

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF TYNWALD COURT

Douglas, Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Present: The Governor (Sir Peter Stallard, K.C.M.G., C.V.O., M.B.E.). In the Council: The Lord Bishop (the Right Rev. George Eric Gordon, M.A. Deemster G. E. Moore, the Attorney-General (Mr. D. D. Lay, T.D.). Messrs. J. B. Bolton, T. F. Corkhill, E. N. Crowe, R. E. S. Kerruish, J. C. Nivison, W. E. Quayle, H. H. Radcliffe, with Mr. W. B. Kennaugh, Clerk of the Council. In the Keys: The Speaker (Mr. H. C. Kerruish, O.B.E.), Messrs. R. J. G. Anderson, H. D. C. MacLeod, G. M. Kermeen, P. Radcliffe, J. C. Clucas, Miss J. C. C. Thornton-Duesbery, Messrs. P. A. Spittall, J. R. Creer, J. F. Edmonds, T. C. Faragher, A. H. Simcocks, G. T. Crellin, C. L. P. Vereker, J. E. Callister, T. A. Corkish, J. J. Bell, E. C. Irving, C. E. Burke, G. V. H. Kneale, G. A. Devereau, R. MacDonald, Sir Henry Sugden, K.B.E., C.B., D.S.O., Mr. P. G. Hislop, with Mr. T. E. Kermeen, Clerk of Tynwald

ECONOMIC SURVEY OF THE ISLE OF MAN — STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR

The Governor: The Economic Survey prepared for the Government by P.A. International Management Consultants Limited will be laid before the Court this morning. Those who have read the report will appreciate that detailed study is necessary in order to understand the message that it contains, and also that a considerable amount of further work is required to define the

detailed implication of policies, now that the opportunities and difficulties facing the Island have been indicated. On the recommendation of Executive Council, I have, therefore, requested the Finance Board to consider the Report, co-opting such persons to assist and advise as may appear appropriate, with a view to proposals being discussed by Tynwald after the General Election.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, do you permit any comment on your statement?

The Governor: Yes, but there may not be a debate.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, it would appear to be premature for this House at this stage to ask Executive Council and other persons to give judgment on a report which the electorate should well judge in the days that lie ahead.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ROYAL ASSENT

The Governor: I have to announce, in accordance with the terms of section 2 of the Acts of Tynwald (Emergency Promulgation) Act, 1916, that the Royal Assent was given to the following Acts on the 28th July, 1971: Tenancy of Business Premises Act, 1971; Sea-Fisheries Act, 1971; Diseases of Animals (Prevention) Act, 1971; Game (Hares) Act, 1971; Laxey Village District Act, 1971; Isle of Man Loans Act, 1971;

Matrimonial Homes Act, 1971; Oil in Manx Navigable Waters Act, 1971; Tourist Premises Improvement Act, 1971.

BILLS FOR SIGNATURE

The Governor: We have the following Bills for signature—Isle of Man Constitution (Elections to Council) Bill; Local Government (Rating) Bill; Licensing Bill; Government Property Trustees Bill; Weights and Measures Bill; Education (Compulsory School Age) Bill; Water Bill; Education Bill. If the hon. Court will agree we will carry on with our business during the signature. Is that agreed? It was agreed.

PAPERS LAID BEFORE THE COURT

The Governor: I call upon the Clerk to lay papers.

The Clerk: I lay before the Court:—

Constables' Fees and Witnesses' Allowances Act, 1947—Coroners of Inquests Act, 1961—Witnesses' Allowances (Amendment) Order, 1971.

Postal Services—Report of the Committee of Tynwald on the transfer of the Postal Monopoly in the Isle of Man.

Pension Rights—Report of the Committee of Tynwald dated 29th September, 1971.

Legal Aid—Scheme for Legal Aid in the Isle of Man dated 10th September, 1971.

Representation of the People Acts, 1951 to 1971—Representation of the People (Table of Fees) (Amendment) Order, 1971; Absent Voters (No. 2) Regulations, 1971.

Pensions (Increase) Act, 1971—Pensions (Increase) Order, 1971.

Licensing Act, 1961—Licence Fees and Duties Amendment Order, 1971.

Isle of Man Board of Social Security Act, 1970—Social Security (Isle of Man) Order, 1971.

Local Government Acts, 1916 to 1970—Michael Parish Refuse Collection District (Extension) Order, 1971.

Urban Housing Improvement Act, 1969—Urban Housing Improvement Regulations, 1971.

Town and Country Planning Acts, 1934 and 1936—Town and Country Planning (Interim Development) (Lez-ayre Road School) Order, 1971.

Public Service Vehicles (Inspection) Act, 1928—Hackney Motor Vehicles (Inspection and Condition of Fitness) (Amendment) Regulations, 1971.

Road Traffic Act, 1967—School Crossing Patrols (Prescribed Places) Regulations, 1971.

Police (Isle of Man) Act, 1962—Isle of Man Police Pensions (Amendment) (No. 3) Regulations, 1971.

Church (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1971—Church (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1971 (Appointed Day) Order, 1971.

Church (Synodical Government Measure) Act, 1971—Church (Synodical Government Measure) Act, 1971 (Appointed Day) Order, 1971.

Purchase Tax Act, 1949—Purchase Tax (Isle of Man) (No. 4) Order, 1971; Purchase Tax (Isle of Man) (No. 5) Order, 1971.

Catering Education Committee—Proposals of the Isle of Man Tourist Board.

Employment—Statement by the chairman of the Employment Advisory Committee.

Report of the Tourist Industry Development Commission—Statement by the chairman of the Tourist Board about the creation of picnic sites.

Economic Survey — Economic Survey of the Isle of Man dated July, 1971.

Annual Reports — Report of the Employment Advisory Committee for the year ended 31st March, 1971; Annual Report of the Public Analyst for the year ended 31st December, 1970; Annual Report of the Chief Constable of the Isle of Man for the year ended 31st December, 1970; Annual Report of the Manx Museum and National Trust for the year ended 31st March, 1971; Report of the Isle of Man Board of Agriculture and Fisheries for the year ended 31st March, 1970; Report of the Agricultural Organiser for the year ended 31st March, 1970; Report of the Government Veterinary Officer for the year ended 31st March, 1970; Report of the Freshwater Fisheries Inspector for the year ended 31st March, 1970; Report of the Agricultural Wages Board for the year ended 31st March, 1970; Report of the Curator of the Curragh's Wild Life Park for the year ended 31st March, 1970; Report on the Agricultural Returns as at 4th June, 1969; Report on the Manx Herring Fishery for 1969; Report on the Manx Herring Fishery for 1970; Annual Report of the Manx Museum and National Trust for the year ended 31st March, 1971.

Accounts — Accounts for the year ended 31st March, 1970, together with the Report of the Public Auditors of — Isle of Man Airports Board; Isle of Man Assessment Board; Isle of Man Board of Education; Isle of Man Electricity Board; Isle of Man Forestry, Mines and Lands Board; Isle of Man Harbour Board; Isle of Man Health Services Board; Isle of Man Hospital Administration Committee; Isle of Man Highway and Transport Board; Manx Electric Railway Board; Isle of Man Tourist Board; Isle of Man Water Board.

Report of the Public Auditors on Accounts of — Borough of Douglas; Ramsey Town Commissioners; Peel

Town Commissioners; Castletown Town Commissioners; Village Districts of Onchan, Port Erin, Laxey, Michael and Port St. Mary; Parish Districts and Endowments Committees; Marashen Crescent Housing Committee.

Local Government Board's Approval to Petitions — Approval dated 2nd July, 1971, to the following Petition — (1) Petition of the Laxey Village Commissioners for authority (i) to purchase Karrier Bantam Refuse Collecting Vehicle; and (ii) to borrow £3,600 for that purpose; Approval dated 6th August, 1971, to the following Petition — (1) Petition of the Port Erin Village Commissioners for authority to purchase a plot of land from the Isle of Man Electricity Board for the sum of £85 for the purpose of the Edremony Estate; Approval dated 3rd September, 1971, to the following Petitions — (3) Petition of the Douglas Corporation for approval of the sale of Nos. 1, 2 and 3 McNeil's Court, Douglas, to Messrs. J. Horsthuis and P. Irving of 30 Strand Street, Douglas, for the sum of £105, (4) Petition of the Port Erin Village Commissioners for authority to borrow £3,267 to defray the cost of the renewal of the electrical installations in 28 houses owned by the Petitioners in Marashen Crescent, Port Erin; Approval dated 17th September, 1971, to the following Petition — (5) Petition of the Marashen Crescent Housing Committee constituted under the Marashen Crescent Housing Order, 1967, approved by Tynwald on the 12th December, 1967, for authority to borrow £2,200 to defray the cost of the installation of central heating in seven bungalows vested in the Petitioners in Marashen Crescent Housing Scheme, Port Erin; Approval dated 1st October, 1971, to the following Petitions — (6) Petition of the Castletown Town Commissioners for authority to sell the plot of land surrounding the Mediaeval Chapel at present known as The Old Grammar School, Castletown, to the Trustees of

the Manx Museum and National Trust in consideration of the sum of 25 pence. (7) Petition of the Onchan Village Commissioners for authority to borrow £1,200 to defray the cost of the purchase of one Bedford 8-cwt. Van and one Mini-Van for general use.

COMPLETION OF AGENDA

The Governor: Hon. members will be aware that we have a very long agenda and only a limited time to get through it. I shall be grateful if the Keys will let Mr. Speaker know during the lunch interval if they are agreeable to sit until 7 p.m. tonight. I would not like to thwart anybody who has other engagements, but we have to get through a very big agenda.

The Speaker: May I ask a question, Your Excellency?

The Governor: Yes.

The Speaker: In relation to the limited time can you give us an indication of the limitation? Is it, in fact, Tuesday and Wednesday that you propose sitting?

The Governor: It is until midnight tomorrow.

The Speaker: Very well, sir. (Laughter.)

Mr. Bell: Your Excellency, I can assure you that certain members of the Keys that I know have no wish to leave the Chamber and will continue for many years if you so let them. (Laughter.)

NEW GOVERNMENT OFFICES — QUESTION BY THE SPEAKER

The Governor: Questions. Number 1, the hon. Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, I beg to ask: Whereas Tynwald on the 21st

day of October, 1969, approved in principle the development of the site adjoining the Legislative Buildings as new Government Offices and on the 6th July, 1971, agreed to the implementation of a Scheme of development formulated by a sub-committee of Executive Council. And whereas press reports indicate that decisions are being taken to move staff and introduce other measures and policies purporting to be in connection with such Scheme. And whereas no express authority has been vested by this hon. Court in any department of Government or other body of persons to carry out the said Scheme. Will Your Excellency give an assurance that no decisions are taken by any unauthorised department or body of persons with reference to the site development until such time as Tynwald appoints a specific agency to advance the Scheme in accordance with the wishes of Tynwald?

The Governor: I will ask the chairman of the sub-committee of Executive Council, dealing with this matter to reply. Mr. Crowe.

Mr. Crowe: Your Excellency, hon. members will appreciate, as indicated in the first part of this question, that the history of the matter is not in dispute. On the 21st October, 1969, Tynwald did approve in principle the phased development of the present site for new Government offices, and agreed to provide a sum, not exceeding £6,000, to commission a sketch scheme of the projected development. On the 6th July, 1971, Tynwald resolved that the report on the projected development be approved and that the scheme for new building referred to in such report as scheme 4, be implemented at an estimated cost of £799,000 and that the Treasurer of the Isle of Man is hereby authorised to apply from the Special Development Fund, during the year ending 31st March, 1972, a sum not exceeding £74,000 to enable this scheme

to be commenced. These two resolutions to Tynwald were put forward by a sub-committee of Executive Council and, since no-one raised the matter of who should commission the sketch scheme, it is difficult to understand why anyone should now raise the question of who should translate the wishes of Tynwald into action. Someone had to, and it would appear both logical and proper for the body which has dealt with the matter all along to continue dealing with it. Although not appointed as such by Tynwald, the composition of the committee, two members of the Council and two members of the Keys, suggests that it is, in fact, a joint committee of Tynwald. Moreover, the authority of the sub-committee to act in this matter has been previously acknowledged by Mr. Speaker, who requested an interview with the sub-committee on the 21st July, 1971, for the purpose of discussing his own and the accommodation of the Clerk of Tynwald when the demolition and the re-building of the present Government offices was in operation. This meeting did take place on the agreed date and Mr. Speaker seemed to be very happy with the alternative accommodation offered. This hon. Court and I am sure everyone will agree with me, did approve on the 6th July a resolution to spend £799,000 and surely Tynwald would not have approved that resolution if they did not have complete confidence in the committee which was putting it forward.

The Speaker: May I ask a supplementary, Your Excellency? Will the hon. member who has replied to the question agree that this is yet another indication of authority being taken out of the hands of Tynwald without any approval by that body to carry out major works and that the points he has made which are incidental to the setting-up of about 21 sub-departmental committees for this purpose, are not relative to the question and will he assure the Court

that the sub-committee of Executive Council who are an advisory body at all times, will bring to this Court proposals which will enable the Court to decide who is to be authorised to carry out this particular responsibility?

Mr. Crowe: I could not agree to that, Your Excellency, because if Tynwald did to this sub-committee vote a sum of £799,000 to get on with the job, why should we now wait and ask Tynwald to approve a new committee to be appointed to carry out the work?

Mr. Creer: Your Excellency, may I ask a supplementary? I would like to know if this sub-committee is going to put the full plans in front of us? What we passed that day was just a model on that table. I would like to see before this sub-committee proceeds with the building of the new offices, that we have proper detailed plans put in front of the new House. I believe, Your Excellency, that the new House will cancel this and get our priorities right.

Mr. Bell: I would like the chairman who has replied to the question, will he not give me the assurance that no further expenditure other than that authorised will be incurred either by contract or by deed until we have set up a proper authority designated by Tynwald to spend public money?

Mr. Crowe: Could I answer the last one first, sir? As Tynwald has approved a vote in this present year of £74,000, this is really to get on with the demolition of Government offices. Are we to hold that up and wait for the new Tynwald to approve of what we are going to do?

Members: Yes.

Mr. Crowe: So far as the scheme and the plans are concerned for new Government offices referred to by the hon. member, Mr. Creer, I think this is a reasonable thing to do and I would be in favour of it.

OFFICIAL SECRETS ACT —
QUESTION BY MR. CLUCAS

The Governor: Question number 2. The hon. member for Ayre, Mr. Clucas.

Mr. Clucas: Your Excellency, I beg to ask: (1) On how many occasions have the provisions of section 2 of the Official Secrets Act, 1911, as amended, and/or section 1 (2) of the Official Secrets Acts, 1920, been invoked in respect of secrets pertaining solely to the Isle of Man and which are of no concern to the United Kingdom Government? (2) Referring to my question to Your Excellency last February about the position of members of Tynwald under the Secrets Acts Your Excellency was asked, in a supplementary question put by Mr. Speaker, to prepare and submit to this Court a memorandum on the whole subject of official secrets. Will Your Excellency issue such a memorandum to members in explanation and clarification of their rights and obligations in this important matter?

The Governor: The answer to part (1) is none, so far as can be immediately ascertained, though it has not been possible in the time available to make a completely exhaustive search. The answer to part (2) is yes, in due course. When the hon. member receives the next summary of Executive Council proceedings he will note that the Executive Council has already addressed itself to this problem.

Mr. Clucas: I thank you, Your Excellency.

EVICITION ORDERS — QUESTION
BY MR. CALLISTER

The Governor: Question number 3. The hon. member for North Douglas.

Mr. Callister: Your Excellency, I beg to ask His Honour Deemster Moore: Will Your Honour state how many

eviction orders have been made by the High Court since the Tenants Protection Act, 1963, came into force?

Deemster Moore: Your Excellency, the hon. member in his question has asked particulars in relation to what he calls eviction orders, which are more correctly orders for possession. I want at the outset to say that orders of possession figures which I am about to give include not only those in which the Tenants' Protection Act to which he refers apply, but also includes cases where it was known that the rent was in arrears, cases taken by housing authorities to which the Tenants' Protection Acts do not apply and also business premises cases, which again are under a different Act. The total number of orders for possession granted in the nine years in question is 221. Of that 221, 22 were never issued. Also of the total of 221, 191 were admitted by the tenants. That is an average of just over 24 cases of all types in each year. I think I might usefully add this for the benefit of the hon. member, three-quarters of the cases were in the Douglas area and, of course, I have no knowledge of what happens to the orders for possession once they are issued from the Rolls Office. I do not know what happens with regard to actual enforcement.

Mr. Callister: May I ask a supplementary?

The Governor: If it is within the Standing Orders.

Mr. Callister: I hope I understand the Standing Orders, sir. In view of the important position held by Your Honour, Deputy Governor, First Deemster and a member of this hon. Court, will you do your utmost to alleviate the distressing conditions, resulting from the serious shortage of houses, by pressing this Parliament to build more houses immediately for those people who are unable to provide them for themselves?

The Governor: That, sir, is out of order, because it contains matter not in the original question.

Mr. Callister: I am sorry to differ with you, Your Excellency. (Laughter.)

The Governor: It is almost the last time.

**EFFECT OF WATER ON VEHICLES' BRAKES AT GRETCH VEG, LAXEY
— QUESTION BY THE SPEAKER**

The Governor: Question number 4. The hon. Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Highway and Transport Board: Will your Board institute an investigation into the effect of water on the braking efficiency of vehicles on the main Douglas-Ramsey road when they approach through the ford at Gretch Veg, Laxe, and to this end, will you ask for a report from the Road Safety Officer?

Mr. Kerruish: Your Excellency, it is an accepted fact that if a quantity of water enters the brake drums of a vehicle, the braking efficiency of that vehicle is adversely affected for a time and any prudent motorist after passing through water, should take steps to ensure the efficiency of his brakes. This point is continually being emphasised in road safety publicity and in view of the fact I see no useful purpose would be served by adopting the suggestion made by the hon. Mr. Speaker and my reply to his question is in the negative.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, may I ask a supplementary? Is the hon. member, the chairman of the Highway and Transport Board, so unconcerned about road safety that he is not prepared to permit his road safety officer to investigate a position which could cause a danger to life and limb? I would ask him to study his answer care-

fully in the event of possible future happenings and at the same time I would also ask him if he would ask the road safety officer to carry out an investigation about the legality of the signs at the entry to Shore Road, Laxe, which indeed cause confusion and can possibly result in accidents?

Mr. Kerruish: Your Excellency, to touch upon the last portion of Mr. Speaker's question first, I will certainly investigate the allegations. At the moment I am not in possession of information concerning the signs he refers to, but I can assure him the matter will be investigated by my Board. As far as his first comments are concerned, the road on which this water splash is situated is not a public highway; it is an accommodation road over which an alleged public pedestrian right of way exists and the maintenance and the condition of that road is entirely a matter for those who enjoy its facilities. I might say, sir, that my Board, along with Mr. Speaker, share this concern for the well-being of those who dwell in this constituency and in all parts of the Island and we are continually addressing ourselves to a multitude of matters concerning road safety throughout it.

The Speaker: May I ask a further supplementary, sir? If, in fact, this is a private highway, as the hon. chairman of the Highway Board would contend, how is it that his Board has recently approved access on to this private highway by new dwellers in the area with the full authority of the Highway Board?

Mr. Kerruish: I would require notice of that question, sir, but I am perfectly satisfied that the road concerned is not a public highway; it is an accommodation road and I stress that its maintenance is a concern for those who enjoy its facilities.

SCHEME RE STANDARD GRANTS
FOR BASIC AMENITIES IN HOUSES
— QUESTION BY THE SPEAKER

The Governor: Question number 5.
The hon. Mr. Speaker:

The Speaker: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Isle of Man Local Government Board: On the 20th January, 1971, on my motion Tynwald asked the Isle of Man Local Government Board to formulate and submit to this hon. Court a scheme similar to that operated by local authorities in the United Kingdom which would provide standard grants for the installation for the first time in houses of any or all of the basic amenities set out in the resolution. Will the chairman explain why this scheme which is broadly based on the system operated under the U.K. Housing Act, 1969 (on which advice should be readily available from the Department of the Environment) has not been drawn up and presented to Tynwald? Will the Board expedite the submission of the scheme bearing in mind that many householders still lack the basic amenities which I specified?

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, in my reply to the motion moved by the hon. Mr. Speaker in Tynwald on the 20th January, 1971, I stated that the Local Government Board was in sympathy with his resolution to introduce a system of standard grants for basic improvements to assist householders who are unable to benefit from the existing schemes laid down under the Urban Housing Improvement Act, 1969, and the Rural Housing Acts of 1947 to 1955. In my statement to the hon. Court at that time, I mentioned that it was the Board's intention to introduce, in addition to the amendments referred to in the question, certain other proposals to remove the discriminations, differences and anomalies which had been found to exist in two schemes in order that they should be united

into a single worthwhile and fair scheme, having universal application to all dwellings on the Island. My reply to the hon. Mr. Speaker's motion foreshadowed the introduction of a new Bill to give effect to the proposed changes which I have propounded in some detail and which have been the subject of discussions with the Finance Board in view of the financial implications. The Board is now in broad agreement with the Finance Board to the proposals and work is proceeding on the preparation of the details in order that the amending Bill can be brought before the new House as soon as possible. Although the resolution approved by this hon. Court nine months ago is quite simple in its terms, to ignore the other important and rather complex amendments to which I referred would obviously be incorrect and it is therefore for this reason together with the pressure of other duties on the Board that the new Bill has not yet reached its final form. It has occurred to me that the hon. Mr. Speaker may have been under the misapprehension that the two Acts to which I have referred already provide sufficient statutory enabling powers to permit the Board to introduce the scheme you seek, but this, as I have explained, is not so and a new Bill is therefore required. This procedure, as all hon. members are aware, takes time. I can assure this hon. Court there is no lack of resolve in the Board to introduce the necessary amendment as quickly as possible.

The Speaker: I am indebted to the hon. member for his reply.

SOUTH RAMSEY DEVELOPMENT
SCHEME — QUESTION BY
MR. HISLOP

The Governor: Question number 6.
The answer has been circulated as it is lengthy.

For written answer in terms of Standing Order 31 (3): The hon. member for Ramsey, Mr. Hislop, to ask the chairman of the Isle of Man Local Government Board: Will the hon. member make a statement in the most comprehensive terms possible on the present position of the South Ramsey Development Scheme and the outlook for the future of this area?

Answer:—Your Excellency, looking back to that dull November day in 1963 when Tynwald approved the resolution on the South Ramsey Development Scheme which was moved so eloquently by the hon. Mr. Speaker who referred at that time to its acceptance as meaning the restoration of the lustre of a jewel, a new concept of Government responsibility and a first step towards facing courageously the challenge of the age in which we live, the Local Government Board has negotiated, purchased and demolished 253 properties in this area and the remaining dwelling "Seacroft", is now in the possession of the contractor who is proceeding at once with its demolition. On 18th June, 1968, the Board obtained the approval of Tynwald to sell land in the South Ramsey Development Area, at a nominal sum of 1s. per square yard, to private developers who were prepared to develop the land at their own expense subject to conditions laid down by the Board and in accordance with schemes acceptable to the Ramsey Town Commissioners. Arising from the foregoing resolutions, the Board immediately advertised for development offers for three adjacent sites in the redevelopment area and three firms were selected with whom negotiations proceeded. These were Messrs. Malcolm Milton Partnership, The Isle of Man General Development Company Limited and Messrs. Thomas Croft and Sons Limited. The first-named firm are in possession of the northern end of the area and are proceeding with their approved development which comprises an aparthotel, a shopping centre, two blocks of flats,

car parking areas and ancillary works. Recent assurances have been given by this firm following a meeting with them regarding their financial ability to progress their scheme as quickly as possible and the Board confidently expects that the buildings will be rising on this land within the coming weeks and months. I feel it is appropriate to mention that over £60,000 has already been expended on this site by the developer, much of which cost has been incurred in expensive foundations and other preparatory works. The site at the southern end of the area, formerly occupied by Thomas Croft and Sons Limited, who have now withdrawn, was advertised in the local and national press for development offers in July this year. A total of 22 firms and persons has expressed interest in this land and a short list of four was drawn up jointly by the Board and the Commissioners on Friday last, 15th October, with which firm negotiations are continuing. I am at liberty to say that sketch proposals have been considered for different schemes including various types of flats and also for an hotel complex. Hon. members will appreciate the need to check most carefully the technical and financial credentials of the firms concerned before selecting a developer for this site but again the Board is confident that a worthwhile development will soon commence on this land when the necessary approvals, including planning and byelaw permissions, have been granted. The point should be made that some of the recent delays in dealing with this particular section arise from the fact that the Board has been unable to obtain possession of the whole of the site by reason of several remaining properties which this hon. Court authorised the Board to possess in October, 1970, the last of which we have only just gained vacant possession. I am happy to announce that this last building is now being demolished. Turning to what is known as the centre section in which the Isle of Man General Development

Company Limited had an interest, the Board and the Ramsey Town Commissioners, at the joint meeting held on Friday last, considered a letter received the previous day from this firm stating that they no longer wished to continue their negotiations for this land. This now leaves the way open to consider alternative uses for this site which will be actively pursued by the Board in collaboration with the Commissioners. To complete the picture, it should not be overlooked that the new swimming pool, which is within the development area and which has proved to be such an attraction and an asset to Ramsey, was completed some time ago at a cost of £153,000 and the first phase of the roadworks costing £25,000 which surround this site and run along the northern extremity of the area, is the subject of an item for approval on the agenda before hon. members at this sitting. It is also understood that the vicar and churchwardens of St. Paul's Church are proceeding with their development proposals for the land adjoining the Church which the Board is in the process of conveying to them. Your Excellency, I have endeavoured to bring up to date, without recrimination, the position now obtaining in respect of the South Ramsey Development Scheme and to convey to hon. members on behalf of the Board and the Ramsey Town Commissioners the prevailing sense of optimism and progress which is now being engendered in this area.

Mr. Hislop: May I, Your Excellency, express my thanks to the chairman of the Local Government Board for his comprehensive reply.

HOUSING ADVANCES SCHEME — QUESTION BY MR. CALLISTER

The Governor: Question number 7. The hon. member for North Douglas.

Mr. Callister: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Finance Board: (1) What is the total amount advanced under the Housing Advances Scheme since its inception? (2) How many advances have been made under this Scheme? (3) How many new houses have been built under this Scheme? (4) What are respectively the highest and lowest amounts that have been advanced to an individual person?

Mr. Bolton: Your Excellency, the answers to the questions asked by the hon. member are as follows. Up to the 30th September last, the total amount advanced was £4,084,407. Advances have been made to 1,463 applicants; 316 new houses have been built under this scheme and the highest advance made was £7,000, which is the maximum permitted under the scheme and the lowest amount advanced is £150.

Mr. Callister: I thank the hon. member for his reply.

DETAILS RE PROPERTY ASSESSMENTS — QUESTION BY SIR HENRY SUGDEN

The Governor: The hon. and gallant member for Ramsey.

Sir Henry Sugden: I beg to ask the chairman of the Assessment Board: Will the chairman instruct his officials to provide those who ask for them with floor areas and other details concerning the assessment of surrounding properties in the area without disclosing the name or address of the owners and properties?

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: I regret, Your Excellency, that I am not able to say yes in answer to the question. In giving this answer I am influenced by many factors and an important one of which is the fact that measurements and other details are the work of qualified valuers, who are not officials of the Board. Whilst the forms may be

held in the Board's Office, the clerical staff could not be called upon to interpret them. They are not qualified to do so. In any event, by the 1953 Act, the valuers are not required to submit to the Board full details used by them in arriving at the gross value. Valuation lists of all properties are available for inspection at the Board's offices and at the office of the particular local authority concerned.

Sir Henry Sugden: I thank the hon. member for his reply.

Mr. Bell: May I ask a supplementary, in the light of the chairman's answer? Would he like to re-state the fact that he did say, that only qualified valuers were employed in the measuring of properties during this assessment?

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: The answer is yes, Your Excellency. They were assisted by other people, not qualified, in measuring.

The Speaker: Could I ask a supplementary? Could I ask the chairman if he will instruct his officials in future to indicate to anyone who enquires that they are not responsible for the actions of both Government and Local Authorities taking advantage of re-valuation decisions? (Hear, hear.)

DRAFTING OF NEW RATING AND VALUATION BILL — QUESTION BY MR. SIMCOCKS

The Governor: Question number 9. The hon. member for Rushen, Mr. Simcocks.

Mr. Simcocks: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Assessment Board: Following your recent announcement at a public meeting in Port Erin that Her Majesty's Attorney-General had been instructed by your Board to draft a new Rating and Valuation Bill, will you please inform the Court — (1)

if the Bill will contain a provision under which the Government contribution in lieu of rates on agricultural hereditaments will be related to current valuations and not the valuation of the 12th day of May, 1948; and (2) if the Bill will repeal the present requirement of a lump sum payment into Court by a ratepayer to cover the legal costs of your Board where such ratepayer wishes to appeal to the High Court against a decision of your Board?

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: The answer to the first part of the question, Your Excellency, is yes. The answer to the second part — this question, as worded, is not fully consistent with the facts, but I am happy to endeavour to answer it. Section 42 of the Rating and Valuation Act, 1953, states and I quote "Where a person appeals to the High Court he shall immediately after giving notice of the appeal enter into a recognisance with two sufficient sureties, or give such other security by deposit of money or otherwise, as a judge of such court may direct, and such recognisance or security shall be conditioned effectually to prosecute the appeal and to abide by the judgment of the Court thereon and to pay such costs as may be awarded by the Court." This provision is discretionary. It allows a judge of the High Court to determine whether a person should enter into a recognisance, give security by a deposit of money or otherwise and such recognisance or security shall be completion — not simply to pay the Board's costs, but in the order as expressed in the Act to prosecute the appeal, to abide by the judgment of the Court and to pay such costs as may be awarded.

Mr. Simcocks: Your Excellency, is it the intention of the Board in their new Bill that the section quoted by the hon. member shall be repealed?

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: In the present consideration of the Board, no.

FELLING OF MATURE TREES
— QUESTION BY MR. CLUCAS

The Governor: Question number 10.
The hon. member for Ayre, Mr. Clucas.

Mr. Clucas: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Forestry, Mines and Lands Board: With regard to the felling of mature trees in the Island, for which the prior sanction of your Board is required—(1) Would you kindly state, in respect of each of the five calendar years 1966 to 1970 inclusive—(a) the number of such trees felled without your Board's approval; and (b) the number of cases mentioned at (a) in which your Board has instituted legal proceedings? (2) Is your Board satisfied with the powers conferred under existing legislation? If not satisfied, what steps are being taken to remedy the situation?

Mr. Spittall: Your Excellency, the answer to the first part of the hon. members's question is that in these five calendar years the only such cases my Board are aware of all occurred in 1968, when a total of 11 mature trees were felled by three people. In none of these cases were legal proceedings instituted; warning letters being sent to each of the persons concerned. I would not say, of course, that other trees were not felled, but we obviously cannot police every tree in the Isle of Man. In answer to part (2) my Board are not satisfied with the provisions of the existing Act which we do not think gives us sufficient power and an amending Act or a new Act is, in fact, in final draft form and I hope that it will become law within the next year or so.

Mr. Clucas: Your Excellency, I am indebted to the hon. chairman for his reply.

LICENCES RE MINING IN THE
AYRES — QUESTION BY
MR. CLUCAS

The Governor: Question number 11.
The hon. member for Ayre, Mr. Clucas.

Mr. Clucas: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Forestry, Mines and Lands Board: In view of the general public concern aroused by a press announcement that the Rio-Tinto Zinc Corporation Ltd. have an option to purchase 200 acres of land in the Ayres and the absence of any reaction by your Board, will you give an assurance that no licence will be issued by your Board for such a project before members of Tynwald have been made fully aware of the Company's proposals and all the attendant circumstances?

Mr. Spittall: Your Excellency, in answer to the hon. member's question my Board, which is the responsible body in whom the mineral rights of the Island are, with certain exceptions, vested have no knowledge of the intentions of this company concerning land at the Ayres. We have had absolutely no communications from them at all. The public concern, if such exists, being all that we know about it, has been in the papers. I would not give any assurance such as is sought by the hon. member because the statutory duty granting prospecting mining or licences does rest with my Board and not necessarily with this Court. However, I would assure the hon. member that the Board is very well aware of the scenic beauty of the Island and would be very careful indeed as to any form of licence they were giving concerning mineral rights.

Mr. Clucas: Your Excellency, may I ask a supplementary? May I ask the hon. chairman whether he will pay especial regard when an application is received, if one is received, to the question of sub-leasing? Rio-Tinto is

no doubt a reputable organisation but I would urge his Board to pay particular regard to the possibility of them sub-letting the concession.

Mr. Spittall: We will certainly give him that assurance.

Sir Henry Sugden: May I ask a supplementary? Can the hon. chairman say what has happened to the American oil company? (Laughter.)

The Governor: That is out of order as it contains matter not in the original question.

SURVEY OF HARBOURS — QUESTION BY MR. VEREKER

The Governor: Question number 12. The hon. member for Castletown.

Mr. Vereker: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Harbour Board: (1) Will the hon. member refer to his statement to Tynwald on the 19th January, 1971, and inform this hon. Court what progress has been made by the National Ports Council in carrying out a survey of the harbours of the Isle of Man? (2) In view of the urgency in resolving the position of the Island's harbours in general and the problems of Castletown and Ramsey in particular, will your Board press for an early delivery of the Report and give an assurance that it will be laid before Tynwald without delay?

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency, I am pleased to inform the hon. member that the National Ports Council, despite the problems they have got to deal with in many of the ports in the United Kingdom, are progressing very satisfactorily with the survey of the Manx ports. I think the hon. member, being a member of the Economic Survey sub-committee, will realise that economics play a very large part in so far reaching a study of these conditions and in order to avoid unnecessary cost and

duplication of effort, the National Ports Council did decide to await the publication of the Economic Survey Report. They were given a copy of this, under confidential cover, on the 13th August of this year — this is not very long ago. However, the detailed survey is going on very well indeed and the member will get this and Tynwald will get it as soon as it is completed. I am sorry we could not have it completed, Your Excellency, in time for the General Election.

FLAGS — QUESTION BY MR. ANDERSON

The Governor: Question number 13. The hon. member for Glenfaba.

Mr. Anderson: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Government Property Trustees: (1) Under what authority have blue flags bearing the emblem of a sailing ship been ordered, supplied and flown from flagpoles on the processional way to Tynwald Hill and outside these Legislative Buildings? (2) Will the hon. member note that the representation of the ship on the flag does not coincide with the heraldic device of the Viking ship, the proper form of which is reproduced in the top left hand window of this Chamber and on the coat of arms of the Borough of Douglas? (3) Bearing in mind the opinion of the general public (particularly voiced by my constituents) that the intrusion of these flags detracts aesthetically from the appearance of Tynwald Hill and the traditions associated with it, will the Government Property Trustees desist from using this type of flag which has, like the mule, neither pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity?

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency, in answer to question (1) the Tynwald Arrangements Committee, in answer to question (2), as a Manxman I do not

think I need any advice or information from an Irishman, north or south of the border, as to the various devices used by the Kings of Man during the period they ruled, not only Man but also ran the Irish ports. In case the hon. member gets his facts mixed up on Manx history as he did over certain rating systems. I can assure him that the Tynwald Arrangements Committee did do their homework very carefully and the device he referred to as a Viking ship, which members can see on the stained glass windows behind me, is in fact not a Viking ship at all, it is a lymphad galley. It was first known in the Isle of Man after a vassal king Edgar of England, rowed an English king on the River Dee in 931. It has nothing to do with Godred Crovan, but King Orry who formed the constitution of which Tynwald is the heir and thus the Tynwald Arrangements Committee having the wish to perpetuate a badge, which is the badge of a vassal king, decided to select from a very renowned authority a correct ship of the Manx kings and that ship—I had better quote this, in case he gets this wrong—"Finally, in reference to the ship or galley there can be no doubt that the specimens of the seals of those Kings of Man which have been called the race of Godred Crovan have been preserved and seen. In fact there was a seal of Godred in the office of the Duchy of Lancaster. This is a ship in ruff sails." Your Excellency, ruff sails means a ship in full sail and for this reason the Tynwald Committee did select a correct ship. Your Excellency, I would also like to mention that I only hope that the hon. member when he sits in the Executive Council will look—

The Governor: I am sorry, we cannot hear. There is another debate going on down there.

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency, I would also like to say that I hope the hon. member for Glenfaba next time,

if he sits in Executive Council, and looks to the eastward, he will see in the stained glass window in that Council the correct ship. I also feel that the Manx public in his constituency, I hope, will, as he suggests, think of all things Manx, persons and things, at the forthcoming election. (Laughter.)

Mr. Anderson: Your Excellency, may I ask a supplementary? Would the hon. chairman of the Government Property Trustees give this Court an indication of what money was spent in buying these extra flags to replace the three legs of Man?

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency, no extra money at all was spent. It was merely replacement money used for buying Union Jacks which by order of this Court, I believe, and by Government Office, were replaced.

Mr. Corkhill: Your Excellency, I would just like to ask one question. It is with regard to the Union Jack. Has the Union Jack gone for good on Government buildings and if so, who ordered it?

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency, I am not responsible for which flags should fly in the Isle of Man. This is an order issued by Government Office that apart from certain occasions the Manx flag should be flown over Government buildings and not the Union Jack.

Mr. Corkhill: Thank you.

TENDERS RE PREMISES AT AIRPORT—QUESTION BY MR. EDMONDS

The Governor: Question number 14. The hon. member for Middle, Mr. Edmonds.

Mr. Edmonds: Your Excellency, I beg to ask the chairman of the Airports Board: (1) Has it been hitherto the policy of the Isle of Man Airports

Board to invite tenders for the occupation of office and business premises in the Airport Building? (2) Should the answer to the first question be in the affirmative, will the hon. chairman of the Airports Board please say if the policy referred to has been changed, if so when and why was it changed? (3) If the policy has been changed, will the hon. chairman tell us if existing tenants of premises which were previously the subject of tender have been notified of the change of policy? (4) If the policy of inviting tenders still exists, will the hon. chairman please explain why the new office and business premises which have been constructed as a result of the recent alterations have not been offered for public tender?

Mr. Vereker: Your Excellency, the answers to the questions are as follows. Firstly, it has been and still is policy of the Airports Board, where appropriate, to invite tenders for office and business premises at Ronaldsway. I might add, Your Excellency, accommodation leased by the airlines, etc., is not put out to tender, but is let in accordance within an established scale of charges. In reply to the second part of the question, the policy has not been changed. No. (3), in view of the reply to part (2) this is not applicable. Part (4) in order to adequately answer part (4) it is necessary to give some background information. It has for some considerable time been the policy of the Airports Board to allow two car hire firms to operate in premises at Ronaldsway. In February, 1970, tenders were invited for the two offices concerned. The hon. member asking the question will be aware of this fact as a tender was received from the firm of which he is the managing director. But one office was more advantageously sited than the other in that it was inside the terminal building and almost all incoming passengers were required to pass in front of it. Access to the other office was from the roadway in

front of the terminal building. The building of the extension connecting the terminal building to the control tower has altered all this, in that the space of the terminal buildings occupied by Customs has now been vacated and has been converted into a baggage collection room. Obviously it is in this area that car hire firms would wish to have their offices. As the changes were the result of actions taken by them, the Airports Board were of the opinion that it would not be right for them to penalise the firm who had previously occupied the most advantageous office. The fact that the site was more advantageous was reflected in a higher rental. They therefore offered this firm the opportunity of transferring to a new office in the baggage collection room for the remaining portion of their existing lease. Hon. members who have visited the Airport recently will have seen that both car hire firms have now offices with direct access to the baggage collection room. In conclusion, Your Excellency, I can confirm that the Airports Board proposes in all appropriate instances to continue the policy of inviting tenders for office and business premises under their control, bearing in mind, that the proper facilities for the use of terminal passengers arriving at the Airport should be provided and sited in the right place.

Mr. Edmonds: Your Excellency, if I may I would like to ask a supplementary question arising from the hon. and gallant member's answer to the first part of the original question. The answer contained the phrase "where appropriate". The answer was given that it is still the policy of the Isle of Man Airports Board to invite tenders where appropriate and I should be obliged if the hon. and gallant member would expand this phrase "where appropriate".

Mr. Vereker: Your Excellency, the hon. member is suggesting I did that in my answer by adding "where

appropriate" means where you are leasing offices to such people as the A.C.S. and other firms such as the hon. member's and it meant that there would be other offices, as I explained, which were let out to airlines and at a rental purely within an established scale of charges based on the floor area.

Mr. Edmonds: I thank him for the answer, Your Excellency.

LOAN RE RECONSTRUCTION OF PRINCES LANDING STAGE, LIVERPOOL — APPROVED

The Governor: Item number 6. The chairman of Executive Council.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, I beg to move:—

WHEREAS the Princes Landing Stage, Liverpool, is in need of reconstruction.

AND WHEREAS Government has been in negotiation with the Mersey Docks and Harbour Company (hereinafter called "the Mersey Company") and the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company Limited (hereinafter called the "Steam Packet Company") about the reconstruction thereof and matters incidental thereto.

NOW THEREFORE Tynwald —

(1) Approves of the Treasurer of the Isle of Man on behalf of Government entering into an agreement with the Mersey Company and the Steam Packet Company containing the provisions set out in the Schedule hereto and such further and better provisions as may be necessary to give effect thereto;

(2) Upon completion and recordal of such Agreement, authorises the Treasurer of the Isle of Man to expend from Capital Transactions Account during the year ending 31st March 1972 a sum not exceeding £100,000 to discharge the liability of the Treasurer under such Agreement during such year; and

(3) Approves of and sanctions borrowings not exceeding £800,000 being made by the Government under the provisions of the Isle of Man Loans Act 1971, such borrowings to be repaid within the period of fifteen years.

SCHEDULE

The Agreement to be entered into between the Treasurer, the Mersey Company and the Steam Packet Company shall provide—

1. For the Treasurer to undertake to pay to the Mersey Company the capital cost of reconstructing 880 ft. of the Princes Landing Stage estimated at the sum of £800,000.

2. For the Mersey Company to undertake—

(a) To maintain, operate and make available the reconstructed stage for the use of the Steam Packet Company and other shipping interest for a period of not less than 15 years;

(b) Not to include in any user charge to the Steam Packet Company any element of finance charges referable to the cost of the reconstructed stage.

3. For the Steam Packet Company to undertake—

(a) To use the reconstructed stage for a period of not less than 15 years;

(b) To pay half-yearly to the Treasurer of the Isle of Man interest on and repayment of the sum expended by the Treasurer under paragraph 1 hereof calculated as follows—

(i) The rate of interest shall be £5 per centum per annum; and

(ii) Capital repayment shall be based on a 15 year period.

(c) To pay the Mersey Company such user charges for the use of the constructed stage as may be fixed by the Mersey Company having regard to paragraph 2(b) hereof.

In November, 1970, the Liaison Committee of Executive Council were informed that the then Mersey Docks and Harbour Board had technical advice that the Princes Landing Stage at Liverpool had reached the end of its useful life and was becoming unsafe and unless re-built would be unavailable for use after the 31st December, 1971. For the interest of members the first portion of the great landing stage, known as the George's Landing Stage, was constructed in 1847. This was 500ft. long. In 1857 the Princes Landing Stage, 1,000ft. long, was built, 500ft. to the north of the George's Stage. In 1874 the intervening space was filled up and the George's Stage, re-constructed, but this was destroyed by fire and had to be re-constructed a second time. In 1896 it was extended further north and its length is now 2,534ft. and its breadth 80ft. It was supported on floating iron pontoons, approximately 200 of them, connected to the river wall by 10 bridges, besides a floating bridge for heavy traffic 550ft. in length and 35ft. in width. The present users are the

Isle of Man steamers, the Liverpool ferries and a decreasing number of cruise liners. The problem facing the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company Limited, therefore, was how the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board would continue to make facilities available at Liverpool. As it is vital to the tourist industry that the port of Liverpool should continue to be available for Isle of Man steamers, the Company invited Government to join in the discussions with interested parties to consider how the problem could be met. Accordingly a meeting between the interested parties was held in January, 1971, to discuss the future arrangements. The Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, I shall refer to hereafter as the Harbour Board, had done an exercise on renovating a length of 1,200ft. at a minimum cost, by using existing materials as much as possible to give a useful life-time of 10 years. 800ft. of this was to provide two berths for the Isle of Man steamers and this length was agreeable to the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company Limited. The capital cost of 800ft. was estimated to be approximately £792,000. A complete reconstruction for a much longer life, say 40 years, would result in a capital cost of at least £1,016,00 for 800ft. of the stage. I say, at least, because in any scheme there is an element of fixed capital cost regardless of the ultimate size of the stage. If other port users whose trade life is less than that of the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company could be involved, then the effect of this to individual users could be minimised. A high capital cost project such as this might price out others and result in a disproportionate part of the fixed capital cost being borne by the Isle of Man trade. Regardless of the costing of the two alternatives, the Harbour Board stated that it would have difficulty in obtaining the necessary capital. It could only borrow from the Ministry and the United Kingdom Government had already refused a bridging loan to

help them over present difficulties, making it clear that the Board should stand on its own feet and pay its own way. It was suggested that the Isle of Man Government might find it easier to provide the capital; should they do so, the asset would be constructed to the Island's requirements. It was appreciated that the re-construction would be carried out over a period of about two years and if landing facilities were to continue to be made available without interruption after 1971 it was important that the work should commence as soon as possible. Following that meeting a press release was given at that time ensuring normal operations for the 1971 season and negotiations commenced between the parties. The Isle of Man Steam Packet Company informed the committee that they were unable to contribute towards this stage as their borrowings, both now, and for the next eight or ten years, were fully extended having regard to the financing of the new car ferry. They also confirmed the preference for the life of the stage to be 25 years but in deference to the engineers' views were prepared to accept a life of 15 years and, in this respect, would be prepared to give the Harbour Board a guarantee of tenure for that period. They appreciate that the guarantee would have to be in financial as well as period terms to allow the full amortisation of the asset. The Harbour Board were prepared to accept a life of 15 years for the stage, allowing for increased maintenance costs but the same capital cost. The provision of the capital, therefore, was put squarely on the Government's shoulders. It is vital to the Island's economy that suitable landing and embarkation facilities to cope with the large summer tourist traffic should continue to be available. Other possible ports along the west coasts of England and Wales have been looked at and it is considered that Merseyside is the only practical one for this purpose and apparently the Princes Landing Stage is the only practical stage at Mersey-

side. We, as a committee, felt therefore that the Manx Government should take steps to provide the money and the interim period has been spent in a series of discussions with representatives of the Harbour Board, the Steam Packet Company, and officers from both the Home Office and the Department of Environment, Ports Division, largely about the security to be offered in return for the provision of capital. The original intention was that the Manx Government would provide the capital, the Harbour Board would repay the loan and the Steam Packet Company would guarantee the Board a minimum annual income. Naturally the committee were concerned with the security arrangements for this loan. We could not agree to it being just one of the Harbour Board's liabilities ranking equally with all its other liabilities. This issue was discussed with officers of the United Kingdom Government who itself is investing money in the new Seaforth terminal and they stated that the Manx Government could not expect better security than the United Kingdom Government itself was receiving and its loans ranked *pari passu* with others. Finally, however, the Harbour Board stated it would be prepared to consider an arrangement whereby the Steam Packet Company would assume responsibility for the money lent by the Government to the Board or its successors for reconstruction of that part of the stage to be used by the company's vessels and the payment of the interest thereon to be paid direct to the Manx Government. This new suggestion avoids the financial difficulties which could arise on the original proposal in the event of the Receiver being appointed for the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board at a future date. In return Government will forego the floating charge on the Harbour Board's assets and will look only to a successful Steam Packet Company for the repayment of the loan. It is not envisaged that the

Government will have a charge on the Steam Packet Company's assets. Looking into the future over the next 15 years it is very difficult to believe that any Manx Government could afford to allow the Steam Packet Company to collapse for financial reasons because of the considerable benefit of the company to the Manx economy. Therefore, the new suggested arrangement for the repayment of the Government loan appears to be much more satisfactory than the original proposal. In essence the proposal is simple and appears to meet the needs of all parties. As regards the terms of the loan the representatives of the Steam Packet Company have urged that as low a rate of interest as possible be charged on the loan pointing out that as the company will be reimbursing Government this interest charge would have to be recouped from passengers and this would have a direct effect on steamer fares to the Island. Naturally this reasoning is accepted and accordingly a rate of five per cent has been proposed. Even at this rate of interest the annual charges to the Steam Packet Company are expected to rise by about £30,000 per annum and obviously further increases could seriously affect tourist arrivals. If we are to keep our lifeline to the Island open, these proposals require the immediate consideration of this hon. Court. I therefore beg to move the resolution standing in my name.

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

The Governor: Is that agreed?

It was agreed.

ISSUE OF MANX DECIMAL COINS — APPROVED

The Governor: Item number 7. The chairman of the Finance Board.

Mr. Bolton: Your Excellency. I beg to move:

In accordance with Section 1 of the Manx Decimal Coins, Act 1970, Tynwald hereby

approves the issue by the Treasurer of Manx Decimal Coins to a total denominational value not exceeding £150,000. The denomination of such coins are to be fifty pence, ten new pence and five new pence in cupro-nickel, and two new pence, new penny and new half penny in bronze.

The Manx Decimal Coins Act of 1970 gave His Excellency authority, with the approval of Tynwald, to authorise the Treasurer to issue decimal coins of such denominations and denominational value as may be authorised. This resolution provides for the issue of six coins in the same denominations as have been issued in the United Kingdom and also provides for coins of a total value not exceeding £150,000 to be issued. If this resolution is passed His Excellency will then place before the Court the orders prescribing details of the coins. The resolution for the approval of the orders appears on supplementary agenda number 2. I think that the coins proposed have already been circulated and hon. members will have seen them. I beg to move the resolution, sir.

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

Sir Henry Sugden: Your Excellency, could I just ask one question about the coins, I see that there is among them a 10s. piece. May I take it, sir, that we will continue to print our 10s. note?

Mr. Bolton: That is so, Yes.

Mr. Burke: Your Excellency, we can be assured I presume that all these coins will be legal tender in the United Kingdom because I was reading that the banknotes of Scotland are not legal tender in England, which raises the point will ours?

Mr. Bolton: First of all may I say we never intended to discontinue the issue of the 50 penny notes. The notes will continue and we have found they are extremely convenient. With regard to the question of legal tender, no notes issued in the Isle of Man are legal tender in the United Kingdom. They may be circulated and certain people

may be prepared to accept them but they are certainly not legal tender and these coins will be legal tender within the Isle of Man but not outside the Isle of Man.

The Governor: Is that agreed?

It was agreed.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS TO TAKE SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA — APPROVED

The Governor: Now supplementary agenda, it should have number 2. It is the one that has been circulated this morning. Item 1, the chairman of the Finance Board.

Mr. Bolton: Your Excellency, I beg to move:—

That permission be granted under Standing Order 27(6) for the following business to be considered.

I think, sir, that I should refer to the circular letter which has been issued to all hon. members and I think they are aware of the reason for this resolution appearing on the supplementary agenda. I beg to move.

The Governor: Is that agreed?

It was agreed.

PAPERS LAID BEFORE THE COURT

The Governor: Item 2. I call upon the Clerk to lay papers.

The Clerk: I lay before the Court:—

Manx Decimal Coins Act, 1970—
Manx Decimal Coins (Miscellaneous
Coins Designs) Order, 1971; Manx
Decimal Coins (Fifty New Pence Coin
Design, Etc.) Order, 1971.

**MANX DECIMAL COINS
(MISCELLANEOUS COINS DESIGN)
ORDER AND MANX DECIMAL
COINS (FIFTY NEW PENCE COIN
DESIGN, ETC.) ORDER
— APPROVED.**

The Governor: Item number 3. The chairman of the Finance Board.

Mr. Bolton: Your Excellency, I beg to move:—

(1) That, in accordance with Standing Order 162(3) the provisions of Standing Order 162(1) be waived to enable the following resolution to be considered.

(2) That the Manx Decimal Coins (Miscellaneous Coins Designs) Order 1971 and the Manx Decimal Coins (Fifty New Pence Coin Design Etc.) Order 1971 made by His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor under the provisions of the Manx Decimal Coins Act 1970 be and the same are hereby approved.

Your Excellency, Tynwald has just approved that decimal coins may be issued and the two orders for which I am now seeking approval are made under section 2 of the Manx Decimal Coins Act, 1970. The reason for the two orders is that, in the case of the half-penny, one penny, two-penny, five-penny and ten penny coins, details of the size, weight and remedy were included in the 1970 Act, but no such information was laid down in the Act for the 50 new pence coin. Consequently the order dealing with this coin must provide for the size, weight, etc., of the coin in addition to the designs. If these orders are approved the coins can be issued. It is proposed to issue the coins tomorrow and as hon. members have already been advised 10,000 coins of each of the six values will be issued through the local banks, whilst sets of coins in a wallet with a card describing the designs will be available from Finance department. A special office will be opened in the Finance department to handle the sale of these coins. In addition to the ordinary coins a set of proof coins in a presentation case will be available at a cost of £7.50 and these too will be available from Finance department office. I would emphasise

that the coins to be sold through Finance department will be in sets of six coins and no individual coins will be available from Finance department office, although individual coins will be available in the banks. The coins issued through the banks will be loose and subject to availability as numbers are restricted—customers may obtain individual coins if they desire. If there is any further information that hon. members wish on this matter I will endeavour to give it, but I now beg to move resolution number 3 on the supplementary agenda.

The Speaker: I beg to second, Your Excellency. I welcome this resolution. It implements the report presented to Tynwald on Manx coinage adopted by the Court and I congratulate the Finance Board on the manner in which they have set about this proposal. I would like, however, to ask just one question—would the hon. chairman give us an indication of the likely profitability of this first issue.

Mr. Callister: Your Excellency, may I suggest that the Treasurer follows the example in the case of the acceptance by the British banks of our currency notes and I suggested that we appeal to the British Bankers' Association to see if they would allow their office to accept the Manx notes and they agreed. Is there a possibility of them doing the same over the coins?

Mr. Irving: Your Excellency, I am sure the members of the Finance Board will appreciate the congratulations received from Mr. Speaker, but I think it is fair to point out today, sir, that we would not have this magnificent selection of coins if it were not for the personal efforts of Mr. Speaker himself in this Court many months ago.

Mr. Nivison: Your Excellency, I would like to congratulate the Court on the expeditious way in which this matter has been introduced. Standing Orders have been thrown overboard and I would hope that other matters of

great urgency that do arise from time to time should get similar treatment. We are often told you cannot do this, you cannot do that and you cannot do the other because of the protection of Standing Orders. I would also like to add, Your Excellency, we understand the reason for this because of the profitability of the coins and that certain information has to be kept back but as a general rule we would hope that our Standing Orders should not be flouted around in this way and if we make Standing Orders we should keep them. Now, having said that I would like to say also that we understand that the coins that are being sold and "sold" is the correct word in Finance division will be sold at a profit. Are we to understand that the banks, too, will be selling the coins at a profit?

Mr. Bolton: No.

Mr. Irving: They are currency.

Mr. Nivison: We are not? How then is it suggested that an enormous profit will be made on the coins involved because we are to understand that some of the coins actually cost as much as the face value of the coin, in fact more. Apart from the fact that we are putting into the Isle of Man currency coins which have no backing. Where does the profit come from?

Mr. Bolton: £7.50. Your Excellency, I would like to thank Mr. Speaker and other members of the Court who have expressed their appreciation of the activities of the Finance Board in this matter and it is indeed refreshing to hear the hon. member of the Council, Mr. Nivison, suggesting that Standing Orders might be waived more often.

Mr. Nivison: Yes, in the case of more necessary things.

Mr. Bolton: Oh, I see. Well, I would like if I could, sir, I know that I am quite out of order but it would be interesting to ask the hon. member who is going to decide what are the necessary things?

Mr. Nivison: Not the chairman of the Finance Board, we hope, sir.

Mr. Bolton: It would create some difficulty. Now with regard to the hon. member for North Douglas and the acceptability of these coins in the English banks I think the answer would most certainly be "no". We would be quite prepared at any time to ask them but we have such a limited number in circulation and the fact that there would be considerable difficulty constantly in separating them in small numbers from their own currency, it would be extremely difficult for them, and I doubt very much whether they would be prepared to accept them.

Mr. Callister: The same applies to notes.

Mr. Bolton: I think, sir, that we must remember that wherever you go in England they will not accept an Irish coin. If you go away with Irish coins in your pocket which are readily accepted in the Isle of Man, you will find that no-one in the United Kingdom will accept them. If they will not accept Irish coins with a very much bigger circulation, I feel quite certain they are not likely to accept ours with a very limited circulation.

Mr. Kneale: They would be all right in telephones and toilets?

Mr. Bolton: If they are of the right size, you can put them in the telephones and the toilets—that is an idea the hon. member for West Douglas can give you. Now, Mr. Speaker, did ask for the financial statement. It is very difficult to prophesy — we are satisfied that it will be a very profitable exercise. We anticipate that with the proof sets, if we sell them all, 10,000 of them at £7.50, we should get a total of £75,000. This may well be reduced by certain discounts which are allowed on these matters and by allowances to Messrs. Spinks who will be handling it and the point is this, that we should, perhaps receive something between £65,000 and £70,000 total but there

again this is guess work. Now the total costs, including the cost of the coins, and the wallets and cases and the proportionate cost of making the coins will be about £26,000. It would appear as though we could estimate, very roughly, a profit of £40,000 on the proof sets, perhaps more than that. Now the ordinary set, there will be 10,000 through the banks, there will be 90,000 sets in wallets and it is estimated that the total cost of the ordinary sets may be in the region of £57,000. So we can perhaps look forward to a very considerable profit which we suggest, after paying these freight charges and staff and miscellaneous expenses of something between £80,000 and £90,000 profit on these sets. In the meantime there is a certain contingent liability and the total face value of these coins which will be issued is £75,350.

The Governor: Is that agreed?

It was agreed.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE RE FIRE TENDER FOR AIRPORTS BOARD — APPROVED

The Governor: Item number 8.
Chairman of the Airports Board.

Mr. Vereker: Your Excellency, I beg to move:

That Tynwald authorises the Treasurer of the Isle of Man to apply out of the current revenue of this Isle during the year ending 31st March 1972 a sum not exceeding £4,000 to enable the Isle of Man Airports Board to purchase a fire tender with all necessary equipment at a total cost of £29,000.

Such sum to be additional to the sum of £25,000 voted by Tynwald on 18th May 1971.

(References: Item No. 26 at page 31 of the Estimates of Government Departments and Boards of Tynwald 1971/72 as amended by Government Circular No. 34/71).

Your Excellency, if I may give a brief explanation of why this resolution has been necessary. Unfortunately this is one of the pitfalls of the difference in time when we have to make our estimates and when the Budget is

finally approved. The original estimate made last November for this particular fire tender was in fact £21,000 — the Board made an extra allowance on top of that of £4,000 bringing the total up £25,000 which was passed in this hon. Court during Budget time. In confirming the order to the firm we were then told that for this particular machine, the price had gone up to £31,000, mainly due to chassis costs. Now, obviously the Board had to make some more investigation into this and we did in fact discuss this with that firm and other alternative firms the possibility of bringing down the cost. We finally made the choice of another firm but the cost was only pinned down by a personal discussion and the pinning down of the chassis costs which had gone up considerably — and during the week, in fact, that we were making our discussions, it went up £1,000 then. Owing to the fact that we could not be subject to further rises in costs on a possibility of delivery next March I managed to get the managing director of that particular firm to pin down the cost of a machine to a definite price which would not be altered and this we have been able to do but it is still £4,000 above the original Budget approval. So I would ask this hon. Court to approve the extra £4,000 for this machine. It may seem an awful lot for one fire tender but I am afraid this is a very specialist machine which has to be hand-made to special Board of Trade standards and when one considers the cost possibly over 15 to 20 years perhaps it is not too much. I hope to goodness it will never have to be used but we still have to have it in order to cope, with the higher capacity and speed of the engine, for the more modern aircraft. I beg to move Your Excellency.

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

The Governor: Is that agreed?

It was agreed.

Additional Expenditure Re Fire Tender for Airports Board — Approved.

RECONSTRUCTION OF DALE STREET AND SECTION OF SOUTH RAMSEY PROMENADE — APPROVED

The Governor: Item number 9. The chairman of the Local Government Board.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, I beg to move:

That Tynwald approves the reconstruction of Dale Street, Ramsey, and a section on the Ramsey Promenade adjoining the new Swimming Pool in the second stage of the re-development of South Ramsey, at a cost of £25,000.

(Reference: Item 66 of the Second Schedule to the Resolution of Tynwald of the 18th May 1971 and Item 8(b), page 114, of the Estimates of Government Departments and Boards of Tynwald 1971/72).

As part of the Government's involvement in the South Ramsey development area it was agreed that the phased reconstruction of the South Ramsey Promenade and Dale Street would be carried out for a capital sum of £25,000. It was included in the Local Government Board's approved estimates to undertake the first section of this work. It is proposed to re-align Dale Street between the new swimming pool and the Catholic Church and reconstruct the promenade to the full extent of the frontage of the swimming pool. The road at the rear of the pool adjoining the land owned by the vicar and churchwardens of St. Paul's will also be reconstructed. A new surface water sewer is to be laid in Dale Street and the works include all the usual and ancillary roadworks such as pavements, ramps, safety barriers, road gullies and so forth. The proposals, I should add, have received the approval of the Ramsey Town Commissioners. A reconstructed portion of the promenade and Dale Street will be a full 30ft. width to allow these carriageways to be used as a first-class road. The Board also included in the scheme a small car-parking area on the land immediately to the south of the swimming pool up to the boundary of the adjoining land occupied by the private

developers Messrs. Malcolm Milton Partnership. This part has been included together with other minor works so that the whole of the South Ramsey area at its northern end will be tidied up and fully developed on completion of this road contract. Three tenders were received for this work. Those being from Messrs. Mannin Development and Investment Limited amounting to £25,190 which has been adjusted down to £25,000 being the sum included in the Board's capital estimates and that referred to in the motion before hon. members. The highest tender figure was £33,493. It is proposed to complete the work within 24 weeks. Concurrence of the Finance Board to this scheme has been given and satisfactory financial guarantees obtained from the firm supplying the lowest tender have been checked and found satisfactory. Your Excellency, I beg to move this motion and it represents a further demonstration of the Government's intention to pursue its development proposals for this area of Ramsey.

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

Mr. Edmonds: Your Excellency, I should be obliged if the hon. chairman of the Local Government Board would tell us just how many car parking spaces will be provided in this new development. I do not want it to be inferred in any way at all that I am in opposition to it — I am all for the proposition but I should be obliged if he would give us an indication of what provision will be made for car parking in the area.

Sir Henry Sugden: Your Excellency, may I ask the chairman of the Local Government Board whether or not the Highway Board was asked to tender?

Mr. Faragher: Your Excellency, there seems to be no scarcity of money at all when the north of the Island comes in view. I am just wondering is this just pie in the sky like the last suggestion

of selling all the land down there at a 1s. a yard. Is there any substance in this or is it just a push-over for election time? (Laughter.)

Mr. MacDonald: I agree, Your Excellency, that something has got to be done, but I would like once again to stress, but it appears, all that Mr. Faragher has said, in certain parts of the Island — Government seems to be prepared to go in and spend money developing the roads, developing areas with public money and yet other parts of the Island —

Mr. Hislop: You cannot complain.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not complain, sir.

Mr. Anderson: Good representation.

Mr. MacDonald: They have good representation in Peel that is why there is no need to complain. I do feel that the Local Government Board should seriously consider spending money on an overall Island policy to assist local authorities because we have heard recently of Douglas Corporation not repairing vital roads in the town because the funds are not available and yet here we have another part of the Island where money is no object from the Government.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, while highly critical of the Local Government Board in South Ramsey I am, nevertheless, fully supporting this resolution because this is, in fact, part of a deal, negotiated between Tynwald and the town of Ramsey years ago and referred to by the hon. chairman earlier today in a reply to the hon. member, Mr. Hislop. In return for Ramsey accepting liabilities which no other town were prepared to accept at that time, namely a 4s. rate, Government undertook to do certain things and this, in fact, the improvement of the roadway is part of the Government responsibility. It is a minor part, to my mind, of what Government have still got to face in South Ramsey. Nevertheless it is

Government's responsibility and as Ramsey has accepted its responsibility we must, in all honour, accept ours.

Mr. Clucas: Your Excellency, South Ramsey is indeed a vexed question and I have no intention of putting my oar in—I support this motion but I am rather concerned with one small passage in the hon. chairman's address. This is the 30ft. first-class road which is to be made of the promenade and I just question the wisdom of this when you consider it is a promenade and children will be tripping across that road between a modern swimming pool and the beach. It is not what I would like to see.

The Governor: Would you like to reply?

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, thank you. First of all I would like to thank Mr. Speaker, for his support on this resolution. Some hon. members of this Court have very, very short memories. They all agreed to this resolution that Ramsey be developed in 1963 and this was part of the resolution so we cannot very well back-pedal at this stage and say we are not going to fix the roads when we agreed in Tynwald to do it. Now with reference to the remarks made by Mr. Edmonds regarding the car-parking facilities, I would like him to elaborate on what he means exactly by this area—is he referring to the whole of South Ramsey or is he referring to this specific development at the present moment? It is going to re-surface the car park which is already existing adjacent to the swimming pool and which to the best of my knowledge takes approximately the sum of two dozen or 30 cars. This is not estimated by any means to be the only car park in South Ramsey area — this is all coped with within the other developments of the various sections of the scheme. Now Sir Henry commented, I think, was the Highway Board requested to make a tender. The Highway Board were not asked to

make a tender at the time. It was felt that at that time our Board having consulted on the issue of the Highway Board, at all time, are well aware of the amount of work the Highway Board have got to carry out. Our inspectors are continually in consultation with Mr. Vick—we knew that they would not be interested and we asked other local firms to tender and the firm price we have we think is a very reasonable price for the work to be carried out. Now Mr. Faragher mentioned about all this money being available for the north and was this a bit of electioneering. We do not need to electioneer, in the north—they are all satisfied with the members they have got. (Laughter.)

Mr. MacDonald: They have got all the roads down there.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: And as long as they have got progressive candidates who are looking after their constituents as they are supposed to do we will always continue to look after the interests of the north and the whole Island, I think, as well. Would Mr. MacDonald kindly like to re-cap his question, I did not quite catch what he said?

Mr. MacDonald: I will have a word with you later.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: It could not be very important so I will ignore it. Mr. Clucas, I thank him for his interest in this—naturally being in the north of the Isle of Man we are all interested in what happens in Ramsey. In reference to the promenade in Ramsey we must face the fact that unless the Government are prepared to spend another considerable amount of money in the demolition of one side of Waterloo Road, to widen Waterloo Road, there is only one other means of access into the town and that is down the promenade and at the present time it is physically impossible for coaches and the normal traffic to all use Waterloo Road. So we have got to bear in mind that a lot of traffic in the future

will have to come along the promenade and that is why it has been made 30ft. carriageway. Ramsey, I would say, at the present moment although many comments are made about it and the state it is in, I would, without doubt, say it is one of the most prosperous towns in the Isle of Man.

The Governor: Is that agreed?

It was agreed.

HOUSING SCHEME AT UPPER VALLEY GARDENS, LAXEY — APPROVED

The Governor: Item number 10. The chairman of the Local Government Board.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, I beg to move:—

That Tynwald approves of the erection by the Isle of Man Local Government Board of twenty-eight two-storey dwellings together with ancillary works at the Upper Valley Gardens, Laxey, at a total estimated cost of £118,331.69.

(Reference: Item 76 of the Second Schedule to the Resolution of Tynwald of the 18th May 1971 and Item 18, page 115, of the Estimates of Government Departments and Boards of Tynwald 1971/72).

Hon. members will know that for some time the Local Government Board has been endeavouring to provide additional houses in Laxey to meet pressing needs in that area. The site in the Upper Deads Valley Gardens has now received the approval of the Special Planning Committee, both in principle and in detail and tenders for the houses have been received and considered. The scheme is for a total of 28 dwellings, comprising 16 two-bedroomed flats in two-storey blocks; eight two-bedroomed three-person houses and four three-bedroomed four-person houses. The rents proposed are £3.40, £3.60 and £4.15 respectively. I would like to point out to hon. members at this stage, naturally, there is a rebate scheme operated by the Local Government Board and if anybody finds themselves in a financial position of being unable

to pay the rents they can come forward and ask for a rebate. These houses will all be located in a sheltered south facing situation on Government land in the Upper Deads. The site is conveniently situated in relation to the shops, the buses and the electric trams. The houses will all have electric hot-air central heating in order to conform with the planning conditions required for the elimination of smoke from open fires and particular care has been given to the elevation and siting of the buildings in order that they should not detract from the natural amenities of the area and interfere with the approach to Laxey Wheel. The house types are such as will allow the interchange of families between the Board's other estates in Laxey area in order to deal with cases of under-occupation which now exist. Five tenders were received for this contract varying between £118,322 for completion in 90 weeks and £147,344 for completion in 104 weeks. The lowest tender received was from Messrs. A. M. Grimshaw Limited, building contractors, of Onchan and has been accepted subject to the approval of this hon. Court and work can commence on the site immediately. I would mention that the lowest tender is a very keen price for the work and is accounted for to some extent by the fact that quite a number of the contractor's workmen actually live in Laxey, thereby reducing to a minimum the overhead expenses incurred by non-productive travelling time. The concurrence of the Finance Board for this scheme has been received and I beg to move approval of the motion standing in my name.

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

Mr. Creer: Your Excellency, I am going to support the resolution for I think it is time that the Local Government Board got a reasonable plan for houses out. Eventually in this Island we are going to price ourselves out

completely by erecting types of houses like this. Now we have got 15 dwellings of flats at a total cost—it is going to be £118,000. I was going to put a tender in this job but even if I had got it I would have had something to say about it today. I think it is time that the Local Government Board can get a standard house out for local authorities. It is absolutely ridiculous the way it is.

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency. I would only like to ask the chairman a question I have asked on other occasions and that is, are the local ratepayers paying anything at all towards the cost of these houses? Twenty-eight houses are quite a lot to build in a small area.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, Laxey needs new housing very badly. It has had no new housing since 1952 and as you see others jump the queue and developments take place in areas which are not unknown to the Local Government Board we have been left out on a limb. But, Your Excellency, it may come then as a surprise to hon. members to find that as representative for the area I am opposing this scheme. The point is here is that the demands and need for housing must be balanced with the needs of the Island as a whole and when you take into account the Laxey situation—where Government have been extremely generous over a long period of years—transferring in the first case the Deads, which were a complete eyesore, into a very acceptable gardens proposition leaving the Upper section, which it is now proposed to develop in the care of the Forestry Board to develop it as an amenity—where the Government have, in fact, taken over Laxey Glen Gardens and, in turn have also assumed responsibility for Laxey Wheel and helped with the playing field. Now Government have been kind to Laxey, there is no question about this and in so doing Government have

improved the image of this village and created, as a focal point in the village, the Laxey Wheel which is an industrial monument which is unusual, at least in the British Isles. The proposal this morning to site these houses on the approach to the Wheel, which has some 200,000 visitors a year, conflicts in my mind completely with the Island's desire to retain its image as a tourist resort. This is happening all too frequently. We have before us, for consideration, a plan of development and lots of very nice sounding thoughts are expressed in that plan, lots of flowery proposals but when you get down to brass tacks and find this sort of proposal emanating from the Planning Authorities themselves then you wonder how much of it is lip service and how much reality. This is a dastardly scheme. It is going to put people to live in a pit. Anyone of you who knows Laxey knows very well that they are going down into a hole which has no proper foundations, it is all filled ground, is subject to flooding, that the very cost you are being asked to accept today, the extremely high cost, is due to the planning requirements, the excessive planning requirements which would be associated with housing in no other part of the village and if you think of the people that you are going to house—you take even such tiny items apart from rent, which is the major item, a tiny item such as television. They will not get it down here, one of the essentials of modern living and so, Your Excellency, one could go on but I am not going to labour it, sir, I am in absolute opposition. I am backed in this by the reactions of the people of Garff at a public meeting. It is against their wishes even though it may be the wishes of the Laxey Village Commissioners and the people who, of course, urgently require houses but there are, in my opinion, alternative sites which can be developed and this move is one of several which have taken place recently which tend to destroy

prominent features in the Island, selling points when it comes to the fading image that we have read about of the tourist industry. Consequently, I cannot accept the proposal and will vote against it.

Miss Thornton-Duesbery: Your Excellency, this issue has indeed been a sadly divisive one in that part of Garff Sheading most closely affected. There are those as my hon. colleague has just said, who are most strongly opposed, mainly on aesthetic grounds, to these houses and there are those who feel equally strongly that the houses must be built there. I think it must be said, in all fairness, that many of those who oppose the scheme are themselves outside the Laxey Village area and that the main body of persons within the village are in support of this Upper Valley Gardens Scheme. The reason for this is, as my hon. colleague has said, the really desperate need of young couples and others for houses and the failure, in spite of very many efforts of very many people to find any other suitable area where the housing can be provided as speedily and reasonably. We have also to take the word of our experts that this site is good and sound for building. I most certainly myself have great sympathy with those who are opposing the scheme, I understand their viewpoint, but in the face of the need and backed by the strong support of those who know and understand building who have examined the site in every detail and given their professional advice, I cannot but support wholeheartedly the hon. chairman of the Local Government Board in asking this hon. Court to give its sanction for this work to proceed and to supply the really desperate need in Laxey.

Mr. Bell: Your Excellency, I am almost inclined to support the views of Mr. Speaker. I do feel that not enough information has been given to the Court.

Mr. Bolton: It has been talked about for months. Have you not read the papers?

Mr. Bell: Well, actually, I would like to listen to the person who moves the resolution and take note of what is omitted on more occasions and what he did omit to inform the Court of is what procedure his Board intend to adopt to give effect to the under-occupation, which he has referred to, of the other houses? Now in questions like this I am most interested, especially when one has knowledge that the occupation of the under-occupied houses is probably at a lesser rent than what these new houses propose to charge and that you can lead a horse to water, shall we say, but you cannot make it drink. Now one local authority did attempt to effect under-occupation a few years ago, they were the Braddan Parish Commissioners, and they did it in a manner which is almost tailor-made for the attitude that the Local Government Board have in dealing with local authorities and with minority groups. The Local Government Board during the last five years have earned themselves the infamous reputation of "dictatorial administration". This is their history of association with local authorities and even with individuals on all manners and aspects that come in contact with the Local Government Board. I have real fears that unless it is explained to me fully that the question of under-occupation and moving, shall we say square pegs into round holes, is to be done and effected with the consent and co-operation of the people who are under-occupying the other houses, I would not wish to be a party to endorsing the dictatorial methods used by the Local Government Board. One needs to have explained how the expenses of moving, in order to smooth this rough policy of the Local Government Board, is to be met. Are the people who have carpets and lino and curtains in their houses to

throw all of these away? Are they to throw away their furniture which will not go into your prefabricated chicken boxes that you are talking about? Has there been any consultation with the persons who are scheduled and I use the word "scheduled" to be moved or is this now going to be, having been resolved by Tynwald that the houses will be built and that because of under-occupation known to the Local Government Board that Tynwald supports the moving of these people by direction? I think, Your Excellency, the chairman of the Local Government Board has a lot to answer in these queries before my support to this matter can be given.

Mr. Kneale: Your Excellency, it has been suggested that the chairman of the Local Government Board did not give the full picture. The hon. member for Garff, Miss Thornton-Duesbery referred to the people who were at this meeting and who opposed it as the majority of them, or a lot of them coming from outside the area. Well I think we should fill in some of the details and point out that the Local Government Board for many years have been trying to find a suitable site, to put houses in this area and that they did call in the two hon. members for Garff to help them to find a suitable site, without success.

The Speaker: Oh yes you did.

Mr. Kneale: Without success.

The Speaker: We gave you sites.

Mr. Kneale: You gave us a site and you referred to the difficulties of progress on this site and developing this site. The site that you put forward was one that was virtually impossible to develop without a tremendous lot of expenditure.

The Speaker: Glen Road.

Mr. Kneale: Far, far more than this. the Glen Road I am thinking about. We will not go too deeply into it either.

The Speaker: Glen Road was free.

Mr. Kneale: Glen Road was not free.

The Speaker: It belongs to Laxey Commissioners.

Mr. Kneale: It may have been free there but it was the question of building roads to this, there was no proper access to it, to this site that was being pushed by the hon. Mr. Speaker to the Local Government Board. Now as regards the meeting where the hon. Mr. Speaker says that a vote was taken in opposition to this, I think we should get the newspaper reports and remind us about the reports there where the impression that was given by the people who were voting that this was virtually a "rigged" vote. The people at the back of the hall were saying that they had not heard what resolution had been put and were asking for it to be heard again and they were told by Mr. Speaker that the vote has been taken and you have accepted, that is the end of the meeting. As a result of this they went and collected their own petition and presented a petition supported by long numbers of people.

The Speaker: Get your facts right, that is quite untrue.

Mr. Kneale: Well these are the facts that were reported in the press.

The Speaker: And that is untrue.

Mr. Kneale: The question of the cost of the buildings, if you work out what these buildings are going to cost they are no different to what we are paying for the majority of Local Government houses at the moment.

Mr. Creer: Get away with you!

Mr. Kneale: They are all in the region these days of around the £4,000 mark. This is somewhere around the £4,000 mark as well. I feel that the people who are opposing this are themselves well-housed and the people who are supporting it are the ones who either have not got homes of their own or have some thought to the ones who have not got a home of their own. I hope the Court will support.

Mr. Crellin: Your Excellency, I do not want to labour this. I too grieve for the attitude which has been taken by the hon. Mr. Speaker on this subject, but I feel that the remarks made by the hon. member for South Douglas need an answer. I know they are meant really to waste the time of this Court, that they are not meant to be disruptive they are meant to be destructive. He is well aware that the problem of under-occupancy is dealt with and will continue to be dealt with in the most sympathetic manner possible. Very recently, there have been several moves in the constituency that I represent because of under-occupancy of local authority houses. It is never done and I trust that I am sure will never be done without the whole-hearted consent, approval and co-operation of the tenant who is already under-occupying houses. Nobody ever wants to be dictatorial in the question. There are many people who live in units which are too big for them, who gladly welcome the opportunity to move, in retirement into smaller units. There is ample demand on the list for the houses of this nature, there will be ample opportunity for those people who desire to move from under-occupied houses into them by the normal processes which this Court would approve and I would not like it ever to be thought that the Board would allow or countenance any other method of solving the question of under-occupancy.

Mr. Callister: Your Excellency, I am a critic of the Local Government Board on many things, but I do not criticise them in this particular respect. As a new resident of Garff constituency, I do not know which candidate to support when it comes to the election.

The Speaker: I did not know that you had a vote yet!

Mr. Callister: Don't you make any mistake I have seen to that! (laughter). Perhaps the Speaker has some points, but I think the overwhelm-

ing balance of reason and argument is with Miss Thornton-Duesbery. I question very much whether the building of this site will affect anybody visiting Laxey Wheel. The present site is more or less a dump and it needs something being done about it and I would suggest that a new well-laid out Estate, which I expect this to be, would be an acquisition rather than a detriment to the environments of Laxey, but I am coming down whole heartedly on the side of the overwhelming need of houses for people who cannot afford to provide them for themselves. The Local Government Board is not meeting the ordinary demand never mind what we need for the economic future of the Isle of Man. I am supporting this resolution.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, very briefly, I do not intend to go back into any past history of this development and I will be very brief in my remarks. Suffice to say that since I have become chairman of the Local Government Board it has always been my policy to be progressive and we have tried our utmost to get an area in Laxey in which to build houses. It has been one of the most difficult jobs, I think, that has faced the Local Government Board and without a doubt we have found that the only place we could really site these houses was on the area now suggested. I would just like to make one comment with reference to Mr. Speaker's remarks — I know and appreciate the point he is making, but I fail to see how anybody could really say that the Old People's Home in the Lower Deads at Laxey is a blot on the landscape and I have never heard anybody living in it complaining, up to now, about the situation of it and the Upper Deads is exactly the same in comparison to the Lower Deads and the housing there. I certainly feel, on the layout suggested and also including the point made by Mr. Creer, the cost of them is slightly more than the normal council house. This was done on purpose to try and get them to fit in

with the Laxey area taking into consideration the point, made by the hon. Mr. Speaker, of the people who visited the Wheel and again very briefly to refer to Mr. MacDonald — the residents of Laxey do contribute 12½ per cent. on the deficiency of houses. I do not know, Your Excellency, that there are any other points that have not been covered by my two colleagues on the Board, Mr. Kneale and Mr. Crellin. Mr. Bell's reference as to how we are going to do this and the dictatorial attitude taken by the Local Government Board rather amuses me because I would think that the residents of Douglas, generally speaking, have appreciated what the Local Government Board have done. They find it in the town of Douglas whereas the Douglas Town Council for many years sat on the fence and were not prepared to bring in realistic rents for the houses now appreciate what the Local Government Board have done, actually to the extent that when they went away very recently to visit new developments on the Mainland and to consider the type of house they were going to build they sent an invitation to the chairman of the Local Government Board to go with them and I thank them for it.

The Governor: I shall now put the question. Those in favour please say aye, those against please say no. The ayes have it.

ALTERATIONS TO TOILETS AT
CASTLE RUSHEN — APPROVED
EXPENDITURE AT ST. MARY'S
OLD SCHOOL — DEFERRED.

The Governor: Item number 11. The chairman of the Government Property Trustees.

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency, I beg to move:

That Tynwald—

(a) authorises the Government Property Trustees to carry out alterations and

Alterations to Toilets at Castle Rushen — Approved. — Expenditure at St. Mary's Old School — Deferred.

improvements to the toilets at Castle Rushen for a sum, not exceeding £600.

- (b) authorises expenditure not exceeding £880 in connection with the housing of the Probation Service in St. Mary's Old School.

Item 11(a) — this is actually contained in this year's budget. It is a column 6 item. We did include a sum of £2,000, but since then we have had a very careful look at this expenditure and we have managed to cut the cost down to £600 and still get what is urgently required — decent toilet accommodation at Castle Rushen.

Mr. Bell: How urgent?

Mr. MacDonald: It is very urgently required. With regard to the second item. Your Excellency. I am afraid that this has come as quite a surprise to me to find it on the Agenda. It has because it was not discussed by the Government Property Trustees, we were not aware of this, but I have since discovered this morning that this is a sum of money apparently which has been required by. I think it was Executive Council.

Mr. Bolton: No sir, no.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I do not know where it has come from. I believe, however, that it is a sum of money required very urgently because I believe the Probation Service are in serious difficulties over accommodation and it has been suggested that they move into St. Mary's Old School.

Mr. Bolton: They are in there already.

Mr. MacDonald: Well I do not know who authorised it in that case, but I am asking on behalf of someone for money to carry out these urgently needed modifications to the old school. That is all I can say on this.

The Governor: Is that agreed?

Members: No.

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: In view of the very definite uncertainty of the member proposing this £880, I would move that, that item be withdrawn or take

the vote against them singly and we can vote against it. He has given us no explanation whatsoever. We have a Children's Clinic, I believe, in the same building and we are looking for alternative accommodation, because we have got to move out in view of the developments in the area and we are moving out having just spent several hundred pounds in the last year or two for use Children's Clinic. Now they are proposing £880 for Probation.

Mr. Bolton: No, no.

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: Well, let us withdraw it then. I am just asking, Your Excellency.

Mr. Bolton: I think, sir, that we really ought to understand what this is and I am very much afraid that the chairman of the Government Property Trustees has thrown it out in such a way that everybody is very suspicious about it.

Mr. MacDonald: We have never been told.

Mr. Bolton: No, well maybe you have not.

Mr. MacDonald: This is what happens.

Mr. Bolton: I know but then it is a very fine way of proposing a resolution to say "I have not been told what it is about, throw it out boys." Let us be realistic about this thing and enquire as to what it is rather than get everybody's hackles up about it. As far as I understand and I have nothing whatever to do with authorising this, that the money has already been spent.

Mr. MacDonald: Who by?

Mr. MacLeod: Who spent it?

Mr. Bolton: Well I do not know whose authority.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know either.

Mr. Bolton: I am trying to tell the Court that the money has been spent on making this accommodation available and it is necessary for Tynwald Court

to vote the money before the whole thing can be paid. This is to regularise a position, as far as I can understand it. It came to the Finance Board, we had got no alternative whatever but to say this will require a resolution of Tynwald. Now if you wish to enquire into who did it, very well enquire into who did it. I am merely making it quite clear, I am making it clear to the Court that this is not money being voted to alter premises that are going to be pulled down. This has been done. I have been myself very, very critical about a number of moves that have taken place into this building before it is pulled down. I can say this that there have been a number of people who moved in there, I would refer to the learned Attorney-General as one. He has only been in there a matter of months and his office is going to be pulled down. There are others and I am not suggesting for one moment that this was a wise thing to do but I would like the Court to know that this is not voting money which somebody is going to spend foolishly, it is money which somebody has spent foolishly.

Members: Who?

The Speaker: Your Excellency, after listening to the chairman of the Finance Board I suggest there is only one course open to the Court here and that is to delete (b). I do not think it is right that Government can go on in this way. Over the last year or two we have been developing this pattern and it is interesting to note this morning that the Finance Board have passed this for approval by Tynwald.

Mr. Bolton: No.

The Speaker: It would not be on the Agenda unless they had passed it.

Mr. Bolton: Your Excellency, I think I made it abundantly clear that the Finance Board's attitude is this, that if this money has been spent Tynwald must approve it. It is not for the Finance Board and you must take it to Tynwald for approval.

The Speaker: I agree quite sincerely. Your Excellency, with the hon. chairman of the Finance Board and I would have expected a real blast from the Finance Board on this. Somebody has expended this money without any Tynwald approval whatsoever. Now let us get to the bottom of it. Reject it and let it come back to Tynwald and let us have knowledge of what is developing without our authority. All around there are decisions being taken and implemented without any Tynwald authority whatsoever until Tynwald is just becoming a helpless institution. Reject this.

Mr. Anderson: Your Excellency, I want to know, before I vote on this, who exactly authorised and who was responsible for doing it? I do not know. I just cannot find out and I think the Court deserves an answer to that before we pass this resolution.

Mr. Faragher: Your Excellency, being a member of the Government Property Trustees I dislike this kind of thing and always have done and I think, in future, if this should ever happen again instead of putting it under the heading of the Government Property Trustees that it comes from the chairman of the Finance Board not throwing the baby into our arms. We know nothing whatever about it and until such time we do not want anything to do with it.

Mr. Nivison: I would like to ask, Your Excellency, to make it abundantly clear, has this £880 been spent on St. Mary's Old School and we are to understand that St. Mary's Old School is to be demolished, in order that we should know the picture. I would say what has arisen during this last few minutes does seem to me to strengthen the question which was asked by Mr. Speaker this morning. I believe as far as Mr. Speaker's question is concerned, in order to regularise things in the future, even for the building of new buildings around here, that we should put forward a simple resolution at the earliest

opportunity during the new session authorising people to continue or to discontinue or to carry out the wishes of Tynwald. From time to time these things do happen and subsequently somebody has got to take the can and unfortunately this morning it has been the chairman of the Government Property Trustees.

Mr. MacDonald: I am taking no can, you do not need to worry about that.

Mr. Nivison: It is in your name, sir, and I would say with due respect —

Mr. MacDonald: Not my authority, sir.

Mr. Nivison: I would say with due respect to the proposer of this resolution that the Agenda has been out for some days and I think really we are all duty bound when we are proposing something to make one or two enquiries personally.

Mr. MacDonald: We have done that and we cannot get anywhere.

Mr. Nivison: And then if it is not a satisfactory one to ask the Court's permission to withdraw it rather than to cause this embarrassment and to show us up, we the Government of the Isle of Man, in disrepute to the general public. I would have thought that the hon. member might have withdrawn this rather than embarrass us all in such a way. I think the money has to be paid. It has been spent. It has to be paid and I believe the easiest way out of this is to watch it in the future but to support this resolution.

Mr. Bolton: Could I suggest, sir.

The Governor: No, you have spoken already.

Mr. Bolton: I want to get some information, sir —

The Governor: The hon. member for North Douglas.

Mr. Callister: I am rather staggered that the hon. member for Peel, of all people, should have moved this resolution in the circumstances in which he received it. Secondly I want to know and we have a right to know, who authorised this expenditure? It is an insult to this Court to ask us to pass it on these conditions. Is it the secret cabal of the Legislative Council and I am amazed too that the Treasurer, I am perfectly certain that if I had asked him for anything he would have been very quick off the mark to say no we are not passing this, but he is also in ignorance of it. Your Excellency, unless we are given satisfaction as to who authorised it and why I am supporting the suggestion that it be withdrawn.

Mr. Crowe: Your Excellency, the hon. member of Council Mr. Nivison did mention a moment ago the Speaker's question. Now I must make it perfectly clear that the Central Offices Sub-Committee did ask Boards of Tynwald not to spend more money on these buildings — they did ask that — because they were going to be pulled down.

Mr. Irving: Your Excellency, I wonder could this item possibly be deferred until a bit later in the Agenda and enable the Finance Board in the meantime to find out who did authorise this work, sir, because the situation at the moment is most unsatisfactory. No one in this Court has owned up to authorising the money.

The Governor: It was not the chairman of the Civil Service Commission? (Laughter). I will put (a) let us get (a) out of the way. Is it agreed?

It was agreed.

The Governor: And (b) will be brought back later if we have time otherwise it can come to a subsequent meeting.

**PURCHASE OF LAND FOR
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
OFFICES — APPROVED.**

The Governor: Item number 12. The chairman of the Government Property Trustees.

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency, I beg to move:

That Tynwald approves the purchase from Miss Charlotte Dorothy Christian of the ground or soil of and under a portion of the lane at the rear of Buck's Road in the Borough of Douglas measuring approximately 250 square metres for the sum of 25p for the purpose of the erection (inter alia) thereon of Central Government Offices.

This is a small item and a very small sum. This land has been offered to us, it is the lane behind Government Offices, for this paltry sum of 25p. This is the price that has been asked and I strongly recommend to the Court that this sum is accepted.

Mr. Bell: This is really the straw to break the camel's back, because there is and are a great number of members of this Court who are not of the opinion that this present site should be the site for Government buildings and who will and who intend making it one of their strong election planks and if returned the first item they will see debated in this Chamber is the rescinding of the previous resolution. Now from the exercise we had this morning and the very innocent question of Mr. Speaker was that we were present when some committee was passed and it is logical from that to assume that we pass powers and consent. Now anyone who supports this this morning will be accused at a later date of having supported the Scheme and also assisted in the purchase of land. There are many facets of this Scheme which the public need to be told about and also the members of this Court. Many, many items we wish to know before any authority is further assumed whether it be a logical assumption or an illogical one. For a start, at

the moment there are evidently car parking spaces in this immediate area and used for about 80 to 100 cars. The result of the new Government building, designed with the consent and co-operation of the chief architect and planning officer and all of his competent staff and with all of our planning committees is reducing this number of car parks around this area to something like 18 cars.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Can you prove that?

Mr. Bell: Wait a minute——

The Governor: Now I must ask the hon. member to speak to the motion.

Mr. Bell: Thank you, Your Excellency.

The Governor: We are speaking about 250 square metres.

Mr. Bell: Related to the Central Government Offices, Your Excellency, I hope I have made it clear that I am not supporting this resolution and I am not supporting any further logical assumption of power or authority.

Mr. Callister: Your Excellency, briefly, I am very strongly opposed to the building of new Government Offices here but when we are offered 250 square metres for 25p I am in favour of this Government buying it.

Mr. Clucas: Your Excellency, just a small point, I too think that 25p is a bit small, I would like to ask the chairman of the Government Property Trustees whether in fact Government is to pay Miss Christian's legal expenses in this because if not she is going to really lose out?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, Government are not that mean. I think Government will do that.

The Governor: Is that agreed?

It was agreed.

WITNESSES' ALLOWANCES
(AMENDMENT) ORDER —
APPROVED

The Governor: Item 13. The learned Attorney-General.

The Attorney-General: Your Excellency. I beg to move:

That the Witnesses' Allowances (Amendment) Order 1971 made by His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor on the 5th October 1971 be and the same is hereby approved.

When the last Witnesses' Allowances Order was made this provision was, strangely, omitted. It is to cover the travelling expenses of medical practitioners who come into Douglas from outlying parts of the Island to conduct post-mortem examinations. I beg to move.

The Governor: Agreed?

It was agreed.

RESOLUTION RE REPORT OF
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
TRANSFER OF THE POSTAL
MONOPOLY — AS AMENDED —
APPROVED

The Governor: Item 14. The hon. Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, I beg to move:

That the Report of the Select Committee on the transfer of the Postal Monopoly in the Isle of Man be and the same is hereby adopted and the recommendations set out in such Report be and the same are hereby approved.

In presenting this further report of the committee on the acquisition of Postal and Telecommunication Services in the Isle of Man I would briefly wish to recall the pattern of development this issue has taken. On the 3rd August, 1966, the Postmaster-General informed the Commons that in future instead of being a Department of State with Ministers at its head the Post Office was to become a Public Corporation

and this Island in the same way as the other off-shore dependencies, the Channel Islands, would be given the opportunity of taking over postal services if it so desired. An investigation by Your Excellency in Executive Council and subsequent report to Tynwald by the Government Treasurer resulted in the following resolution being passed by Tynwald on the 18th October, 1967 — "That Tynwald having taken note of the proposals made to the Imperial Parliament concerning the reorganisation of the Post Office desires Her Majesty's Government to make provision for the continued application to the Isle of Man of the Postal and Telecommunication Monopolies presently vested in Her Majesty's Postmaster-General." Now, Your Excellency, during the next year there was a growing feeling in Tynwald that this decision had been taken without sufficient information being available and this feeling resulted in Tynwald passing the resolution which led to our appointment. In order to be assured that the best possible expert advice should be available to us and subsequently to Tynwald we, as indicated in paragraph 2 of our report, sought the professional assistance of Mr. R. W. Powell then manager of the Industrial Department of the Industrial and Commercial Finance Corporation who had previously carried out a comprehensive investigation on both postal and telecommunication services for the States of Jersey and Guernsey. We also had the advice of Mr. E. D. Stacey, head of the Security Printing Division of the Crown Agents, who assisted us with the philatelic side. Our initial investigations quickly revealed that Tynwald's hesitation to accept the original offer had in fact resulted in our approach coming at a difficult period in the transition from a Ministry of the Crown to a public corporation and on the 21st January, 1969, we reported to you in Tynwald indicating that the

option to take over both telecommunications and postal services was still open under the terms of clause 84 of the United Kingdom Post Office Bill but that it would take until August, 1971, to collate, with the assistance of the Post Office, the statistical information necessary for us to reach a proper conclusion. The attitude of Her Majesty's Government at that time was that they would readily agree to the transfer provided that it made provision for the surrender of Post Office privileges in respect of both postal and telecommunication services and this we stated in our report to you. When by May, 1971, it became apparent that while the statistical information regarding postal services would be ready on time those relating to telecommunications would, with the best will and co-operation available to us, take considerably longer. We pointed out to the United Kingdom representatives that as the Channel Islands had been given the chance of accepting either postal or telecommunications services or both in 1968, we felt that Her Majesty's Government should reconsider the position and allow the Isle of Man to proceed with negotiations on the basis of Tynwald taking a decision on postal services leaving the decision on telecommunications in abeyance and without commitment. After long discussions this course was accepted by the negotiating team and it was agreed that the Tynwald Committee should approach the Home Office and inform them of the representations made to the Post Office and through them to the Minister of Posts and Telecommunications and seek the Minister's support of the relaxation of the original principle whereby a simultaneous decision by Tynwald on the acquisition of both services would have to be taken. On our part we wrote to the Government Secretary on the 17th May asking for the matter to be advanced by the Home Office through what are now known as "proper

channels" to the appropriate Ministry. At the same time the chairman of the London negotiating team put a similar request to the Post Office Board. An interesting observation on the efficiency of the operation that it was not until September that the Home Office, after two reminders, managed to convey our request to the Ministry. This has meant that, although assured of support the Ministerial decision accepting the division has only come to hand as recently as Friday of last week and I must add here that it was largely due to the effort and goodwill of the Post Office side that this was, in fact, brought about at all. However, to turn to the position in May. Having agreed that it was reasonable to assume that a divorce of these two services could be achieved, we continued to negotiate on the basis of a Post Office take-over only, and in this connection there is a point that I wish to emphasise and that, hon. members, is, and I am sure my colleagues will wholeheartedly endorse this, the wonderful co-operation we have received from every section of the Post Office administration throughout these negotiations and further that we appreciated their obvious desire to see that in the event of Tynwald accepting the transition from one area of control to another, it would be carried out smoothly and their desire to see that on the completion of the transition the venture should be a successful one and to that end we were assured of the fullest co-operation to achieve those objectives. Now obviously one of the principal factors to be determined was the cost of acquiring the physical assets of the service which are set out, you will find, in paragraph 4 of the report. These costs, you will find on page 5, were valuations amounting to some £127,000 with regard to property indicated. The values are based on valuations made and agreed between a local and a Ministry of Environment Valuer; while the assessment valuation of such items as vehicles has been done

on an actuarial calculation. The outcome, hon. members, appears to your committee to be a fair agreement which we can commend to Tynwald. We next set out to consider revenue likely to accrue from the operation. In paragraph 5 (2) of the report you will find the general picture of Post Office activity, from which its revenue is derived, namely mail services on the one hand and agency services on the other. In paragraph 5 (4) you will find the pattern that our advisers calculate will apply as far as 1973, with possible revenue ranging up to £465,000 and with the salaries and wages responsibility amounting to some £308,000. On page 9 there is the broader illustration of how the figure of profitability is arrived at. With the full estimates of likely expenditure for the years up to March, 1973, outlined, and the projected results in terms of profitable operation indicated in paragraph 7 on that page, where for 1972 it would appear a figure of £41,000 profit is likely to accrue to the Post Office, and in 1973 with — and I would make this point — expected increases in postal rates a higher figure is visualised. You will note that these figures, hon. members, exclude any mention of philatelic sales and reflect a reasonable margin of profitability which can be maintained we believe, without — and I would emphasise this point — any deterioration in the standards of service. The next feature of the operation, having favourably assessed the economic viability — and in this context I would pay tribute to the assistance we received from the Finance Board who helped our consultant considerably, verifying calculations and so on; there has been a team operation on this which was most welcome — and having assessed the economic viability we then endeavoured to ensure that staff relations would be maintained on the best possible basis. Here again, Your Excellency, we were indebted to

our Post Office colleagues for helping us to arrive at the sort of assurances embodied in this report, and which we feel that Tynwald has to accept without reservation if this operation is to be a success. We, for our part, are determined to maintain good faith with those to whom we have given — and I make this point — firm assurances. You will note we recommend that all existing contracts in being at the time of the take-over should be honoured. All staff employed here should be free to join either the new Manx administration or remain with the United Kingdom Post Office. This right, we believe, should remain in being as is the case in the Channel Islands for a period of five years. We strongly recommend to Tynwald that it confirms in its acceptance of this report its desire to assure the Regional Consultative Council of the Post Office and the Council of the Post Office Unions that they will be fully recognised here. I would add, Your Excellency, that our negotiations in this field have been realistic. Our assurances have been genuine, and the acceptance of the Post Office Unions of these points has been based completely on the factors I have mentioned. It came therefore as something of a surprise when in common with members of the Legislature I received a lengthy document from the local Post Office Engineering Union in opposition. In it they quoted correctly my statement to Tynwald on the 21st June, 1969, setting out the position that applied at that time, but apparently failed to realise that by negotiation a new position had been achieved which made it possible, hon. members, to deal solely on this occasion with the Post Office, and that is what we are doing. The only relevant passage in their document, as far as this resolution is concerned, is their view that to take over the postal service would be a retrograde step from an economic and standard of service point of view. I have given you the expert assessment, and neither this

465,000
308,000
157,000

£41,000

assessment nor the report itself was, I understand, in the hands of the Post Office Engineering Union when they penned their letter. As you know that we proposed no changes, I hope the suggestion of deterioration in services does not imply a slur on their colleagues of the Post Office Unions who have been fully acquainted with the developing position by arrangement with the United Kingdom negotiators, and who, as interested parties, have had copies of the report sent to them through the Postmaster whose co-operation we have had fully from the inception of these negotiations. I would add that if the Engineers' Union will have such a champion in Tynwald as the Post Office staffs have had in Mr. Albert Corkish, when it comes to examining the telecommunications side at an appropriate time in the future, their interests will certainly not go by default. Paragraph 9 on page 11 deals with superannuation, and you will note that we recommend the accepted practice of an actuarial calculation here. We are pleased, hon. members, to have established with the north-west region a relationship that ensures training facilities for Manx personnel will be available in the United Kingdom whenever they are required. Coming to paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 you will find there an outline of the pattern we suggest for future handling of mail for both home and overseas, and as an indication of the depth of investigation that we have carried out in order to ensure that ours is a correct decision, the detailed examination has ranged from such items as the provision and cleaning of mailbags to the stamps policy and the welcome assurance that the new Island administration will be permitted to benefit from the bulk purchase arrangements which the United Kingdom Post Office enjoys. However, it is in paragraph 14 that you will find the sort of bonus which can emanate from the

Island handling its own postal services — the development of philatelic sales. The development of philatelic sales imaginatively handled can result in a substantial contribution being made to the Island's finances through this medium. In paragraphs 14 (2 and 3) you will see the type of return which accrued to the Channel Islands in the early days of the operation and which continues at an equally profitable level. We have placed in your hands from a reliable source an independent assessment that confirms our view that philatelic sales can be a lucrative enterprise, and also as far as tourism is concerned, an advertisement for the Island throughout the world. Samples of what can be done are in your possession, and you will note that these are most attractive, and the broad lines of policy here can be pursued in such a way as to give the Island in fact world-wide publicity. Paragraph 14 (5) contains our view that this feature must be vigorously pursued through world-wide marketing agencies and that everything must be got ready to put this operation in hand on the day of transfer in order to get the maximum economic benefit from it. Finally, we deal on page 15 with the form of administration that should handle the operation of the Post Office. Not a Government department, you will note, but a separate entity handling its own finances through a commercial Board of Tynwald consisting of five members, two being members of Tynwald, two with either an experience or interest in postal matters, and finally the director of Postal Services as a member of the Board. We indicate how we feel the Board should exercise its functions and it is our unanimous view that it is of the greatest importance that a Director of Postal Services be engaged to handle the operation. Hon. members, you will realise that you cannot take over a Post Office overnight, and it is necessary to indicate to the personnel concerned in the present operation of the

Post Office when the vesting date will be. So after discussions with the United Kingdom team we have settled on our national day, the 5th July, 1973, as an appropriate day for transfer. Such a transfer will, of course, involve legislation, and we recommend the introduction of this legislation at an early date in paragraph 16 of the report. It should not, I would suggest, be difficult as the precedence in relation to the Channel Islands' take-overs are readily available. We had a committee, in fact, hoped to present to you a draft along with the report but this has not proved to be feasible. Hon. members, our conclusion is firm and is set out on page 17 where you note that we say we are confident it is in the best interests of the Manx people and will be of benefit to the economy of the Island that the opportunity be seized of taking over the existing postal service by the Island and creating above all a symbol of our autonomy and distinctive way of life. I beg to move.

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

Mr. Anderson: Your Excellency, I would congratulate this committee on doing what appears to be an extraordinary job; in fact, it is so good that I am a little bit suspicious. It would look as though we are being handed everything that is worthwhile and everything that is viable at this point. But before I am prepared to support it I want a double assurance that there is no commitment to the taking over of the telecommunications services, which as I see it would be a lot less profitable—in fact, I would question whether or not we would continue to get as good a service then as though they had both in operation.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, could I, sir, regrettably interrupt the debate at this stage in the hope of being helpful to the Court with this prolonged agenda. I would wish to assure the hon. member and all other hon.

members that as I said earlier there is no commitment whatsoever on the communication side at this stage.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for that assurance. This is the main fear that I had in my mind that we were just being gradually led into something which in my opinion could prove less attractive in the future. The only thing I would then request is to be assured that in the event of this being taken over, that we would not get in any way an inferior service to the telecommunications. This is the only question I had in mind.

Mr. Kerruish: Your Excellency, I too, would like to congratulate Mr. Speaker and his colleagues as members of this committee on addressing themselves to what has been obviously a very complicated question. The fact that it has been so complicated makes me turn a blind eye to certain shortcomings in the report. One could, if one wished to be pinpricking, refer to paragraph 11 (7) where some very big question is made about the telegraph services. One could also comment upon the vagueness with which overseas mail services are to be made in the future. But, sir, after having considered all the minor shortcomings stated in the report I may say quite openly and plainly that I am 100 per cent. behind an attempt being made by this Island to take over its postal services. From the figures that have been indicated by the committee in the report it is possible that we might make a small profit on the postal services and the agency services. But with the same token I think it is equally clear that the figures available to the committee have been so vague that it is equally possible that we may make a small loss. However, I would stress that as far as I am concerned personally I am not concerned with that particular aspect of the situation. I feel that even if it could be proved that we could make a small loss on postal, agency

and related services, I feel the case presented by the committee from the standpoint of proving that this position could be utilised by the Island to make very large profits upon the sales of stamps—I am quite satisfied that the committee are correct in that assumption. I believe that the figures they quoted in relation to Jersey, in relation to Guernsey could relate even more truly to this Island with its very unique history and so many really unique features to draw upon, which I feel certain could make the issuing of stamps a very profitable standpoint from the Island's financial position. Although I am absolutely convinced that the step to be taken with a view to taking over postal services is correct, I am by no means satisfied that the means employed through the medium of this resolution is the correct one in order to implement the wishes of this Court. It has been said by Mr. Speaker that we have been given firm assurances that we will not be married to the telecommunications services. But, sir, I feel that it is equally clear that we are committed to continuing negotiations with a view to acquiring; negotiations must continue in this particular area. I take it that in theory if it was found to be a viable proposition from the standpoint of the Island we would also take over the telecommunications services. I think we have to be conscious of the fact that some very positive statements are made in the report, and by the resolution before the Court at the present moment we are adopting a report. In that report it says very clearly—despite what Mr. Speaker has said this morning—that, and I quote from paragraph 3 (4) on page 3. "The Post Office made it clear at our first meeting that they did not wish to complete an arrangement which made the Isle of Man Government responsible for one service, but left the Corporation responsible for another." Then further on, on page 4, the committee says in its report, paragraph 3,

sub-paragraph (8) "We could see that a decision on the Isle of Man Government accepting responsibility for the postal administration should, with advantage, be taken separately and well in advance of any similar decision on acquiring telecommunications in the Isle of Man." The point I am stressing is this. That it is by no means clear just what the situation would be legally or in relation to our relationship with the Government of the United Kingdom if we pass this resolution as it is printed against the background of this particular report we are considering. Because it appears to me that by a most strange coincidence the situation that would develop, that would result, would be very similar to the situation which Mr. Speaker alleged related to central government buildings this morning. His allegations were refuted, but there is no doubt whatever in my mind—and I am not being, I hope, destructively critical of this matter, I am hoping to be helpful because I am all behind taking over postal services—but I think we would be committed in principle to a certain step, but it could be alleged that it was against the background of everything that was said in that report, and that report is extremely vague. The hon. member for East Douglas, Mr. Irving, is a member of this committee, and I would ask him as a member of the Finance Board does he think this prudent from the standpoint of business acumen, of commonsense, of political wisdom to commit ourselves to this particular situation. With a view to clarifying this particular situation I intend to move an amendment.

The Governor: Just before you move that amendment may I intervene to read out a statement I have received from the Home Office. This is, I think relevant. It may also be worth noting that the Isle of Man Government have secured the concession that they may

take over the postal service without a commitment to assume responsibility for the less profitable telecommunications services. I think that may save a lot of talk.

Mr. Kerruish: I am extremely grateful for your intervention, sir, and I am sure the Court—I hope the Court as a whole—will be very grateful for it. But, sir, I still feel that the position as it is at the moment is not satisfactory. The amendment I intend to move is as follows. That I wish everything after the word “adopted” in the resolution to be deleted, and added after the word “adopted” in substitution the following words: “And action be taken forthwith to submit terms of transfer for the approval of Tynwald.” The resolution, sir, would then read as follows: “That the report of the Select Committee on the transfer of the postal monopoly in the Isle of Man be and the same is hereby adopted, and action be taken forthwith to submit terms of transfer for the approval of Tynwald.” I do not know what would be the reaction of the hon. Mr. Speaker and his colleagues on the committee to this amendment. (Interruption.) I beg your pardon, sir?

The Speaker: You have had the terms of transfer!

Mr. Kerruish: Yes. Well, I am not satisfied that we have, sir, and I sincerely hope that the hon. Mr. Speaker and the Court as a whole will accept this amendment because I feel that if the situation is as Mr. Speaker has indicated to this Court, then they have nothing to fear. In one of the last paragraphs of the report—and I refer to a matter which I regard as of some importance on page 20 where it says, and this is the last section on the page, and I quote from the report: “We emphasise . . .”, They emphasise, “. . . that these recommendations must, of course, be provisional and even if approved by Tynwald are subject to acceptance by the Minister of Posts and

Telecommunications as the statutory authority in whom the responsibility for both postal and telecommunications in the Island is now vested.” For my part on this matter I am not prepared to leave the last word in the hands of the Minister of the Government of the United Kingdom. I think in a matter of such importance as this it is right and proper that the terms should be spelled out to Tynwald Court, and that Tynwald should be given an opportunity of endorsing this most important matter. I move this amendment, sir, believing it to be in the interests, the long-term interests of the Island and also of a continuation of our good relations—of which Mr. Speaker spoke so highly—with the appropriate Ministries on the other side. I formally move, sir, the amendment which I have indicated to this hon. Court.

Mr. Bolton: I would like to take the opportunity of seconding that amendment, Your Excellency.

Members: Ah!

Mr. Bolton: I do not know why the “ahs” are. They may be “bahs”. (Laughter.) But I do think, sir, that we must take note of these recommendations, particularly on page 18; we find summary of recommendations, “That an agreement on postal services in the Isle of Man and the terms set out in this report and in accordance with section 87 of the Post Office Act, 1969, being an Act of Parliament be negotiated and concluded.” The first question arises—who is authorised to negotiate it, and who is authorised to conclude it? There is nothing in here which suggests that this committee is authorised or that any other body is authorised. I believe, sir, that this is leaving it wide open so that the committee could if they wished come back and say, “Oh, well, you told somebody.” So I do believe, sir, that it is essential that the amendment be passed so that an agreement . . . Because if

we read a little further on we say: "Tynwald respectfully requests Her Majesty the Queen that this Agreement should by Order in Council be put into effect." We never know that it has been done until somebody tells us about an Order in Council. I do believe, sir, that it is essential that the agreement itself, when it has been negotiated, should come back for Tynwald to say yes or no to the detail of the agreement, and in that case we should be quite safe in entering into such an agreement, and we should also be quite safe in accepting this resolution. I think that Tynwald would then have another opportunity to see the exact detail which, when all is said and done, is not contained in this report.

The Governor: The Court will now adjourn until 2.30 p.m.

POSTAL SERVICES DEBATE — RESUMED

The Governor: We shall sit until 6.30 p.m., hon. members as some members have commitments, and we will take Petitions immediately after the tea break. Does any other hon. member wish to speak on the postage?

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Yes, Your Excellency, very briefly. I am very pleased indeed that hon. members in this hon. Court this morning were given an assurance that we would not be involved in the telecommunications section of the Post Office services. I certainly think that every hon. member of this Court has been aware of some bitter experiences we have had in entering the field of commerce. We have had, for instance, the gas undertaking which has cost the Government many, many thousands of pounds; we also started off with a lottery, all being given expert advice on, which has cost us many more thousands of pounds. We had a shipyard also which we cannot forget for a long time. Here again

today I certainly would have been voting against this resolution if we were going to be involved in the telecommunications side of it. I do feel, however now, having been given the assurance, that I am quite prepared to support the amendment put forward by the hon. member. Many times we wonder at the experts we get advising us in the Isle of Man on different aspects of government policy. We have had an economic survey. If the hon. members of this Court looked to the economic survey and checked up on some of the figures of it, the people that counted them I think must have had a very elementary education. They are many, many thousands of pounds astray in their calculations. Referring to agriculture—

Mr. Irving: I thought that would be it!

Mr. P. Radcliffe: It makes so little of it that their figures are nearly half a million pounds astray. I think we want to be very careful about expert advice. Therefore, I think at this stage it is very advisable for hon. members of this Court to support the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Ayre in the Council.

Mr. Vereker: Your Excellency, I am not going to speak on the report which I think is an excellent one and for which I congratulate the committee on presenting to us. What I am concerned about is that the actual committee which is in being should keep on being in existence and be allowed to carry on. I would like to move a further amendment which I think would allow this to be done. That is, adding on to the existing resolution the following words, that is: "The resulting agreement negotiated by the committee be subject to the approval of Tynwald." I think, sir, although I agree in many ways with the amendment moved by the hon. member of Council, Mr. Kerruish, I think this would give

the committee a better standing in order to carry on, and in order to carry on negotiations which are essential if this hon. Court agrees to the resolution. I beg to move, sir.

Mr. Callister: Without joining issue in making a big speech which I intended to make, sir, I will confine myself to saying that I will be happy to support either of the amendments. I do hope that the public will recognise what is happening with regard to the suggestion of taking over the Post Office.

We have just been told that the Post Office in England has lost £35 million last year. I hope that the electorate during this campaign will see to it as to how their candidates are going to approach this position. I have my doubts about the Manx Government being able to carry through the services of a worldwide institution with all its ramifications and maintaining the services which the Island has been having for many years. The Post Office is the finest service in the civilised world, and to let it go . . . One point I would like to make, sir, is that I believe that the British Government are very happy to get rid of the Manx losing section of the Post Office.

Mr. Kerruish: Your Excellency, perhaps in order that the position might be clarified — have I your permission to proceed, sir?

The Governor: Well. I thought you had spoken once.

Mr. Kerruish: Yes, I was going to speak to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Castletown, Mr. Vereker. Has it been seconded, sir?

The Governor: No, it has not been seconded.

Mr. Irving: Your Excellency, I beg to second the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Castletown. I feel that the amendment proposed by the hon. member of the Council, Mr.

Kerruish, was a bit too severe. I can understand his point that he wants any agreement to be ratified or agreed by Tynwald. This is fair enough. I feel that his amendment gives the impression that we might well go back on arrangements we have already made up to now; negotiations we have concluded about staff, and so on. I think it is important that it should not go out from here that we are considering going back on any of the items which we have already negotiated. I do not think the hon. member would want us to. I think his point would be served well, if we supported the amendment by the hon. member for Castletown which ensures that Tynwald has the final say, and I have pleasure in seconding is amendment.

Mr. Crellin: Your Excellency, I just wanted to make this point clear. This was the point which was worrying me. I was not quite sure from the hon. and gallant member for Castletown's amendment whether indeed it was an amendment to the original Resolution, or whether it was an amendment to the Resolution as amended. You see. So it is an amendment to the original Resolution. I want to be absolutely sure that this committee continue the good work, and I believe it is good work which they have done. But I want the way to be left open for the consideration of the points which have been so very well made by the hon. member of the Council, Mr. Kerruish. If this is satisfactory to the hon. member of the Council then I would agree to the amendment in the name of the hon. member for Castletown.

Mr. Kerruish: Yes, I can assure the Court, Your Excellency, that I am a full supporter of the committee in their endeavours to acquire for the Island full control of our postal services. Not only because that would be — to use their words — a symbol of our autonomy, but also because I believe it is capable of doing our finances a con-

siderable amount of good. I would not for one moment like to lend my name to an amendment which would in any way restrict the committee which has already been paid full tribute by the Court for carrying out very extensive work. I feel, sir, that the subsequent amendment moved by the hon. and gallant member for Castletown meets the case adequately, and with your permission sir, and with the permission of this hon. Court, I would beg leave to withdraw the amendment standing in my name. I sincerely hope that my hon. seconder will agree to this course being adopted.

Mr. Nivison: Your Excellency, I wish to speak on the Resolution. All speakers so far seem to be concerned about one thing only, and that was the possibility that telecommunications also might be involved, and they have evidently got a lot of evidence to show that if this was involved that we would be leading ourselves into heavy financial commitments, or perhaps going backwards in so far as progress is concerned, and there has been some anxiety. Despite the fact that His Excellency read some communication from the Home Office, which stated that you could deal with one or the other, the Report does definitely say without any shadow of a doubt that it is only a matter of time and they want to keep the door open for further negotiations. I would like to remind members, Your Excellency —

Members: No. no.

Mr. Nivison: The Report states . . . I am not saying what has been said here today. I am saying what the Report has said, and it has been repeated here, however the Post Office made it clear, made it clear at our first meeting, that they did not wish to complete an arrangement which made the Isle of Man responsible for one service, but left the Corporation responsible for the other. I know they have still gone on to say . . . But I am going to develop this point a little further, Your Excellency.

The services to some degree are integrated; they are integrated to some degree. Perhaps in transport, perhaps in certain mechanical senses, perhaps in the telegraph system itself. I know there is a means here for paying for services; that they could pay the communications the same as the Social Security Board or anybody else could pay for the services that was issued by this new Board. I say they are integrated to some degree. It could well be that it is only a matter of time before insistence would be made on this other occurring. I do want to say about the postal service. Let us make no mistake about it, the postal service in the United Kingdom would not have been able to operate at its present service, which is an excellent service, unless it had had large lumps of government support from time to time. This was in an industrial area in industrial Britain. Here we are in the Isle of Man, which apart from the seasonal time, is really a rural area. A rural area receiving the same kind of collections and the same kind of deliveries as you have in your main cities. This was only possible because it was integrated with this United Kingdom service. I am not a prophet but I am going to say, Your Excellency, that I believe we should hasten slowly on this alleged takeover. The hon. member for North Douglas has stated — and I agree entirely with him — that the present Government have stated to these kind of enterprises that they want to unload them, and they want them to be self-supporting. They probably have given instructions, too, to the British Post Office — if any section of society wish to take over their commitments, their liabilities as far as we are concerned, shed them. Because sooner or later they will have to bear the burden and not us. Many of us in our minds are saying — ah, but we have got one very fine trump up our sleeve, the first-day issues. We will issue 365 new issues in the year and we will make fortunes. (Laughter). Let us make no mistake about it. The object of the exercise is

that this is the thing which is going to be cashed in upon. The issues, the new issues, I believe that the general public as time goes by will get sick and tired of the new issues that are being issued by this country, that country and the other country and they will be somewhat reluctant to take them up. Reference was made by Mr. Speaker — and here we would say that nobody would fall out with the Report, it is a wonderful Report and the marvellous amount of work that they did here — but reference was made by Mr. Speaker to the fact that Jersey and Guernsey had made considerable profit in the first year, and he then stated, he did not say these exact words but he alleged, that this considerable profit was maintained. He said something to the effect that gave the Court to believe, that this considerable profit was still going on.

The Speaker: Can I help the hon. member, Your Excellency?

Mr. Nivison: Please, yes please, yes. I can only speak for myself.

The Speaker: If I could help the hon. member, I indicated the actual figures of profit made by the Islands, and I went no further as I had no facts to go on, only indications.

Mr. Nivison: Yes. I gained the impression — I must say this — I gained the impression that Mr. Speaker said that the first year was very profitable and subsequent years also seemed to be coming out fairly well. We know, we know from our conversations with the people of Jersey and Guernsey, that it has not been maintained — in fact it has slumped terrifically and they do not know what is going to happen in subsequent years as the people get tired of buying the new issues of stamps. What I would say is far more important than the fact that we should control our own postal services in a day when we are living, in the days of economic communities — when there is an enlarging of these kind of things rather than a

narrowing down; the general tendency is to become members of bigger economic groups and services, rather than small ones. The important thing, associated with this — and it is not a humorous item — the important thing is that we in the Isle of Man shall be able to maintain a service like we have had in the past on similar lines to what they enjoy in Great Britain without involving the Manx public in large amounts of money, as was hinted at by the hon. member for Ayre. The hon. member listed out of the wonderful enterprises that were given to this Court, that were all going to make large sums of money. There is one further one, which was stated to us — Manx Radio. When we gave £50,000 for Manx Radio we were told it had already turned the corner and was now making a substantial profit and the inference was it was going to continue to make a substantial profit. What has been the actual facts? We have had to pay a further, was it £50,000? A lot of thousands for an American machine quite recently. Is this not true? We have had to pay. We must admit that we have the service — we have got something we did not have before — nobody is complaining about that. But there is no question that from the economic point of view, it has been a financial disaster.

Mr. Kneale: It has not, rubbish.

Mr. Nivison: Mr. Kneale is accustomed to putting those words out of his mouth.

Mr. Kneale: Aye and they are true in your case this time.

Mr. Nivison: So far as Mr. Kneale is concerned, these are the facts. We paid handsomely £50,000 for Manx Radio at the outset, and we were told — anyone deny this? We were told it was now making a profit. We were told by the hon. member, the chairman of the Finance Board — and we were also told that this was the tendency, that it

would continue to make a profit. We also know that we passed a resolution in this Court giving another large lump of money quite recently, and we do now know that they are not losing as much money as what they did hitherto. Now that is what we know. Now anyone can say that is rubbish, but if that is rubbish, well rubbish is a fact. What I am afraid of is that the services in the Isle of Man, which we enjoy . . . Let us remind ourselves—when the Post Office in the United Kingdom decided that they would limit the service on a Saturday, a large representation was made to Members from Rushen constituency about the letters that they normally received from their visitors on a Saturday afternoon, and that the whole weekend would be wasted. Any restriction that has happened in the service of the Post Office has been commented on, and we have been concerned about it. Eventually we get used to this. Are we going to find ourselves in a position in the Isle of Man where we are not able to maintain the service which we ourselves would like to give to the people, the business people of the Isle of Man, without involving large amounts of money? Can we face up, when the times comes, to the increase — which was hinted at this morning — in postal charges? Can we ourselves face up to it? In the past we have had to face up to it because it was imposed upon us by a British Post Office. Will we do it or will we say, "Ah no, we will cut down the service, perhaps to some of the rural areas" — or we will perhaps do like some of the other countries throughout the world do, where you go to collect your own mail from the Post Office, or at least have to go to the bottom of the garden to a box.

Mr. Anderson: Might give a better service.

Mr. MacDonald: Some of them should do!

Mr. Nivison: We may well give a better service, but I say this, there is no question, there is no denying the fact that this service has only been possible in the past because large amounts of government money has been poured into it. There is no question about that. If we are relying on the first day issue of stamps to survive this, I think really we should do more thinking. I would hope that this Court should hasten slowly on this, and should not embark, I would contend, even if I am the one and only in this Court, and I may well be, but I believe that the public generally, the public as you go round . . . "Did you ever hear such nonsense," said one lady to me, "They are now thinking of taking over the postal services. Did you ever hear such nonsense?"

Mr. Irving: What did she know about it?

Mr. MacLeod: Did she know anything about it?

Mr. Nivison: She may, hon. member, she may have known as much as you.

Mr. MacLeod: Well she would not have known very much.

Mr. Nivison: With that I will agree, but I do say, this is what you are guided by as a rule, you people who are going to face the electorate. What the public think — surely you are going to have some regard to this.

Mr. MacLeod: It is a good job you do not have to face them.

Mr. Nivison: It is not a good job my friend, I have never feared the public, neither will I in the future. I do say this, that the public are not behind any idea of pouring large amounts of money into a Post Office merely to say, "This is our own Post Office." I believe in these days, to repeat, of services where they are expanding rather than contracting, it would be a retrograde step for us in the Isle of Man to take on our own postal services.

Sir Henry Sugden: Your Excellency, I just want to draw attention to two items in the conclusions. One is 11(7) on page 19, which says that the "public telegraph service if possible be acquired concurrently with the postal service." Well now I hope that that excludes the telephone services. I hope I will have that assurance. The other one is 12(2), "That the transitional provisions on the recognition of United Kingdom stamps after the day of transfer as set out be accepted." Well now, sir, I do not see really that we can accept such a limitation on our affairs. The tourist industry will be getting their stamped addressed envelopes. I will be getting mine from various firms across — all right if posted in the United Kingdom, which includes the Isle of Man. I believe that it is important for us to keep that touch with the other side. I am not going to move an amendment, but I would suggest, sir, that the committee which goes into this matter, considers these two things.

Mr. Kneale: Your Excellency, first of all I would like to make some reference to the remarks of the hon. member of the Council, Mr. Nivison. I think what he has proved today is that he knows very little at all about this question of philatelic sales. When he referred to us trying to balance our books by issuing 365 first day covers-a-year, well, this is ridiculous. That is the way to disaster and be ridiculed by anybody who collects stamps.

Mr. Nivison: Yes, sir, that was what I was trying to convey.

Mr. Kneale: You must only issue three or four special issues a year, and this is what we as a committee have considered and what we as a committee recommend is done. Now the suggestion that is made, that Jersey and Guernsey although they had a bonanza to start with, have gradually gone down the slippery slope — this is quite untrue. Actually Jersey and Guernsey were

very fortunate, that they got in when they did. They grasped the nettle that was offered at the time. They issued a complete set of definitive stamps. Now this is the big money spinner to start with. You have got your whole range of stamps, as it was then, from a half-penny up to a £. Decimalisation came in, and they were able to issue another complete definitive issue, and soon their figures will show the results of this. We have not had them yet. But you have only got to look at the figures that we have been supplied with recently in the booklet by Spinks. Now Spinks have handled our coin issues for us, and we were told this morning how much money we have made on these coin issues. Forgetting the gold issue which made, I believe somewhere in the region of a quarter-of-a-million pounds. We are told that we will clear about £100,000 on this present coin issue. On the Crowns they recommended that we would make about £65,000 — I believe we will make more than that on it. So Spinks in their estimates in the past on the coins have been proved to be correct — if anything, they have underestimated. I am quite sure that they will be proved to be correct on their estimates here, in fact, I would go as far as to say that they are under-estimated here. If you look at their figures for the first year, second year, third year and fourth year — they show they are going to make more in the fourth year than they are making in the first year. Now I would point out that the hon. Speaker and myself were members of the Coin Committee, when this was going on, and I would also point out that we met considerable opposition to introducing the present coins from the Bank Workers' Union, but we ignored this and we know the result. We have been proved right that we can make a profit on this, the Government. If you want to knock it into hard terms, the

money that we made out of the Manx Crown will pay for one of our new primary schools. Now in 1967 when Tynwald debated the possibility of taking over the Post Office, we had a memorandum from the Treasurer, trying to frighten us off. You will remember at that time that I questioned the figures, and I said that he was right out on his estimation. Now we have got the experience both of Jersey and Guernsey to look on as something positive and solid, and we have also got the views of Spinks, which proves that the figures that I gave at that time and the views I expressed at that time were the more correct ones. I would like to make reference to the "dead duck" which Mr. Nivison seems to think Manx Radio is. Manx Radio is not losing money at the moment. Manx Radio is making a small profit. It has not made any of these wonderful £5 million that was forecast if we could get a station to cover the whole of the British Isles and Western Europe. We did not get that. Manx Radio is making a profit, and by the installation of this new machine that we are putting in now, the Isle of Man will have a viable link with the United Kingdom in case we run into another postal strike and a seaman's strike. If the Tourist Board had made proper use of Manx Radio during the postal strike they may have done a bit better job than they did.

Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Kneale: Now, stamp collecting is without any doubt, big business, and if we turn down this second opportunity of taking over, then we deserve to be kicked. Now all members will have received. I take it, the letter from the Post Office Engineering Union warning us that this would be a retrograde step, both from an economic and standard of service point of view — to take over either or both the Post Office and telecommunications. As the Speaker

pointed out, this letter was written before they had even seen our report. Now having studied the question at close quarters with the Post Office officials, having had the advice and help of Mr. Powell of the Industrial and Commercial Finance Corporation Ltd., who advised the Channel Islands, and having had Mr. Briercliffe of Finance Division to check all our calculations, I am absolutely convinced that we must agree to take over the Post Office without delay. If it is a retrograde step to take over an organisation which we know will make a profit for us, then it is time we got marching. After all, we can spend too much time picking up these dead ducks that were referred to by the hon. member. It will be a change for us to take up something that is not down and out before we get a grip of it. As for the telecommunications, the Post Office Engineering Union would appear to have based their forebodings on a speech made by Mr. Fennessey, the managing director of Telecommunications, to their conference at Blackpool in June, a copy of which has been sent to all members, with certain parts of it underlined in blue ink. Now although we as a committee have not got down to studying the facts and figures of a possible take-over of telecommunications, we have recently received some factual information from the Post Office on this matter, and although it would be wrong of me to disclose it at this stage, I can tell this hon. Court that far from painting a black picture, they paint quite a rosy picture and indicate that they are making a substantial profit on income over current expenditure. Now this was something that has come as an agreeable surprise to me, but it does indicate that these figures they put forward to us, and try and frighten us, off fall in the same category as those that were produced by the then Treasurer in 1967. We should wait for the reliable informa-

tion before we make a decision on telecommunications. We are not dealing with telecommunications today, we are dealing with the Post Office and we should wait for the report on the telecommunications which will come in the future. In that respect the decision will lie entirely with this Court, whether they take over or not. Now on this letter that was sent round — this speech made by Mr. Fennessey, I would just point out to members some of the parts that they did not underline. I feel that they missed the real message that they were getting passed over to them. He writes that despite the enormous expenditure anticipated in the near future, the postal authorities intend to make the services economically viable and an economically viable proposition. Now if you look at your pages you will see on page 2, he talks of the problem of finding the money. Then he talks about the development of Pulse Code Modulation and says the cost is coming down quite dramatically. At the bottom of the page he refers to meeting the growth, and meeting it economically, and the data service and video service will find economic realisation. On page 3 the same message is repeated several times, and at the bottom of page 4, he says the Board is dedicated to ensuring "that our investment programme is as stable as we can make it." And half-way down page 5, he states quite bluntly, "We have got to be firm and resolute in achieving our financial targets." Then he goes on to say, "None of us wants to be in a business whose profitability is declining, where you are in the end going cap in hand to those who have to lend you money, saying well, we want money but we cannot make any profit on what you are going to lend us." I have never heard a clearer declaration from the Post Office authorities that they intend to make the customer pay for their programme of expansion and they intend to make a profit. I

would also point out that these people who try to frighten you by talking about £5 million here and £5 million there — they forget to make any reference to the income that is coming in, and that in an expanding service there will be an expanding income. I feel that we have got a wonderful chance now to take-over the Post Office. I feel that if we neglect it today, then we do not deserve to be in Government. I support strongly the resolution.

Mr. Corkish: Your Excellency, I will be very short and swift. In reply to Sir Henry Sugden, on the telegraph question, there are three ladies involved in the telegraph section in the Post Office, so I do not think there will be much difficulty there.

The Speaker: You never know I have got three in Garff.

Mr. Corkish: Now Mr. Nivison mentioned about the amount of money that had been pumped into the Post Office, by the British Government. Now for Mr. Nivison's information, the Post Office used to be run on a vote by Parliament, and all the profits were all handed over to the Treasury. It is only since about seven years ago, I think it is now, that they have had to stand on their own feet, and through that they did lose money, but they are gradually coming up and holding their own.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, I am indebted to the Court for the manner in which they have received this report, which has admittedly taken a long time to produce and this of course was in an endeavour to present to you the fullest factual information that was available to your committee. Now, at the outset, may I say I accept the hon. member for Castletown's amendment which places the ultimate responsibility in the hands

of Tynwald and of course it would be unusual if, in presenting a report of this nature, there were not observations which cast doubts on certain aspects of the operation, and this one is no exception. I am pleased however, that the hon. member for Glenfaba, Mr. Anderson, has found this report even more satisfying than anything he could have envisaged; that the assurances that have been given him have really satisfied him that this is a really worthwhile endeavour at this stage. Now going on then to the hon. member of the Council, Mr. Kerruish, the questions he raised related to telegraph services and overseas mail. Now we were not the people who raised the question of the telegraph services. This was raised by the other side of the negotiating team, and it was pointed out to us that 90 per cent. of the work of the telegraph service was in fact embodied in the working of the Post Office, as opposed to telecommunications, and it was a much more sensible thing to approach this one on the basis of a possible take-over with the Post Office, excluding telecommunications in every other way, than to leave it outside. This will however be something that has to be examined thoroughly, yet, by a Working Party which is proposed for the future. And that point, sir, is one that will be gone into as well as that of customs and overseas mail, which needs clarification within the terms of the arrangements that we have on the Island with the United Kingdom. Now I am delighted that the hon. member, who although describing the report as vague, has withdrawn his resolution, which could have endangered the whole of the negotiations, and I appreciate that concession on his part. Now the hon. member, Mr. Callister, has cast doubts on Government being able to carry through this operation. Well, you know, sir, I sometimes wonder whether or not we

under-rate our own abilities, or whether we have any ability. Because if the Channel Islands can, through their administration, carry through these things successfully, what is wrong with our electorate and representation.

Mr. Callister: There is no comparison between the two Islands.

The Speaker: There is a great comparison, when it comes to operating postal and telecommunications services, and on the postal services alone, they are doing these extremely successfully. Now, we propose — as I said earlier — that this be done through a commercial set up. I do not agree with the dead hand of government. We have had instances, from the hon. member for Ayre, of mistakes of the past. He forgot to relate those mistakes to the existing prosperity of the Island. He forgot to mention that we have been going through a phase of the dead hand of government in recent years, with nothing happening at all. But, sir, the fact is that our experts are of the opinion — and you are not so far away when it comes to bringing in experts if I recall a demonstration on these tables not so long ago of new Government offices — our experts are of the opinion that this is a viable proposition, and without banking on their opinion completely, we too are convinced of this. Now, the amendment by the hon. member, Mr. Vereker, I accept. Then we come to Mr. Nivison, of the Council. Your Excellency, the other day there was a headline banner in the "Star", "Spanner in the Works." I wonder whether the hon. member is the sort of political toolmaker for Government.

Mr. Nivison: I am not taking over for you sir, you are the spanner in the works.

The Speaker: Political toolmaker. Your Excellency. Last week it was the spanner in the Consumer Council Bill,

today it is the spanner in the Post Office works. I wonder what it will be tomorrow.

Mr. Nivison: A spanner is a useful tool.

The Speaker: Indeed they are, but you keep them on the Council benches, they need them.

Mr. Crellin: They are all nuts! (laughter).

The Speaker: Your Excellency, the point has been made, of effectively integrating certain services, and I would point out that the Post Office indeed does quite a considerable amount of work for the body of which the hon. member is himself chairman, and I would hope continue with the agencies in being at the present time. Now, really, he has said that the British Government have indicated that these are loss-making features of the administration — let them go. But that is not the case. The British Government, have, on producing their Bill, recognised the internal autonomy of the dependencies and this is a jolly good thing. It is what we have been contending all along. We should be recognised — these offshore dependencies — in our true role. They have recognised this point, and have offered us responsibility in spheres within our own control. This is proper and good, and in keeping with policy throughout the world. But to say that Jersey and Guernsey have not exactly been on a running gamble here, winning all the way, would be wrong. Because, the figures I can quote you now are that Jersey in the first three months of operation collected £200,000 — in three months. Admittedly this does not happen overnight. Two years' preparation would go into that operation. Guernsey, on the other hand — and I have longer figures on this — made a profit of £362,000 in 15 months. Now these activities are going on. They each

have a department set up specially to handle this feature of philatelic sales, and they do it on a world-wide basis, and they are doing it extremely successfully. The amount of money they are investing from this avenue, would be sufficient to run the Post Office. Now as to the possibility of deterioration in the standards of service, why should they deteriorate? We are going to have the same people running the Post Office, the same effective administration — I cannot see why there should be any change whatsoever, and I am quite confident that we will get the same service from the personnel as the United Kingdom Government are getting at the present time. Now, Your Excellency, Sir Henry on telegraphic services — I will happily give him the assurance he seeks here, that this will be the subject of a Working Party investigation. There is the question then of stamps. Now this has been overcome — I am talking of stamps in relation to the tourist trade, the envelopes that come for a stamped-addressed reply — this has been overcome in Jersey and Guernsey by an arrangement with the United Kingdom. We do not see any difficulty in entering into a similar sort of arrangement in the course of time. So, Your Excellency, having dealt with all the points, I would really commend to the Court this report and the amendment which will make it the responsibility of Tynwald to approve the final agreement reached, and in so doing I would once again pay a very warm tribute indeed to those negotiators that we worked with over the past three years, from the Post Office, who have been so extremely helpful and made our work — not, shall I say, a chore to be carried through but rather a very pleasant task on behalf of the Island Government. I beg to move.

The Governor: I shall first put the amendment by the hon. member for Castletown, that all the words after the

word "adopted" be deleted, and the following words substituted, "and the resulting agreement negotiated by the Committee be subject to the approval of Tynwald." Those in favour of the amendment please say aye, and those against please say no. The ayes have it. Now the resolution as amended those in favour please say aye, and those against say no. The ayes have it.

**REPORT OF PENSION RIGHTS
COMMITTEE — APPROVED AND
RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE
IMPLEMENTED.**

The Governor: Item number 15. The chairman of the Pensions Rights Committee of Tynwald.

Mr. Kneale: Your Excellency: I beg to move:

- (a) That the Report of the Pension Rights Committee dated 29th September 1971 be and the same is hereby approved.
- (b) That the recommendations contained therein be implemented.

When we were appointed in January, 1967, as a Committee of Tynwald to examine the question of Pension Rights of Government and Local Authority employees, we never thought for one moment that it would take us nearly five years to prepare our final report. But this has turned out to be an extremely complicated subject, and I can assure this hon. Court that we have not been wasting our time. On several occasions we have almost had a report completed, when there would be a change in the State Pension Scheme or an alteration in wage scales, which would throw our calculations out completely. We were able to present an interim report to Tynwald in July, 1970, when we asked that an actuarial review be undertaken as to the formulation of the scheme, and the determination of costs. Tynwald agreed, and a sum not exceeding £1,000 was allocated to enable the United Kingdom Government's Actuary Department to carry out such a review

for us. This has now been completed, and after many meetings we are pleased to be able to lay our report before you today and hope that the recommendations contained therein will be implemented. In the United Kingdom it has been a progressive policy for many years for all local government employees, including workmen, to be superannuable and most, if not all, are now superannuable. In the Isle of Man attempts have been made on several occasions since 1957 to obtain pension rights for our manual workers, but Executive Council seems to have thrown a spanner in the works on every occasion. For example, when it was learned in 1964 that the Highway Board was endeavouring to co-ordinate with other Boards, a superannuation scheme for workmen, Executive Council advised His Excellency to inform all Boards that it was not Government policy to make workmen superannuable. However, certain workmen have been made superannuable from time to time, and now we have many anomalies. In some cases in the same Boards we have persons doing the same job, some are superannuable and others are not. It is time this was altered. Civil servants are superannuable by analogy with the provisions of the United Kingdom Superannuation Acts. Why should some of our lower paid employees be treated as outcasts as far as superannuation is concerned? We are recommending that instead of adopting the present method of financing whereby the cost is met out of General Revenue, that a fund should be established so that present rate-payers and taxpayers would contribute towards the pensions of those who are serving them. Now in our deliberations, we have had the help of Mr. Tom Kelly and Mr. Briercliffe of Finance Division, Mr. Norman Clague and Mr. Caley have acted as secretaries of the committee and I would like to record our appreciation of the help they have given us during our deliberations. Now the scheme as proposed is one for Govern-

ment employees, but it can be utilised to include local authority workers without altering the cost to Government. We have found great difficulty in bringing the over-45's into this scheme, and we recommend that consideration should be continued to see what can be achieved for them. I beg to move the resolution standing in my name.

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

Mr. Callister: I sometimes feel that I may be permitted to say this today, on my departure from the Legislature; but I feel rather like Bunyan's Pilgrim, without ever reaching the promised land. I congratulate the Court on fulfilling something that I proposed some seven years ago. It has been a long time, but I am very happy to support it and I hope that it will come into effect immediately, and that our manual workers will receive the same consideration as the high officials in government. I see no reason why a workman is not as valuable to the community as the most important person here, and he is entitled to the rights and privileges enjoyed by the Civil Service, and by local authorities.

Mr. Anderson: There is just one question I would like to ask the hon. mover, and that is in relation to the scheme being put forward in the United Kingdom, and how it will apply for all manual workers and everybody to be pensionable. I do not know exactly how this is going to work in relation to this scheme. If it is not going to cover these people, I certainly whole-heartedly support it. It is something I have done myself for my own staff. I think it is something highly commendable and I would just like to know how the other schemes will work in, whether these people will be included in that scheme

or will they be exempt from it because of the scheme now being brought in by Government.

Mr. Bolton: Your Excellency, I am somewhat staggered at the way in which this report has been received today. First of all, no case has ever been made out for this scheme at all. I have taken care to look up the history of this matter, and it appears that in 1967 the hon. member for North Douglas suggested that a committee should be set up to look into the possibility. About a year ago the committee came to the conclusion that they could not go very far without some expert advice from actuaries, and they came back to Tynwald Court and said, "It is very difficult for us to advise you at the moment. But we shall have to have an actuary. Can we have £1,000?" Tynwald said "Yes, spend your £1,000 and get the advice of the actuary." Now they come back with the report which we have got here today which does not put forward any case whatever for what they propose, beyond telling us what it is. There is no argument whatever, the hon. member has not put any argument for it even in his speech this afternoon. We are presented with this simply because four years have passed since the hon. member suggested the setting up of this committee and it has become accepted that this is policy. I intend to oppose it absolutely, and I think really that if we think about it most carefully we should be bound to oppose it. We have a case here where it is proposed that a non-contributory pension — and mark that — a non-contributory pension is to be paid to manual workers employed by Government. Now manual workers' wages are negotiated by their own union on a universal basis, so that all the private employers, all the companies, all the local authorities, and all the government authorities pay the standard wage, which is negotiated without any relation to a pension. Now we are going to say that we shall set up

a privileged class of manual workers, who may be employed by government and they will, after 40 years service, in which they have been guaranteed their jobs for every day of 40 years, they are going to get half-pay in addition to all the other benefits that they are going to get. They are going to get the benefit of the State pension, for which this Court has made a vast contribution, they are also — if we believe what is being said in the United Kingdom — going to receive the benefit of a graduated pension tailored to their earnings, and then they are going to get this, with a little bit knocked off it because of the rest they are going to get, and a man is going to finish up who earns at present £900, with a pension of £655, and a lump-sum payment of £1,300, which on an annuity basis at the age of his retirement, will I am quite sure, produce another £4-a-week. Now does this really make sense, or are we just going to accept it? Are we just simply going to say, "Oh, this is the kind of thing we should do. This is the trend." What it is going to do is, it is going to make everything that we do more expensive. Every activity that we undertake on behalf of Government is going to cost us so much more and it is not a question of doing justice to anybody. I would assume that justice is being done when wage agreements are negotiated and State pension schemes are provided. Now we are going to go with an extra hand-out. Just because you have got a perfectly secure job, probably the most secure and best job in the Isle of Man, then we are going to give you something more. You are in no danger of being laid-off as if you were in the building trade; you are in no danger of being laid-off because of the weather — even on account of sickness you will probably find that a grandmotherly government has decided that you will be paid sick pay. Now this is the kind of thing that we cannot as a government — in my view — do without running into considerable criticism.

It is all very well for people to say, well we can do it. It is other people's money we are spending. It is so easy for Socialists, and I name them, to spend other people's money. That is the principle that they work on, and I believe that we should resist this kind of thing, or at any rate, let us have a case made for it. Let us understand why it is suggested that these particular employees of government require to have this pension. Nobody told us; nobody has said a word. And this report simply comes forward and says the benefits of this scheme are set out as follows. Then they tell us what a man is going to get, what it is going to cost, and we suggest you do it. There are one or two remarks I have on my report, quite frankly, that I would not like to repeat in Tynwald Court. We have got here in page 5, "costs", "In terms of November, 1970 earnings, the total annual cost to government would be initially £12,300, after 20 years £21,500 per annum, after 40 years £20,000 per annum." In terms of 1970 earnings. Now we are in 1971, let us go back and consider what would have been the position if we had been talking about 1931 earnings. These figures are vastly out and completely erroneous. You cannot measure today's earnings and then apply it to 40 years ahead. I really feel, sir, that this requires a great deal more consideration and certainly a case to be made for doing it before we should even consider passing it, and I shall certainly oppose it.

Mr. Nivison: Your Excellency, this was Mr. Bolton at his best. This is the kind of speech that we would expect from the hon. member of the Council.

Mr. Callister: Having been put there for eight years.

Mr. Nivison: Now I want to say, the hon. member has said that a case has not been made out for this. Let us think first of all, we are dealing with Government employees. Now the Government employ clerical

workers, administrators, technical men and manual labourers. So far as the clerical people are concerned, they have a full superannuation scheme whereby a man who has attained the rank of an AO1, an Administrative Officer Grade I, would receive a salary of £3,000-a-year, give or take a pound, on retirement would receive a golden handshake forthwith of £4,500 plus a pension of £1,500 for the rest of his life.

Mr. Bolton: What could he earn in private employment?

Mr. Nivison: Now this is the important point. The hon. member has said a case has not been made out for this. There was a period when the hon. member knows quite well, and I have been in the Court along with him, and we have had cases, whereby the private sector was being robbed of their men by the public sector. It was said that they were going over the hedge on to the Highway Board, into the Forestry Board, into this that and the other. Not so today, Your Excellency, because in the private sector the remuneration is higher, very much higher than that obtaining, as far as a manual worker on the Highway Board, the Forestry Board or whatever it could be. A man can get considerably more if he is working in an unskilled job in the private sector today. The Douglas Corporation over the years have put forward schemes for their manual workers. These schemes were killed long before they came to Tynwald by certain sections of Tynwald. It was said that they would not be agreeable and the Douglas Corporation went forward with a scheme of their own and financed it themselves and have such a scheme in operation. Not, perhaps, as good a scheme as is proposed here. There is no question in my mind, Your Excellency, that there is a case for giving a man who gives his lifetime's service and sticks loyally to his particu-

lar employer at a manual worker level, the same as if he had been a clerical worker or if he had been a technical worker. Why do we discriminate between the clerical, the technical and the manual, why do we discriminate. If the man stays loyally to his job over the period and who needs it more at the end. Who needs it more, surely the man in the low income scales of which these are. I would urge, Your Excellency, that the Court would support this because it is so important, even to those who are in charge of the particular departments who appreciate the long service of some of their employees. Who have not left during the summer months to gain employment where higher wages are paid but have stayed loyally to the jobs—the lower paid working jobs. Who have not gone on to jobs—who promise you certain amounts of guaranteed overtime—guaranteed bonus—paying over the rates and many of them, as the hon. member Mr. Anderson, the member for Glenfaba has said, many of them have their own occupational schemes. Many of the private employers have these. The Onchan Commissioners have indicated to this committee that they would be willing and ready to take part in this scheme with the full knowledge that it would cost them, the Commissioners, money to do so. I want to answer the question that must be in some people's minds, about what will happen when and if the new State scheme which has been announced comes into operation and here I would quote from the actual memorandum, extracts from the White Paper. This is planned, incidentally, to come into operation in 1965—

Mr. Corkish: 1975.

Mr. Nivison: I accept this—in 1975. It does say this that membership will be compulsory for all employees

between the ages of 21 and pensionable age for any period during which time they are not covered by a recognised occupational scheme. By a recognised occupational scheme and that would be a scheme which would pay better benefits or as good a benefit as was obtained under the new pension plan and this scheme is so designed to do that very thing. It would produce 50 per cent. of the person's income on retirement, which is in excess of what is required under the State pension scheme. The Douglas Corporation scheme, incidentally, would not qualify. It is not of a high enough standard. They would either have to amend their scheme or go into the new State pension scheme but there is no question. Your Excellency, that the scheme proposed would qualify for opting out of the new Government pension scheme because the contributions, the benefits under the new scheme would be more beneficial than those proposed in the new plan. I think, Your Excellency, that many of us know that there is a case. The hon. member for Council, my friend and colleague, Mr. Bolton, seems to suggest there is no case for such a thing to happen. The hon. member himself would not deny the right of the clerical worker, the right of the technical worker, the right of the administrative worker, surely by that same right he should not deny the right of the manual worker who stays religiously by — sometimes a low paid job — conscientiously through the years that he should received some reward at the end of that period of loyalty and enjoy a pension scheme, as is the case in many private employers. I hope, sir, that what I have said will convince, first of all, and as far as the new pension scheme, it will not conflict. I would hope that the members, from what they have heard, know sufficient

about it to have faith that we want to do the right thing by our Government and local authority employees.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, we may wish to do the right thing by Government employees but I feel sure that in doing the right thing by the Island we would not do it by accepting this report but rather we would do it by following the lines indicated by the hon. member for Council. The question has been posed this afternoon — why discriminate? Perhaps if you look at that Economic Survey which came into our hands not so very long ago, you will get one reason why we should discriminate. Government have become the largest employers in the Island today and the benefit of being in Government service, whether in the Forestry, the Highways, the Harbours, or on the Manx Electric Railway, is pretty well-known and it is well-known that the small individual entrepreneur in private enterprise industry cannot compete with Government. We are being told by the Economic Survey, or through it, diversity — encourage little industries and all the rest. At the same time Government is developing its labour force in such a way that these people cannot compete. Now speaking for my own constituency — what do we have? Two forms of employment, agricultural and small light industries and I venture to suggest that neither of them can compete with Government when it comes to this type of pension set-up. The consequence is, that when posts are vacant, the trend is a drift from the private employer to the security of Government because Government is acknowledged to be the employer that never fires unless the worst possible things ever happen to their employees. They are a benevolent employer — there is no doubt about this and. Your Excellency, what we have to be realistic about is the fact that there are other people in this Island who have to pay Government to pay these

people through their efforts and it is those small employers employing one, two or three men who cannot indulge in such a scheme who are going to have more overheads to face to keep Government increasing its ever growing establishment. So, Your Excellency, I am quite convinced that before taking on a mill-stone of this kind and I regard it as that, one should pay attention to the viewpoint of the hon. member of the Council who has quite clearly indicated that in the report we have received there is not one word of justification as to why this should be done. Yes, it is a nice thing to do and a thing we would all like to do with the whole of the set-up—let us do it through the medium of the Social Services, let us make everybody's future a little brighter by ensuring them of more at the end of their employment days. That would be the logical way to give everybody fair treatment but, Your Excellency, where in this report does it make it imperative that Government should do this and justify that. I cannot find this reference at all and like the hon. member of the Council I am voting against it believing that it is going to be something that will cut right across the very living of the small employers in my constituency.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, very briefly, just one point I would like to get clarified. I am wholeheartedly behind the principle of giving a pension to a manual worker. I do support the idea that we must depend a lot in our various industries on our manual workers and loyal workmen want to be all appreciated but I would like to know on the fact mentioned by the hon. chairman of the Board of Social Security—on what basis was this pension arrived at when we have already been told that very shortly, in the future, there is going to be a Government scheme, which means

that all manual workers will get a pension but, the Government scheme is going to be less beneficial than this scheme. Can you explain to us why these figures were arrived at, to make Government employees in the Isle of Man, in a better situation financially regarding pension than what other people are going to be when the Government scheme comes into operation.

The Governor: Do you wish to reply to all these?

Mr. Kneale: Yes, Your Excellency. I would not have been surprised at the debate today because, like Mr. Bolton, I looked back in the debates and I think all he did was copy his last speech that he made and repeated it again today and I wrote the answer out from that speech that he made before. (Laughter.) He trotted out the same old argument as in the past that we are giving our manual workers something extra, that private enterprise must follow and that the effect on private enterprise is bound to increase the costs. The cost of living will go up, the value of money will go down and we will all be up the creek.

Mr. Bolton: I did not say that!

Mr. Kneale: This is what you have virtually said in the past. Now he said this in October, 1966—this is the general trend whenever you mention manual workers, this seems to bring the same response. In fact, I would suggest that he applies for a job with Frankie Howard as a stand-in for the soothsayer in "Up Pompeii" (Laughter) and shout "Woe, woe, a thousand times woe" all the time. Now we are certainly not competing with private enterprise here to take their manual workers away from them. We are competing to stop them taking our

manual workers away from us. With the continuing building boom private enterprise is paying their workers far above the normal wages and these were negotiated wages and there are opportunities for increasing their pay by long hours of overtime. In fact, there are certain firms where employees say to them, "Unless you guarantee me so many hours overtime I am going somewhere else". This is what is happening in private enterprise. The manual workers employed by Government departments and local authorities are usually paid the basic rate with very little chance of overtime. It is no good talking about the security that Government jobs provide. Mr. Bolton refers to the workers, the jobs of our manual workers as the most secure and best jobs in the Island. I would like him to try a trip or two out in weather like we have had this week on the highways and to see whether he still considered that the best job in the Island. Now as regards the continuing building boom I have referred to that and we are talking about the security that Government jobs offer. Now this might be all right as far as the Civil Service is concerned. In some departments you seem to be able to increase your staff when you find that the work is beyond the people you have got—you do not get rid of them to employ somebody with better qualifications, you employ extra people. This is where things can develop and I would point out the department the hon. member Mr. Bolton is in charge of—how that is expanding and not only expanding but the rates of pay are continually increasing and with those rates of pay the pension rights increase, the lump sums increase and we are not talking about small figures, we are talking into long, long thousands of pounds—when they come to retire, having had jobs all through their lives which should have enabled them to save for their old age. Now we should

not deny our manual workers the same privileges. After all Government is supposed to be an enlightened employer and we must not forget that some manual workers employed by Government departments are already getting benefits which their colleagues are denied. For example, the school caretakers are superannuated by an Act of Tynwald while other manual workers employed by the Board of Education are not. In the Local Government Board there are men doing identical work—some of them are superannuated and others are not. The Douglas Corporation have introduced their own scheme which has been referred to by the hon. member of Council, Mr. Nivison. They introduced this some years ago without any effect at all upon private enterprise and there are numerous anomalies we could quote in our service today. Now the United Kingdom have recently issued a White Paper called Strategy for Pensions which has already been referred to. It is well to remember that they have a Tory Government in power in the United Kingdom, in case anyone falls for the remarks of Mr. Bolton about Socialist squandermania. The theme that is repeated over and over again in that document is that employers and trade unions and the occupational pension movements should make the most of this opportunity for improving and extending occupational pension schemes and, I underline this, that the position of the lower paid workers must be protected from continuing increases in contributions. They stress that wages are only one aspect of the total remuneration the employee gets for his services. Pension rights should be as much a part of the service of employment for the shop floor worker as for the top executive, that is a Tory Government speaking and that is what we are asking for our manual workers that they should be treated fairly.

Reference has been made to the proposed lump sum. The figure of £1,350 relates to a person who has worked for Government for 40 years, earning an average of £900 in his last three years. If you bother to work it out you will find that this sum is the equivalent of less than one and a half hours overtime a week and that is little enough award for a lifetime of service. It must be stressed again that under the scheme that we are proposing no-one will qualify for an age pension for 20 years, which should enable the fund to build up considerably if the annual contribution from Government is invested wisely. The cost to Government is a modest sum and if this modest sum is a mill-stone round our necks as the hon. Speaker suggests then I think it is time we all jumped in the lake and let it flow over us. This is a flea-bite to what we are paying out for pensions to other people and I cannot imagine anybody voting against this resolution today. The remarks that were made by the hon. member for Glenfaba regarding the scheme, I think his point was answered by Mr. Nivison. The situation is that we were planning our scheme before we had any knowledge of this and it turns out that if the scheme that comes into the United Kingdom in 1975 is implemented in the Isle of Man it will not cut across our scheme but it will certainly cut across the scheme that has been operated by the Douglas Corporation. If they decide not to come in with us on the scheme that we are proposing they will certainly have to abandon their own scheme and go into the new Government scheme. Mr. Callister, I thank him for his support. Mr. Radcliffe, he refers to the loyal workmen, he as the chairman of the Local Government Board knows of the anomalies in his own department on this and I look forward to his support and the support of all the members of this Court.

The Governor: I shall now put the question. Those in favour of this please say aye, those against please say no.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:—

In the Keys—

For: Messrs. Anderson, MacLeod, Kermeen, Radcliffe, Clucas, Miss Thornton-Duesbery, Messrs. Spittall, Creer, Faragher, Simcocks, Crellin, Vereker, Callister, Corkish, Bell, Burke, Kneale, MacDonald, Sir Henry Sugden and Mr. Hislop — 20.

Against: Messrs. Edmonds, Irving, Devereau and the Speaker — 4.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, the resolution carries in the House of Keys. Twenty votes being cast in favour and four against.

In the Council—

For: The Lord Bishop, Messrs. Nivison, Crowe, Kerruish, Quayle — 5.

Against: Messrs. Bolton, Radcliffe, Corkhill — 3.

The Governor: Five in favour. Three against. It therefore carries.

GRANT TOWARDS PURCHASE
OF VEHICLES FOR I.O.M.
ROAD SERVICES LTD.—
APPROVED

The Governor: Item 16. The chairman of the Finance Board.

Mr. Bolton: Your Excellency, I beg to move:

WHEREAS Tynwald on the 15th day of June 1971 authorised the Treasurer of the Isle of Man to apply during the years ended

31st March 1972 and 31st March 1973, out of monies to be supplied by Tynwald grants to the Isle of Man Road Services Limited and to Douglas Corporation Transport Department equivalent to 50 per cent. of the cost of vehicles purchased for use on approved scheduled services between 1st April 1971 and 31st March 1973, in accordance with arrangements and conditions to be made by His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor.

NOW THEREFORE Tynwald authorises the Treasurer of the Isle of Man to apply out of the current revenue of this Isle during the year ending 31st March 1972 a sum not exceeding £6,392, being 50 per cent. of the estimated cost of acquiring six second-hand double-decker buses by the Isle of Man Road Services Limited, such sum to be additional to the sum of £10,281,700 voted by Tynwald on the 18th May 1971 to carry out the services approved by Tynwald.

Members of Tynwald Court will remember that in June this year we had a debate on the granting of assistance to Isle of Man Road Services Limited and Douglas Corporation Transport Department. In a two-fold resolution it was agreed that the operators should, in the first instance, benefit from an increase in the petrol duty rebate and in addition, should be given grants of 50 per cent. of the cost of new buses, provided they were used on approved scheduled services. Your Excellency made Orders setting out the terms and conditions upon which such increased assistance was to be granted and for the information of members I would briefly enumerate the more important conditions. These are that the annual fleet replacement programme must have Government approval. Secondly, that 50 per cent. of the sale price of any vehicle bought with Government assistance will be repaid to Government if the vehicle is not retained for ten years. Thirdly, the operators will, where possible, continue their existing policy of rationalising routes, improving scheduling and reducing man-power and introducing more one-man operated vehicles. Fourthly, the operators will prepare separate accounts for the summer

periods. Five, all routes will be costed more accurately and the operators will prepare estimates of possible savings by suggesting the withdrawal of what are considered to be non-essential services and six, the operators will negotiate with each other with a view to one fully integrated service being operated from the 1st April, 1973. Some of the above conditions are already being met and arrangements are being made for the implementation of the others. Preliminary integration discussions have been held but there remain several important matters to be resolved in the months ahead. A sub-committee of Executive Council is endeavouring to keep a watchful eye and a guiding hand on the integration question. Isle of Man Road Services Limited have now applied for a 50 per cent. grant for the purchase of new vehicles on section one of the Assistance to Road Operators Order and the Company proposes to buy from the Birmingham and Midland Motor Omnibus Company, six secondhand 73-seater, double-decker buses at an all-in cost of £12,784.

Mr. Bell: What age are they?

Mr. Bolton: These buses, all Leyland P.D.3 Titans were built in 1963 and have completed on average 340,000 miles, mainly in the Stratford-upon-Avon area. They are expected to complete a further 260,000 miles each for the Road Service Company. The vehicles are of greater capacity than the existing 56-seaters and will provide a total of an extra 102 seats, which may help to cut relief mileages and be of great value in dealing with the peak hour loads all through the year. They are, in fact, no bigger overall than those at present being used. The buses are suitable and have been adapted for one-man operation. They are somewhat superior to the buses they will replace in that they have heaters on both decks,

a cab demister system, platform doors, flashing direction indicators and air brakes. All these vehicles have been meticulously examined in every detail by the engineer of Road Services Company. New vehicles of this capacity are now priced at about £11,500 each provided that 60 are bought on one contract. A proposed 50 per cent. grant for the purchase of these vehicles amounts to £6,392 or, on average a Government contribution of £1,065 for each bus. I did point out that if these buses are not retained in the service of the Company for 10 years then 50 per cent. of the payment that they receive if they dispose of the buses must come back to Government. I am sure that the committee have looked into this matter very, very carefully and confidently recommend that this step should be taken in order to enable the bus services throughout the Island to be maintained. I beg to move.

Mr. Kerruish: Your Excellency, I beg to second and reserve my remarks.

Mr. Anderson: Your Excellency, I was always in favour of supporting this but I am rather alarmed to hear the hon. member suggesting there is a possibility of a lesser service than is now being experienced by many people throughout the Island. I would only support this if you are going to maintain the service with the buses as good as it is today.

Mr. Irving: Where to?

Mr. Anderson: To all manner of places, places like Dalby in our own area. On the route from Michael to Ramsey there is a very bad bus service indeed. I would not support this if I thought we were going to have a lesser service than that which we have been having.

Mr. Bolton: Did I say we would not?

Mr. Anderson: Well, you indicated that you were going to cut down on several items.

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: Rationalise you said!

Mr. Bolton: This depends upon the Road Traffic Commissioners and not on us. As you know.

Mr. Anderson: Well, I will support it only if they are at least going to maintain as good a service as we have at the moment.

Mr. Faragher: Your Excellency, I do not know if I heard correctly but I thought the mover said that coaches of such a large size were going to be managed by one person.

Mr. Bolton: They are now.

Mr. Faragher: Would not legislation in the Isle of Man have to be changed to permit that?

Mr. Bolton: No. The buses are no bigger but they have got more seats in them.

Mr. Faragher: Well, I thought you had to have a second man with any bus if you had to stop and back them into a road.

Mr. Bolton: Well, I am not backing them into a road.

Mr. Faragher: Well, this does happen. It happens continually in our particular district.

Mr. Bolton: It does not mean that you have to carry two men around.

Mr. Faragher: It is easy saying that but that is not the way to answer it.

Mr. Bell: Your Excellency, my understanding of it is that we are agreeing to a certain proportion towards the purchase of buses which are eight years old, that we require them to kept in

use for a further 10 years, or at least not to be disposed of and if they are sold before expiration of that period then we redeem 50 per cent. of the amount we originally gave by gift, or grant.

Mr. Bolton: No, half of whatever they get.

The Governor: Could we have a speech and not a dialogue please?

Mr. Bell: Thank you, Your Excellency. I would like to have the assurance that the member of Glenfaba sought and timidly gave up. I was in no doubt at all when the chairman spoke, that they had without question directed the Road Services Company to get themselves organised to cut out the lesser service routes and have directed them, ipso facto, to stick on the main bus routes. Now the hon. member for Glenfaba raised this point about the money from the taxpayers in the Dalby district or in the districts of Middle or in the districts of the Ayres and Andreas to subsidise a bus service which is not going to remain at the status quo, bad as it is, but with the aid of Government — or through Government and their money, is to be worsened. I do remember also that when this resolution originally came to this Court it was in such a state that the Court was adjourned or the resolution was withdrawn until a memorandum setting out in clearer form the intent of using this money so members could think on it. The point that the member for Glenfaba, Mr. Anderson, raised, causes me also now to believe that we should also think on this. It does not seem satisfactory that we are going to give money away and accept what has been said and can be checked by a play-back of the Hansard, that they are being directed to cut out the lesser profit paying routes.

Mr. Creer: Your Excellency, I am very concerned at the use of these buses. Now it has just been said that

they are 73 seats. Now there is no room in this Island for 73 seats in the winter-time so I think this is a subsidy for the Road Services to be able to earn more money in the summer months and run in opposition to the Manx Electric. Going to Ramsey you get the 73-seater instead of the ordinary 52 or 56 at the moment. I cannot see any sense in this at all. Either we are prepared to grant 50 per cent. for small buses for the Isle of Man but I am sure I would not vote for a grant of 50 per cent. for second-hand coaches to carry 73 passengers.

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: I opposed it in the past and I will continue to oppose it. The hon. member who moved this the hon. chairman of the Finance Board said that one of the terms or conditions if you like, is that these buses are not to be sold. If they are sold, half the sale price is turned into their funds. Well, I may be very stupid but if I was running a bus service I would sell every other bus I owned and keep the money because I did not have to turn half the sale price for these in. In other words keep these and sell the others. These are just taking the place of ordinary buses but, more than that, there is the competition involved with other road users, coach services, etcetera. These six buses here are to be used as stage coaches — it releases their other buses to compete with private enterprise who are not subsidised and I repeat the old argument by voting against it and I will continue to vote against it. If and when the Road Services fails to pay its dividend and an increased dividend then perhaps they will receive some of my consideration because what has been said by others, the service will not be improved. The hon. member of the Finance Board said one of the conditions is they rationalise their services — meaning that they examine them very closely and cut out unprofitable routes.

I think he used those words. There is going to be no improvement in service but a subsidy to a dividend.

Mr. Bolton: Non-essential.

The Governor: The Court will now adjourn for tea.

PETITION OF PEEL
COMMISSIONERS RE EXTENSION
OF BOUNDARIES AS AMENDED
— APPROVED

The Governor: Item 36. Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, this is a petition of the Peel Town Commissioners for an extension of the boundaries of the existing District of the Petitioners to take in the area within and including the red line on the plan annexed to the Petition. I beg to move:

That the Report of the Select Committee dated the 5th day of August 1971 be and the same is hereby received, that the Prayer of the Petition, amended in accordance with the recommendations contained in paragraph 10 of the said Report, be and the same is hereby granted, and that it be further resolved, in accordance with the provisions of Section 10 of the Local Government Consolidation Act 1916, the boundaries of the Town of Peel be extended to include the area coloured blue on the Plan deposited with the said Report, such resolution to take effect from the 12th day of May 1972.

Hon. members will have in their possession, of course, the report of the committee and, at the back of the report, you will find attached a plan of the area with several coloured features to it, about which I will speak. From the report in your possession, hon. members, you will have noted that after the appointment of the Select Committee by Tynwald to investigate the Petition of the Peel Town Commissioners, we visited Peel and viewed the

proposed new boundary line, investigated such essential points as availability of services and sought to obtain the views of interested parties or organisations with regard to the Petition and, after suitable notice, held a public enquiry to that end. The appendices to the report contain the views of the principal organisations affected, namely the Peel Town Commissioners and the German Parish Commissioners, while, at the hearing Mr. K. Corlett also presented evidence to the committee. If you look at the map attached to the report you will see defined by a yellow line the existing boundary. The red line indicates the extension sought by Peel. The present area within the yellow line covers some 336 acres and you will see that in the area now proposed by Peel as the extension area, it is in fact 60 acres larger, the extension area in itself, than the whole of Peel is at the present time. With regard to this area within the red line, we consider that insufficient consideration has been given to the point that a substantial section of this ground would not be capable of draining by gravity to the head of the existing sewers and we have come to the unanimous conclusion on one point, that, whatever else the Court may feel about this proposal, it should at least accept the feature on which your committee is unanimous and that is the existing boundary should be extended to take in the area coloured blue. Thereby, hon. members, taking in 107 acres in the Parish of German and adding them to Peel. This will increase the size of Peel by just over 30 per cent. If you look again at the plan you will see there another area outlined in green which is, in reality, the Peel golf course and cemetery. Here, having accepted, as you will notice in paragraph 6, the fact that the football club is a recognised amenity and should be within the

boundary, the majority of your committee however, feels that these two features of community life should be excluded from the boundary extension. However, the minority, that is the hon. member for North Douglas and myself consider that, in the absence of any local guide lines the Statutory Rules and Orders of the English Boundary Commission can well apply as a guiding factor. They state that the object of all alterations and the status of local Government authorities and of all alterations in the boundaries of local Government areas is to ensure individually and collectively, effective and convenient units of local Government administration. In attaining this object all factors relevant to the areas under review shall be considered by the Commission and the following are some of the factors placed in alphabetical order that they consider important. Community of interests, development or anticipated development, economic and industrial characteristics, financial resources measured in relation to financial need, physical features including in particular, but not excessively, suitable boundaries, population, size, distribution and characteristics and size and shape of the area. In all aspects except with regard to the area coloured green the committee have followed these principles and I and my colleagues reserve the right to support any amendment for the inclusion of the green area, believing that the golf course is an amenity to Peel and that the cemetery provides the ever-binding link between the Peel of yesterday and the Peel of tomorrow. The arguments advanced as to rating can, of course, be countered by the effectiveness of the control that inclusion within the boundaries would give Peel over the retention of the golf links as an amenity, particularly when a proposal for development of such items as sand-pits in this area could well be

acceptable to the parishioners of German to the detriment of the amenity of value, not only to Peel but to the Island. With these reservations, Your Excellency, I beg to move that the Petition be amended in accordance with the findings set out in the report and at the appropriate date at which the change should be effected, be the 12th May, 1972, and further, the differential rating, on the basis set out in paragraph 3, should apply and that the Petitioners be permitted to introduce legislation to effectively put into operation such conclusions as Tynwald may arrive at on this report. I beg to move.

Mr. Kerruish: Your Excellency, I rise to second the motion proposed by the hon. Mr. Speaker and I think it is important that the Court should note that on all points other than the question of the future of the golf links being included in the town boundary, the committee were unanimous. As Mr. Speaker has said we came to the conclusion that the original area asked for by the Peel Town Commissioners was altogether excessive and we feel that the area we recommend that should be included in the new boundary, that which is coloured blue on the map attached to the report, would provide adequate facilities for reasonable expansion for the town for a considerable time to come. I sincerely hope, in view of the fact that part of the report is unanimous, that this hon. Court will see fit to endorse it in its entirety, but as far as the future of the golf links is concerned, as Mr. Speaker has said, there was a difference of opinion as far as the members of the committee were concerned. Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for North Douglas, Mr. Callister, decided, in their view that this area should be included within the town boundary of the future. The hon.

member of the Council, Mr. H. H. Radcliffe, the hon. member for Michael. Mr. Kermeen and myself, being the other member of the committee, were of a different opinion. We found out from our enquiries and we are satisfied that Peel Town Commissioners had played very little part in the affairs of Peel golf links in the past. Indeed the prosperous state of this particular organisation is a tribute to the enthusiasm and the activity of those responsible for running that particular organisation. We are satisfied, and I refer to Mr. Radcliffe, Mr. Kermeen and myself, that the members of the golf committee are directing themselves towards expanding the activities in that particular area. We are assured by a very reliable authority that a large number of the members of Peel Golf Club, and they have a very large membership, come from outside the boundaries of the town of Peel. That area has members from all over the Island, from the north, from the south and the east and the west and we feel, sir, there is very small grounds for suggesting that this particular area should be incorporated within the town boundaries of Peel. There is one very important point which, as hon. members will have noted has been touched on by the committee in the report, and it is the burden of rates that could be imposed upon the Golf Club by its inclusion in the town boundaries of Peel. At the moment they are paying something in the order of £8 per annum in rates. If they are to be included in the town boundaries they will eventually pay £80 in rates. I suggest that for a voluntary organisation who are directing themselves energetically and enthusiastically to developing this amenity, an amenity that serves not only Peel, but I would say a very large portion of the west and indeed other parts of the Island, this would be an unduly heavy burden to impose at

a time when we are calling for private enterprise, for private individuals, to assert themselves, to develop just these such amenities. I feel that there is a very strong case indeed for going against the hon. Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for North Douglas, Mr. Callister, in refusing to include in the new town boundary the area which is coloured green upon the map. I sincerely hope that the energy with which the members of the Peel Golf Club have directed themselves to their affairs in connection with that organisation will be some earnest of their desire to develop in the future without having imposed upon them an unduly heavy burden in rates which would result from their inclusion within the town boundary of Peel. I feel that the report, as it is before the Court unamended, provides a reasonable solution to this particular problem and I sincerely hope that it will commend itself to the majority of the hon. members of this Court.

Mr. MacDonald: Your Excellency, having listened to the hon. member of the committee give his reasons for not including what the minority of the committee recommended, that is that the Peel Golf Club, as it is called, and the Peel Cemetery, again as it is called, should not be included within the boundary of Peel, I feel that without any doubt whatsoever in my mind, that unfortunately on this committee we did have a very strong bias towards people who are country members of Tynwald, a very strong bias to this view. Your Excellency, it is said that many members join the Peel Golf Club from outside the Peel area. This may be true. There are very many golf club members of the Fort Island or as it is sometimes called, the Castletown links—they come from Dublin to play there, they come from England. (Interruption.) They are not in the town but

people come to play golf from all over the world. Mr. Palmer recently has been travelling about in a jet aircraft to play golf. So where people come from, I contend, Your Excellency, where people come from to enjoy the facilities provided has nothing to do with the fact that those facilities should be included within the boundary of the community on which it virtually lives. The Peel Golf Club was formed by Peel men. It is a rather remarkable organisation, it is a company limited by guarantee and I believe, the learned Deemster or the Attorney could possibly tell me, it may be the only company of this type left. It may be the only company of this type left in the Isle of Man and who were the men who guaranteed it to start this club off and get it on its feet? Everyone of them was a Peel man. They all put their money down and some of that money still remains within the club funds having never been withdrawn. Everyone, Henry Gell of Peel, a medical practitioner; Patrick Williams of Peel, a solicitor; W. H. Walker, a gentleman; W. H. Looney, a draper; Edward Christian, a bank manager; W. K. Fargher, a publisher and George Dean, who was a bank agent in Peel, all of these were Peel men.

Mr. Anderson: Edward Christian lived at Ballacallin.

Mr. MacDonald: My dear sir, this is the registered document of the club. Everyone of these men, Your Excellency, was a Peel man and it was formed and quite clearly formed in the articles of association, very clearly formed for the benefit of the Peel community. However, as people came, even then, this was 1911 when it was reformed, even then they recognised that people would come from other parts of the Island to play golf and so the full resident, what they call a

resident member, i.e., a member living in Peel, paid more than the non-resident member.

Mr. MacLeod: He paid less.

Mr. MacDonald: He paid more. The full resident member paid one guinea towards this club. The full non-resident member, i.e., a person living more than five miles from Peel only paid 10s. 6d.

Mr. MacLeod: What does he pay now?

Mr. MacDonald: Let us forget that, I am telling you how this was formed. (Interruption.)

Mr. Anderson: You are living in the past.

Mr. MacDonald: He still pays less. Your Excellency, there is no doubt in my mind that the Peel Golf Club is part of Peel. Now when we look at the plan, which has been produced by the committee, you will see that the whole of this area which the Peel Commissioners tried to take into the boundary in fact is shown on the Local Government Board's Development Plan as an area of land suitable for residential purposes. Yes, it is, you were on the Local Government Board and you should know this. It is shown as suitable for residential purposes. I know the Peel Town Commissioners, who are quite prepared, I think, to compromise on anything, they realise that perhaps this time they will be allowed to build virtually where they are building up to now. In Ballaquane they have been told they can go as far as the Brickfield. The houses on that site have already been approved and well one of the members of this Court knows. On the Ramsey Road since the committee sat, another five fields have been put up for development. Housing has already started on

these. This will take the western boundary or the north-western boundary of Peel out to the proposed boundary suggested by the committee. On the Douglas Road where the golf links exists we have got a rather remarkable situation, we are going up—this is the committee's recommendation—we are going up the Douglas Road, that is the Peel/Douglas Road, on the right-hand side of the road, because they cannot possibly say that the Peel Football Club is not the Peel Football Club, the boundary has been extended up the road to the football field, it goes around the football field comes straight down in a straight line from the football field, down into the town again. The poor individuals who happen to be caught, two houses between the football field and the present boundary are all brought into Peel. People on the other side of the road nearer to the town have been left out because it is said they are living on what is prime agricultural land.

Mr. Vereker: Not nearer to the town.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course Ernie Wood's house is far nearer the town. You could not have walked out and looked at it. Your Excellency, the left-hand side of the road, this prime agricultural land, all of it here has grown nothing but cushag and weeds. Recently when it was heard that I was about to suggest that it was not quite so prime, I notice it has all been cut and a few cattle put into it. However, on the Development Plan of the Local Development Board it quite clearly states that this is poor agricultural land. (Interruptions.) Your committee, sir, said this was prime. Your own report, the written report of the Local Government Board where they have a soil expert, not a cattle expert, a soil

expert had a look at this land and he has decided, for the Local Government Board, that this is poor land.

Mr. Anderson: That is a load of rubbish all right.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not rubbish at all, sir, we have listened to your blarney as lots of people do, but this is fact. From your own Board's mouth this is fact. The Peel Golf Club, I know it will mean an increase in rates for the Peel Golf Club, but I contend it is not the worry of what the Peel Golf Club are going to have to pay, it is the worry of what the £20, I think it is or thereabouts that the Parish Commissioners are going to lose. When we sat with the Committee on the bench in Peel I listened to it, it was most amusing, Mr. Speaker asked the Parish Commissioners, what are you providing for the 45 souls that live in this extended area? Nothing, they said. He said, are you providing for the light? No. Are you collecting their bins? No. Are you providing anything? Nothing. This was the exact reply of the Parish Commissioners. They are providing nothing but they are collecting rates. Your Excellency, there is no doubt at all the cemetery in Peel we know who that belongs to; the people in there are in the main Peel men and women and children. There are a few buried at Patrick and there are some out at Marown, but in the main, the people buried in there are also Peel people and the bulk of the rates paid towards the upkeep of that "factory" (laughter), of that cemetery, the bulk of the rates are paid by the town of Peel. There was, as Mr. Speaker said also, there was a threat to the Peel Golf Club which worried the club and this was that someone wanted to dig a big hole and have a sandpit in the middle of it. This did rather frighten

the Peel Golf Club. They did then come running to the Town Commissioners — please support us because the Parish Commissioners will do nothing about it. This is fact. The Peel Commissioners were worried and were prepared to fight this to the bitter end. Fortunately, other people took it up and the sand-pit in the middle of the golf course, at the moment, seems to be a thing of the past, although it could happen again. I would like to recommend to the Court that the golf club and the cemetery, I think the green area on the map, be accepted, as within the boundaries of the town of Peel, the city of Peel. I am very sorry that certain of the other area has not been included, because I feel that within two to three years time back to this Court will come the Peel Commissioners with another request for another extension of the boundary. As we have found and other towns have found it would be easier now to grasp this nettle when there is very little built on it, than to wait until we get another hundred houses on it then try and fight the battle of the extension. It is very, very difficult then, as I know the chairman of the Local Government Board knows only too well, once you start to try to move into an area where houses are built, your chances then of extending the boundary and being fair to all people, and this is what I think you must be, fair to all the people of the Island not just one little community or one part of the Island, fair to those that have to pay their whack and I believe the Peel Town Commissioners are paying more, at the moment, than necessary in their own area. I would like to recommend, Your Excellency, that the recommendation of the minority report be accepted by the Court.

Mr. Bell: I would rise to second the amendment. Your Excellency.

Mr. Anderson: I have heard from my hon. colleague for Peel a lot of nonsense with respect to agricultural land. I know this land very, very well. I need no expert to tell me what it is like. I helped to farm it for quite a number of years, I know every field pretty well on this area in question. That is not my chief concern because it is not before the Court here this afternoon. My chief concern is for the Peel Golf Club and I will say here without any shadow of a doubt that Peel Golf Club do not want to be included in Peel. The committee—

Mr. MacDonald: Nobody wants to pay rates, as you know.

Mr. Anderson: Nobody wants to be included in Peel, I know that and I do not blame them, but there are only two members of the committee of the Peel Golf Clubs today living in Peel. The rest of the members of that club and that committee live outside of Peel. As far as the football club is concerned I would not have included this either, because, quite frankly, Your Excellency, Peel has done nothing for either the football club, as Commissioners have done nothing for either the football club or for the golf club. Individuals have done far more for either of these organisations than what Peel Commissioners have done.

Mr. MacDonald: They believe in free enterprise.

Mr. Anderson: Well, I believe in free enterprise. I believe that the programme set out by the golf club at this present day, and I spoke to them last night about it, is a very good one. They are doing a really good job. There is a very good greens' man and he is being sent away this very week on a course and he is going to prepare and he is coming back with new know-how and so forth and they are going to

really go to town on this golf club. They do not want to be included in Peel at any rate at all. The Parish Commissioners may not have done a lot for them but they are most certainly not going to be milked of them, but I can tell you that a lot of individuals outside of Peel, as I say, have done more for the football club and the golf club than what the Peel Commissioners have done. (Interruption.) I know, the facts are there but the point is, Your Excellency, that this idea of pushing out the Peel boundary beyond the cemetery, to me is completely and utterly wrong. Those of you who have had the misfortune to drive up the Ballaquane Road at any time during this past 12 months will realise really that you almost require a Landrover to do it. The Peel Commissioners are just not looking after the responsibilities they have at this present time.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not true, sir.

Mr. Anderson: It is true. Anybody can go and see it. I mean it is there. (Interruption.) Well, I said the same when we were in Peel Courthouse and you were there as well, the streets in Peel are not looked after because they have just not got the facilities to do it. The whole point of the matter is this, that at the moment the condition of the road right into the very edge of Peel, at this stage, is very well looked after by the Highway and Transport Board and to me it would be a completely retrograde step to hand it over to a local authority who has not got the facilities to look after it. I am absolutely certain that the whole of the district, including the Peel people themselves, will be better served as the majority report accepts and I have talked to a lot of Peel people about this . . .

Mr. MacDonald: And they will tell you anything.

Mr. Anderson: . . . who hold exactly the same view as I do myself. I will oppose, Your Excellency, the extension of the boundary to include the Peel golf course and cemetery.

Mr. Bell: Your Excellency, all the opposition to the proposal which has been moved by the hon. member for Peel is in effect support for the proposal. If because of the low cost of living, has been explained by the member of Council and supported by the member for Glenfaba, is sufficient reason for isolationism to occur then we would have to apply this to every voluntary organisation within a rateable community and let them set their own rates for that area. Now it is illogical to expect the town of Peel, having a golf club on its boundary, calling itself the Peel Golf Club—

Mr. MacDonald: The club is within the boundary now.

Mr. Bell: Even within the boundary, calling itself the golf club, now it is just not on and the Court must not be made to look ridiculous by rejecting this well based and reasoned amendment. I am supporting the amendment and I am sure that a lot of members of the Court will do the same.

Mr. Bolton: Could I ask, Your Excellency, I do not think I have missed anything, but I just wondered whether the amendment has actually been moved yet?

The Governor: Yes, it has. The amendment seeks to include the golf course and cemetery.

Mr. Bolton: Yes, sir, I understood that, but I did not know it had been moved.

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: If it is agreed who moved it?

Mr. Bell: The hon. member for Peel moved it when he spoke.

The Governor: Does any hon. member wish to speak?

Mr. MacLeod: Your Excellency, if it is the intention of the Peel Town Commissioners to take the boundary out as far as the cemetery, will they be responsible for the high road from the cemetery right into Peel? I can assure you at the present time there is a high road—

The Speaker: The answer is no.

Mr. MacLeod: The answer is no. Well I can assure you at the present time, sir, that the high road between the town of Peel, out as far as the brick works on the Poortown Road, is probably one of the worst roads in the whole of the Isle of Man. To me it is something like the Khyber Pass, a terrible place.

Mr. Bell: You are on the Highway Board.

Mr. MacLeod: I have been there along the Khyber and I have been along this road as often as you and maybe a bit longer. (interruption). Never mind. This road has been dug up I should think about six months ago or more to provide water or sewerage for a house —

The Governor: This is not really relevant you know to the matter before the Court.

Mr. MacLeod: It may be said it is relevant to the boundary of Peel and if they are going to extend the boundary surely they will have to maintain the roads within the boundary. The road I am speaking about at the present moment, the Poortown Road, will come within the boundary and there are parts of this road now in the boundary of Peel that are in a terrible state and I would advise the Peel people to get the thing done first and to repair it and ask the Highway Board to take it over at some future date and they probably might maintain it for them. What I would like to know, sir, is the particular

reason as to why Peel Town wants to extend the boundary. If it is for the building of houses, there is plenty of land within the boundary at the present time, I believe, to build houses for the town of Peel for the next 30 or 40 years without going outside it at all. I also believe that if they start building as it is at the present time, that they will have no sewage because the land runs down hill and there would be no fall to carry the sewerage to the sewage works so it would mean that a great many people would either have to put in septic tanks or they would have to extend sewage and pump it right into town which I think would be detrimental to the place instead of a betterment and I personally would strongly oppose this, because I think that the boundary of Peel is large enough at the present time.

Mr. Kermeen: Your Excellency, I am supporting the report before the Court here today as I think the Select Committee has made a very generous offer in giving the extensions to what is marked blue on the plan, but I am going to oppose the amendment for I do not think really, as far as I can see, that Peel Town Commissioners require this actually except for one purpose only and that is for what they can get out of it. There is no purpose in any other way unless they are intending to develop it at some further date. Some years ago I met a member of the Peel Town Commissioners and he said if I had my way I would put houses on the golf course. That was view of that member at that time and I do not know whether he has changed it at the present time or not. The argument has been made in the report that the golf course would be much safer under the protection of the Peel Town Commissioners than under the German Parish Commissioners, but we must not get away from the fact that ever since the Isle of Man has been divided up into

parishes this golf course has belonged to the Parish of German and up to date no development has taken place on it. I am very doubtful if it would have been in the town of Peel whether that would have been so today, because it would have been an ideal building situation and I believe —

Mr. MacDonald: It is no further away at the moment is it?

Mr. Kermeen: No further away, not at the moment and never will be. It is getting closer, it is actually. The Peel Golf Club pays to the Peel Commissioners somewhere about £30 in rates today, for the golf club and the little bit of land surrounding it. As far as I can see they are not satisfied with that, they are wanting another £80 from the golf club. £80 may not be much but it is a lot for the golf club and I really think that the Peel Commissioners are just like vultures flying in the sky looking down on their prey below ready to pick it up. I will certainly oppose this.

Mr. Callister: We are accustomed to listening to these reactionary views, Your Excellency, but I do not understand why we cannot acknowledge the fact that our golf courses in the Isle of Man are really a national resort for our golfers. Not only our golfers, but our visiting golfers and for this parish pump policy of saying we are all right Jack, we do not have to pay the rates on it, we can control it and all the rest of it. The argument is that the German Parish are looking after this area. We found out in our enquiries that they do nothing whatever for the district. We know also that Peel Golf Club was created by Peel men. It would not exist as it is today without Peel and its environment. Every golf club in the Isle of Man is near a town and without that nearness of the town facilities, refreshments, travel and the rest of it, you would find that the golf club would not be so popular. The hon. member for Glenfaba spoke of the space for build-

ing not being required. This is a very different view from the facts we get from Peel. The area between Brewery Road and Brickfield is being developed at this time as a residential estate. Part of this estate falls within the existing boundaries of Peel and part outside. Indeed some properties will straddle the boundary. Now Peel is a very progressive town so far as its housing is concerned and they want space and when one looks at this area, which the Speaker and I agree is too much for Peel at the moment, you find that we have got about one-tenth of the space we have agreed to for Peel. We have cut them down to the fact and we had recognition for agricultural land as we pass along and this leaves us with one issue and that is the golf course and the cemetery. It is suggested that not all the people are buried in Peel Cemetery nor are they. Douglas Cemetery and Crematorium for instance is full of people from outside Douglas. A cemetery also is a public space and it is not exclusive to Peel, but at the same time it needs the jurisdiction of the Peel Commissioners. Mr. Kerruish the hon. member of Council praised the golf committees for everything that has happened at Peel Golf Course. I would suggest that without the help of Peel and its population the Peel Golf Club would not be in the happy position it is in. They rely on Peel for their very existence. He went on to appeal for "poor Peel". The new rates will be infinitely more than before. Poor Peel parishioners — they will be glad to pay it for the benefits they receive from the addition of the golf course and also the people who are building houses now outside will really benefit from the services from Peel. I am amazed, Your Excellency, to find this narrow view. I believe it is a retrograde step entirely not to include essential parts of the land around the town within its vicinity and its amenities. I do feel that we are adopting a rather retrograde step in not allowing Peel to take over this. Peel

will burst and extend and there is no doubt whatever that before many years come Peel will have to have more ground than it has now, but so far as the golf course is concerned I happened to have worked in Peel for a few years and I knew the Peel Golf Course and its members in Peel, but the Management Committee very largely are resident people in Peel.

Mr. Anderson: No, there are only two of them.

Mr. MacDonald: The bulk of the members are.

Mr. Callister: The bulk of the members are and the bulk of the organisation and —

Mr. Anderson: 70 per cent. are outside Peel.

Mr. Callister: How far outside?

Mr. Anderson: Well even into Ramsey.

Mr. Callister: Into Ramsey which also proves that this is not exactly a local affair and I hope that the Court will really grant Peel the opportunity of building space, of giving those people who are building houses the amenities that Peel can give them and that Peel will see that Peel Golf Course is properly run and it would get all the support it needs.

Mr. Creer: Your Excellency, there is just one question I would like to ask. I would like to ask the mover of this resolution the reason for leaving out opposite the Peel Football ground to Ballaquane, why is that? That is one question I want. The other is I think that Peel Golf Club would benefit by being in the boundaries of Peel. I am absolutely certain of that because we have the Howstrake within the boundaries of Onchan and I am sure we benefit from that. When the sand pit was there a few years ago they were glad to run to the Peel Commissioners to try and get help for it but I would

like an answer to that question from Mr. Speaker, why this piece was left out.

Mr. H. H. Radcliffe: Just very briefly. Your Excellency, more than one speaker has said that German Parish Commissioners have done nothing for the people presently in the land which it was suggested might be taken from them. We had one witness who appeared before us, we took him seriously and he was serious, but he really made us laugh in that he did not want Peel to do the things they proposed to do for him — thirty mile an hour speed limit all the way through; dogs got to be on a leash and a few other things that he would have to do and as he said, suffer by being brought into Peel whereas at the present time he was not Peel, but that is by the way. It has been said that Peel is an expanding area and wants land. We went into that very carefully as to the number of houses which have been constructed over the past two years. The expansion in their population. All those matters were considered very seriously when the unanimous approval was given by the committee to the land marked blue. All these things were considered. The fact that somebody said that on certain plans this is poor agricultural land—on that Development Plan, I have looked for land in the Isle of Man that is described as good agricultural land and I cannot find it. Apparently the man who sized up the land thinks it is all poor, so I have not much faith in that recommendation. The last speaker said that the Links would benefit by being taken over or he thought they would. I think our experience of nationalised anything is that it costs more money, is not always improved and I personally wonder why Peel Commissioners want to take in the Golf Links. It is going to be a liability to them if that Links is to continue, because costs are rising continuously. The costs at the present time are the responsibility of the members.

The members have run an excellent golf club for many years. They are providing an amenity for residents and visitors to the Isle of Man which is admired by all. They have given us no reason why they want to take in the land except it is called Peel Golf Links. They have given us no reason. They have not said why or what they are going to do for Peel Golf Club. They have done nothing in the past. They did not give us any intimation of what they intended to do for the future if anything, in fact it was not mentioned what they intended to do but, as I am repeating myself, the upkeep of that Golf Club and Links is going to increase, it is going to be a strain on the limited resources of Peel as a small town. Why they want to take it I cannot understand and instead of agreeing with the last speaker, the hon. member, Mr. Creer, I am disagreeing in that it would be to their benefit not to take it.

Mr. Bolton: Your Excellency, there is only one small point I wanted to make. I understood the hon. member for Michael, Mr. Kermeen, suggested that it was going to cost £80 more in rates to the Golf Links if they were taken into Peel. Now there is one point I would like to make arising out of that and it is that we have got the chairman of the Tourist Board sitting here who constantly suggests to the Finance Board that the Peel Golf Course among others cannot pay its way and needs assistance from the Government and that we should do something in order to assist them financially. So that if you put an extra burden of £80 on the Peel Golf Links then there will be a bigger demand for assistance from the Government and in fact we are only subsidising the Peel Town Commissioners. I really believe, sir, that even geographically looking at the map it sticks out like a sore thumb and it should really be left out.

The Governor: Would you like to reply, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: I would be delighted, Your Excellency. There has been one point raised relative to the proposal other than that relating to the golf club and the cemetery and that was raised by the hon. member for Middle, Mr. Creer, who queried why the boundary line came in right on Ballawattleworth Farm and showed no change. Quite an appropriate question, sir. It relates in fact to the sewage disposal problem. The sewer there goes in tight on the boundary and to extend into that area would mean pumping. We have the plan here indicating the line of sewer and that is the reason it was held in light. The position of our agricultural land values was irrelevant in my opinion. Having said that, Your Excellency, and having welcomed, as I do, the response of the Court to the proposals to extend in this way, I want to touch on the amendment. The amendment is an interesting one because it endeavours to establish in Tynwald that when you consider boundary extensions you give proper examination to areas where there is a community of interest. There are precedents for this being done and the most recent of all was Port Erin. At Port Erin we took in Rowany Links regarded as a desirable thing to do by Tynwald. At Peel a minority of your committee, and I am one of them, support the boundary embracing the Golf Links and the cemetery, because there is a community of interest. It is all right saying that Peel is taking over. Peel is not taking over the Links at all. It is, however, ensuring that they are within the boundary and are effectively protected. Now, Your Excellency, when you consider that it has been said that Peel's interest has been negligible in the past with relation to the Golf Links, you must also consider that we have it on record here that Peel's interest in the football club was negligible from a local authority point of view, but go to Peel any one of you and challenge the activities of the football club or the golf club and you will find there the

community of interest, the people's interest as opposed to the local authority interest, they believe that they belong to Peel, that they are theirs and that rightfully they have a very positive interest in them. They also feature them in their advertising material. Pick up any brochure on Peel and pick up any Tourist Board publication and you will find Peel Golf Club featured as a West of the Island attraction associated with Peel, not with German. Now you accuse Peel of disinterest, what about German? German have been pretty cute. They have given no services over the years, they have not even removed the refuse from the golf course, but, knowing full well that Tynwald was not going to let this one go unchallenged and the axe was likely to fall, what have they done? They have put the rates up already to compensate for the loss of £50 that will occur with this transfer to Peel. Pretty good thinking. I think, on their part, pretty astute. That has already happened and it is in our evidence. Now, Your Excellency, I have touched on, by way of an intervention, Mr. MacLeod's point that the high road out to the cemetery will not be a Peel responsibility, I would emphasise this, the boundary lies on the side of the road which will make it a Highway Board responsibility.

Mr. MacLeod: You want the best of two worlds.

The Speaker: Of course, sir. We regard this as a reasonable settlement and far from, as some people have alleged, the vultures of Peel being active on this particular carcass it would appear to me that there are some others who might have an interest in picking the bones too or at least in hanging on to what they have, but, Your Excellency, discounting all these things, getting down to brass tacks if you are going to create a community, if you have got a Ramsey, a Laxey, a Peel and so on you want within that community the features that are in fact part and parcel

of the social life and this is the same with Peel. It must not have its golf club out. We recognise that the football club that has had no different treatment must be included and the boundary has gone out specifically, as you can see, to do this. Right, it is logical to assume that the rest must follow and I fully support the amendment and commend it to the Court.

The Governor: The amendment of Mr. MacDonald is in effect that the cemetery and the golf course be included and that be added to the recommendations. Those in favour of the amendment please say aye and those against please say no.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

In the Keys:

For: Miss Thornton-Duesbery, Messrs. Creer, Edmonds, Faragher, Callister, Corkish, Bell, Burke, Kneale, Devereau, MacDonald and the Speaker—12.

Against: Messrs. Anderson, MacLeod, Kermeen, Radcliffe, Clucas, Spittall, Simcocks, Crellin, Vereker, Irving, Sir Henry Sugden, Mr. Hislop—12.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, the amendment fails to carry in the Keys. 12 votes being cast in favour and 12 votes against.

In the Council:

For: Mr. Quayle—1.

Against: The Lord Bishop, Deemster Moore, Messrs. Bolton, Radcliffe, Corkhill, Nivison, Crowe and Keruish—8.

The Governor: One Peelite and eight Germans. (Laughter). It fails to carry. Now the original resolution. Those in favour please say aye and those against please say no. The ayes have it.

PETITION OF RAMSEY TOWN
COMMISSIONERS TO BORROW
MONIES RE FOUL SEWER
BETWEEN BOWRING ROAD
AND LEZAYRE PARK
ESTATE — APPROVED.

The Governor: Item number 37. The chairman of the Local Government Board.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, in respect of the Petition of the Ramsey Town Commissioners for authority to borrow a sum not exceeding £13,500, at a maximum rate of interest not exceeding the rate of lawful interest from time to time obtaining, repayable within a period of 30 years from the date of borrowing, to defray the cost of the installation of a duplicate foul sewer between Bowring Road and the Lezayre Road Housing Estate. I beg to move that the Prayer of the foregoing Petition be and the same is hereby granted. Borrowing powers are sought in this petition in the sum of £13,500 for the adequate replacement of the existing sewer, 15 inches in diameter and approximately 1,050 ft. in length in order to link the foul sewer presently serving Lezayre Road housing estate in the town of Ramsey with the existing duplicated foul sewer in Bowring Road.

Sir Henry Sugden: I would like to ask Your Excellency, whether or not it is intended to connect any of the present houses already built in the housing estate in the Lezayre Road, with this sewer, or whether it is not?

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, the houses already built in the Lezayre Road are naturally already connected to their sewers, and it is therefore not concerned with this extension. This extension is to provide further facilities for the extension of Lezayre Park and any other additional building on the area because the present sewer through

the town, and especially through the car park area, is not sufficient to cope with any future development.

The Governor: Is that agreed?

It was agreed.

PETITION OF DOUGLAS
CORPORATION RE PURCHASE
OF FELICE'S DAIRY, ETC.,
AND 7 CHURCH ROAD AND
CONSEQUENTIAL BORROWING
POWERS — APPROVED.

The Governor: Item number 38. The chairman of the Local Government Board.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, in respect of the Petition of the Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of the Borough of Douglas — (a) for approval to the purchase of premises in Chester Street, known as Felice's Dairy and Ice-Cream Factory, from Doris Ena Felice and Dominic Felice, for the sum of £43,500; (b) for approval to the purchase of Riversdale, 7 Church Road, Douglas, from Florence Armitage, for £12,500 and (c) for authority to borrow a sum not exceeding £56,000, at a maximum rate of interest not exceeding the rate of lawful interest from time to time obtaining, repayable within 30 years from the date of borrowing, to defray the cost of such purchases. I beg to move that the Prayer of the foregoing Petition be and the same is hereby granted. This Petition covers the proposed purchase of property and the continuation of the Chester Street/Wellington Square area clearance and re-development scheme. The agreed purchase price of £43,500 for Felice's Dairy and Ice-Cream Factory and £12,500 for Riversdale, 7 Church Road, Douglas, are considered by the Board to be reasonable taking into consideration compensation claims for removal and legal and other fees. In the case of the factory premises the Vendors'

original claim was for £50,000, but negotiations resulted in agreement being reached on a satisfactory lower figure. It is proposed that the Vendors, following payment of the purchase money, continue to occupy the premises as tenants at a rental of £2,000 per annum, rates also to be their responsibility pending their occupation of their new factory. The property at 7 Church Road, Douglas, which was purchased by the Vendor, Mrs. Armitage, in 1966, for £10,500 has been considerably improved since then, necessitating the higher figure. The petitioners hope to obtain possession of this property on the 12th November, 1971. It is appreciated that a considerable period may elapse before the new factory is ready for occupation, but the Board has impressed on the petitioners the need for expedition in the clearance and redevelopment of the Chester Street/Wellington Square area, and expressed the hope that it will be possible to include provision for parking facilities in connection with the new central government offices. The petitioners have given an assurance that negotiations presently proceeding with regard to the remaining 12-14 properties will be pursued diligently, compulsory purchase powers already being in their possession should such negotiations be unsuccessful. The annual interest and sinking fund on the proposed borrowing of £56,000, are together estimated not to exceed £5,479. Your Excellency, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The Governor: Is it agreed?

It was agreed.

PETITION OF CASTLETOWN
COMMISSIONERS RE SALE OF
LAND AT THE PARADE
— NOT APPROVED.

The Governor: Item number 39. The chairman of the Local Government Board.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, in respect of the Petition of the Castletown Town Commissioners for approval to the sale of a plot of land containing 145 square yards or thereabouts abutting the Parade, Castletown, to G. H. Costain Ltd., for £1,310. I beg to move that the Prayer of the foregoing Petition be and the same is hereby granted. Under this Petition authority is sought to sell to G. H. Costain Ltd., for the sum of £1,310, the plot of land lying between the Town Hall and the Isle of Man Bank in the town of Castletown, such plot being approximately 145 square yards in area. In their public notice inviting offers for this land the Petitioners stipulated that any offer must be accompanied by a scheme for the use of the site and reserved their right to consider offers in the light of the benefit of any proposed development to the town of Castletown, not being bound to accept the highest offer. In addition to the offer of Messrs. G. H. Costain Ltd., for £1,310 — the site to be developed as a butchers' shop — an offer of £750 was received from the directors of the Isle of Man Bank Ltd., who further offered to top the highest offer by £50 to a maximum of £1,250 and proposed that the plot be retained as an open space for flower tubs and the possible parking of two or three cars. The Petitioners wish to accept the offer of Messrs. G. H. Costain Ltd., not only being the highest offer but also the one which included a proper proposal for development. During the hearing of the Petition opposition was entered by the Isle of Man Bank Ltd., who considered the area in question would be enhanced by an open space, rather than by the development proposed, and strongly objected to the conduct of the transaction, particularly with regard to certain delay in notification. The Board, recognising the Isle of Man Bank Ltd. may have certain grounds for dissatisfaction, have expressed the Petitioners' concern over the procedure in

this matter, but at the same time decided to uphold their decision. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

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

Mr. Vereker: Your Excellency, it may seem strange to this hon. Court that I, as a member of the local authority, should get up to object to this, but I object on the strongest grounds of principle, and I would like to give some history in this — what I consider a sad affair. The original paper advertisement, was put in the paper for this particular property and offers and plans were to be submitted to the Board by the 15th June, 1970. On the 1st July at a Board meeting only one offer was received from the Bank, which has been stated, of a financial offer but no plan, although certain suggestions and a firm proposal of use offered. We also received at that particular time a rough sketch plan from Messrs. Costains but no offer of finance, but a request to meet the Board to discuss the future of their proposals. To my mind, sir, technically, and in accordance with the original advertisement, both of these offers should have been pronounced out of order and technically we should have started again. I might mention at this stage, sir, that the Planning Officer had been requested to make his observations on this particular property and he had advised that if we were going to build there that it should be office accommodation. At this stage the principle of accepting any offers at all should have only been done through the medium of advertising again for offers offered by a certain date, and this would have given all parties including the interested ones that had submitted certain proposals, a chance and an equal chance to re-tender or re-submit. The question of whether it is a tender or an offer is to my mind, sir, only splitting hairs. It is, of course, subject to the usual procedure that a Board or authority is not subject to accept any

offer if it so thinks fit, and especially as stated in the published Conditions of Sale by the Commissioners. However, further discussions were held during the ensuing months and at a meeting held on the 2nd September, 1970, an offer or tender — whichever you like to call it — was opened from Costains, without any further advertising, and at this stage this offer or tender was accepted by the Board with three members of the Board including myself absent, and up to that moment no word, no prior word, no prior approach had been made to inform the Bank of what had happened since they put in their original offer which was opened on the 1st July, 1970. But my concern, Your Excellency, is mainly on principle, and I felt so strongly about this at that particular time that at a Board meeting on October 7th, 1970, I moved a notice of motion to re-open the matter and had Standing Orders suspended so I could do this, and to have the whole matter carried out in a proper procedural manner, in consideration that we were a public authority dealing with public monies and subject to public opinion. Unfortunately this motion was defeated by one vote, and I still felt so strongly that I had to put on record that I would not and had not taken part in what I considered a very wrong and detrimental procedure. It is on this matter of principle, sir, that I must object to this Petition. I personally reported my misgivings to the hon. chairman of the Local Government Board, and I am frankly rather surprised that the Board have apparently condoned this Petition, despite the concern expressed in the last paragraph of the Petition which has been read out. I have no interest whatsoever in who gains the property or who builds there, but it is on the strongest basis of correct principle of negotiations by a public body that I am voting against the Petition.

Mr. Bell: Your Excellency, briefly, much the same views. I would express. I read this, appearances in the news-

papers, and I have listened to the chairman and I have heard him say that they are in the least disappointed with the procedural irregularities — if you could use that description — and that he has ticked them off, and then he says that he is recommending this for our approval. I do not think that something which is as irregular as this should come to the Court of Tynwald to be approved. I think it should be done — as the hon. member for Castletown has said — and should have been done long ago, it should have been done the correct way. Because it has been so incorrect for so long a period is not sufficient for me to approve it today and I do regret it has been brought to us for approval. I would much prefer, although I would be wishing for pigs to fly, for it to be withdrawn. I would encourage every other like thinking member of this Court to vote against its approval.

Sir Henry Sugden: Your Excellency, the hon. member for Castletown has indicated that there was a period of two or three months between the Isle of Man Bank's tender and the actual firm tender from G. H. Costain. It does seem to me that there is in this a very wrong degree of procedure. I personally support the hon. member for South Douglas, that this should be withdrawn.

The Lord Bishop: Your Excellency, I wonder if I could just raise a point, not about procedure, but about the town planning aspect of this. It may be that the other members of the Court all have the picture of this in mind, but I have not, and I would be grateful if somebody could provide me in the immediate future with a plan showing what we are talking about. Because it is impossible, really, to form a judgement without having the thing in detail. But having said that, I notice that the Petitioners were not bound to accept the highest offer, but would consider the benefit of any proposed development to the town of Castletown. I was delighted to see

that because as I judge it it means that when we are settling the development of our towns we shall not consider only matters of how much money we get for a site, but what will be the general appearance of the town when we have finished. In the case of Castletown I would judge that all of us would feel that the beauty and dignity of Castletown is a Manx national interest concerning us all. Secondly, I notice that the Board's Planning Officer advised high-class office type development. Looking at the thing without knowledge of detail there are three methods of using the space. One is an open space; the second is office type development, and the third is a butcher's shop. Well, all these things are valuable, including the butcher's shop. But speaking quite independently of detailed knowledge of it I would have thought in place like Castletown one would hesitate very greatly before setting aside an open space. But if you had to set aside an open space I would have thought the Board would have wished to accept its Officer's advice to have high-class office development rather than the shop — and I am not speaking, of course, with any particular animus against the shop concerned, but just principle.

Mr. Kneale: Your Excellency, as a member of the Local Government Board to this case, I think every member of the Local Government Board was disturbed at the methods adopted by the Castletown Commissioners. Their spokesman said himself that it was bad manners that they had adopted to the Bank. But I think it goes much deeper than that, and whereas I agreed to it coming before this Court, I agreed with it because I think it is time we let people know that there is a proper method of doing things, and they must comply if they are hoping to get their petitions through here. In this case, not only did they ignore the Bank completely, but they brought the other person in and there is more than a strong suspicion that they told them what the

Bank's offer was and virtually said you make us an offer above that and it is yours. There is more than a slight suspicion about this; this is what leaves it wide open, the methods they adopt. I think that some of the methods that some Commissioners adopt to get their petitions brought forward, or the methods they do before they present their petitions even to the Local Government Board, are very much in need of revision, and it would be a salutary warning to the others if the Court rejected this today.

Mr. Devereau: Your Excellency, I am a bit shocked that the Local Government Board did hear this Petition and made judgement on it, hear these facts and then recommend that Tynwald accepts the Prayer of the Petition. It seems to be completely wrong to me. Members of the Local Government Board are admitting now in Tynwald Court that they heard all the facts in this case. I think that most of the members of this hon. Court feel rather shocked that this has been allowed to go this far, and I think that the Local Government Board must bear some of the responsibility in this case. I feel that the action of the Local Government Board should have been to have sent this back in the first stage to the Castletown Commissioners for the proper action to be taken. I think that the hon. member for South Douglas has got something when he says it should be put back.

Mr. Crellin: Your Excellency, I feel that there are one or two things which have been said in this Court which do want putting right. I would like to make it perfectly clear that the Local Government Board, as such, had no evidence whatsoever before it that there had been any indication given to anybody about what price was offered by anybody. What people may suspect in their minds is not our affair. We were dealing with evidence that was placed before us, and there was no evidence whatso-

ever that G. H. Costain Ltd., were notified as to the price which had been offered by the Isle of Man Bank. Let us be absolutely sure. Your Excellency, when we consider the role of the Castletown Commissioners in this respect. We, as the father and mother of Commissioners, have to hear their Petitions and make recommendations to this Court, who are supposed also to show responsibility of the same like. When the Castletown Commissioners came before us they explained first of all that they did not call for tenders in the normal sense of the term; that they called — as has been explained by the hon. member for Castletown — for offers and schemes for the development of this piece of land. In answer to the query which was made by the Lord Bishop, the reason why the Architect and Planning Officer had suggested to the Castletown Commissioners that high-class office development would be the best way to develop this site was, because in his view, you had a wall at the present moment which would be removed, and if an open space were made, albeit a thing of beauty, when the winds do blow it would make the Parade in Castletown an extremely windy place, and he thought that there was sufficient wind about there already. Therefore it was far better to have an edifice of the same type and character as those already built on the site. Hence, he thought, high-class office development, because this was a suitable town centre development, just the same as shops or shopping facilities is a normal town centre development. So there was no advice, so far as the Architect and Planning Officer of the Local Government Board was concerned which would in any way offend any of the sensibilities of either conservationists or architecturalists with regard to the development of this site. But it meant always that it was a town centre development which would do the one thing which an open space at that point might not do, and that was keep the Parade sheltered.

The schemes came before the Castletown Commissioners and they were neither of them complete. Let us consider, as we considered on the Board, the question of the offer which was made by the Isle of Man Bank. It was an offer which said that they were prepared . . . they thought of using this as an open space, but they had no immediate plans for it, no immediate plans for it, but they were prepared to offer £750 for the site and they would top anybody's else's offer by £50. This may be a very suitable offer in certain worlds, but so far —

Member: What to ?

Mr. Crellin: Up to a limit of £1,250. Supposing the other firm, George Costain, had come along and said that they too wanted the site and they would be prepared to pay the £750 and top anybody's else's offer until they came to a limit of £1,250. These were, Your Excellency, not real schemes. I look upon it that the Castletown Commissioners are responsible for the administration of the affairs of Castletown, and within the limits of their responsibility, I considered that their attitude towards this was fair and reasonable. From the one person they had had an intimation that he was interested and would submit a scheme for consideration; from the other person that they were prepared to offer money for it, but had not got their scheme finalised, but at the present moment did not intend to do anything about it. I would have said that any local authority, at that stage, would have been quite justified, in the interest of their ratepayers, to find out which was the best use. There was no question of lenders, no question of precedent, no question of procedure which normally we would attend to in the buying of a vehicle or the awarding of a contract; there were no contractual responsibilities involved in this. This was a question, a moral perhaps and this is why we told the Castletown Commissioners that we were not

happy with the way it had been handled, but we were quite happy with their decision on the subject. I believe that they have the right to bring this forward, and I think we would be wrong to turn down their Petition.

Mr. Nivison: Your Excellency, one point that I would like to raise. Many of us were not quite sure as to the actual site, and we received the plan. It does say in the Petition that is before us that the property is between the Isle of Man Bank and the local authority offices. Am I right on that ?

Members: Yes.

Mr. Nivison: Absolutely right. In my view it would be completely wrong and further along that Parade to have a butcher's shop, in my view — and I would support the suggestion put forward by the Planning Officer who has to be — he has come forward with a recommendation here and he has got to be very careful what he says. But it is not always desirable to put a food shop between an office, like a Bank, and a local authority office. I would hope that some further consideration may be given to this. It might be (interruption). Well why not ? Of course why not, but I think you have got to have some ideas of planning in your mind. There are shopping areas and there are office areas, and in my view it would be quite wrong to put a butcher's shop between a local authority office and a Bank. I would hope that further consideration might be given to this in order that they might even consider the Isle of Man Bank offer.

Mr. Callister: Your Excellency, having heard all we have, I feel certain that we ought not, and we are not competent, to pass this Petition. I think that the best thing we can do is to vote against it and allow Castletown Commissioners to put their house in order and come forward later with a new Petition.

Petition of Castletown Commissioners Re Sale of Land at the Parade — Not Approved.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, I would like to thank my vice-chairman for explaining the situation as clearly as he has done. All I have to say further to what he has already commented on is two basic factors. The Castletown Commissioners advertised a piece of ground for tenders and they wanted to know to what use that piece of ground could be put. The first objection we had to the procedure was that, on accepting the offer from the Isle of Man Bank, having been advised by the Planning Officer that this piece of ground should be used for development, either office or some other kind of development, they did not tell the Isle of Man Bank that their use of the land was not to the satisfaction of the Castletown Commissioners and therefore their offer would not be considered. There was only one offer and this is the main reason why the Board today have brought this Petition to this hon. Court. There was only one offer made to the Castletown Commissioners for the use of the ground for the purpose for which they intended to have it used.

Mr. Vereker: Not by the date stated.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: This is the evidence. I am not interested in what happened at Castletown Commissioners' meetings; I am interested in what happened when this Petition came before the Local Government Board. As much as we were concerned about the procedure the best decision that we felt we could rightly take was to consider the factor and we only had two cases to consider whether or not the Commissioners really were using this land to the benefit of the town and for the reasons they wanted to use it, and on the advice of the Planning Department. Reference has been made to a block of offices. This was suggested, admittedly by the Planning Officer. No offer came forward for the piece of ground to be used for offices, and the Planning Officer, sitting with us, recommended at the time that when this offer was put

forward for the shop in a town centre development, it was quite in order to accept the principle of having this used for shopping purposes. Bearing all the factors in mind, the Board saw no other alternative, as there was only one offer that the Commissioners really could accept; the main fault was that they did not tell the Isle of Man Ltd. in the first place that they were not interested in holding it as an open space (interruption).

Mr. Vereker: They did not give anybody else a chance.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: They advertised in the first place.

Mr. Vereker: Only once.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: They advertised and only two offers came forward. Anyhow, Your Excellency, it is up to this hon. Court to make up their own minds. I feel certain, having considered the evidence before the Board, we took the correct decision and I would like to move the resolution in my name.

The Governor: Those in favour of granting the Petition please say aye, and those against say no. The noes have it.

PETITION OF ONCHAN VILLAGE
COMMISSIONERS RE BORROWING
POWERS RE SEWER DIVERSION
IN VICTORIA AVENUE
— APPROVED.

The Governor: Item number 40. The chairman of the Local Government Board.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, in respect of the Petition of the Onchan Village Commissioners for authority to borrow a sum not exceeding £8,500, at a maximum rate of interest not exceeding the rate of lawful interest from time to time obtaining, repayable within 50 years from the date of borrowing, to defray the cost of the diversion of the foul sewer running down Victoria

Avenue, Onchan, from its present junction with the foul sewer in Main Road, Onchan, by joining the Victoria Avenue sewer to the existing foul sewer in Summerhill Road. I beg to move that the Prayer of the foregoing Petition be and the same is hereby granted. Your Excellency, this is a Petition for borrowing powers in the sum of £8,500 to defray the cost of necessary sewer diversion in the Village District of Onchan, involving the laying of a new sewer in Victoria Avenue along the main road and Summerhill Road until it reaches the existing sewer manhole near the junction of Ridgeway Road and Summerhill Road, including the diversion of the Governors Road sewer into the proposed new sewer at the junction of Summerhill Road.

The Governor: Is it agreed?

It was agreed.

Mr. Callister: I would like to ask Your Excellency if this work is not already proceeding?

Members: No.

Mr. Bell: That is unusual (laughter).

Mr. P. Radcliffe: I think they have learnt their lesson with the van.

**PETITION OF ONCHAN VILLAGE
COMMISSIONERS RE LEASE OF
MEADOW VIEW TO BOARD OF
SOCIAL SECURITY
— APPROVED.**

The Governor: Item number 41. The chairman of the Local Government Board.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, in respect of the Petition of the Onchan Village Commissioners for approval of the lease to the Isle of Man Board of Social Security of the Warden's House at Meadow View, Onchan for term of ninety-nine years, at a rental of not less than £4 per week. I beg to move that the Prayer of the foregoing Petition be and the same is hereby granted. Your Excellency, under this Petition authority is sought for the Petitioners

to lease to the Isle of Man Board of Social Security the Warden's House for the elderly people —

Members: Agreed.

It was agreed.

**REPORT OF STANDING ORDERS
COMMITTEE — PETITIONS
FOR REDRESS.**

The Governor: Item number 42. I have to report to this hon. Court that the Standing Orders Committee, who have circulated a Report, have found Petition No. 1 in order and Petitions No. 2 and 3 to be out of order.

The Speaker: Your Excellency, is anyone permitted to comment on your Report?

The Governor: Well, it is not my Report.

The Speaker: Well, sir, you are announcing the Report. May I comment on it, sir?

The Governor: Yes.

The Speaker: This is what I wish to say. I feel, Your Excellency, that the right to petition Tynwald is losing whatever effectiveness it may have had or enjoyed in the past. I believe that the right to petition Tynwald is a true right of every Manxman and that in the imposition of Standing Orders, in the manner that we are dealing with Petitions, we are effectively reducing that right to such a stage that it is completely worthless. My point is, Your Excellency, that any future House should give consideration to an amendment to Standing Orders to make Petitions much more effective, and to enable petitioners to have the feeling that having petitioned Tynwald, they are getting the opportunity to come to the ultimate body and have their case dealt with by them and fairly. That, I believe, Your Excellency, is a feeling that is diminishing in the minds of the Manx people and must be looked after.

Mr. Callister: Your Excellency, you reminded me this morning about

Standing Orders before I started to speak. I would like to be assured that this does not interfere with my resolution regarding the Nunnery on the Agenda.

The Governor: But your Resolution is suspending Standing Orders.

Mr. Callister: Yes, quite. It does not affect this? It does not affect my move?

The Governor: No.

Mr. Callister: Thank you.

The Lord Bishop: Could I ask a question, Your Excellency. With regard to No. 1, what now is the next thing that will happen or ought to happen now that this Petition has been regarded as in order?

The Governor: It is now open to any member of this hon. Court to make a proposal in the terms of the Petition.

Mr. Kneale: What the Committee recommended should have been done. The people instead of wasting time should have done that in the first place.

ATTEMPT TO PLACE A RESOLUTION ON AGENDA RE NEW GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS — REJECTED.

Mr. Bell: Your Excellency, may I rise in conjunction with Standing Order 54 and 55, notice of which I give you and ask four other members to stand with me on a matter of urgent public importance.

The Governor: Well you had better read out what it is first.

Mr. Bell: "That in respect of new Government buildings, no contracts for demolition or erection should be concluded before Tynwald has been informed of the detailed proposals, plans and costs and approved same."

Four members rose in their seats.

The Governor: That is the first hurdle.

Mr. Bell: Yes, I have been in this position before, sir.

The Governor: Will you hand up the resolution. Thank you very much. Mr. Bell wishes to move a resolution — "That in respect of the new Government buildings no contracts for demolition or erection should be concluded before Tynwald has been informed of the detailed proposals, plans and costs and approved same". Under Standing Order 55, he has to obtain the leave of Tynwald to propose his resolution. Will those in favour of putting this on the Agenda immediately, please say aye. and those against say no.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

In the Keys:

For: Messrs. MacLeod, Clucas, Miss Thornton-Duesbery, Messrs. Creer, Edmonds, Faragher, Callister, Corkish, Bell, MacDonald, Hislop and the Speaker — 12.

Against: Messrs. Anderson, Kermeen, Radcliffe, Spittall, Crellin, Vereker, Burke, Kneale, Devereau and Sir Henry Sugden — 10.

The Speaker: The voting, Your Excellency, on the Resolution was 12 votes in favour and 10 votes against.

In the Council:

For: The Lord Bishop, Messrs. Corkhill, Nivison and Quayle — 4.

Against: Deemster Moore, Messrs. Bolton, Radcliffe, Crowe and Keruish — 5.

The Governor: Four in favour and five against. So I am afraid you do not get your way.

Mr. Bell: Is it possible to have a joint vote? I would like to rise to ask for the eight members of the House of Keys to adjourn to their own Chamber.

The Governor: But you do not seem to have eight men.

The Speaker: He is checking the Standing Order, sir. Standing Order 19(2) Your Excellency. Do you wish me to put the Resolution?

The Governor: At any time. Well, he can move. Yes, you have to move, and there is no debate or amendment. If one-third of the members of the Keys present vote in its favour then the Keys retire.

RESOLUTION THAT KEYS
ADJOURN TO OWN
CHAMBER — PASSED.

Mr. Bell: I so move that the Keys adjourn to their own Chamber. Your Excellency.

Mr. Corkish: I beg to second.

The Governor: Those in favour please say aye and those against say no. Well I should think at least one-third were

in favour but we had better have a division for the record.

In the Keys:

For: Messrs. MacLeod: Clucas, Miss Thornton-Duesbery, Messrs. Creer, Edmonds, Faragher, Callister, Corkish, Bell, MacDonald, Hislop and the Speaker — 12.

Against: Messrs. Anderson, Kermeen, Radcliffe, Spittall, Crellin, Vereker, Burke, Kneale, Devereau and Sir Henry Sugden — 10.

Mr. P. Radcliffe: Your Excellency, would it possibly be in order to ask at this stage how many of the hon. members today that voted for the adjournment to our own Chamber against this Resolution voted in favour of this Resolution in this hon. Court?

The Governor: Well, it would not be in order but you have made your point. In view of the Keys retiring to their own Chamber, the Council, will go home until 10.30 tomorrow. (laughter).