitude a member of the special Planning Committee is going to take about it. I sincerely hope—

Mr. Bell: Were the plans approved? Of course they were!

Mr. Radcliffe: We will leave that matter out of it; it does not come in.

Mr.Bell: Without the usual Local Government Board delay, I may add.

Mr. Radcliffe: I think it is essential, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, that clause (a) remains in it. I was only stating the other day in our own Board that if the developers who are now showing this interest, if we get this compulsory purchase and get the area cleared and they do not proceed as quickly as we want them to proceed, that we will tell them "You have got until a certain date to get started. If you are not started by that date we are finding somebody else to do it, or we are doing it ourselves." This is exactly what we have got to do and without a doubt this, as my hon. colleague here has stated, this matter was fully debated in Tynwald and we were given instructions to get developers to do it and if we could not get developers to do it, we would have to come back to Tynwald for leave to do it ourselves. I beg to move the clause as it stands. (Interruption.)

The Speaker: You wish to ask a question.
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Mr. Vereker: I did ask a question, Mr. Speaker, and I am still waiting for the answer.

Mr. Radcliffe: The question regarding the rates? Well, you should be aware, as a member of a local authority, that regardless who owns the property in a district, the rates go to the town authority.

The Speaker: The resolution before the House is that clause 4 stand part of the Bill. To that resolution I have one amendment—

Mr. Bell: Did you not receive my seconder, Mr. MacDonald from Peel, on mine?

The Speaker: I did not receive your seconder and neither did the Secretary.

Mr. Bell: He acknowledged it. I stood up and said "I second".

The Speaker: Mr. Kermeen, have you any recollection of a seconder?

The Secretary: No.

The Speaker: I must take your word for it, sir, if you say you did.

Mr. MacDonald: I did.

The Speaker: In that case, hon. members, there must be two amendments before the House. The first is to delete (a) and (b), as I understand the position, of this clause. I will put that amendment to the House now. Those in favour of the deletion of (a) and (b) please say aye, against no.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

For: Messrs. MacLeod, Callister, Corkish, Bell, Irving and MacDonald—6.


The Speaker: The amendment carries. I will now put the clause in its amended form. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Clause 5.

Mr. Radcliffe: Clause 5, Mr. Speaker, is the release of the covenants on the land and provides that all the land to be held by the Board shall be released from all covenants, restrictions, agreements, etc., that may now or at any time be on it. I beg to move.

Mr. Bell: I beg to second.

The Speaker: It is proposed and seconded that clause 5 stand part of the Bill. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Clauses 6 and 7.

Mr. Radcliffe: Clauses 6 and 7, Mr. Speaker, are quite straightforward. They are the interpretation of the area of the South Ramsey scheme and the short title and commencement. I beg to move.

Mr. Anderson: I beg to second.

Mr. Radcliffe: I know, Mr. Speaker, this has been a controversial matter—
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The Speaker: Wait a minute, until I put these clauses. It is proposed and second that clauses—

Mr. Bell: I wish to speak, please.

The Speaker: I thought you might.

Mr. Bell: Just one searching enquiry. Is this South Ramsey Development Scheme as filed in the General Registry on the 15th day of January, 1970, the same scheme in detail that received the Tynwald approval which has been the big defence in this debate?

Mr. Radcliffe: No, I would not say it was exactly. There are certain pockets of land within this area that the Local Government Board in negotiating or enquiring for the purchase of this land it would have cost this hon. Court and the town of Ramsey many thousands of pounds to purchase this area which was reduced because of this fact. The area now as specified brings in entirely what has recently been brought to Tynwald and suggested in the area that shall be sold to the developers. Originally the old scheme, the original scheme went up Market Hill and along Bourne Place, and took in the shop to the west of the street and that area would have been an expensive area to purchase and unnecessary for the redevelopment of the town. The new area as submitted and shown on the plan and now put into the Registry is the area now defined as the one for development and which has always been considered since the detailed plans have been coming in for the area. But if you go back to 1963 there is a slight modification.

The Speaker: It has been proposed and seconded that clauses 6 and 7 stand part of the Bill———

Mr. MacDonald: I rose, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: You rose and this time I am not permitting you to rise because the hon. member has, in fact, replied. Hon. members I am putting clauses 6 and 7 to the House for approval. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Bill read a second time.

Mr. Radcliffe: Mr. Speaker, I am not doing this in any jocular mood that may be thought of. I think this is of extreme importance to us. We have these developers who have their plans submitted for planning approval, who are anxious to know before they are going to spend a tremendous amount of money on architects' fees whether as a Board are legally able to transfer to them the land. Until we get the power to do that they naturally say, we are not going to go into all the final details and spend a tremendous amount of money until we know that you have the authority in this area to sell us the land and that the title deeds of all the area are clarified. I hope that the hon. members here this afternoon, realising how anxious we are to get this area developed, will give consideration to the third reading of this Bill. I beg to move.

Mr. Crellin: I beg to second and reserve my remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wish to oppose the third reading. When I look at the original 1963 debate I see that the scheme approved by Tynwald was a definite scheme. This scheme was to cost a maximum of £1,886,000 and was to be executed in accordance with the report submitted to His Excellency at the time. I cannot see how the scheme we are getting today is, in fact, anything to do with the original scheme as we have already been told of the very high cost area which was to be purchased has been cut out of the original scheme. This being so, I cannot see how Tynwald has the power to allocate any money to cover the redevelopment which the Board could do under 4 (a) or (b) of the Bill. For that reason I think we should have a chance to have a second look at it, so that members can refresh their minds.
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over the 1963 debate, to see exactly where we are going and that we are not going to be hoodwinked into another £1 million scheme before we know about it.

Mr. Bell: I concur with the last speaker's remarks and will vote against the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. Spittall: All I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that whilst I appreciate the remarks of the hon. and gallant member for Peel, I do believe that the longer this is delayed the more it is going to cost.

Mr. Creer: I am of the same opinion as my colleague for Middle, Mr. Speaker. I think this House should decide this today, because it has gone on for nine years and it is not going to get any better or any cheaper as we struggle on like this. If it is not passed today, it will be another month before it will leave this House.

Mr. Callister: I am supporting the refusal to suspend Standing Orders. This Isle of Man is being opened wide to opportunities and we do not know where they are going or what they are doing. We have had some glaring examples of it in the last 10 years. We have no definite proposals before us. We do not know what is going to happen. We do not know who the Local Government Board is going to sell this property to or what it is being sold for and I am definitely opposing the third reading at this stage. I hope that the public will think seriously of what is happening in South Ramsey now under this Bill, and let them look round the Isle of Man and see some of the things that have been happening in the last 10 years.

The Speaker: Do you wish to reply, sir?

Mr. Radcliffe: I do not know what I can reply to Mr. Speaker. I am rather amazed this afternoon at the statements that have been made by the hon members, they do not know what is happening in South Ramsey. The whole—

Mr. Callister: Do you?

Mr. Radcliffe: I certainly do. If you want me to spend an hour elaborating it in detail exactly what the proposals are. (Interruption.) When the matter was debated in Tynwald not so very long ago, the whole scheme was then put forward showing exactly what the layout was going to be, principally it is going to be hotel/motel accommodation adjacent to the swimming pool; the next phase is going to be private flats development and the third phase is going to be a similar private flat development. The company at the top of the development especially is a company of repute that has been established in England for well over a century and are now established in the Isle of Man, being some of the biggest developers in the Isle of Man, and they are anxious to get started. They are the main company that are stopped because of the purchase of this property. I would hope this hon. Court would reconsider the whole matter—

Mr. Corkish: Who are they?

Mr. Radcliffe: They operate in the Isle of Man as James Callow and Sons, they are Thomas Croft of Preston, who are building the new school for the Board of Education.

The Speaker: The question before the House is the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the third reading of this Bill to be taken. Those in favour of that suspension please say aye, against no.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

For: Messrs. Anderson, Crowe, Kerruish, Radcliffe, Spittall, Quayle, Creer, Faragher, Simcocks, Crellin.
Vereker, Irving, Burké, Kneale, Devereau, Sir Henry Sugden and the Speaker—17.

Against: Messrs. MacLeod, Callister, Corkish, Bell and MacDonald—5.

The Speaker: The voting is 17 in favour and five against. We will now proceed with the third reading, the resolution having carried.

Mr. Bell: Could I draw your attention to the clock and the items set out on the agenda for 4 p.m.

The Speaker: Yes, but I think that as the House has expressed itself so strongly in favour of the third reading on this measure, I would be in order in perhaps disregarding this suggestion to move into private sitting at this stage.

Mr. Radcliffe: Mr. Speaker, I formally move the third reading of this Bill. I thank the hon. members who have supported it and I feel certain that those who have opposed it, will one day come round to think that it has been a very good job, that they gave the Board the power to proceed as quickly as possible to get this area redeveloped. I formally move the third reading.

Mr. Crellin: I beg to second and reserve my remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: I am afraid I must get on my feet again because I am very worried that once again we are being bulldozed into something without any real knowledge of what is going on. The hon. chairman, Mr. Speaker, has said, he has mentioned a firm here this afternoon who are going to do something without having heard of this firm before. The last time I saw a plan of this site Boilushag were building it. (Interruption.) Yes, the last time I saw a plan of this site Boilushag were building a very carefully planned hotel block. The only thing I have seen since is Malcolm Milton Partnership, Mr. Speaker, who were insistent last year at a Board I was then on, that unless a decision was made in a fortnight they were running away. The decision was made in a fortnight and they still have not started properly yet and this was nearly a year ago. I am very worried about these things, Mr. Speaker, and I honestly believe that the House of Keys must start putting a brake on rush developments. I think the House should know exactly who is doing what, where the money is coming from and if it fails who is going to find the money to complete. I think it is essential that that we should get to know these facts and we are not getting them.

Mr. Callister: Up to the stage of giving the Local Government Board authority which is approved by Tynwald to purchase this part of Ramsey, I agree, but beyond that, no. Certainly because of the powers that the Local Government Board have got to dispose of this property at any price they like, to whom they like, for what they like within Ramsey. I would remind them of three things in Ramsey, or at least two, and that is the Grand Island, the Ship Yard and now the Salt Yacht City. Are we walking into a fourth?

Mr. Kerruish: Mr. Speaker, I would support the hon. member for Peel in saying that we should not rush into panic legislation, but, sir, by no stretch of imagination could I consider a project that got off the ground seven years ago and which has not really tangibly started yet, could be considered anything in the way of a rushed project. A little earlier on the hon. member for North Douglas said, “Look around the Island and see what is happening.” In the context of this particular Bill, I would say, “look around South Ramsey and see what is happening.” It is time we equipped the Local Government Board with the powers to see that something does happen. This is a determined effort on behalf of the Board to be equipped with the neces-
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sary measures that they can make real headway at long last. For heaven's sake let's back them.

Mr. Irving: Mr. Speaker, I support the Bill, sir. I think it is reasonable for the Local Government Board to come forward now and get powers for compulsory acquisition. What I cannot agree even in principle now, is the suggestion contained in clause 4(a), that if private enterprise does not develop South Ramsey that the Local Government Board should do it with the taxpayers' money. Now this may have been agreed in Tynwald a few years ago, but now we have a different Tynwald. I can recall being chairman of the Planning Committee many years ago and getting one plan after another for South Ramsey. It went on and on and we paid hundreds of pounds for these plans of South Ramsey. We went as a Planning Committee to Ramsey and asked the Commissioners what they wanted in South Ramsey, and one said the swimming pool, and another said a theatre, another said a block of shops, they put forward every possible thing they could think of. It may be, it may well be to my mind, that if private enterprise is not prepared to spend money in South Ramsey, now that it has been cleared, or cleared as far as it has been — and I am very glad to see it has — it may be that the only answer in future would be to make a park of it, instead of building something there. This is if private enterprise will not do anything. It is a very bad sign indeed that if private enterprise is offered cheap ground, with which I agree, in South Ramsey and it cannot be developed, what else is there for it. Now it may well be that sometime in the future the Local Government Board might say they have failed to get development in this area by private enterprise. When that day comes I am prepared then to consider the Local Government Board doing something, but I would require a great deal of justification for Government undertaking large-scale development in South Ramsey. However, having said that I am not going to oppose the Bill; I am not going to oppose the real purpose of this Bill which is to acquire the land.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is only a measure that, in case of the same sort of tragic circumstances as happened with the houses in Foxdale, that the Local Government Board could come in. Would you say that those eight houses should be left incomplete for the rest of time? This is the same sort of principle which could apply. Somebody could just get 99 per cent. done and the rest must be completed. This is to enable, in my opinion, such a tragedy to be avoided. It is not the intention of the Local Government Board to get involved at all only in cases of emergency. I certainly would not wish that. I want to see it done by private enterprise, but in the case of something going wrong certainly they would have to have the opportunity to complete such a scheme.

Mr. Faragher: I, along with a lot of other members of this hon. Court, feel a bit jealous of Ramsey especially when we come from the South. I can remember when this Bill was first introduced about seven or eight years ago, or a bit longer than that, I had quite a lengthy argument with a couple of representatives from the south. It is a pity we had not a few northern members down south; we would get something done down there. Now there is this jealousy sure enough, still existing, but surely when Tynwald did decide to do this in their wisdom, this Court should support and finish the pledge given then. I do not think that this Court is going to gain anything by holding back now. This may seem a gift to Ramsey, sure enough, but the men prior to us in the positions that we hold now, they thought it was something good for Ramsey and it was good for the Isle of Man, so they voted that way. As I said before, I only wish that we had a few of those down south. I think this is a
Mr. Bell: I was not going to say anything on this Bill at all today, Mr. Speaker, but when we get a member of the Local Government Board in the shape and form of the hon. member for Glenfaba, Mr. Anderson, giving the illustration why we should support this measure and he quotes the instance of the Foxdale houses, the Local Government Board accept the tender and accept the builder, which is exactly what they are saying they are going to do here, and when the builder falls down because there has not been a proper enquiry into either his efficiency or his means, they say surely you would not stand in our way of stepping in and completing it. These are the very fears that we have been expressing: the very fears we have been expressing. If we accept what the hon. member for Glenfaba has said and we bless it, how much more right it will be to bless it one million fold in South Ramsey. I give up. (Laughter.)

Mr. Radcliffe: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Glenfaba or the hon. member for South Douglas can put whatever interpretation they wish on this definition. What we are concerned about is being able to proceed to get this area developed. I wonder if the hon. member, Mr. Irving, could tell me how the Local Government Board could possibly proceed to develop South Ramsey without first of all getting the consent of the Finance Board and the consent of Tynwald to do it.

Mr. Irving: We have had too many thin ends of the wedge in this House.

Mr. Radcliffe: We have not got the finance or the power to do it with the approval of Tynwald. I feel certain that this Bill as printed is essential, that we have this power to negotiate with the developers and I certainly hope that the hon. members of this Court who have voted with us, and I am sure some of the others who have voted against us, will agree that this area must be immediately proceeded with. I thank you for your support and I feel certain that we will now get support for the third reading.

The Speaker: The question before the House is that the South Ramsey (Compulsory Acquisition) Bill be now read a third time. Those in favour please say aye, against no. The ayes have it. Bill read a third time. That gentlemen, concludes our public business. We will now sit in private.

Mr. Bell: Was my call for a division not heard, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: I did not hear you call for a division.

Members: Too late.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I would be obliged if hon. members either trying to catch my attention or indeed calling for divisions would make themselves loud and clear on these points.

Mr. Bell: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am worn out speaking. (Laughter.)

The Speaker: I had not noticed. Thank you.