

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF TYNWALD COURT (DEBATES AND OTHER MATTERS)

**Douglas, Wednesday, 20th November 2002
at 10.30 a.m.**

Present:

The President of Tynwald (the Hon. N Q Cringle).

In the Council: The Lord Bishop (the Rt Revd Noël Debroy Jones), Hon. C M Christian, Mr D F K Delaney, Mr D J Gelling CBE, Mr J R Kniveton, Mr E G Lowey, Dr E J Mann and Mr G H Waft, with Mrs M Cullen, Clerk of the Council.

In the Keys: The Speaker (the Hon. J A Brown) (Castletown); Mr D M Anderson (Glenfaba); Hon. A R Bell and Mr L I Singer (Ramsey); Mr R E Quine OBE (Ayre); Mr J D Q Cannan (Michael); Mrs H Hannan (Peel); Hon. S C Rodan (Garff); Mr P Karran, Hon. R K Corkill and Mr A J Earnshaw (Onchan); Mr G M Quayle (Middle); Mr J R Houghton and Mr R W Henderson (Douglas North); Hon. D C Cretney (Douglas South); Hon. R P Braidwood and Mrs B J Cannell (Douglas East); Hon. A F Downie and Hon. J P Shimmin (Douglas West); Capt. A C Douglas (Malew and Santon); Hon. J Rimington, Mr Q B Gill and Hon. P M Crowe (Rushen); with Mr M Cornwell-Kelly, Clerk of Tynwald.

The Lord Bishop took the prayers.

Items Considered

Residency Control – Referendum – Debate Commenced	T256
Residency Control – Referendum – Debate Concluded – Motion Lost	T276
Iraq – Government Policy – Amended Motion Carried	T292

Residency Control – Referendum – Debate Commenced

The President: Hon. members, we continue with our order paper this morning at item 13, headed ‘Residency Control’, and I call on the hon. member for Ayre to move.

Mr Quine: Thank you, Mr President. I beg to move:

That Tynwald resolves that a referendum, under the provisions of the Referendum Act 1979, be held in the Island on the question of whether or not residency control should be introduced.

I recognise that this motion centres on the matter of referenda, more specifically the proposition that we should have a referendum on residency control. Nonetheless, and unavoidably so, I must also speak to the need and the importance of residency control.

The person in the street is inclined to make the case somewhat subjectively. The dilution of national identity: unquestionably that has taken place in recent years and continues to take place. Many Island residents would, I believe, in the same breath, point to the absence of effective checks on who comes into this Island. Of course, we have our own home-grown rascals, but they are very properly our own responsibility. Disfigurement of the Island through excessive development, of which there are many examples: given that this hon. Court has sanctioned a process to bypass the established planning procedures to hasten the building of more homes, further disfigurement is inevitable. That this disfigurement has taken place is transparently obvious. It is the almost inevitable consequence of the rampant immigration that we have witnessed over the lifetime of the last parliament, over the five years, immigration growth of such order that it would take a town the size of Peel to accommodate them. Of course, some of our infrastructure was in need of renewal. We already had a commitment to a new acute hospital, albeit that many question the size and the cost of the hospital that we are just completing. Similarly, with IRIS and the energy-from-waste plant, there was already a commitment, but, that said, it is problematic how long the design capacities and projected staffing levels will hold good with continuing immigration of the present order. Other parts of our social structure are directly related to the size and rate of immigration, or the rate of growth of immigration, the most obvious example, of course, being our schools. I believe we have, for example, something like 30 mobile units around our schools at this point in time. These costs, I am afraid, are not only reflected in capital terms but they are going to be ongoing in terms of the revenue. Without doubt, people coming to this Island are going to come here for other reasons apart from those which are purely economic, and one of those reasons is to take advantage of our superior social services at a cost to this Island.

This, Mr President, brings me to the part of the case on which I wish to focus primarily this morning, and that is the present situation where we have largely undirected economic development which fires the population growth. It is this undirected development – and, to an extent, indiscriminate development – which has caused, and continues to cause many of our problems. It is not economic development *per se*; it is the *laissez-faire* approach on which it is borne. Of course, government will contest this but, in the absence of a clear and comprehensive economic strategy, I would suggest that, before any jury, they would have great difficulty in refuting it. Mr President, it is my contention that demographic policy is inseparable from economic policy, in that residency control should be used as a management tool. Let me underline that statement with a quote from a distinguished retired member of this hon. Court, a highly qualified man with a record of success in the finance sector – and I quote – ‘Undirected economic growth can do great damage to the long-term health of any community. The Manx nation, being small, is particularly vulnerable. The destruction of the Manx nation is not a price that I can even contemplate paying. Such destruction would undoubtedly threaten the political independence of the Island, thereby destroying the rationale for the finance industry in the first place. In the same way as the beautiful countryside can be utterly turned into a derelict land, so can a small nation be utterly destroyed by an immigrant neo-colonial culture.’ (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.)

Mr President, a somewhat prophetic quote, having regard to what has happened over the last five years, starting with the Edwards exercise and now the EU pressures with which we are confronted. After all, it is on the strength of Hobson’s choice that we have adopted a new (amended) tax strategy. Undeniably, momentous changes are taking place throughout Western Europe, and we are not immune from them, but that is not the whole story. The Isle of Man Government has a new economic strategy in the making, so we have been told. That new strategy should recognise the relevance of demographic policy in fashioning a more discerning and less indiscriminate economic policy. In the view of some economists and bankers here on the Island, there is a need to interface economic strategy with demographic strategy to essentially achieve three things: firstly, to minimise demand on social infrastructure; secondly, to reduce the cost of social policies; and thirdly, to enhance productivity and maximise the affluence of the Manx people. Put another way, there is a need to use our limited capacity, which is, in the main, overextended, by regulating population growth to make it available in the most beneficial way for economic growth.

As matters now stand, the Island is open to all forms of economic development, irrespective of worth, whether it contributes to a high wage economy or not, and it has equal claim on the Island’s overextended labour market. If the labour for the enterprise cannot be met, then you have largely made your case to bring in more people on work permits, in doing so creating further pressure on the social infrastructure and

services. A high percentage of those who enter the Island on a work permit do not leave the Island; the commitment therefore is ongoing. This is, in large part, why I support residency control – not the totality of the case, but a large part of it. Assuredly, residency-cum-immigration control – in our case, we are talking of residency control, but the underlying principles of control are very much the same – is not a novel concept; most countries have such régimes and unashamedly apply them as an economic management tool. They readily recognise the importance of the size of the population, the rate of growth and the relationship to economic productivity, and the impact on their ability to meet social costs. It is their belief that the greater the net return, the greater the affluence of the population. In common with those countries, I see nothing abhorrent in seeking to reconcile economic and demographic factors.

Of course, the administration holds that there are almost insuperable obstacles in implementing residency control, yet most countries with immigration régimes, accepting the marginal differences in control techniques between residency and immigration control, have regulatory mechanisms incorporating gateways and criteria which determine the acceptance or rejection of passage through those gateways. They have confronted the matter of intrusiveness, but in my view, here on the Island, any intrusiveness would be readily and willingly accepted because of the advantage for the majority of the population (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and the bottom line which matters to them, which is the future for their country. These other countries have dealt with difficult choices about which the Chief Minister is apparently so concerned, but the initial step is for the administration to come forward with their proposals, something they have not yet done, with all the resources at their beck and call. Failing that, then, as I have said before, they should hold up their hands and let a select committee of this hon. Court continue the task.

Mr President, yes, there would be a cost, which would be offset in part against reduced social costs and in part by the slimmed-down work permit system, and yes, the two systems do need to continue, to an extent, in parallel. That is not in dispute. Then there is the matter of perception, taken in their stride by numerous other countries, but such a problem in the eyes of our administration. I subscribe to the view, expressed by an informed commentator, that the perception of those people outside the Island, those people who really matter, would be positive, as we would be seen to be realigning economic policy with the accent on quality. And how often have we heard this administration say, ‘Quality, quality, quality’?

Reduced to its most basic, Mr President, the hypothesis, I think, is readily understandable: rampant increase in population has a heavy cost, primarily in relation to social structure and services. It is, therefore, logical and sensible to seek to regulate and direct labour, so far as may be feasible, to those areas where it is needed and where, in economic terms, it makes the greatest contribution to national income. Quite recently, we had a headline in the paper saying, ‘X jobs

to be created by this fast-food outlet.’ What does that contribute to this Island economy? (**A Member:** Nothing.) What does that contribute? (**A Member:** Litter.) That contributes to further overextension and further cost, further demands for housing and further demands for social services. The bottom line there is not a net benefit, (**Mr Houghton:** Hear, hear.) Hence, Mr President, the need for this essential interface between economic and demographic policy. And please, hon. members, do not accept without question the line that we are doing exceptionally well because we measure up against the United Kingdom, a country with a mid-league placement in terms of GNP; take another example, for the simple fact is that Jersey’s GNI per capita, which is essentially the same thing, is almost twice the Isle of Man’s. Could we do as well or better with a less indiscriminate and more discerning approach? I believe we could. Certainly, no case has been made for the doom and gloom held out by opponents of residency control, because the case, such as it is, that has been proffered to resist residency control is based on negative considerations.

Why is this motion seeking this hon. Court’s support for a referendum on residency control? Well, there are a number of reasons, firstly because it is blatantly obvious that this administration is not sincere in its commitment to advance residency control. (**Mr Karran:** Hear, hear.) Recent administrations have pursued a course of attrition over many years to avoid residency control. It took a Tynwald motion in February of this year to prompt recent debate, only for the Council of Ministers to respond with their report of September 2002, recommending that the issue be pushed sideways to the Social Issues Committee for at least another year. As regards the September 2002 report, that carried such conviction that it was simply to be received. The fact is, Mr President, that we are in a government-sponsored impasse. We have allowed this situation to develop, notwithstanding the majority of elected representatives in this hon. Court having pledged to their constituents to make residency control a reality. (**Mr Karran:** Hear, hear.) If hon. members cannot or will not honour their pledges, then we should revert to the people.

Secondly, Mr President, because residency control is uniquely important, not least in relation to its relevance to the economic and social well-being of the people of this Island. We cannot justifiably pass the primary legislation and then proceed to hide behind that as if it is sufficient in itself. The crucial issue is whether or not residency control should be implemented now, of which there can be no better judge than the people of this Island. It is their Island.

Thirdly, sir, because a point has been reached where the information for an informed decision on whether or not residency control should be implemented is available to the public. The key issues on which the public can make an informed judgement have been identified. It is not beyond the collective competence of the Manx people to take a view on gateways and the related optional criteria. There is a much larger question mark over the willingness of certain members of this hon. Court to enter into public

debate as a part of the referendum process – and let us just bear in mind that the referendum process carries with it public debate. To suggest that the Manx people are any less capable of digesting the essential information relating to residency control than millions of people throughout Western Europe who have exercised their rights under referenda in recent years is an insult to the intelligence of the Manx people.

Fourthly, Mr President, a referendum on residency control should be afforded to the Island's electors because they have been denied an opportunity to make their positions known through the election box at the general election. The electors have had no direct say in the selection of the Chief Minister, the ministers who make up the government, or the policies promoted and pursued by this administration. The Island's political structure does not provide our electors with a choice of policies. From the utterances of many candidates, including some of those in the Council of Ministers, the electors have good reason to believe that residency control would have been high on the political agenda, but that is not the case.

Mr President, we have a Referendum Act; the process is a legitimate process. The issue is certainly of sufficient import to warrant use of the referendum process. There is good cause for resorting to the referendum process. Sufficient information is available on which the electorate can express an opinion, and they should not be denied use of this democratic process to do that. The views of Island residents as a whole should not be subjugated to those of favoured business interests. There can be but one reason, Mr President, for this hon. Court today denying the electors the right of referendum, and that is that they wish to go along with the government, a government that knows there would be a substantial vote in favour of residency control if this was put to a referendum. To deny the electors access to a referendum on that basis is politically untenable. Mr President, it is not as if access to the referendum process is a rarity. Referenda are relatively commonplace in Western Europe, including the United Kingdom. Indeed, sir, four have been held in the United Kingdom in the last five years, and that is against a backdrop where the political framework allows the electorate, at the general election, the opportunity to influence the choice of government and policy. We have not accorded our people that right. To withhold the right of referendum on this important matter from our people would be a denial of their political rights and an *unwarranted* imputation on their ability to comprehend and express an informed opinion on the issue – and I stress that would be an *unwarranted* imputation. Mr President, I beg to move, sir.

The President: Hon. member for Ramsey, Mr Singer.

Mr Singer: Thank you, Mr President. I am very pleased to second this resolution proposed by the hon. member for Ayre. At the last election, my experience on the doorstep was that I found the topic of residency control and how the government was going to handle

situations that would be caused by a growing population to be a major concern, and I do believe that the majority of candidates in all areas of the Island found that this was a major subject on the doorstep. And that is not automatically making the assumption that the population was going to extend at a great rate, but what proposals would the government have if that, in fact, appeared to be happening? I intend to refer to various matters and comments that have been made in recent times on the subject, Mr President, to illustrate the need to ascertain the view of the public either for or against residency control.

The public, on the election doorstep, expressed considerable concerns about the unchecked influx of new residents, and they are now interpreting the previous government's decision to introduce a residency Act as a way to pacify the critics but without any resolve to act, and the present government is following that very same policy. There is, I feel, a definite opinion that this is a situation where forward planning is essential, a case of being in control of events as they are happening, not fire-fighting in the future, and I would say quite categorically that this government's policy of no action is out of step with public opinion. The general public can see that, without any plans for limitation of immigration and defining who would be allowed to settle here and who would not and for what reasons, forward planning of the infrastructural needs is nigh impossible. The government seems to have rejected the position of leading from the front on several pretexts, including damage to the economy by potential investors being scared away. I consider that, in fact, the opposite is the truth; investors wish to see a stable economy where it can be seen that the government knows exactly the direction in which it intends to move to bring prosperity to the people who reside here, to provide the worthwhile and well-paid jobs, to be able to afford the necessary infrastructure changes and improvements, to be able to afford a top-class social system for those less well-off and the young and the old, and to provide a roof over the head of every citizen. Any investor in business needs to know approximately where it will be in five or ten years' time. It is important for those businesses to know what policies this government will be following. They surely expect that, by promoting the residency Act the government intends to do something in the future. To keep the confidence of those business people, they need to know when and how these things are going to occur. It is no policy to keep the business sector and all the population guessing. The public are entitled also to indicate to government whether they agree with the change in policy direction after the government has promoted the residency Act. They see the present government policy as the following: a policy of 'We do not really know' and 'This is a difficult problem'. That is the way to chase business away. Surely the government needs to state its view as to the future so that businesses can be aware and able to plan for their future, taking into account a positive government policy and not having to plan blind. I am confident that if you ask the businessmen their opinion, they would say that

government should have a positive and strong policy to ensure the Island stays competitive by encouraging high-value, low-employment business, where the drain on the infrastructural resources is kept to a minimum. If that policy is implemented and is successful, then there may never be a need to implement the population limitation, but that is not an argument against having the regulations ready and available if needed. If there is no structured planning of the type of new business to be encouraged here, then we will have little or no control over the numbers of people settling here. A free-for-all does none of these things, and a general view is that the Council of Ministers, the government, has no desire to control and influence a future development of the Island, allowing the economy to grow wild without any pruning, to a point where, like a wild plant, it becomes a law unto itself and strangles the other healthy plants in the garden.

If you do not have any idea of your end product, how can you plan for the future and how do you prevent an imbalance occurring in the services you provide? Certain provision may be excessive and unnecessary, other provision could be far short of what is needed, and then any emergency measures needed could be at a great cost to the taxpayer, with disastrous consequences, where what is needed cannot be suddenly provided. These are the threats to the quality of life of every single resident in the Isle of Man, and they should be permitted to make a personal judgement via a referendum. It was interesting, in debate in this Court, that speakers, including ministers, all acknowledged that population could not be allowed to outgrow infrastructure –

Mr Karran: It has already happened.

Mr Singer: – yet the Chief Minister was saying that those who wish to see some control on the population are saying, ‘Close the doors and retreat into a shell.’ Well, that is mischievous; that is not what was said. We have to acknowledge that if there is a problem to retain our quality of life and our future policy, then we have to take the necessary steps and be prepared to take those steps, however difficult they are. This motion is asking the people if they believe we have, or may have, a future problem, and then it is up to us to decide the best way to tackle it. The easier thing to do is to do nothing. So much of the Island’s general development is reliant on knowing what the approximate maximum permitted development will be; there can be no confident forward planning with an open-ended policy.

Mr President, the view I hear openly expressed outside this building, is that the people see that the Council of Ministers promoted a residency Bill but wished to take it no further, and then they ask why. This position of great reluctance was demonstrated by the Chief Minister who said in this hon. Court that he felt aggrieved and he could not stomach the proposed regulations. Did the Chief Minister support the Bill promoted by the Council of Ministers and taken through by the Minister of Tourism? Yes, he did. Did he vote against any stage of the Bill as it went through

its various stages in another place? No, he did not; he gave it his support. He now seems surprised that difficult decisions will have to be made. So, was the Bill there to give the public the impression, before an election, that the government was concerned about the problems that would be caused by a population increase above a certain level? It certainly seems, from the Council of Ministers’ progress report, whilst it states the case, that the Council of Ministers are not prepared to tackle the answers to the question. Any concern on population has suddenly vanished. Quite understandably, again the question is being asked: ‘Why?’

The residency report discussed last month indicates quite clearly that it would be difficult to draw up and agree regulations to go with the residency Act, that difficult decisions would have to be made and that much thought would have to go into it, perhaps cutting across present policies and accepted practice, but these would all be open to full debate of the different viewpoints. But the government has taken a pre-debate negative view, and this is the point of the resolution of the hon. member for Ayre at this juncture. The government does not intend to have a public debate. It appears to think it knows better than the public who elected it. It appears to think that the public cannot develop its own views on the subject of residency control. Well, I would hope that most members of this hon. Court think differently and that the general public will want to absorb both sides of the debate and that they have an important contribution to make to determine the future direction of this Island, which, after all, is their future. The public are certainly more than able to absorb the arguments and make a decision on the principles of the introduction of residency control or not. This then leaves it to us to decide the mechanism. The subject of any need for residency control will determine the future prosperity of this country. There appears to be no intention, I repeat, by this government to let the people have a say in determining that future. By hon. members supporting this motion, the people will then have that input on the future of their children and the future generations. The case will be put by both sides in great detail, for and against. The question to be put to the general public will be framed by the deemsters. The Council of Ministers has nothing to fear; other dependencies have gone down the road of mature debate without harming their economy, and such an argument is scaremongering. I personally believe that the public fully understand the concept of residency control and the need for the plans to be on the shelf ready for implementation. The government seems determined not to allow them to express that view. This motion, Mr President, is to permit the people to express their opinion for or against a policy change that will be a major factor in the way that this Island moves forward in the future. Surely the people of the Isle of Man have the right to have a say in their own future. Mr President, I second the motion.

The President: Hon. member for Rushen, Mr Rimington.

Mr Rimington: Thank you, Mr President. I wish to oppose the motion on constitutional grounds. The introduction of residency control is a decision within the remit and responsibility of the decision-makers of this Tynwald Court. It is a governmental matter and not appropriate for a referendum. If the referendum were to vote in favour of such controls, would this Court be honour-bound to follow that mandate? What would happen if circumstances conspired to make the introduction of such controls impractical and problematic? Would we have to have another referendum to persuade the public to release us from an unworkable mandate? We should not shirk our responsibility to make informed and timely decisions. Referendums should be reserved for matters of constitutional importance, such as reforming the Legislative Council, or changing our constitutional relationship with the UK and Europe. *(Laughter)* The responsibility for government belongs to us. The constitution belongs to the people, not to ourselves, and referendums should only be used to decide on major constitutional matters. Thank you, Mr President.

The President: Hon. member for Onchan, Mr Karran.

Mr Karran: Eaghtyrane, I propose to move an amendment to the proposal of the hon. member for Ayre:

After the word 'Tynwald' insert (a)

And at the end insert –

‘and

(b) agrees that there be no relaxation in the work permit regulations until such time as residency controls are introduced.’

It will hopefully be voted on separately. It agrees that there will be no relaxation on work permit regulations until such time as residency controls are introduced, because people outside this House are very, very frightened, and I move this amendment to this proposal by the hon. member for Ayre because I see the added insult to injury inflicted by any relaxation on work permits. My amendment will mean that any alterations to weaken the work permit legislation will not be allowed until there is an effective residency control mechanism that is in operation, or Tynwald will resolve to have a referendum, under the provisions of the Referendum Act, before doing away with the work permit legislation.

Eaghtyrane, if we had a healthy, democratic parliament that held the executive to account and the executive made policies for the benefit of the people and not the hidden parties which pull their strings, then there would be no need to support a referendum, because our parliament and our government would already be carrying out the wishes of our people. If there is one issue that demonstrates the total disregard for the democratic wishes of the people by the executive, then the matter of residency control is it. I know very few people who do not want to have a

residency control mechanism operating now, and most of the ones that I know of who do not want one are in this hon. Court, Eaghtyrane. We understand that parliament and government must lead on various occasions and sometimes have to go against public opinion, and no-one in this Court has a stronger record of doing that than the now member for Onchan, and ex-member for Middle, on virtually every unpopular issue. But people can see why people do it. However, this is an issue that is not an assault on a minority within our society; this is an issue of assault on the majority in our society by those who have the ear of the Council of Ministers and whose only interest is the short-term benefit of the lucky few, to the long-term detriment of the rest of the community. On every front, there is an assault on the standards and the quality of life of the people of the Isle of Man, who cannot understand why government can ignore such basic common-sense proposals whilst all we receive are platitudes. This out-of-control executive has to run ever faster in order to keep up with its unsustainable fantasy of ever greater growth. It is burning the very soul out of this Island for short-term gain and for its own survival and power. Then they tell us it is not the time to activate the residency Act, which – let us be honest about it, Eaghtyrane – was a compromise to what most of us wanted, and even that is too far for them. They are afraid that if they stop running, there will be time for people to look around and see what has been done in reality.

Mr President, normally I would be totally opposed to a referendum, but unfortunately I can see that there is a need to demonstrate to the executive how strongly the Manx people feel about the situation. Indeed, I believe that the Council of Ministers has deliberately avoided measuring the strength of feeling of the Island's residents on the issue of residency control. Even when they had the opportunity to do so recently in the quality of life survey – the 2002 survey which was carried out by MORI on behalf of the Isle of Man Government – one of the stated objectives was to compare and contrast the findings of the quality of life survey conducted in 1990, which was carried out by the Gallup organisation in October of that year. The original survey asked the question, ‘Does the respondent feel that the current resident population is too high, about right, or too low?’ A staggering 88 per cent of those asked did not want to see any further growth in the population level. That was in 1990, when the population was 69,000 – and that was a matter of opinion, if you allow for all those thousands of corpses we were paying out on GPs' lists not to come into the equation. So, why then was the question of population growth not included in the 2002 quality of life survey, bearing in mind, as I have already stated, that one of the objectives was to compare and contrast its findings with earlier surveys? Members may find it particularly strange, as I do, that there should be a chapter in the 2002 survey report entitled ‘The Development of Housing and Population Growth’, and yet it appears no question relating to population growth was asked. Was this because the government ensured the question was not asked in order to save themselves the

embarrassment of finding the huge majority again in favour of curbs on population growth and they were unable to prevaricate any longer on the introduction of some form of residency control? The truth of the matter, we all know, is that the government takes too much notice of the powerful vested interests who do not wish to see any curbs on our population growth, and as one of the architects of the old Labour grouping, I was proud that this generation is the first for a long time that can stay on the Island and achieve better careers by staying than by having to leave the country. (A Member: Hear, hear.) Our standards in care, benefit facilities and workers' rights in many cases have been improved more than those in the United Kingdom.

Mr Downie: Where has the money come from?

Mr Karran: The money came from having a balanced economy. The point is that now, because of the lack of a democratic position within this country and the fact that parliament does not hold the executive to account, you can go and spend it like it has gone out of fashion, with no accountability, (*Interjection*) hiding behind commercial sensitivities because vanity is more important than sanity with you, sir. And you can rant all you like, because you will soon see over the latest fiasco that you did with the parliament of this Island. This was a hard progress, a progress that took almost two decades to achieve, and I am proud of that and to be associated with this, but I am ashamed that what we have now is a government and a parliament that will nod like a bunch of nodding dogs for the government because what we now have to satisfy is the short-term greed of what we have ended up becoming prisoner to. We are now allowing ourselves to ignore the high cost to quality of life because we have lost what we were there for in the first place. Many of the things that we wanted to achieve have been achieved, and now we have lost sight of what the real issues are within this Court. That is why I believe we need a residency control, and that is why I am supporting the referendum, because most in this hon. Court have lost sight, Mr Downie, of what people want. The ones who have lost sight may be forgiven, but the ones who cynically pay lip service over this issue to residency control, whilst knowing that they have to keep an open-door policy to maintain artificially high growth to support their squandering and their extravagance, should hang their heads in shame, Eaghtyrane. When you can see the elite of the Council of Ministers' party roll over and have their bellies tickled by people who have a record of shameful activities that decent working people would not be associated with, then we know the truth about how much this hon. Court has lost sight of what is right and what is wrong, and what needs to be valued, and what needs not to be valued and that is why we must support a residency control now. We cannot allow the present free-for-all, let-it-rip policy to go on, because when it goes, it will decimate the prospects of our children and our grandchildren for generations.

We heard the nonsense from the hon. member for Rushen, Mrs Crowe, a few weeks ago, who said we would stop the disabled coming in if we had residency control.

Mrs Crowe: What?

Mr Corkill: It is one of the gateways.

Mrs Crowe: That is true; it is a gateway.

Mr Karran: What she really meant, Eaghtyrane, was she would stop the disabled who had no money (**Mrs Crowe:** Rubbish!) from coming in, no matter how they were, whether they were Manx to the core. It seems that she thinks, like so many in this Court, that the only issue that governs this place is money.

Mrs Crowe: Absolute rubbish!

Mr Corkill: Do you want disabled people with no money?

Mr Karran: I do not want ethnic cleansing, Chief Minister.

Mrs Crowe: Well, that is what you will get.

Mr Karran: That is what we will end up with, the way you are going at the moment. I hope that members of the Council of Ministers will revolt and will support the motion of Mr Quine and be honest about the fact that the let-it-rip policy for our economy is not the answer when it has to be fuelled by the reduction of our people to second-class citizens in their own land, when a poorer quality of life just adds insult to injury. Even at this late date, let us change and tell the Council of Ministers that we do not want this free-for-all, because many outside this Court look at us and see only short-term greed and that we are prepared to sacrifice everything and anything that is sacred to the Manx people for fool's gold. The government needs to be shamed into action. Even with us having a tame press and even with us not having any official opposition like any proper, functioning democracy requires, the people outside will hold you to account in four years' time, and many people hold us, as Members of the House of Keys or politicians, in contempt because we are not true to our word. You look at their manifestos, the manifestos that people will note when seeing how we voted on this issue and whether we were true to what we said before the election, and almost every one of us who was elected in 2001, if we refer to our manifesto, placed an importance on residency control. No less a person than the Ard-shirveishagh himself clearly linked any relaxation of work permit regulations with the arrival of a residency Act; presumably, therefore, he would want to see that implemented before any relaxation on the work permits. And I have a copy, Eaghtyrane, of everybody's –

Mr Delaney: So have I, Peter. Everyone's.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: They are public.

Mr Rimington: And it is not in mine.
(*Interjections and laughter*)

Mr Karran: If there is any shred of decency within this Court, I hope that you will support the hon. member for Ayre, because if members believe in democracy in this Court, then I believe that no-one could vote against Mr Quine's proposal. If this hon. Court believes in democracy, then we have to vote for my proposal, because the people outside this hon. Court are frightened. They cannot understand who makes the agenda any more, because they do not know. I just think some more of you should go and listen to what people are saying outside, because the agenda is not being made for the benefit of our people, of this Island, and I believe that that is a terrible indictment of this chamber. I hope this hon. Court will support Mr Quine's proposal, and for Mr Rimington to stand up . . . When I think of the people who have backed him and got him into the position that he is in now, they will be very surprised (*Interjection by Mr Rimington*) at the inconsistencies of the hon. member as far as that is concerned. (*Interjection by Mrs Crowe*) I hope, Eaghtyrane, that this house will support this –

Mrs Crowe: Quite right.

Mr Karran: – because confidence in the democratic process in a large section of our community has already been lost. It would be a death knell in a large section of the rest of the community to be able to see how this Court can support a let-it-rip, open-door, doormat-mentality policy that will be to their detriment in years to come. They might survive for a bit longer, but when the truth comes out, Eaghtyrane, the problem will be the damage that will be done for the survival of this administration, which is unaccountable and hides behind secrecy. I am afraid we will all be associated with it if we do not start to listen to what the people of this Island really want and not to the ones who are pulling the strings of the Council of Ministers at the present time.

The President: Hon. member of Council, Mrs Christian.

Mrs Christian: Mr President, I rise to oppose the proposal that there be a referendum. hon. members have heard a dissertation on the social and economic pressures that the Island is facing at this time, and we are all very familiar with those. The economic success of recent times has meant that our population has grown and that there has been demand for people to come in and support our economy at a time of very low unemployment, but those pressures in themselves have put demands on infrastructure and so on. Not all those demands are actually because of incoming residents; some of them are due to social changes

within our own social fabric, but I do not want, Mr President, to particularly expand on those issues.

I would just like to look at some of the comments made by the mover and seconder of the proposal. The hon. member Mr Quine has focused on the fact that the majority of the members of this Court at the last election supported residence control. If that is the case, Mr President, and if they are sincere in their convictions, there is absolutely no further need to go to the public for a referendum. (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) The hon. members of this Court will be pursuing their election pledges.

The hon. member who moved the resolution also insisted that residence control was expected and demanded now, whereas his seconder expressed the view that people are not concerned particularly with now, but are asking the, 'What if?' questions and 'Is there anything in place as and when we believe it should be applied?' So, there are two slightly different approaches to the issue from the mover and the seconder.

There have been, I also think, a number of contradictory statements made by people who are supporting the proposal to go out to referendum, and part of the argument that has come forward is that the government is doing nothing about this issue. I have to say that that is not the case, and for people who say that they want to impose residence controls now, we need to explore the actual practicalities of the matter. We have primarily legislation on the shelf; it not worth a jot without the regulations which are needed to bring it into effect. Hon. members, although there is a statement made that Council of Ministers have masses of resources available to them to develop this – and I would contradict that – I would say that resource has been put into developing the regulations and, as hon. members know from the report to the hon. Court at the last sitting, a report has come forward on the basis of the way forward. It is only a month ago, Mr President, that the hon. members of this Court agreed that the matter be further progressed by sending it to the Social Issues Committee to further develop the regulations. If they did not want that to happen at that time, why did they not say so? If they wanted it to go some other route, why did they not say so? If they are concerned about the timetable, then they have had an opportunity to express that view. The matter has been referred to the Social Issues Committee, which, like the Public Accounts Committee and every other select committee of this hon. Court, has, because of its numbers, a little difficulty in getting together, but, nevertheless, a date is being sought for that committee to make progress on looking at the proposals which have been drafted in respect of the gateways. That committee, I would add, is not simply a Council of Ministers' committee but does comprise members of the hon. Court, members of the House of Keys and members of the Legislative Council, who are not ministers, and they are quite free to express their views on the nature of the gateways which are to be established within the regulations.

The hon. member Mr Karran has made play of what he believes might be the views of individual ministers within the gateways, and I would confirm to

him that the reason that some of the concerns expressed by the Council of Ministers have been referred to the Social Issues Committee is because they did not like the type of social engineering (**Mrs Crowe:** Absolutely.) (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) which was being proposed within those regulations.

Mr Corkill: It seems Tynwald is more –

Mrs Christian: Quite in line with his sort of view, (**Mrs Crowe:** Exactly.) not against it.

On the other hand, the hon. member, the mover, Mr Quine, has expressed, I think quite clearly and I think valuably, for the committee's perspective, his view that there should be economic drivers to the gateways. That, perhaps, is slightly in contradiction with the broader social issues, but these are the issues which we are all going to be faced with at the end of the day.

So, Mr President, if the majority have expressed a view at election that they support the principle and support, indeed, the introduction of residence control, it is, in my view, a waste of resource and an unnecessary move to go out to the public by way of seeking a referendum. And I would suggest that I think the hon. member has not had his proposal on work permits seconded. I will not second it, Mr President, because I think that is an entirely separate issue and will only serve to cloud the debate on the referendum.

The President: Hon. member for Rushen, Mrs Crowe.

Mrs Crowe: Thank you, Mr President. I, too, will be opposing the motion before us today but I would like a little to clarify, and indeed expect an apology from the hon. member for Onchan regarding comments he made about the fact that I would wish only disabled people who had financial backing to them entering the Island – quite the reverse. The hon. member for Onchan made some –

Mr Karran: It is the reality.

Mrs Crowe: It is absolutely untrue. The reason that the Council of Ministers sent the regulations to the Social Issues Committee is because we were all most unhappy with the gateways, and whatever you think, hon. member, someone has to administer those gateways. If we are to say that some people cannot be admitted to the Isle of Man, then regulations have to be in place for an officer to determine who those people are, and that is quite obvious. If you are going to exclude from this Island, there has to be some reason for excluding them. So, some regulations were drafted which would be the so-called 'gateways' to the Island, and I resent the implication that I would ever not admit a disabled person to live on this Island with us. I resent that comment, and I do think you should withdraw it.

A Member: Hear, hear.

The President: Hon. member for Douglas North, Mr Henderson.

Mr Henderson: Thank you, Mr President. I rise to support the motion here this morning, for reasons which I will set forth just now in a brief speech. First of all, I wish to tackle the hon. member for Rushen, Mr Rimington, with his input in relation to decisions being left to the decision-makers within this Court. I was most interested in that, Mr President, because I thought Tynwald Court was the highest decision-maker in the Isle of Man, and if there are any large decisions to be made, then here would seem to be the most appropriate place for that – (*Interjections*)

A Member: We heard that last month. (*Interjections*)

Mr Henderson: – including certain referendums, Mr President. I think it is important enough for that.

Mr President, I set out on my election campaign last July when I was questioned on the 'Mannin Line' as to what I saw as the greatest challenge to the Island over the next five years. I answered simply that the greatest challenge facing the Island over the next five years and beyond is undoubtedly consolidating and building upon our economic success, ensuring our business and market attractiveness remains for the finance sector and other businesses, balanced with sustainability. That remains true and accurate. The Island has done remarkable well developing its business portfolios; we are emerging as a top-class player in our speciality/niche markets on the world stage. Our success has led to a steadily rising population, now officially estimated to be 76,000 people and possibly rising to a potential 120,000 people. A previous Chief Minister, Sir Miles Walker, said in an outgoing speech on public radio that he believed the Isle of Man could sustain a population of 120,000 people –

Mr Corkill: Not next week, though.

Mr Henderson: – and also that things like the IRIS scheme are geared for a population increased up to 120 thousand people.

A Member: If it works.

Mr Henderson: Well, that may be so, but I believe that cannot be sustained without consequences. Government is committed to a combination of unrestricted residency and development. The reality of residency management will have to be grasped at some point. This was one of the biggest issues, as other members have pointed out, posed by my constituents when I was out on the doorstep. The effect the current policy is having on our community is plain for all to see: busier roads, rising school numbers, growing hospital waiting-lists, amenities under pressure, people recruited from elsewhere and, of course, the housing problems, all competing for one set of resources which have not grown in proportion. As the economy streaks

away, there is an increasing layer of our community being left behind, including a section of people who were once able to manage but are now finding it is increasingly more difficult. There are plenty of young local couples who cannot afford the Island's high mortgages, house prices or rentals, even though the Department of Local Government is trying its very best – we know that. Our people deserve a better chance, and they have a right to a dignified standard of living and a right to achieve their true potential and aspirations. Our health service, and especially our social services, are increasingly under pressure to deliver the quality standards and objectives set out so fancifully in the government's policy document. They are failing, especially social services; but it is not their fault; they are just completely under-resourced to cope with the changing population and its needs.

There is now full employment on the Island, or almost full employment, with most new workers and staff having to be brought in from the UK or further afield. We have a growing multiracial section within our community. Manx people are becoming a minority. Our culture is undoubtedly becoming diluted and changing; we need to be careful not to lose any more of it.

The tone has changed on the streets of Douglas, which, on a Friday and Saturday night, resemble sometimes a Hollywood crime film. (**Mr Houghton:** Hear, hear.) There is no such thing as old-fashioned fisticuffs any more; when people have disagreements now, people are killed. Young people, especially, die of substance abuse.

A Member: Manx people, too.

Mr Henderson: Other folks kill themselves – the amount of suicides is remarkable over here – or stab each other with knives, as we have recently seen on Broadway in Douglas. The whole tenure of being a member of our community has changed. Values, morals and judgements have all changed, especially among our young people. We have also seen, from time to time, some very dangerous people turn up on our shores and, thankfully, turn off again and leave. As our community develops and the population grows, it is becoming ever more cosmopolitan. Law and order issues are increasing in parallel with this. Consequently, we are seeing more violent crime, robberies, opportunistic crime, vandalism and drug abuse. Our young people are being exposed to this kind of thing.

We also have a wonderful natural environment, which has a specialness and uniqueness, as I keep going on about, Mr President, in UK, European and world terms. This, in turn, gives this Island one of its most attractive and endearing features; it gives us an unrivalled element to our quality of life that others are jealous of, yet, at our present rate of knots, I just wonder how much will be left in another 10, 20 or 50 years. I wonder how much open land will be left, I wonder how many choughs and peregrine falcons will be left and I wonder how much of our countryside will be given over to development, how busy our roads will

be and the population that will undoubtedly go with that. I wonder if our community will feel safe and be safe then.

A gloomy picture, Mr President, but while we are doing undoubtedly very well and we are able to support community projects, such as the new hospital, the gas-fired power station, the natural gas pipeline to the Island and more, we are making ourselves attractive and open to business opportunities, and we are unrestricted. Anyone can come here to live, work or buy a house. How will we cope if the current UK government refugee and political asylum seeker strategy keeps on track, with dispersal around the UK and other cities? Our doors are wide open at the minute, and we should listen to people like Dr Mann, the hon. member of Council, and the hon. member of the Keys, Mr Quine, and very carefully consider support for these ideas. I started my contribution with the word 'sustainability' and I will finish on that note. This is the key to our continued success. On the whole, things are good, but we do need to be careful.

The President: Hon. member for Michael, Mr Cannan.

Mr Cannan: Thank you, Mr President. The motion is that Tynwald resolves that a referendum, under the provisions of the Referendum Act, be held on the question of whether or not to have residency controls introduced. That is one item of a large government agenda. The biggest referendum we had was 12 months ago, where members of the House of Keys were interviewed by their constituents and their constituents decided whether or not to support them. I hear the hon. member for Onchan saying we are going to be in favour of residency control. Well, I pulled out of my briefcase this splendid document which says, 'Vote for David Cannan' –

The Speaker: Pity about the picture. (*Laughter*)

Mr Cannan: – and I cannot see anywhere in this wonderful document . . . Yet in this constituency that I have the privilege to represent, there was a 69 per cent turnout, only beaten by Glenfaba at 71 per cent turnout. I only had one candidate against me, so there was a choice – him or me – and I feel, therefore, that I represent certainly the majority of the views of my constituency. And after five elections, they know me, even if I do not know all of them.

I am a little disturbed when I listen to the hon. member for Onchan – and I have listened to him for a long time: – 17 years, I believe. (*Interjections*) He appears to have a monopoly on knowledge and a monopoly on Manxness, that he, and only he, speaks for the Manx people. Well, I happen to have to tell him, at this late stage in my life, that I too have Manx blood of very ancient lineage on all sides.

Mr Henderson: Hear, hear.

Mr Karran: Maybe you have gone too far; you are interbred.

Mr Cannan: That sort of cheap jibe is contemptuous. (**A Member:** Disgraceful.) He does not have a monopoly on Manxness. He does not have the monopoly on the views of the people out there, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) because if he did have the monopoly on the view of the people out there, why did a majority vote for this manifesto?

Mr Karran: Who got more votes at the last election, son?

Mr Cannan: In Onchan, people have three votes (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) per person. The real vote is when you are in a single-seat constituency (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) and there is one choice and (*Interjections*) one winner, not three winners. One vote, one man, one winner.

Two Members: Hear, hear.

Mr Karran: And I top the pole every time, too.

Mr Cannan: And so have I, because I would not be here if I did not. (*Interjection*)

Mr Corkill: Clash of the Titans!

Mr Cannan: I get irritated when this one man in this hon. Court gets up. He has the right to pronounce his views, but to pretend that they are the views of the whole of the population is a lot of nonsense.

Mr Karran: Well, we will see. Do a referendum.

Mr Cannan: The referendum, sir, was held last year. We do not govern, Mr President, by referendum; we govern by representative democracy. If we are going to have a referendum, let us have a referendum on the waste disposal charge.

Mrs Crowe: That is right.

Mr Cannan: Let us have a referendum on that. Let us have a referendum on –

A Member: Archallagan.

A Member: The death penalty.

Mrs Crowe: The new prison.

Mr Cannan: No, we have had that in Jurby. That is decided. (*Laughter*)

Mr Delaney: Collect £200 and go to jail!

The President: Hon. members!

Mr Cannan: But what I am trying to say, Mr President, is that we have representative government. This whole Court, not the decision-makers in it – meaning the Council of Ministers – but each and every one of us, has a vote and we are the

decision-makers and we will vote, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) just as we did last night on the prison. And we will vote on residency control; the next referendum on residency control will be in 2006 –

Mrs Crowe: Absolutely. When people have seen the –

Mr Cannan: – when you go to the poll and you put your policy before the people and the people will return you (*Interjection*) or not return you, but we cannot be having a referendum on every issue before this Court, except on major issues. I remember many years ago there was talk of a referendum on whether we should nationalise the Steam Packet Company. Same arguments: ‘Ooh, the public want to save the Steam Packet’, this, that and the other, the galleries were full – 1985, I think it was – the row went on and directors were before the bar of Tynwald. At the end of the day, Tynwald, the representatives of the people, made the decision and that is how we govern this Island. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) And as for all the rant – he is entitled to free speech – saying that it is the people who will decide – the people have decided. And what question are you going to put? Let us have residency control – voting for that will mean, of course, negative house prices, possible unemployment and a decline in business opportunities – or no residency control et cetera? And the money spent on all this wonderful referendum could at least provide certainly primary healthcare in one constituency in which I am very interested. Do we go on wasting money on this sort of thing? The people have voted for us to hear and to govern, (*Interjection by Mr Karran*) and in turn they want clean water, they want primary healthcare, they want education, they want a new hospital, they want those things that matter to them, and they want the prospect of employment for their children, to pay their mortgage and to maintain their quality and standard of life. And those young people who are now establishing businesses in their own right in Douglas and elsewhere in the Island want the prospect of success and growth in their businesses. They do not want contraction – and I know what I am talking about, too, because I represent some of those young people going out and starting in life now in businesses on their own.

We have been chosen to govern, and let us govern. We have chosen our Council of Ministers –

Mrs Cannell and Two Other Members: We have not.

Mr Cannan: Sorry, we have chosen the Chief Minister and, in choosing him, we have delegated to him to choose his Council of Ministers. We may not agree with his choice, (*Interjection*) but it is up to each member here, if you do not agree, to put a motion down and say you do not agree and you have no confidence. It is in your power, hon. members, so, by extension, you cannot say you do not approve of hon. member X as a minister because you did not vote for him; you can vote to have him removed. That is in

your power, and for the hon. member to say in Onchan that there is no democracy here, that is nonsense too. There is democracy, otherwise I would not be standing up and I would not have the freedom to put motions down on this paper that can be supported or not supported. Government is by representation, and I hope we will stick by that.

The President: Hon. member for Middle, Mr Quayle.

Mr Quayle: Thank you, Mr President. I rise to my feet to oppose the motion put forward by the hon. member for Ayre, Mr Quine, and it is simply because under Item 13, 'Residency Control', the first part of the motion is 'That Tynwald resolves that a referendum, under the provisions of the Referendum Act 1979, be held in the Island'. Whilst not under any circumstances underestimating the seriousness of the issue of residency control, we have already given that a good airing over a period of time, and it will be returning before Tynwald in due course. So, I will be opposing the motion simply because I am not in favour of referendums.

At each general election, the public use their judgement to elect members of the House of Keys to vote on their behalf in the House of Keys and in this hon. Court. They effectively entrust and empower MHKs to take all necessary decisions required in their rôle as members of this legislature. Many of the decisions that we make on their behalf are finely balanced, requiring comprehensive consideration of some very complex issues. I do not believe that members of the public expect us to abdicate our responsibilities by inviting them to vote on various issues in referendums. While I agree that there may well be certain issues that would require detailed consideration by the public and their ultimate vote in a referendum, this particular motion is not something that I believe should go to a referendum. A major constitutional change, such as breaking the link to the Crown – which is not something that I am advocating in any respect – in my opinion would be a matter for a referendum if the matter ever arose. The issue before us today is not of major constitutional importance, important though its consideration is, and it has already been considered at length over the last year since we have all been elected.

If we go down the road of a having a referendum on residency, important as I say this issue is to the public and ourselves here in this Court, how could we determine in future which issues are important enough to be considered by the public in a referendum and which issues should be left to members here of this hon. Court? I think it would lead us along a path where, if Tynwald votes on a particular issue and a member disagrees with it, the member could seek a vote for the issue to go to the public in a referendum if the member believed that the public would vote differently to the view expressed by Tynwald. Members may also feel that if a particular issue is too contentious for them to consider and vote upon, then

the easy way out would be to push that out to the public for them to vote on in a referendum.

I urge members not to abdicate their responsibilities by taking what is a relatively easy option to go for a referendum. Whilst residency control is important to be considered by this Court and the public will have a huge interest in this, we are all here elected to make difficult decisions, and I think the public would expect us, quite rightly, to continue to make those decisions on their behalf, difficult as they are. So, for all the reasons mentioned, Mr President, I will not be supporting the motion or the amendment.

The President: Hon. member of Council, Dr Mann.

Dr Mann: Thank you, Mr President. It has been a very interesting (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) debate so far, and certainly the introduction by the mover I thought was a very well-balanced argument. I particularly want to consider the factor of the referendum, because that is what we are being invited to support this morning. The fact that there has been almost a rush away from the idea I suppose is not surprising. There never has been a referendum in the Isle of Man, and the very thought of having a referendum in the Isle of Man is obviously causing shudders to go around this Court. The reasons why primitive societies used referendums were because the government appeared to be separate or to have separated itself from the original community councils, and one has to ask why we should have a referendum. Certainly, the hon. member for Rushen was using a constitutional argument as to why we should not have one and, to be fair, the Referendum Act here was introduced, I think, with the main intention of being able to prove to the UK at some point that the majority of the residents of the Isle of Man wanted to change the relationship between the Isle of Man and the United Kingdom. That having been said – and I might add that it was a time when there was great keenness and enthusiasm in this Court for independence – let us not forget also, although it is not directly relevant to the argument, that independence *was* once offered to the Isle of Man, as recently as when the UK went into the European Community. It is amazing how the nationalists became very quiet at that point, but anyway, that is another issue.

We are being asked this morning whether, in fact, we should have a referendum. To have a referendum in these circumstances, one would be doing one of two things: we would either be legitimising the policies and actions of the executive of the Isle of Man Government or seeking the views of the ordinary elector in the Isle of Man. At this particular moment, if all those speakers – with whom I have to agree – are saying that the electors are not happy and do not accept the policies and actions of the current Council of Ministers, then should the people be given the right to express that view? The present Council of Ministers undoubtedly do not have a positive position that they could go to the people and use a referendum to legitimise their

position. They have a position, but it is not a positive position, and this government could not go to the people, as things are at this particular moment, with a policy that they could reasonably expect the population would accept. So, I am not surprised at all that ministers are rising, one after another, to object, because the main reason for a government using this procedure would be to legitimise its position. It falls upon us, outside the Council of Ministers, to ask ourselves: should the question therefore be put to the people? In putting it to the people we are doing a very serious thing; we are transferring the responsibility of the executive to the electorate. That is quite a different thing from, for instance, suggesting a change in the constitution in which the government would be putting something to the people to either agree or disagree. Now, that may seem to be splitting hairs, but it is not splitting hairs and, by using this circumstance to go to the people, it would be quite unique anyway, but we cannot deny that there is a strong feeling amongst the electorate that a course of action, a policy, should be pursued by this government irrespective, and I have to agree that in talking to all kinds of people, as we all do, we cannot deny that this is preoccupying the views of the people. Now, there may be quite wrong reasons and I suspect there are some wrong reasons for the people having the view they have.

Mr Bell: Coloured faces mostly.

Dr Mann: I think those of us who were in this Court back in the 1970s, when the increase in the population was far greater than it is now, came to the point of doing something, and the Court retreated.

So, what is different? What was suggested then meant that individuals would all have to register and be identified as being a Manx citizen. This proposal I do not want to elaborate on, because the argument in my view is whether we should have a referendum, not arguing the rights and wrongs at the moment of residency control. The residency Act, of course, puts forward an entirely different way of dealing with the situation than previous proposals, but I think this residency Act has been used now for 10 to 15 years. First of all we are talking about introducing it, which kept everybody at bay for about 10 years, and then we actually voted on it, and that kept things at bay for another five years. You cannot go on much longer, but face up to it.

Now, we either go forward with the support of the people or we stop and just carry on as we are. We have got to face up to it this Court will not face up to it; it will find all kinds of reasons why it should not vote in favour or against, and here I have to disagree with my friend in Michael. He may have been elected with all his crowds of people shouting, 'Hurrah' (*Laughter*) but when it comes to it he is not governing and the people of this Island do not have the power to elect a group of people with a defined course of action or political policy, and so the people could quite reasonably say that they should be the group that decides whether we go forward or drop it. We cannot carry on the charade

much longer, and to a certain extent the member for Michael is right: if we carry on the charade, there are going to be mighty big casualties at the next general election.

Mr Cannan: There might not.

Dr Mann: There could be argument that the cost of producing this course of action should not be accepted, because the cost would be the same as running a general election.

What we do this morning is very serious; it is a very serious decision. I am not arguing on residency control – they have been put out time and time again; it is the mechanism and the principle of whether your individual elector has the right. We are going to have to give them that right to say whether we do something about this, get on with it or push it to one side. It could be further argued that the political scene will preoccupy the domestic scene, because the arguments will go on and on until the vote is taken but, by doing that, you will bring home to the people who are shouting that this must happen with the actual consequences of what will happen, and I think it is high time that the people out there knew the downside as well as the upside of doing this, because there is a downside. It is whether the downside is acceptable.

So I am prepared to support the proposal in this resolution as a serious political statement of this Court, not this government, because I do not think the government is in a position to go to the people, but the members of this Court, who have all been elected as recently as just over a year ago, as to whether they think that it is the people that should be consulted and not the government. That is quite an unusual reason for going to the electorate under these circumstances. I think, certainly considering the political structure of this Island, there is a justification for doing that now.

The President: Hon member for Council, Mr Delaney.

Mr Delaney: Thank you, Mr President. I have made enough enemies in Tynwald Court over quite a long period to want not to make any more this morning. I take the view of my colleague, Eddie, Mr Lowey, the hon. member on this one, is that do not lecture me on what I am here for. I think I have hoped, I have proved I am here in Tynwald Court for the right reasons as far as the people are concerned, and I might not do my job or have the brains of a lot of other members, and I certainly was not given, as some members were, a new brain transplant when they walked through that door, but I managed to survive and I hope I do a decent job for the people that put me there originally. I am interested and fascinated too with my good friend, Mr Cannan, because I agree; I have done a little bit of homework, because that is what it is all about. Do some homework if you have got an issue as important as this and find out where everyone stands, and I will not embarrass the members of the House of Keys who have just returned, as we have been reminded many times this morning, a year ago

from the public to the polls that they were given a mandate, but I ask Mr Cannan, who I agree did not mention anything about this in his manifesto: would you agree with me that if somebody went to the public and told them one thing and then got in here and did nothing about it and voted differently when they got here, somebody has not got a duty to tell them who they were? Would you agree with me? And he was not one who told them something and then did not do it.

Mr Cannan: I have always put on my –

Mr Delaney: That is right, that is exactly right, and I agree with you, you did not in this case, but there are some members of Tynwald Court who went to the polls, told them one thing, and indicated on the door and on the radio how they felt about issues like this, and some of us who are not as clever as the rest, who will never make Chief Minister, who will never, ever get the brain transplant, kept tapes of all these interviews and has got a record of all the manifestos including the Chief Minister's, because they are all available in the library from the last election, to find out where people stood on the issue.

Mr Cannan: Well, you know where I stand.

Mr Delaney: I know where you stand, and you are quite right to stand there. I would not like to stand out in Jurby, but you do that! The situation is that you were elected by the people in your area and I congratulate them on picking such a successful member of the House of Keys on their behalf, but others here cannot claim the same thing, and I have a duty, I think, at some time before the next election, to tell the public in the same way that the House of Keys has the right to get rid of me when I come up for re-election. I have a right to tell them who did not carry out what they promised them, who did exactly as the member for Onchan, Mr Karran, said. I am aware that Mr Karran is not the greatest speaker, and we have had dreadful rows, but he was elected as much as any of you, if not more than some, and I am sure that his amendment, if you think about it – if you really think about it is probably more to the point than the main resolution, because what he is saying is what the government is doing, and I once begged outside of this Court a minister who was moving something not to do it, and I learned a lesson never to beg after that, because I learned that it made no difference, my trying to explain what the people out there felt. It did not matter. But it did, because the member is no longer here and he should be here.

I think it is important that we do not tell the people out there, after one year of a five-year term, that it does not matter now that we are in, we are going to do what we want to do, when they outside are saying something different, and I am sure that all of you are close enough to the public to know what I am saying is true. I know you are. We are not that big that you could not though, unlike other jurisdictions where they have not a clue what their people think and they are following the party line in their parliaments, but here we know out

there that the public is very uneasy. I am not saying they are right even, but they are uneasy. I think we do need to think about how we go about their message inside the administration, and I think I am here – I was put here by you to this place up here – to be able to do that. I am saying now if you are going down the road of saying it is still open season on the Isle of Man and the speculators and everybody else can take their pickings at the long-term cost of the people who put us here with no consideration that the Isle of Man's people were in a minority when I was elected, they are going to be in a bigger minority at the next election. What happens at a time when they become such minority that it is not their representatives sitting in this Court at all? Has anyone given some thought to that? It will be the new people who have not been here long enough to understand.

I am going to pinch something from the Bishop, something I was taught and he knows very well: 'What is the profit of man if he gains the whole world and suffers the loss of his own soul?' I do not know if I have got a soul or if any politician has got a soul, if it comes to that, but I know the community has, and if you want to see it just walk down Strand Street, and if you want to see it in its best light walk down Strand Street 25 years ago. We were not all employed, there were difficulties and one of the reasons I came here was to try and solve those difficulties, but do not tell me there was less soul there then than there is now. There is a loss to the community, there always will be and for thousands of years the change has been happening, but my concern is it is changing so fast and we have lost control of it.

Now, that is why the people have that same worry, so we are going to have a metropolis, and if that is the ambition of some of you, great, but tell the people; be honest; tell the people that is what you want. Do not get elected on some other manifesto and then get here and let that go to stay in the library. Reread what you told the people. And I think worries me that we are saying here that we are the people who make decisions. The hon. member for Rushen – he is unfortunately not here to hear what I am saying because I think it would be something he might learn at the next election: you can go from the top of the poll to the bottom of the poll in five years and, if you do not believe me, just read the history of members here. It means nothing that you top a poll here; it is what you do when you are in for that term, (**Mr Henderson:** Hear, hear.) and if you think that the public are not wary, not now, but in another four years' time they will be told, because it is out duty to tell them who voted for and who voted against.

I am not saying a referendum is the perfect solution, but other communities much larger than ours do not find any of the difficulties. In fact, they are encouraged to have them. Communities adjacent to us had two in 18 months on subjects that are not as important to them as this is. On whether or not they should expand, not the people, but the communities of which they are part, still retaining the control of who comes into theirs in some respects. They have referendums on a number of subjects. It is no great

crime to have one, and if the members generally feel that the control we have now, which we passed knowing that it could never be implemented because members such as me asked the question when it came through our division of the administration. You could drive a bus through the legislation when it came because you knew it would never be implemented for the reason given by the member for Rushen, because they could find all reasons not to implement it, and the administration knew that. You cannot tell me that the people who drafted that Bill did not know that it would not be introduced. Are we kidding the public that much? We knew it would not be introduced and the ministers, the last time we talked about it, stood up and admitted it. It was too difficult, there were too many problems, there were too many rules to bring in. Tell the people that! So we passed legislation though it was difficult – all legislation is difficult, but this was designed to be difficult so that we would never introduce it, and if you think the public are that stupid that they do not know that, you are kidding yourself that you have some magic power when he came in. They know that, they are not daft. At the end of the day I am not going to read out on this occasion who is for some sort of controls and who is not, I will leave it to you, but it will be back under standing orders every six months; you can bring the subject back.

Mr Quine: I can circulate it.

Mr Delaney: Let us have it back in six months if it does not pass, but it will keep coming. It will keep coming because members will want to know, those of us who have read the manifestos, who have heard the tapes, who heard what he said on Manx Radio when interviewed by the panel, why you have suddenly changed your mind, and your voters will certainly want to know. We have got a situation so ludicrous that we have got people who came in here because they did not want the Isle of Man turning into little London. They stood for that reason and it was not out in the hon. member for Michael's constituency they were talking about! But the fact of it is that now they have forgotten that very thing.

Mr President, let us not fall out over it; it is an important issue. Let us think about it, but if it takes four years to do something, it might take four years but it will be done because, at the end of the day, it is not what we want, it is what the people want, and the people out there – and I look to the newest member who just walked in the door yesterday, but you cannot tell me that some people down there did not ask about the problem, and if he said he is not, I will take it all back. If nobody was interested in the future of the Isle of Man in relation to population and who comes in, it does not really matter because he is the freshest from the polls, so let us forget about the six months.

The President: Hon. member, you did indicate, Mr Delaney, that you thought Mr Karran's amendment was possibly more important than the –

Mr Delaney: It has not been seconded, Mr President?

The President: It has not been seconded.

Mr Delaney: Well, I take great pleasure in seconding it.

The President: I thought you might! (*Laughter*) Hon. member for Douglas South, Mr Cretney.

Mr Cretney: Thank you, Mr President. It has been the position of previous governments and indeed the present administration that the Residency Act should form part of contingency planning. I made it clear at the time I took the legislation through the House of Keys that I did not subscribe to that view, and that remains the case as far as I am concerned. I see it as an economic development management tool. At at least two elections now I have made quite clear my position and have been fortunate to enjoy one of the strongest mandates from the people, along with the hon. member for Ayre at the latest election.

In recent history we have seen the difficulties of unmanaged economic growth and the impact in terms of a lag in educational, housing and other infrastructure improvements, and we all witness the impact of population growth, and also, I agree, social change with regard to traffic and housing issues.

We also need to remember the difficulties of the past when our own people had to leave this Island in order to obtain work. We need to remember the totally flawed policy of the early 1970s where our predecessors encouraged retired people here. What a foolish policy that turned out to be!

We now have the position where the Social Issues Committee, of which I am a member, are tasked with examining the proposed gateways and coming forward with regulations which will enable us to assist and to properly manage our ongoing economic and Island development.

Hold us to account, hon. members! Keep the pressure on us to deliver the regulations suitable for our Island, whilst at the same time recognising the wider world in which we live and the economic climate globally in which we have to make the best decisions for the people and the future of the Isle of Man. (**Mrs Crowe:** Absolutely.)

There are, as we are aware, completely diverse views in this hon. Court and indeed in the Council of Ministers on this issue. However, I can say that both sides of the debate were united when we witnessed possible unacceptable gateways in terms of social engineering, in terms of where the report had got to before it was put off to the Social Issues Committee. It is therefore entirely appropriate that a political overview, direction and lead be given. Please give the Social Issues Committee that opportunity, then hold us to account.

Mrs Crowe: Absolutely.

The President: Hon. member for Ramsey, Mr Bell.

Mr Bell: Thank you. Mr President, isn't a month a long time? Listening to the debate this morning, which is on, in effect, an identical subject to what we had last month, it seems that most members have totally forgotten what we have decided to do and why it was done. The tenor of the attack from the supporters of the referendum seems to have been strictly against the Council of Ministers, that the Council of Ministers are blocking any moves towards bringing in regulations or any form of residential control at all. Hon. members think back one month: you, as a body, Tynwald, voted to move the report to the Social Issues Committee; as my colleague for South Douglas has just said, it was a deliberate decision made by a majority of this House to do that. It was not at the behest of the Council of Ministers, it was an argued position and Tynwald accepted that, so let us not forget where we come from. This is not a conspiracy, as is often thrown up by the Council of Ministers, it was a considered policy decision taken by this chamber.

I would also initially like to refute the allegations which have been made that once we are elected we vote differently to what we have been arguing on the doorstep. That is not the case, it is absolute nonsense, and it should be seen for that as well. What I think the majority of people certainly displayed last month, and I would very much hope they will do again this month, is a recognition of just how critically important this issue is and a realisation that residents' control needs a considerable amount of very sensitive thinking before it is brought in to make sure that it does not distort either the economy or the social fabric of the Isle of Man in its process. We are not dragging our feet; we are making a mature decision as to how to handle this issue.

The hon. member for Onchan, Mr Karran, frequently makes the claim, and is making it again this morning in relation to his perception as to the Council of Ministers' move on this, that confidence in our democratic process has been lost outside. Now, from my perspective I believe that no-one has done more to undermine confidence in the democratic process in the Isle of Man than the hon. member himself with the wild allegations and personal denigration that we have had to suffer for month after month after month. That is what is undermining confidence. It is not the policy or the success or failure otherwise of government; it is the personal innuendo which we are confronted with week after week. That drip-feed in the public mind is more damaging than any mistaken policy decision which takes place in this place or indeed any other, and I think we need to be recognising that.

After listening to some of the contributions this morning, Mr President, I feel that we have all been failures. The description of the Isle of Man outside with law and order collapsing, with the public services collapsing, health services overstretched, schools overstretched – I just wonder what we have been doing for the last 20 years. How did we get into this mess? I must live in a different world to a lot of people,

frankly. The Isle of Man has an incredible habit of denigrating every success that it manages to achieve; instead of applauding it and telling people about it, we tend to be ashamed of it. The Isle of Man has done extremely well over the last 20 years. It has come from a position where our GDP, less than 20 years ago, was 54 per cent of that of the United Kingdom. We had 2,500 people unemployed, you could not give houses away and people were leaving the Isle of Man in droves because there was no work here. We have done a tremendous job over the last few years. For the first time ever in our history virtually all our young people who wished to stay here on the Island and get a job and live here and develop a family here have that opportunity. That has never happened before. Why are we ashamed of it? Why are we criticising ourselves and beating ourselves up over it? This is a very positive move. We are putting hundreds of millions of pounds into our infrastructure: new hospitals, a new sewerage system, all the water, electricity, everything, is all being renewed, with £130 odd million going into housing over the next five years. This is not failure; these are the results of a huge amount of hard work that has been put in by members of this chamber over the years, by the public sector outside and by our business community. Why not welcome that? Why not celebrate it? There are very few countries, frankly, in that period of time that have the track record of success that the Isle of Man has. Why are we beating ourselves up over it?

What we need to recognise is that today we have, on the back of that achievement, reached a position not only in our internal development but also because of the changes in external circumstances where we do need to decide where we go next. I fully accept that, and that is a debate that is legitimate and is one that needs a lot of consideration given to it.

We have, moved into totally new uncharted waters for the Isle of Man. It is the first time, probably in our history, that we have been under sustained scrutiny, if not attack, by a range of external forces from the OECD, the European Union, even the United Kingdom Government. It is putting strains and pressures on the Island which we have never experienced before. At the same time, in developing a response to that, we are facing a world, certainly a slowdown in the economy. For those who followed Mr Gordon Brown's comments in the UK only this week he has stated that the rate of growth in the world economy is the lowest for over 30 years, and it is the first time during that time that all three trading blocks – America, Europe and Asia – have been showing a minimal amount of growth all at the same time. It is a very difficult time worldwide economically, and we need to be very conscious of that and very wary of the pressures which we are under.

The Isle of Man has done tremendously well to develop its enterprise within the Island, not just financial services but manufacturing and all the other areas. We have developed it to such a stage now that the Isle of Man is a player, albeit a small one, on the world stage, and we cannot get away from that. We are influenced by what happens worldwide. There is no

hiding place. If there is a downturn worldwide, it affects the Isle of Man too, and we have been extremely fortunate up to now, I have to say, in being able to shield the Island from any noticeable downturn, but it is going to take all our wits, effort and energies over the next few years to make sure that that does not happen.

We have announced, Mr President, in response to the European Union, a tax strategy. Our intention, in response to the code of conduct, is to bring in a zero tax rate for corporations, as we know, by 2006. This enables us to restructure our economy and to become more competitive. Only yesterday, though, Mr President, Jersey has announced it is going to do the same thing, and I understand that on Friday we will be getting a similar announcement from Guernsey. The Isle of Man is in a hugely competitive position at the moment, and we have to, as I say, have all our wits about us to be able to respond to the new challenges which are thrown up.

We currently have 42,600-odd people in employment on the Island. It is the highest level we have ever achieved in our history, and we have a duty to protect those jobs and the livelihoods and the standard of living of all those people as well as all the other issues we have to bear in mind, and any decisions we have to take, Mr President, in relation to ordering the economy and managing the economy better have to bear those issues in mind.

The hon. member who moved this resolution initially referred to the largely undirected economic development of the last few years, and I take his point on that. There has not been an economic strategy as such within which we have been working, largely because we have not been in the fortunate position to be able to dictate what we have in the Isle of Man and what we do not want in the Isle of Man. We have been committed to job creation, probably primarily over those last few years, to remove the blight of unemployment from the Island, and we have been very successful in that, but, as I say, we are now in new territory altogether, and I do believe he is right on this issue.

I have announced already, Mr President, that Treasury has already embarked on developing a new economic strategy for the Island. We have employed consultants to help us with that, and I would hope, early on next year, to be in a position to start giving some indications of what those recommendations are. As part of that though, Mr President, there will be consideration given to residence control, gateways and how that would work within the overall economic strategy, because clearly the points which the hon. member has made on that are very valid. Now that we have got to this fortunate stage of full employment, we need to know where we are going next, what areas we should be focusing our economic attention on and how that economic growth which we would hope to stimulate to support the public services would impact on our social fabric on the Island as well. It is going to be a very, very tricky balancing act, and this is why, Mr President, when we are considering gateways and when we are considering residence control, it is

absolutely vital that proper, in-depth technical consideration is given to how these gateways will work if they are brought in. The worst possible thing, Mr President, that we could do at the moment is to make a decision based on an emotive argument that plays well out on the street. We cannot allow the rôle of populism to take us over here. We have to give it serious, mature consideration.

We have heard a lot about the referendum and the rights of the people, and we want to know what the people think; the one question here, though, Mr President, that has not been put is who is going to write that question in the first place? (**Mr Delaney:** Deemster) And what are we going to instruct the deemster to write. Are we simply going to say, 'Mr Deemster, write a question relating to population control'?

Mr Delaney: Read the Referendum Act.

Mr Bell: You will get the result in any ballot or any referendum you want by the way you phrase the question in the first place.

Mrs Crowe: Absolutely.

Mr Delaney: That is why politicians do not ask it.

Mr Bell: So we are embarking on an extremely dangerous path if we simply hand over to the deemster; what criteria does the deemster have to write a question on? If he tilts it one way or the other, there are going to be cries of 'Foul' from one side or the other. That is a huge responsibility you are giving to a deemster who really has not been involved in any way in the debate and cannot possibly know what the majority, even in here, want to see from any particular referendum.

At this time, Mr President, with all the pressures I have outlined, economic pressures and political pressures worldwide, bearing down on the Isle of Man, the last thing the Isle of Man needs is a bitter and divisive public argument over whether or not we have residence control and what form it should take. I can just see now the governments in Jersey and Guernsey sitting back and rubbing their hands in glee, seeing ourselves tearing each other apart trying to come to some conclusion on this. We need stability and we need maturity at the moment, more than we have ever needed before. We need to give serious consideration to where we are going on these issues and not be carried away on a very emotive argument of 'Let the people speak.' The people need to know the full facts. We could not even decide ourselves, last month between 33 of us, how we would address the gateways and who we would turn away. Do we want to turn away the disabled? Do we want to turn away coloured people? Do we want to turn away English people or Irish people? There will be all sorts of interpretations put on a referendum question saying, 'Do you want population control?' We could not agree with it; how on earth can we expect to get a clear message back from the public and phrase a question in such a manner

as to explain to people exactly what the options and the difficulties are? We are presenting this issue as a very simplistic approach to what is a hugely complicated and difficult decision which we have to make.

Mr President, I do believe, Tynwald took the right decision last month. It has considered the report in relation to the residence Act, it has handed it over to the Social Issues Committee to work on and to develop the regulations. I believe that committee should be given the time now, and the support, as the hon. member for South Douglas has said, to get on with that job and to come back, hopefully in conjunction with the economic strategy which has been drafted, with a range of proposals which hopefully we can all sign up to, but I do not believe, Mr President, that a referendum is anything other than an attempt at window-dressing and populism. Now above all, Mr President, we need steady and mature leadership to take us through this time ahead. We are elected to make decisions on behalf of the general public; that is what we are here for. Some of those decisions are difficult, but nevertheless that is what the public expect of us and that is what we have to deliver, so, Mr President, I would urge hon. members: please reject this resolution and let us get on with the work that is already in hand.

The President: Hon. member for Malew and Santon.

Capt. Douglas: Thank you, Mr President. Being the newest member of this hon. Court, may I be permitted to express some of the views of my constituents? I only missed 171 houses out of the 1,340 (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) so I think I may be able to express some of their views, which are fairly recent. For those who do not know me, I am a Manxman, born and bred, and by inclination. The issue of residency control is important to my constituents, but it was not their single important item as I went around on the doorsteps. Having clarified the situation as it currently exists, I believe, and I understand that, within existing legislation, there are sufficient safeguards to invoke residency control or population management at short notice, which I support. Most of my constituents understand the value of work permits and certainly seem content to allow their elected representative to decide the issue on their behalf.

Perhaps now is not the time to hold a referendum but we certainly need to safeguard our future and the future of the ones who come behind, and surely this can be achieved by good neighbourliness and by decisive action by this hon. Court. I will, therefore, be opposing the motion as moved, but I would not like to see any relaxation in the current work permit regulations, and I would also support the work of the subcommittee on this matter. Thank you, Mr President.

Mr Delaney: Well said.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

The President: Hon. member for Peel, Mrs Hannan.

Mrs Hannan: Thank you, Eaghtyrane. Could I first start by congratulating (**Members:** Hear, hear.) the member for Malew and Santon on his maiden speech in the Court, and I certainly welcome him taking an active part so soon in our deliberations. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) So, congratulations.

The Treasury minister asked why we are beating ourselves up over this particular issue. He then went on to suggest that we were successful, but I would suggest to this hon. Court that it is at a cost. The strains and pressures on our people – and we are expecting our people to absorb the strains and pressures, even if we have got many more people than we have ever had employed in the past on our people and our societies, our communities, are quite considerable, even if it is only just worrying about how difficult it is to get into Douglas to work, or to park somewhere, or how, if I move my car, I will never be able to get it parked again. These are the sorts of issues which I think maybe we do not understand. We come in here every day, we park our car and it is very rarely that we cannot – there are some days we cannot get parked under the Courthouse. So, those sorts of pressures do not necessarily affect us. There are these issues which I do not feel we are addressing. So why are we beating ourselves up over this? Because, I think, there is pressure. As the member for Malew and Santon, who has very recently been on the hustings, has found, there is concern out there. It may not be of the most concern to people, but it is a concern. How do we manage various things? People do not like to see roads widened, they do not like to see new developments and they do not like to see different developments because of the added pressure that that brings, and I think if we are going to sit around here quite cosily thinking that there is no pressure because we have got more people at work, that is not the case. Someone said that the Isle of Man was changing fast and we have lost control of it, and I think that is one of the points that has brought some of these issues to bear on this particular motion before us today.

I think the member for Ayre, who is moving this, did have it on the agenda prior to the other issue being discussed in the House and, of course, we do not know what is going to come on the agenda until the agenda is before us. So, I think they came on the agenda both at the same time. It was decided at the last House, by the representatives of the people, to send it to the Social Issues Committee, because that was what was put before us. The member for Douglas South has suggested that the Social Issues Committee should be held to account, but I would put it to you and this hon. Court that the Social Issues Committee is not the government. It has to then go to the government prior to coming here, so while the member for South Douglas is saying, 'Hold the Social Issues Committee to account', it then goes to the Council of Ministers and they either accept or reject.

When we discussed residency last time, it was quite low-key. It was decided that this particular issue

would go to the Social Issues Committee, and that is fine, but in winding up, the Chief Minister then went on to tell us why it would not be implemented, and I think that is why some of the concerns have been expressed here today. In a way, you could say this is apt, because the frustration has come through on this particular issue, because the Chief Minister then went on to say, 'Is this social engineering?' Nobody has addressed this. Well, yes, it was in the report, but it was to go to the Social Issues Committee to look at. The Chief Minister then says, 'No, we are not going to have any of these gateways. These are unacceptable.' So, on one hand, we are sending an issue to the Social Issues Committee, but on the other hand, we are being told by the Chief Minister of the government that even what the Social Issues Committee says is not going to get through the Council of Ministers because he does not agree with it. My feeling from this House was that we were happy for the Social Issues Committee to look at that. The Chief Minister said it was distasteful with some of these gateways, and the member for Rushen, Mrs Crowe, said that she was unhappy and she supported disabled people, but we already have gateways through social security and through work permits. We have already, maybe not quite social engineering, as has been suggested, (*Interjection*) but if somebody has a low income or cannot work or whatever or does not have the ability to support themselves, is ill or all the rest of that, they will not come in and get social security. That is a fact, and we say, 'No'. And in lots of issues, people cannot get on; they might come here with quite sufficient funds, but the rents are high, their money runs out because the amount that they are able to earn here is not sufficient to pay the high rents in the private sector, and what happens then? They want to apply for local authority housing, but they cannot, because they have not been here long enough. So, there is social engineering already. There are other issues, too, which actually control who can come and live here and we should not pretend that this social engineering and these gateways do not exist already, because I put it to this Court that they do. It is in legislation, and we abide by that.

Could I say that, in the budget, there was a quote made by a member: 'However, it has to be remembered that the development of new housing initiatives cannot take place overnight. Infrastructure development for water, electricity and drainage, education policies and other social issues must be taken into account when planning major building programmes.' That was said by the Minister for the Treasury at this year's budget, and these are the areas which concern my constituents. With new developments going on in my area, they are worried who is going to upgrade and place more places in the schools and for health and who is going to provide all the infrastructure that is needed to support new developments. That has not been answered, and the comments made by the Minister for the Treasury are very apt, but they are no less apt today than they were when he was moving his budget in March of this year.

At the moment, I have a constituent who wishes to return to Australia, where he had a working holiday

visa, and because of a family problem he had to return home. Because that year is almost up when he had his visa, he cannot return to Australia on a working holiday visa. We are not the only country that has work permits and other issues; other countries have them as well. I have used my contacts within the CPA to try to elicit support for this young man, who does wish to return there for a short period to continue working, and I am told that not even on compassionate grounds – and it was compassionate, it was a family bereavement – can he return to Australia on a working holiday visa. So, it is not just us who have restrictions on who can and who cannot work here.

I have a difficulty with a referendum, because the issues, I believe, should be addressed, as we are representatives of the people, but I will support the motion that is down today, because I feel a message should go to government that the people outside are concerned that some of these issues should be addressed. I will also support the amendment moved by the member for Onchan. I am also glad that Edgar Quine was listening to his opponent, Thurston Arrowsmith, (*Laughter*) who wanted referendums (**Mr Quine:** Everything.) (**A Member:** Yes.) and consultation on all issues such as this with his constituents. At least he has been listening, (**Mrs Cannell:** Hear, hear.) and Thurston should be pleased (*Laughter*) that he has had some effect on the hon. member for Ayre when the rest of us have quite clearly failed. Thank you, Eaghtyrane.

The President: Hon. member for Onchan, Mr Corkill.

Mr Corkill: Mr President, I have been listening with great interest to the debate, obviously, as leader of a government who regards this issue as a very important issue. I was paying special attention to the hon. member who moved the motion to see what his arguments were to go for this referendum. His opening line was that 'the public of the Isle of Man have already made a subjective judgement' – and I am sure he used those words. In brackets, in Mr Quine's mind, I am sure, is the feeling that therefore this is a good time to capitalise on that subjective judgement by having a referendum, but, hon. members, we have a duty to that same general public, in the decisions that we make in here, not to just make subjective judgements but to have well-informed subjective judgements, if there is such a hybrid, and I fail to see how with a referendum, with something which is as complex as this . . . because it is not, as we have discussed today, a simple issue of, 'Do you want residency control or do you not?', and we had this debate a month ago. It is all the secondary legislation and all the secondary arguments that are key to whether this goes forward or not, and how do you build that into a referendum? I am sure the hon. mover will say that we will pass that job over to the deemster because that is what is written into the Referendum Act; he will frame those questions appropriately. If I was the deemster, I would be in awe of that task, based on this debate. How on earth could you frame

questions with what has been said in here, with such diverse views that exist this month and last with regard to that? And so, it would not be a simple, one-line question, 'Vote for residency control or vote against it'; we are honest enough, I hope, in this Court, to realise that the issue is with all the secondary situations.

I do not agree with a lot of what the hon. member, my colleague, Mr Karran from Onchan, says these days, and that saddens me a bit, we used to have more in common, I think. But there was one thing he was very honest about today, because he is the only member who has genuinely opened up a debate about one of the gateways, and that was the issue on disability. To some extent, I am sorry that the Council of Ministers' decision was not to, in the last report, show to members what the secondary legislation was all about, because a lot of work has been done in that area (**Mrs Crowe:** Exactly.), but the collective view, endorsed by this Court, was to let the Social Issues Committee grapple with that. That is what they will do and, as Chief Minister, I will ensure that they do that task. There have been times when, because I have views on this as an individual, I have put those across to Tynwald Court. I owe that to the public I represent. But let us make it clear: the policy is to work up a package, including all the secondary legislation, so that it can be implemented if there is a feeling of this Court at some point in future, that it is required. I know that is open to discussion and the comment has been made that we should already have it in place, but that is the task in hand, and I wish to reassure hon. members who feel that, perhaps, I have got an agenda slightly different from the Council of Ministers in this that that is the task that will have to be done and there is a collective view to make that happen. But can I say that that collective view is very disparate; it is coming from very obtuse angles. So, I wish the Social Issues Committee well with their task, and that committee is not just the Council of Ministers; it does have non-ministers on it, and I think that is an important point to make.

The hon. member, in his opening comments, also made a few other arguments to support this cause. He did not want to talk about the referendum; he wanted to talk about the background and why he was coming forward. One of the issues was dilution of culture: that people coming to the Island risk our loss of culture. They also bring culture, and I am very pleased that new people to this Island do bring new ideas and things with them, but when I look in the history books, Mr President, at why Manx culture has been diluted over the longer period, it is because so many of us left the Island (**Mrs Crowe:** Absolutely.) and disappeared. That is why we have diluted our culture. It is because we have an Island where the death rate is still higher than the birth rate, so we need some immigration and we need to have the culture that comes with that. We all regret the loss of things Manx that happens from time to time. There are ways that we react to that, but to introduce residency control on that argument, I think, is flawed.

We also had other arguments about disfigurement of the countryside, and none of us like to see green fields disappearing, but it is not just residential development that despoils the countryside; there are other things that happen sometimes as well. But the throwaway line, I thought, was good, as the hon. member wove his arguments together: 'We have our homegrown rascals.' (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Of course we do, and we all know who most of them are.

Mrs Hannan: Most of them are in here. (*Laughter*)

Mr Corkill: If you go down to the probation office and look at the list of names, it is all names such as that, all on probation, because we *do* know our local homegrown rascals. In-built in that statement, Mr President, was the then hidden suggestion that serious crime issues are things that we import, and I can tell you that a lot of our serious crimes are those same homegrown rascals. (**Two Members:** Hear, hear.) It is not something that is out of balance. Yes, we do import crime, but we also export it as well, so let us be balanced about that aspect.

We have had a lot of debate about infrastructure and about rampant immigration. I got elected to this hon. court in 1991 on the basis, that I wanted to see our infrastructure renewed more quickly. It was falling down around our ears. Who has paid for it in that period of time? We had a debate yesterday about the value of our NI fund. Who contributes NI contributions into that area? (**A Member:** Workers.) We all do, the whole working population does, and at least these days we have an NI surplus fund to discuss. We have that debate, and the one thing that comes through which worries me very, very deeply, as, in fact, the Treasury minister has already said, –there is a thread through the arguments for this referendum – is that complacency reigns, in the minds of certain members in this Court. We have had 19 years of economic growth. Have we got so used to it that we can play with fire? I believe this debate is playing with fire, and I think the hon. member for Michael really made that very clear.

I have to carry on with this issue of the gateways. The hon. member for Peel has put interesting comments. Yes, we do already have some gateways. We saw these gateways on the Council of Ministers' table. They are a points-scoring exercise. If you get the lucky number of points, you are awarded the award of being able to reside in the Isle of Man. (*Interjection by Mrs Hannan*) And this legislation removes almost all of the work permit rules, except for a temporary six-month permit, and what happens when people come in on this legislation? Anyone in the EU can come; we heard all about this yesterday. People can come and live here, from the EU, for six months, and in that time they would have to have a temporary permit. They would then have to seek permission to get residence, and if they get the lucky number of points, they will be resident on the Island. Once resident on the Island, then, of course, we are not going to deny anyone who has got the right to reside the ability to work – it would

be against their human rights – and this law is based on this, so there is a balance to be struck between our current work permit controls and residency in bringing that in.

I go back to the point which is that we are putting together a package which, hopefully, will be scrutinised. I have made it quite clear that I feel very uncomfortable about points-scoring on gateways, whether you are disabled, whether you are a millionaire, whether you are a disabled millionaire or whether you are an artist and you can contribute culturally to the Island. We just talked about diluting the Manx culture, but you do actually get points for cultural expertise and contribution. Are we going to give extra points for those qualified with Manx cultural expertise who are bringing it to the Island? You go down these arguments to infinity.

Mr Cretney: As long as you have got fair hair and blue eyes.

Mrs Crowe: Yes.

Mr Corkill: I know one of the gateways that the hon. mover of the bill, Mr Cretney, member for South Douglas, is extremely concerned about is the £1,000,000 tag: bring your £1,000,000 and put it in an Isle of Man institution and you have got residency.

The Speaker: I hope not!

Mr Corkill: Whatever all the other attributes are, that would score points. If you are not healthy, if you have got a venereal disease of some kind, (**A Member:** Yes.) You would probably get points taken away, I do not know –

Mr Delaney: You should do, you wrote the rules!

Mr Corkill: But there are a certain number of diseases that were not listed – certainly issues to do with alcoholism and drugs. Are we going to really be truthful and start looking at giving points to people based on all of these attributes? The real issue that is driving this is the economy, and one of the gateways is obviously important because it is to do with our economy and our future, and these are very uncomfortable things. Our economy is important to us, and we are all agreed on that, but if you look at what this economy needs at the moment, do we need any more accountants? I would suggest we need more accountants on the Isle of Man like a hole in the head at the moment. What we do need are plumbers; (**Several Members:** Yes.) what we do need are people to work in fast-food outlets-

Mr Downie: Nurses.

A Member: Chemists.

Mr Downie: Hotel staff.

Mr Corkill: Hotel staff. So, what type of gateway is that going to look like, based on the current situation? These are the issues that we have given to the Social Issues Committee to come up with a package on.

Mrs Hannan: Yes, and you are judging them first.

Mr Corkill: I am highlighting the decisions that have to be made, Mr President, somewhere down the line, and what I am saying is: are these decisions going to be built into a referendum? I cannot see how you could actually do it.

I am conscious of the time, Mr President, and there was a lot more that I wanted to say, because I would like Mr Quine, in his rounding-up, to expand greatly on how he sees the gateways. I want to know what his view would be and I have thrown down this gauntlet before – I did it a month ago – and we still did not find out how he would see them operating, and I think it is important, because if he is wanting to go to the general public with a referendum, I think we should be clear on those issues. But please, we should not subjugate our responsibility in this way; it is a job for Tynwald to deliberate.

The hon. member for Onchan, Mr Karran, said that the Council of Ministers has its strings pulled by a secret few –

Mr Karran: A lucky few.

Mr Corkill: – or a lucky few. I have to repudiate that; it gets said over and over, and it is just not the case. Let us also be honest about what politics is; politicians get lobbied, we all get lobbied in different ways. Are we going to ban lobbying as well, in order that we can become totally enclosed in the ivory tower and not speak to anybody? I think it is important that that is made clear. But I will tell you one thing, Mr President: when a new business, when new investment, is checking out the Isle of Man, one of the first ports of call is the Chief Minister's office or the Treasury minister's office, but before that they have got all the policy documents, they have got the figures and they have looked at the newspaper cuttings. They look at the headlines and they check all this out – and let us not kid ourselves: they do – and then they start to make decisions based on what they then find out from government and from the general public. I have a duty, as a member for Onchan, to make clear my feelings on this whole subject. I also have a very great duty, as Chief Minister of the Council of Ministers, to make sure that the Social Issues Committee does their work, and I will ensure that that happens, not because of what I have just said, but because Tynwald told it to do that a month ago, and I think that it is very important that we remember the debate from a month ago. I am going to cut my comments very short; all I would say is that we have a duty of care to the public to get this right.

The President: Hon. members, I think it is an appropriate time at which we do take a break. I remind hon. members that, in fact, we have had 16 contributions to what so far has been a very interesting debate. They have averaged 10 minutes a session. I still have four on my list to speak, and the first to speak at 2.30 p.m. will be the hon. member for Garff, Mr Rodan.

Mr Cretney: Hear, hear. Very interesting.

The Court adjourned at 1.14 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 2.30 p.m.

Residency Control – Referendum – Debate Concluded – Motion Lost

The President: Hon. members, we continue with our residency control debate, and, I had reached a situation, and I call on the hon. member for Garff, Mr Rodan.

Mr Rodan: Mr President, those of us who believe in the principle of residency control, and indeed had it in our manifestos at the last election, obviously have a duty to look very carefully at this particular resolution. The difficulty that I have with it – and it is clear from the debate that a number of people have with it – is that the basic proposition is misleading. What is misleading, Mr President, is that a referendum, which is superficially very attractive, will actually settle the issue. In the words of the hon. member of Council, Dr Mann, he said we should get on with it or put it to one side.

Mr President, I do not believe that it is possible to force the issue in this way as the mover of the resolution would have us believe. There is the question in the resolution where the terms are not at all clear. What is said is that the referendum be on the question of whether or not residency control should be introduced. Do we mean by that in principle introduced? Do we mean it to be introduced as a management tool, as some have said, to be used when the time is right or when the circumstances dictate? Do we mean when the regulations are in place, or do we mean now? It is very clear that the hon. mover does mean now, and the hon. member for Ramsey, who seconded, also made it clear that controls should be introduced now. 'So, if the question is, "Should controls be introduced now?" And if the answer to that question by the public is, 'Yes, they should', then, Mr President, we are mistaken if we think we are actually in a position to introduce controls now, because what will happen the day after a 'yes' result is given? What will happen is exactly what is happening now, in that someone will have to draw up the necessary regulations to put the basic control into effect, and of course, as other speakers have said – and I do not want to repeat what has been said – this is an exercise currently being undertaken at this time by the Social Issues Committee. It is a committee that has got

a formidable job to perform in identifying, as has been said again, Mr President, the gateways, and the difficulty – being a member of that Social Issues Committee, with other hon. members – we are facing is in identifying the gateways and coming to grips with the fact that there are so many exceptions that immediately flow from a particular decision as to what a particular gateway should be, whether it be dependants or whether it be on the basis of human rights considerations or on the basis of natural justice considerations. It actually is becoming very difficult for that committee to identify who we would not permit to go through gateways, given the necessity to allow persons like teachers, the key workers, the nurses and so on and those with Island connections. This is not to say that the exercise cannot be done and should not be done, and indeed, if we are serious about residency control, it must be done. My point is, Mr President, that the issue is not as black and white as it seems, and passing this resolution today will not take the process forward because of the practical problems that would immediately then have to be confronted, and it is working through those practical problems that is actually happening now.

The hon. member of Council, Mr Delaney, was one who threw down the gauntlet to those who had in their manifestos reference to residency control. I will be one who will pick up that particular gauntlet, (*Laughter*) and not on any basis of otherwise it will be a 'name and shame' exercise, either in six months or before the election – not at all. I have had in three election manifestos residency control, and I will reiterate that here and now. As a principle, I believe it is an important objective for the Island, because it is a management tool to properly regulate the development of the economy. This is not today a debate about the principle, Mr President; the debate today is about a referendum on the matter. I would ask the hon. member Mr Delaney and others not to mistake a vote against this resolution today on the question of a referendum as being a vote against the principle or a vote against the mechanism when that mechanism has been identified (**A Member:** Hear, hear.), and the mover in his moving of this resolution today, in his very carefully and well-researched case, I must say, did give a very clear implication that unless we support this today, we are against residency control in principle.

The arguments against having a referendum have been made. It is a question of the fact that, in a representative democracy, we do not routinely govern by referendum on issues, and this issue does not warrant that particular approach for the reasons that have already been given. But I think what the problem is is that we have lost sight, in this Court, of what government policy is. I understand it and what it has been in previous administrations, and that is to have a well thought-out mechanism. The law is there; from it flows the mechanism to introduce residency controls when the circumstances require that they be brought in, when they are needed in the interests of the managing of what would be otherwise unfettered growth of an economy and to damp down an

overheated economy and rampant – to use a word that has been used – influx of new residents beyond the capacity of the Island to comfortably absorb them. That is what I have always understood the policy to be. I do not think the policy has changed, and passing this resolution today will not change that policy as far as I am concerned.

Mr President, finally, there are many jurisdictions which, as the hon. mover has said, have residency controls. The Isle of Man actually is the exception to the rule. We accept that. The hon. member has spent time out east, shall we say, and some of us have lived in countries where British citizenship gives no right of residency, albeit in a nominally British territory, and there are the appropriate controls. Some resemble the ones that are being worked up here and some places do not, but what is very evident is that those controls come at a human cost quite often. I have seen residency permission and work permits revoked, even after long periods of years of residency, for political reasons, and it is not a happy sight to see the human cost of that. Let us just bear that in mind. Of course, it may well be, Mr President, that the ultimate gateway, which is that of economic opportunity, may not be one, in practice, that prospective new residents will feel they can go through in future if we are not careful. I just make that point that the ultimate residency control is the state of the Isle of Man economy (**Mrs Crowe:** Absolutely.) and the economic opportunity that it offers, and we should bear that in mind also.

The President: Hon. member for Douglas West, Mr Downie.

Mr Downie: Thank you, Mr President. I have no qualms about residency control at all. I declared in my manifesto that I agreed with the principle of residency control, and I firmly believe that government is engaged in progressing this matter at the present time and trying to address the issues which were highlighted last month in this Court when the issue of residency control was actually referred to the Social Issues Committee. So, the matter is being progressed.

I think that, during the debate, what has become obvious is that some hon. members, irrespective of the length of service in this Court, have failed to see that there is a difference between immigration control and residency control. If you want immigration control, cut the links, go on your own, bring in your own system of passport control and visas and everything else and then you may or may not effectively control who comes in and out of the Island. If you are going to go down the residency control route, one of the issues that will have to be addressed will be a resident's card and proper identification for all those who are entitled to work here but, as was said last month, that brings with it its own set of problems and criteria to deal with. Some are human rights issues: if you give a person the right to reside in the Isle of Man, you cannot then enforce the work permit criteria on him, because it is contrary to their human rights. You cannot give a person residency on the one hand and deny him the right to work and keep himself on the other. So, these are just small,

minor issues that I am sure the man in the street can deal with quite easily in a referendum. I think that this matter *is* progressing through the wheels of government. We may not seem to go very quickly, I agree, but this is an issue that really must be treated, I think, with the utmost caution.

I just want to talk a little bit about work permits, and I want to dispel the myth that has been broadcast around this Island by a number of people, including the Transport and General Workers Union, that I personally wish to get rid of the work permit system, and I take offence at my name being put on posters at the union headquarters to say that Downie is a traitor to the Manx worker, and I do not think that is a very nice way to do business. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) I was asked to take a document out to consultation on behalf of the government of the Isle of Man, through the Department of Trade and Industry, and I think it is sad that personalities have to become involved in that way. Nevertheless, I think all members of this hon. Court have been circulated with the consultation document. We are now actively hearing the views from the union side, the employer's side and anybody else who wants to make a contribution. We have a live document in front of us. So, to take the hon. member for Onchan Mr Karran's view, we are undermining the confidence of the democratic process; the democratic process is lost. I would put it to you, hon. members, that if you support the amendment that is before you today that there is to be no relaxation in the work permit regulations until such time as residency controls are introduced, you are, in fact, eroding that basic democratic process that we have gone down by way of putting this document out for consultation. You may well find that, after the consultation period is up, government decides that there is no need to change the work permit system. I am the person who has to sit in the middle and make the recommendation to the Council of Ministers.

One of the reasons why we are going out to consultation on this document is that, under the present regulations, it has become apparent that some sectors cannot attract people to come and work in the Isle of Man because the work permit situation, particularly with people like nurses and teachers for instance, is having a counter-effect. People will not sell up in the UK and move to the Isle of Man if they think they are only going to get a work permit for 12 months. It is having an effect, and when the issue was discussed in this hon. Court some months ago, I did agree to take it back, and some suggestions were made by people who have had a lot more time and experience in this Court than I have to see if it would be possible to fine-tune the system in some way and allow for exemptions which could be brought in at times of zero employment when we were having difficulty attracting people. And it is no secret that, over the next 18 months or two years, there are going to be about 150 new jobs required in the health services. We have not got the people with the qualifications here on the Isle of Man. We have got an expanding schools programme; the same situation applies to teachers. I do not want to get rid of the system; I think the system

actually works very well indeed. I am just going to read to some hon. members, if we wanted to be hard-nosed and very insular, the amount of controls that we do have under the work permit régime: we can actually consider the number of persons in the family of the relevant person, the number of additional relatives coming to live in the Island and the likelihood of the numbers involved causing a problem to the Island – we can do that now; the character of the relevant persons and the members of his family, including any conviction of a member of his family of a criminal offence in the Island or elsewhere –

Mr Delaney: You cannot get his criminal records.

Mr Downie: – we can do that now; the medical history of the relevant person and of the members of his family; the employment history of the relevant person and his spouse; the number of Isle of Man workers employed by the applicant as a percentage of the total number of persons employed by him; and the failure of the applicant or relevant person to get behind or pay National Insurance contributions. There is a whole raft of controls which we have access to. I am not saying that we have been vigorously enforcing these because, given the present climate, there is a labour crisis on the Isle of Man. I think some hon. members of this Court are becoming out of touch with reality.

The hon. member Mr Delaney made a number of points yesterday. Just go out and see who is running the tourist industry on the Isle of Man.

Mr Cretney: We are.

Mr Downie: There are not many Manx people –

Mr Delaney: Now, do not go down that avenue or we will have a public debate. Do not try to pull that one.

Mr Downie: Well, there are not many local people. (*Interjection by Mr Delaney*) We are relying on imported labour and we are relying on people to come in –

The Speaker: Always have done.

Mr Downie: – on work permits, and we are also relying on student labour. A lot –

Mr Delaney: Cheap labour.

Mr Downie: With respect, we have a minimum wage in the Isle of Man, which you will have the opportunity to debate in January when it comes back.

I would urge hon. members not to support the amendment. Let us get this issue regarding the work permits back onto the floor of this Court after it has had its full consultation process, and then we can determine in this Court whether we want to see any changes or not. Let us let the case be heard. If you actually look at the amendment and you tie it onto the

end of the actual motion as it appears on the agenda, by accepting the amendment, this could never come before this Court. It would just go on and on and on, and we really need to get this matter resolved one way or the other.

One of the things that government has been doing – and it may have escaped some hon. members – is trying to diversify the economy and, at the same time, trying to do it in such a way that we do not need to have money put in to provide infrastructure. The film industry has been an excellent example of that. We have got four productions being shot on the Isle of Man. Most of the people who are engaged in the industry do not need to send people to school, they do not need hospital services and they do not need access to other parts of our infrastructure. They come in and they go out. They are a very, very positive boost to the Island's economy. Shipping is the same. We are trying to develop systems where there are fewer and fewer people employed in the industry but, at the same time, the industry produces a very high-value input into the Island's economy.

I think the problem that we will all have to grapple with is the establishment of the gateways and how we are actually going to get this residency control to work so that everybody is happy. I see winners and losers in this, because you will never, ever devise a scheme that is going to be all things to all people. I honestly think that, with so many big issues facing the Island, we should not blindly rush into residency control; we should wait for the report from the Social Issues Committee and then we should give ourselves time to put some of these other bigger issues behind us, and then we can look at it afresh and we will then be fully aware of what impact this is going to have on the Island. Some previous speakers have made reference to damage to the economy; I think this has to be considered. I think that if you are going to bring restrictions in, you will definitely, in my opinion, be looking at having a knock-on effect on property prices on the Isle of Man. I would admit that they are high at the moment, but they are high at the moment because of a shortage, and once these new houses come along, if you do start a run on the property market and we go into a negative equity situation, there are going to be an awful lot of young people who have bought houses here who are going to get into difficulties very, very quickly. I think, really that that needs to be thought out as well. So, I would urge members to vote against the motion and vote against the amendment. Let us leave the progression of this matter to the Social Issues Committee.

The President: Hon. member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell.

Mrs Cannell: Thank you, Mr President. It has been a very interesting, very informative debate, but disappointing in part because, of course, I have heard yet again all the arguments for not introducing a management tool for residency – because that is what, in essence, we are actually looking at. But, in fact, what we are looking at today is whether or not

Tynwald is of the opinion that the public should be consulted on this and that the public should be asked whether or not, in their view, there should be a management of residency or not. That is the crux of the matter, and yet I have heard all over again today all the arguments and the red herrings flying right, left and centre, which worries me, Mr President –

Mr Bell: You should have listened to them then.

Mrs Cannan: – because, on the one hand, the Social Issues Committee, of which the hon. member for South Douglas, Mr Cretney, is but one member as I understand it, looks at all the nitty-gritty of the secondary legislation, the regulations, and then it has to go back to the Council of Ministers, who have made their opinion on this issue quite clear today. They are very concerned and really do not want to introduce it. In fact, the only constructive contribution from the Council of Ministers that I have heard, to my view, today was from the hon. member for Ramsey, Mr Bell, the Treasury minister, because he recognised the valuable contribution that was made in the opening speech moved by the hon. member for Ayre, Mr Quine, and the seconding from his colleague in Ramsey, Mr Singer. He acknowledged the value of the arguments that were put forward in terms of strategic outlook, approach and management of all sorts of things, not just the residents who are here, but economic prosperity, looking further afield, perhaps even targeting certain industries and making it attractive to bring in and attract certain expertise that we need in certain areas where we have a shortfall. That is what residency management is all about; it is not about controlling people and saying, ‘You must stay here, because if you move there, you will not be able to come back here’ or ‘If you go off-Island for a period of time . . .’ That is part of it, yes, but a very small part of it, I would suggest. What we have heard today is the case being made to be more proactive and more strategic in our outlook for the future, and I fully support that. I think we should be doing that. Often we only look as long as the end of our noses and focus and home in on a particular problem without exploring all the scenarios and filling the gaps in all those areas where problems may come up through examining various scenarios.

We have also heard during debate today – and this is when I say it has been informative – that the secondary legislation, the regulations that were considered by the Council of Ministers, which we as hon. members have not had sight of, as mere backbenchers, were fashioned in such a way as to be unpalatable. Well, I would be wanting to know why they were fashioned in such a way that they had to be sent back again to be fashioned in a more palatable and more amenable way. Perhaps there is a story in that alone.

I wish to congratulate the new member of this hon. Court, the hon. member for Malew and Santon, on his maiden speech. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) A very brave thing to do at your first sitting of Tynwald, and my due regard and respect to him. Of course, he

said in his contribution to debate that residency was touched upon by his canvassing attempts. It was not the main issue, of course; I believe the main issue in his constituency was the issue of speeding traffic. Let us look at that: the speeding of traffic through Malew. This has all come about by economic prosperity, the Isle of Man having expanded in terms of the numbers of resident population and businesses prospering. Of course, with all of that, we have more of an affluent society, more people have cars – some have more than one – and they are geared to speeding from one destination to the other, motivated by economic prosperity, time management and getting the job done, and things like family values, home values and all of those things are suffering as a consequence.

The hon. member also went on to say that he believed that, because we have primary legislation in place, if we needed to activate the regulations, we could do so quickly. I have to inform the hon. member today that this is what we are arguing about, if you like, on this floor in this hon. place, because there is no regulation in place. There is no secondary legislation; it is primary legislation that sits there and cannot be effected, because there is no meat on that bone, and it is the meat that we are quibbling about. Of course, we have not had a sample of meat to taste yet; we have only had some red herrings flying from the Chief Minister to the Minister for the Department of Local Government and the Environment, latterly from the Minister behind me for the Department of Trade and Industry, and any other minister who has cared to jump in on the debate. So, it cannot actually be implemented quickly, because first of all draft regulations have to be looked at and they have to go out to public consultation. Ah, yes, the public have to be asked; that is what we are debating today, isn’t it? (**Several Members:** No.) We are debating putting in place a proactive measure at the same time as the Social Issues Committee is considering what the meat should be. We are asking, ‘should we be asking the public whether or not they regard that we should have some meat on the bone and we should have residency control or not?’

Talking about scenarios, what if the Social Issues Committee comes back and after it has been peppered with the contribution from the Council of Ministers, accordingly amended, we still find what they are proposing unpalatable? And in the meantime, a national referendum is running, and the people come back and they say, ‘Everything is fine. We do not feel that we need residency control at this moment, or management of residency.’

Mr Downie: Tynwald decides.

Mrs Cannell: Then, of course, that takes the pressure off. It has fulfilled the obligation that the majority of hon. members in this place made at the hustings last year and it also gives time to consider and monitor and evaluate. Of course, equally, if they come back and say, ‘Yes it should’, then we will need their contribution in terms of how the regulations should be drafted and what sort of things they should include and what sort of things then should not include. So, I see

this as timely; I think it is well timed, it is well placed and it is well intentioned, and I do not think anybody would be best served if we do not support the motion on the agenda today. Dealing with some of the red herrings, I think I need to put it down just for record because it has not been included in anybody's contribution today: we do have, in the Isle of Man, human rights legislation; we do have sex discrimination legislation; we do have minimum wage legislation; we have primary legislation for residency control; and we have legislation, out for consultation at the moment, on disability discrimination and racial discrimination. We have got a lot of planks in place, and we are actually fashioning some new ones to go in place, so regarding all this business about, 'Oh, but what about this and what about that?', of course we have to have cognisance of these things when putting such regulations together on a management of residency, and they will be fashioned accordingly because of the laws of the land that exist. It would be a different matter if we did not have these acts in force at the moment and then I would understand the dilemma with some of the ministers saying, 'Would you say this person could not come? What about that gateway? What about this gateway?' The gateways are there; all it is is managing them, bringing them together and making it happen. That is what I see the secondary legislation doing.

We have heard during debate that the sewerage infrastructure could accommodate a population of 120,000. I am not going to quibble with that. I am not sure what it could cope with when it is all completed and up and running, but I do know that the water infrastructure can only accommodate a *maximum* population of 90,000. (*Interjections*) Let us look at the last census; let us look at some facts and figures that I have been looking at in the last two days. The last census in 2001, showed that there was a resident population in 2001 of 76,315 people, and it went on to say, 'This represents an increase in the resident population of 4,601 since the interim census in 1996' – that was five years before. That is quite a rise in five years, I would suggest. The hon. member for Michael, who seems to be dozing in his chair as I speak, yet another one nodding off during the course of our deliberations – did say that 2006 would give us – (*Interjections*) I would suggest, Mr President, that he has eaten rather a large lunch, possibly. The hon. member for Michael said the next referendum – because obviously he spoke against national referendums will be in 2006, in five years' time. If that is to be the case, then, and if we are to assume – because the resident population has been growing for quite some significant time, it is not just during the last couple of years or five years or even ten years, it is longer than that – another addition of another 4,601, in five years' time we could realise a resident population of 80,906 persons. That is almost 81,000. We are getting very close to the infrastructure limit for water, the very basis that keeps us alive. Without water, we would all curl up and die, and we can only accommodate 90,000 maximum. And that has risen and those figures have been adjusted because the rate

of consumption per head of population has far exceeded what the economics division of government first anticipated just three years ago. Consider that, hon. members. Consumption has gone up. There is no suggestion, I would hesitate in adding, to say that consumption will not continue to increase. I think it will continue to increase, clearly because we are having more people move, more people settle and more people operate businesses and homes and families. So, we are going to have a larger population to be called on to accommodate, which is going to eat up –

Mr Downie: What about recycling water?

Mrs Cannell: – the amount of water. Mr President, the hon. member for West Douglas is doing his best to throw me off course, but I shall resist and keep to the point and try to –

Members: Hear, hear.

Mr Delaney: Take his work permit off him. (*Laughter*).

Mrs Cannell: So, I just say that, in five years, we have had quite a movement, quite a large influx.

I think it is also worthy of saying that a third of the resident population of the Isle of Man in 2001 reside in Douglas, so the impact on Douglas is sometimes greater than the rest of the constituent parts of the Island because –

Mr Bell: So are the benefits.

Mrs Cannell: – because Douglas, and in particular my constituency of Douglas East, is the main gateway, I would suggest, for anybody coming to the Isle of Man. So East Douglas is the very first area of the Island to be hit, either by visitors, business people or those coming to live or work on our shores – and especially if they are coming to live, because they usually come by boat. So we feel it first, and my constituents have been feeling the pinch and the impact of this for some considerable years, and they make their views known to me very clearly, very precisely and quite often. It is not just a pre-election thing.

In fact, it was quite interesting in the census to realise that the Isle of Man still can boast of having a higher female population than a male, (**Several Members:** Hear, hear.) Mr President. I was quite encouraged by that.

The Speaker: All to do with the air.

A Member: Absolutely.

Mrs Cannell: But again, when you look at the resident population by age and area of residents in 2001, that throws up some quite interesting areas there, because you can see that in some constituencies there is an ageing population, greater than perhaps in others, but also you look at it and the overall picture is that

you have a higher working population than you have ever had, and that has been confirmed by the contribution from the Treasury minister today. Economically active people far outweigh those of retirement age, but equally the Chief Minister also said in his contribution that the death rate exceeds the birth rate in the Isle of Man and always has done. I am not going to quibble on that, because the one thing I have not done prior to this debate is to check on the rate of deaths, but as another government of the day went out of their way to make it attractive for folk who were of retirement age to come and reside here, it is not surprising, at the moment, if the death rate is exceeding the birth rate. But that was an initiative at the time, and that was just before I came to live here, and that was in 1977, so pre then there was an initiative that brought people to settle here and to buy property. Please, hon. members, also note that children – and I include those up to the age of 19, because these are our young people – who not only have to be educated but hopefully will go on to good jobs or maybe even higher education, nevertheless need to be accommodated, and in 2001 they amounted to 17,995 individuals. So, if you relax work permit regulations and make it easier for off-Island personnel to come in – I say it as a possible scenario – it may not be very good for our young people, coming up and expecting good jobs and also expecting the Department of Education to sponsor them into acquiring the necessary qualifications to go for those good jobs.

Yesterday, this hon. Court condoned a 1 per cent increase in national insurance contributions, and I say for the record, Mr President – and I must be getting close to my 10 minutes, I am aware of that –

Several Members: Nearly 20!

Mrs Cannell: – that self-employed individuals who employed others amounted to 1,740 individuals, and self-employed not employing others amounted to 3,963. I am going from figures of last year, but the total is 5,703 people at least who will be affected by the decision that was taken yesterday. I think it is also interesting to note – and I am talking about economic prosperity and those who contribute most to the Island's economic prosperity – that of course the public perception is that it is the finance sector, and all pie charts in government documents would indicate it is the finance sector, that produces more than 50 per cent of our economic prosperity year in, year out, but when you look at the breakdown of that – and this was something I tried to hammer home when I was a member of the Department of Trade and Industry in charge of retail – the number who are employed in retail distribution, that is your shops, your managers and everything else, is 3,644. These are last year's figures. Second is manufacturing; I was disappointed that when the hon. minister for the DTI got up, he did not mention manufacturing. We are talking about **(Mrs Crowe and Another Member: Residency.)** high-value, low-volume industries continuing to be attracted to the Isle of Man, whether we have residency or not.

Mr Bell: What about the referendum? *(Interjections)*

Mrs Crowe: What are we talking about now?

Mrs Cannell: What I am saying here is that we have manufacturing; 3,185 are employed. On the breakdown, banking comes third, fourth is public administration, fifth is medical and health services and sixth is transport and communications – and, of course, a lot of that is government-operated businesses. I am just saying it for the record. There are just a number of quick things I want to scoot through.

The President: Hon. member, I would be grateful if you would come a little closer to the motion.

Mrs Cannell: Yes, I will. **(Mr Corkill: Referendum.)** *(Interjections)* Mr President, talking to the amendment for two minutes – and I will be supporting clearly the motion as printed on the agenda – the minister from the Department of Trade and Industry said that some businesses are finding it difficult to recruit the appropriate personnel and that people will not come in to work on a one-year work permit. Let me put the record straight: when I came in, I was working on a three-month work permit which would be revoked at the end of the three-month period, and that went on for three years, but I still invested in this Island and bought property and decided that I would put my roots here, and each time my work permit was revoked, I would have to go and speak to my MHK, the hon. member of Council, Mr Delaney, at the time –

A Member: Hear, hear.

A Member: Give a free haircut!

Mr Delaney: It was not easy! *(Laughter)*

Mrs Cannell: – who would help me. What I am saying is that in the 1970s the restrictions were far more greatly enforced in terms of work permits. There was more of a discerning attitude with the then work permit committee – and I believe a previous Member of the Legislative Council here occupied a very valuable seat in that – than there is currently, and it worries me that the minister admitted that there is a lack in terms of enforcement, and yet out to public consultation . . . And I welcome the extended date for public submission in December, which I received at lunchtime today, but wanting to relax it worries me because, by relaxing it, you will, in fact, not be able to enforce the remainder of it very efficiently. Thank you.

The President: Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes, thank you, Mr President. I think one of the points is that the debate so far has actually been very helpful and interesting, because I think what it has done is it given an opportunity for hon. members to re-emphasize, from both directions,

the views that they hold in relation to whether or not residency control should be brought it and also the timing of that, and I think the timing is really the important issue.

But I do think one message needs to be put out again, because I think there is a view within the populace that the residency control will only affect those who come into the Isle of Man, and I think it has to be made very clear that residency control is not all plusses to the Isle of Man (**Mrs Crowe:** Absolutely.) and that the Residency Control Act will apply to every man, woman and child. Whether born here, whether they are of Manx descendency going back hundreds of years, the Residency Control Act, when it is brought into force, will affect them. The Manx, as well as everybody else, will have to, if they move property, register under the Act, (**Mrs Crowe:** Absolutely.) and I have to say I do not believe that that message has been portrayed strongly –

Mrs Crowe: Quite right.

The Speaker: – enough for people to understand it. The view outside seems to be that it will only affect those coming in. The issue is that, of course, because we are not a sovereign state, we cannot have immigration control in our own right, and therefore we rely on immigration control and laws that are implemented by another country, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) and whilst the Isle of Man retains its status as it does today, then that will be the fact for a long time to come.

I think the other issues that I would like to cover are some of the comments about the views outside, and I think we all have to acknowledge – and we all do, because I think every member who has spoken so far has acknowledged – that there are views in the community about residency control, and one of the things that we all pick up on is what those concerns are. Mr President, the concern I have picked up from my constituents – and, I hasten to add, from other people, because we all do talk to other people as well around the Island – has, in fact, not just been the concern about people coming into the Island as such, although that is clearly a concern, but the strongest concern that is coming from people – and I think we have to be honest about this, because everyone has basically skirted around it – is, in fact, what they see as the arrival within the Island of certain groups of people who are of a different origin. That is what is causing concern; that is where a lot of people are focusing in on now and are saying, ‘What are we going to do to restrict people coming into the Island?’ I think we have to be honest about that, because that is what is focusing a lot of the views of many people. The fear – because some member mentioned the fear is what I have just said, and what they see as a misunderstanding, because in many cases where I have been asked about this, I have made it clear to my constituents and to others that people who have come in from outside the United Kingdom and outside of Southern Ireland into the Isle of Man require an immigration permit and, on top of that, they require an

immigration permit to work and – I think I am right – on top of that they then require a Manx permit to work. Therefore, there are a number of hurdles they have to already get through to be able to come to the Isle of Man. All of those permits, in fact, if they are coming here to work, will be for a limited period. For example, the Isle of Man permit will be for six months or twelve months, whatever it is, with it reviewed, and it is likely that the immigration permit, which is even far more strictly controlled, coming into what is seen as the travel area of the UK, is likely to be for only twelve months anyway. So, these things are already in place, but on top of that, of course, the Isle of Man has many other controls which are a disincentive, if that is the right terminology to use, for people to come here to live. One is that you need to have 10 years’ residency to get onto a public sector housing list, subject to all the other things, of course, that cause difficulties. There are certain state benefits you are not entitled to unless you have been here more than five years, and therefore unless people who come here to live work or have got their own means, there are other things that can affect whether or not they stay on the Isle of Man. So, there are many other things. We are looking very much here at this very narrowly, but in fact there are many other things that affect whether or not people come here to live and stay and so on.

Most of the increase in our population, as has been confirmed by the hon. member for Douglas East, Mrs Cannell, is of people who have come here to work in our community to generate the income to uplift and help this Island become prosperous. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) The hon. member for Ramsey, Mr Bell, said how the situation was in the early 1980s, and those of us who were certainly in this hon. Court, and many of those who worked outside, know how difficult it was: no jobs for school leavers, no opportunities for school leavers, many people who were in their thirties and forties going on what we called ‘winter work schemes’ because there was no work, and people struggling to pay all sorts of bills. We have successfully developed and moved forward to give a better way of life and a better cost of living than has been before. It is very easy for us all to pick on things we do not like; there are lots of things I do not like; I do not like them changing something; they might widen the road, and I do not like that, as the hon. member for Peel said, or there might be something else done, a building built, and I do not like where it has gone. We all have those views, but then we also have to balance up the positive side. A criticism was made because there are so many cars about. Most of the cars have been bought by young people leaving school, getting good jobs and being able to do it. When I left school, I could hardly afford a pushbike, never mind a car, and most people were the same, so we – and when I say ‘we’, Mr President, I mean this hon. Court, those who have gone before us, who have worked hard to develop our society, to build it up and to provide opportunities – have been successful, (**Mrs Crowe:** Absolutely.) and with that success we have to look at how to manage it, and I understand that, but sometimes we look through rose-coloured spectacles about how

life was on the Isle of Man. Much of our culture is wonderful, fantastic, and the bits that are good we already portray; but by gosh, there was an awful lot of it not so good. There was poverty, there was illness, nowhere to go if you were ill. There was hunger, no jobs –

A Member: No museum.

The Speaker: – nothing at all. Why did so many Manx people leave the Isle of Man? Because there was nothing here for them. People came back from the Second World War and went again because there was nothing here for them, and what I am trying to demonstrate, Mr President, is that it is very easy for us today, the new generation who have got all this, to sit back and say, ‘Well, we have got all this’ and, as the Chief Minister said, maybe become a bit complacent and, I think worse than that, over-confident. (**Mr Corkill:** Yes.) We can then bash on this side and it will still stay there; that is not the reality. Jersey bashed on that side (**Mrs Crowe:** Yes.) and went into major decline very quickly, and they are still struggling, years on, to get out of it. So, we have to be careful we do not do that, because if we do, we will hammer every business on the Isle of Man, whether it is shops, hotels, manufacturing, the media or newspapers. Whatever it is, it will all be hit, because everybody is part of the whole picture and all rely on revenue to make everything work, and therefore we need to be careful on that.

Mr President, the issue before us is whether or not we go out to have a referendum, and I have to say that my view is that we are charged by the people who elect us to make those sorts of decisions with all the information at hand. (**A Member:** Hear, Hear.) How on earth do you get over the reality with the distortions that would come out in a referendum? We have seen it in other countries bigger than ours, where those who do not want something to happen tell all sorts of stories to make it fail and to get the populace to go with them. It is our job to assess the implications to the Isle of Man, make sure that the decision that is made is in the best interests of all the people of the Island and not get hung on groups who may want one thing or another.

Timing is everything. Last month, we agreed that the Council of Ministers should progress with the regulations for implementing the Residency Act, and there is still some way to go. Yes, there is a concern in our community, but there is nobody hammering on the doors of members – or very few – saying, ‘bring it in now.’ There are some who want it, but not on a massive scale, and hopefully we will never get to that situation, because if that happens, we have judged it wrongly. So, that is something we need to keep in mind.

Finally, I would just like to quote from my manifesto that I put out in the last election, (*Laughter*) and the heading – the hon. member of Council is laughing, I suppose, because I was returned unopposed, which –

Mr Delaney: It is marvellous if you put a ferret out.

The Speaker: Well, you see, it is quite interesting, because I do not take people for granted, so that is why I put one out, and what I did, Mr President, was put in my manifesto a heading of ‘Residency Control’. And I would like to put it on record, so that when it comes back, it is on record what I said: ‘The Residency Act is now in being, and the work involved in developing the necessary administration is being developed. I believe that the implementation of this Act needs to be carefully managed, and when it is introduced, it should be done in conjunction with changes in the present control of employment legislation. I believe that when the Residency Act is brought into operation, the main areas of control needed for employment will be in relation to itinerant workers, i.e. those on short-term, 12 months or less, employment contracts.’ I have to say that not one of my constituents – and every one of them got one personally – came to me and said, ‘I do not agree with you on that.’ We know that, within our community, there will be those who do not agree and do. All I can say is that I am pretty close to the people I represent. I go into the pubs, like most people, I go and get involved in organizations in my town for all different age groups, from schoolchildren through to retired people, like every other member, and we do get feedback, and there is concern on occasions, but I have to say that the concern is not heightened to a degree that people have a concern to say ‘Bring it in now.’ Their concern is to make sure we can provide the services that they expect: housing, health, education. Those are the main three, and have always been the main three in my time in here, and employment on top of that, and if we have got those right and we keep the balance and ensure that we do not have an influx at a pace that people cannot accept, then people will be content. And one thing is for sure, as I finish, Mr President: if people are very, very concerned about the amount of people coming into the Island, we will be the first to know.

The President: I call on the hon. member for Ayre.

Mr Quine: Thank you very much, Mr President. I wholeheartedly concur with the comments of a number of members. There has been a very interesting debate. I think possibly the aspect that I have found most assuring is that I set out to carry my motion on two basic approaches. One was to establish the importance of residency control, and I gave three aspects to illustrate that, and I am pleased to say, that I think that by any assessment there has been no attack on the premise on which I have sought to carry that case. Indeed, on the main arm of that case, which was on this matter of interfacing economic and demographic policy, there have been very supportive comments made by the Minister for the Treasury, so I have found that very rewarding. Less so with the matter of

referendum, but I will come back to that, as I will to a number of other key issues.

If I could, first and foremost – and I am afraid I must do this – go through some of the points raised by members in their individual contributions. I thank Mr Singer, of course, for seconding my motion. He led off, I think, by making a key point, and that is that whatever our economic policy and our economic strategy in the future are going to be, there is a need for our investors to know where they stand – what it is, where we are going, where we intend to be in five or ten years, whatever – accepting, of course, that there will be some tuning, even some diversions, to take place, because over a long span of time matters can change. But I think that is a pretty important point: we do need to know where we are going. It is not sufficient to react when we have a Mr Edwards, or a Mr Whoever from the EU, who comes here and says, ‘Look, chaps, you cannot do this; you must do that.’ I am afraid that is not the way to instil investor confidence.

Another luxury we cannot afford was also brought out by the hon. member for Ramsey, and that is that there is an impression created – and it will remain that we are continuing to propagate this impression, unless and until we come to a definitive position on residency control – that we do not really know if it is something we should do something about, but it is a difficult problem. I am afraid that is another position and posture which does nothing to engender the confidence of people who are here working in our economy and, equally importantly, people who would be attracted to come here and join in our economic activity.

The importance of keeping the drain on our infrastructure to a minimum was another point that was made, and I brought this out in my address. I think this is key to economic policy, never mind social policy, because if we disperse our funds – whatever funds there may be available now and, perhaps more problematically, what will be available in the future – over too many people, too broad a front, then clearly it is going to cost us, and that cost is going to be an unwarranted cost and an unnecessary cost and again, it is a principle that is built into the economic approach that I enunciated when I introduced my motion.

The fourth point that I have marked down here as being particularly important is that he said – and I use Mr Singer’s words – ‘Strangle other plants in the garden’, and how true that is. If you have undirected economic development where it is like all-in wrestling, all holds are acceptable and no holds are barred, then I am afraid that, for want of resource in the areas that we should be nurturing, we are going to have a position where the stronger plants in the garden – not necessarily the most productive plants – not necessarily the most worthy plants – are going to be strangled, and again that is part and parcel of what I would see as being an ingredient of the economic approach that I advocated.

Mr Rimington’s contribution was short and sharp. (*Laughter*) He said, ‘It is a matter for Tynwald Court’, The mandate’ – and I presume by that he means the motion – ‘is unworkable’ and ‘This is a matter for

government’, (*Interjection*) so I took it on the strength of that he was not supportive. (*Laughter*)

Mrs Crowe: Were you not, John?

Mr Quine: This is another minister, and I defer to those ministers in the Council of Ministers who I know are supportive of residency control, because I know who they are. As they say in Manx politics, the only difference between open correspondence and confidential is 15 minutes, (*Laughter*) so it is no secret as to where the support for residency lies and where the support does not exist. Quite clearly, Mr Rimington is opposed to residency control, but I think that what I would refer him to, of course, is the Referendum Act. Perhaps he could tell me where in the Referendum Act these profound statements are embodied. I am coming back to the Referendum Act in a little while, because two or three people have raised matters particular to the Referendum Act, but his approach is quite simple: the view that is advocated in this motion is not one with which the hon. member for Rushen, Mr Rimington, agrees, therefore be damned. It will be as I see fit. And, as far as he is concerned, it is for the government, this entity, this government which quite frankly we have never been able to define in this hon. court – to decide; the public does not come into this. The public conveniently put him there, but once he is there, that is the end of it; it is then for the government to decide. I could not disagree more with him. I believe that we are here as nominee holders of those interests of the people outside this hon. Court, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Interjection*) and we should be displaying a great deal more respect and concern for their views than what has been summed up here today by Mr Rimington.

I thank Mr Karran for his support, and he has proposed an amendment. I have no real difficulty with the amendment. Quite frankly, I have heard what the Minister for Trade and Industry has said, but I really have no great difficulty with it. It ‘agrees that there be no relaxation in the work permit regulations until such time as residency controls are introduced.’ I have no problem with that. I think that by the time I have finished this summing-up it will be apparent that we need that incentive –

A Member: That is right.

Mr Quine: – to do something about residency control and a lot more before we will ever see it as a reality because of the in-built hostility to it within the present administration. So, if it has served no other purpose than to induce the administration to come to a definitive decision in respect of residency, then it would be a plus, but I know where he is coming from, and from that position as well I am quite happy to support that amendment.

He made an interesting reference to the quality of life surveys, and he drew our attention to the fact that, way back in 1990, there was an 80 per cent reading that there should be no further growth. Of course, such absolute terms are simply not on, and I would have

thought that if those were the words used in the survey, that is wrong in itself, because quite clearly there must be growth. But the important point he made is that it was as high as 88 per 12 years ago and, with all the pressures that have built up since then, we can assume that that has not lessened and yet when we came to the 2002 survey, it is a non-issue. It does not even feature on the survey.

Mr Delaney: It did not get the right answer, that is why.

Mr Quine: You do not ask the question if you are afraid you are going to get the answer you do not want –

Mr Delaney: That is right.

Mr Quine: – and I am afraid that is the point which the hon. member for Onchan was making.

The hon. member of Council, Mrs Christian, said that, as the majority of members supported residency control, there is no need for us to do anything about it. I assume she is suggesting that it is a foregone conclusion that residency control will become a reality. If only it was that simple for residency control to become a reality. In the first place, we would have to carry the Legislative Council with us, and they certainly have not been before the democratic process and I am not aware of what pledges they may or may not have made on any other footing, but to suggest that simply because in a manifesto a majority of members have said that they are for residency control, we can all sit back on our haunches and say, ‘Worry not, lads. It will come about because that is what they said they would do’, is not my reading of politics. I think you need to reinforce that, and reinforce it in a very strong fashion.

She made the point – quite a valid point – that there is a need for time to address the mechanisms to carry forward residency control. As a simple statement, I have no problem with that, but after 10 to 20 years, I think it is wearing a bit thin. They have had more than sufficient time to produce the primary legislation and the secondary legislation, time and time again (**A Member:** Hear, hear.), if there was a commitment to do so, but apart from a small number of people who may be in the Council of Ministers, that commitment is not there. Indeed, I believe they are working to a different agenda. And as it was agreed to go to the Social Issues Committee, that is it. All is well. It has gone to the Social Issues Committee. Three or four hon. members, principally ministers, have referred to the fact that last month we had this report and we gave the Social Issues Committee this remit. The fact is that the report was one that was received. This Court did not give any remit to any Social Issues Committee. It was a report that was received, and it is on the strength of that that it is now back in the lap of the Council of Ministers to direct as they will. Quite clearly, the Social Issues Committee is going to be working to the Council of Ministers and, to my mind,

that is not the arrangement that is most likely to produce an expeditious solution to our residency issue.

Social engineering’, I think, is an objectionable term, but certainly one I have never used. It has been brought out by members of the Council of Ministers, because they believe that, by conjuring up this term ‘social engineering’, they will inculcate into the minds of members some pretty horrid pictures. Well, it says more about the minds of those who would resort to that terminology than it does, I am afraid, for the great majority of people who are in this hon. Court. I find it a highly objectionable term, and those who repeat it are probably doing as much harm as those who coined the phrase in the first place. (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) Certainly, if we are talking of social engineering in the context of racial issues, then I think I am the last person that you could point your finger at.

Mrs Crowe, of course, said she was opposed to it and, when she led in, she made a very interesting statement. She was referring to the report of September 2002, and she said that it had been rejected by the Council of Ministers, and then she changed it and said ‘sent to the Social Issues Committee’. I think she was right the first time round. (*Laughter*) (*Interjection by Mrs Crowe*) The report which they asked us to receive had been rejected – (*Interjections*) Oh, clarification: it was not the whole report; it was only part of it.

Mrs Crowe: It was the regulations.

Mr Quine: It was just the regulations.

Mr Delaney: You should not be giving secrets away from the Council of Ministers.

Mr Quine: I think that was just indicative of this alternative agenda which is in the minds of some members of the Council of Ministers.

Mr Karran: Hear, hear.

Mr Corkill: We still have not heard your suggested secondary legislation.

Mr Quine: You have had half an hour of it this morning for a start.

If I could thank Mr Henderson for his support, and again – and I am sorry to revert to hidden agendas – he quite rightly referred to the fact that it is not so long ago since a previous Chief Minister – yes, admittedly in a different context – put his finger on a figure of 120,000 for this Island as a possible ceiling *pro tem*, and I think that this underlines the concern which people on this Island.

Mrs Crowe: You have.

Mr Quine: I mean, just where is it leading us? Where is all this leading us: 50,000, 60,000, 70,000, 80,000, 120,000? We will not recognise the Isle of Man. It is not sustainable. You would have to transform the Isle of Man into a concrete jungle, and it is this fear that people have got that we are just forging

on and it does not matter; as long as your nose is in the feeding trough, (**Mr Karran:** Hear, hear.) it is all right. I am afraid that is simply not good enough, (**Mr Karran:** Hear, hear.) but not only is it not good enough, it is not necessary, because it is possible for us to adopt an economic policy that interfaces these demographic and economic considerations to avoid that doomsday scenario.

Mr Henderson made reference to the fact that social services are under-resourced. That is a relative term. I am not sure whether, in truth, we could say, that at this point in time, social services are under-resourced. I think, as the minister said yesterday, she could do more with more resource, and I accept that, but if we are going to have a situation where our doors are left open, where we are going to have another 4,000 in five years and where we are going to have another town being created, then, I am afraid, there will be real pressure on social services and a very real danger of under-resource, even if it is a measure of under-resource that is only relative to a number of countries. So, his point, I think, is a valid one, but it is one where you need to think in terms of: if this situation continues, if these trends continue, then it becomes a matter that should be of great concern to us. He again reinforced this business of what we are doing, what we are allowing, what we are acquiescing to: is it sustainable? He said, 'What will be left in 10 to 20 years?', and that is a very good question. What will be left in 10 to 20 years?

The hon. member for Michael said that this is but one item on a government agenda, and it was tested at the general election. Let us just stay with that for a moment: 'tested at the general election'. Well, I spoke on that particular point when I introduced the motion. It was not tested at the general election. It certainly was not tested at the general election in Michael, certainly not in so far as the hon. member for Michael is concerned, because he very proudly announced to us that it was not in his manifesto. So if it was not in your manifesto, you can hardly test it, other than in the most negative of senses. But take it in the broader sense: it was not tested, at the last general election at all. It was not tested, because we did not give the electorate of this Island a choice of policies, a choice of ministers, a choice of government or a choice of Chief Minister. They have not had that option, because we have a political structure that has denied them that option.

A Member: You are part of it.

Mr Quine: So, it is absolute fallacy.

Mr Downie: It was all right when you were there.

Mr Quine: And as far as 'Father knows best' is concerned, he will note, of course, that he is not at one – this is in the reference document – with his own commissioners, because Michael commissioners hold an entirely different view.

Mr Downie: Well, that is nothing new, is it?

Mr Quine: So it would appear (*Interjections*) that it is a split, according to him 60:40 – 60 for him and 40 for Kirk Michael commissioners. (*Laughter*)

Mr Cannan: My opponent was a member of Kirk Michael commissioners.

Mr Quine: He said we have representative government and no need for referendum. Well, I am going to deal with that referendum matter a little later, but I would just make the point here that, in determining whether or not we adopt or follow a course of residency control, we should look to the importance of the subject matter. If you turn to the Referendum Act, just for the record, you will see that there is nothing in this Act which says that this is limited to constitutional matters – nothing whatever. On a specific matter, pure and simple, that is what this provides for. He said, 'The people have had their say.' I think that is blatantly arrogant, and it is surprising how brave these people can get immediately following the general election (**Mr Karran:** Hear, hear.), it does not seem to hold up the year before a general election. 'Waste of money,' he said; that is a value judgement, but certainly I do not consider any funding that is necessary to afford the electorate of this Island the right to express a view on matter as important as residency control a waste of money. We could have perhaps said, 'Is it a waste of money to have departmental surveys about what they think of us, do they think we are lovely looking and is the DHSS a wonderful body?' (*Interjection and laughter*) What do you think of the Council of Ministers by a government-wide survey?' Perhaps we could question whether that is a waste of money, but allowing the public to express a view on a matter as important as this cannot be a waste of money. (*Interjection*)

He was concerned, of course, for a reason he did not expand upon, that there may be somehow a loss of opportunity for employment for our residents' children. I would share the sentiment that we must not throw away any opportunities such as that – I certainly share that – but I do not think that is in the offing at all. Indeed, hon. members who listened to what I said when I introduced my motion will see that it was the other way around. I was advocating an approach to economic policy which was there to sustain employment, and not only to sustain employment, but to give priority to higher-paid employment. That was the essence of what I am advocating, completely contrary to what the hon. member for Michael has been saying.

The hon. member for Middle, Mr Quayle, said that this is not really a matter that warrants the use of a referendum – he is entitled to his views, of course – and that we will be returning to Tynwald, so therefore he would not favour a referendum. I can understand that line of reasoning but, with respect to him, I think that it is somewhat naïve, and he has not weighed it against the backdrop of the time and effort with which this matter has already been under discussion. If he would just reflect for a moment on the years that it has taken us to progress this matter to this point in time, I

think he would agree with me that we need to do a little more than that, and that is where I think you need the referendum, because that referendum gives you first of all the informed viewpoint of what the public are looking for and, secondly, it gives you the impetus for government to carry that through, and that is why I would suggest to the hon. member that he should reflect on the value of supporting the concept of a referendum. He said that, in his way of thinking, it is an easy option: passing it over to the public by referendum is an easy option. Passing it over is not an easy option – I do not think that is the case at all – but perhaps more to the point is to ask his good self what the alternative is against the backdrop to the progressing of this matter to date. The answer is, quoting from my good friend from Onchan, Mr Karran, that literally the option is that you roll over and have your belly tickled, as the hon. member for Onchan said, because that is what you are left with. You will be strung along and you will ultimately – metaphorically, perhaps, rather than literally (*Laughter*) be rolling over and having your belly tickled.

I thank Dr Mann for his support, which I found a very interesting contribution, particularly in relation to the value of the referendum process. Dr Mann explained to us, if hon. members will recollect, that there are two basic reasons why you could follow the process of referendum: one is that it is a means for legitimising certain actions which a government may be proposing, and we can look to a number of examples which have been done based on that premise, legitimising the course of action which has been worked up by government; and the second is to seek views of the electors, and that is the situation we are in here, seeking the views of the electors. Here, it is the latter case that underpins my proposition for a referendum, because quite clearly the Council of Ministers does not have a positive position. Individual members of the Council of Ministers have a view on this, but the Council of Ministers does not have a positive position, and we only have to look at the September 2002 report to see how true that is. That is why we ended up with a report of that nature which was for us to receive. In other words, it was a sop to get them over another little hump for another period of 12 months, and Dr Mann is quite right: that is where the strength for this line of action lies, and it is more than justified, certainly as Dr Mann finds and I find and other members who have spoken here have explained when there is such a strong feeling amongst the electorate. And I do not think, in truth, that that can be denied. It has gone on and on, as Dr Mann said, for 10, 15 years, and here we are, we are still stonewalling, we are still trying to avoid the issue and, to date, they have successfully avoided the issue. The people, Dr Mann suggested to us, should be consulted, and I wholly subscribe to that, and he made reference to the important fact again that, within our political framework, we do not afford them a viable alternative because of the nature of our political set-up. They do not have these choices at general election time.

I thank Mr Delaney for his support. I think he majored, so to speak, on this matter of: if you go to the public at general election time – or, indeed, at any other time – and you say, ‘This is where I stand on this issue’, then I think that, in all conscience, you should see that through. And if you change your position, it is a very simple matter: you put yourself back before the public. It is easily done, and that has been done in the past too, but what you do not do is take a position when you are in front of the public seeking election and then become a political contortionist to avoid taking definitive action on what you promised. That is politically dishonest.

I thank Mr Cretney for his contribution, and I know exactly where he comes from on this issue; we have been on committees together on this one and I know where his support lies. He, like I, is concerned where this is leading us and how these pressures are building up. Do what we will, whatever our best efforts may be, if you have an open-door policy like we have now, you cannot keep abreast of it, and it just cannot be denied. You cannot build a town of comparable size to Peel every five years; it is just not on. I think where I differ from him is that the hon. member for South Douglas said, ‘The approach we, as a court should be taking, is to keep the pressure on them and they will come up with something that is positive and, hopefully, productive.’ I will certainly keep the pressure on, whatever the outcome of today’s debate (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) may be, but I will finish on that one. But I do not have faith that, simply by keeping the pressure on, we can achieve a positive and definitive position on this, because we do not have the political structure that allows us to do that. ‘Give the Social Issues Committee a chance,’ he said. I can understand the sentiment but in truth, government have had chance upon chance upon chance – this administration, past administrations – and there must be a point where you can say, ‘You ran out of chances. You now deliver the goods’ or put it before the people. If the people are opposed to residency control, let them tell us and we can then take stock of where we stand.

It was a very interesting contribution from Mr Bell, and most of it I tended to agree with, but again he tried to draw us into the belief that last month, when we debated the September 2002 report, we, as a Court, had approved a course of action. That is not so; we received a report. That report suggested courses of action. It is up to the Council of Ministers to what extent those courses of action can or will be followed. He made the point that this is a very sensitive issue, and I do not dispute that. It *is* a very sensitive issue. It is a matter that does need thought. It should have had the thought. We should have been in a position now to finalise these matters.

The hon. member for Ramsey, Mr Bell, said that there has been a loss of confidence in the democratic process and that this has been lost by the actions of certain individual members within this hon. Court – and he did specifically point his finger at the hon. member for Onchan. I certainly do not subscribe to that. I do not believe that, within the political arena, a healthy debate, an exchange of alternative views and

the arguing of cases for or against is anything but healthy, and if it is being suggested that we should subdue political debate and play down our beliefs and our convictions on these matters in order to pave the way for government, then I cannot be party to that. If we have a government, if we have policies, which are so precariously placed that they cannot withstand the strength of open debate, then there is something wrong with the administration and there is something wrong with those policies.

He quite rightly, of course, said that hundreds of millions of pounds have gone into the infrastructure, a point well worth making. I would just add two comments to that. I believe that, had we been in possession of an economic strategy, more particularly had we been applying an economic strategy along the lines that I outlined this morning, we would perhaps have committed or been required to commit less money than we have done into infrastructure, but more importantly, looking ahead, the future bills would be less. He said that there is a need to decide where we are going from here, and he quite helpfully, from my point of view, indicated that he found some merit in the economic argument that I made this morning, and I thank him for that, because that was a candid and honest statement. At the end of the day, when he has finalised the work that he has in hand to produce this new economic strategy, whether he follows that line or not, at least he has had the openness to concede that it is worthy of investigation and consideration alongside all the other matters.

He made reference to the new tax strategy – and, of course, we have been debating that recently and, indeed, the amended strategy, and, as I said this morning, I do not think that that is one that we have just jumped into on our own initiative; we have been levered into a certain way and we are making the best of the situation with which we are confronted. But it does underline the fact that we are moving into that new tax strategy, that there are going to be, at least in the short to medium term, a number of years when we are going to have less money flowing our way. It does underline the need to minimize social costs and to maximize productivity and the return, and that, I believe, again puts the focus onto this question of whether we should be without any element of control – or any element worth considering as having any substance – leaving our doors open for all and sundry to pile more and more costs upon us through social infrastructure and social services. There must be a value judgement to be made here. (**Mr Corkill:** Gateways?) I am coming to that. Again, I thank the hon. member for Ramsey for his comments that he concurred with me about largely undirected economic development, because that was a point that I had made and it is clearly a point which he accepts.

Now we come to the question of Jersey rubbing their hands. I do not think Jersey and Guernsey – or indeed us, vis-à-vis Jersey and Guernsey – are standing back, rubbing their hands and taking delight in the fact that somebody may have more difficulties than we have at a point in time. I think that really, there are two issues with Guernsey and Jersey as far as I am

concerned. One is that we have a lot in common. There are common interests, and that calls for collaboration. It does not call for one-upmanship or anything else; it calls for collaboration so far as our interests remain common. The other matter is, of course, that I think we should be there to learn from each other and I think it is those elements in relation to Jersey and Guernsey that we should be putting the focus on, not whether we can stand back and say, ‘Oh, we are in a better position than Jersey and Guernsey in relation to this or in relation to that.’ I really do not think that is productive.

Window-dressing and populism: of course, we are all entitled to our views on that. I do not think you would be in politics – you certainly would not survive in politics – if you did not have an element of populism, because we are, for better or worse, involved in this system of politics that is personality-based. I think you have got to qualify that but, in this sense, I think there will inevitably be a degree of populism. We are elected public representatives. We are here to represent the public view, and if we do not represent that view, if we do not take on board those concerns, accepting that we are going to have to apply our own logic and make our own representations as we see fit, then we will be letting down our electorate. So, populism, in the sense that it gives full expression to the political rights of the electorate through us, is populism to which I can wholly and strongly subscribe. I would not have it any other way. I could not be a public representative if that was not the basis upon which I function.

Mr Delaney: Somebody loves you.

Mr Quine: My mother did.

Again, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Malew and Santon, Captain Douglas, on his maiden speech. He was off his starting line fairly quickly and said that he felt it was not the time for a referendum. Well, it would not be productive for me to go into a long exchange of views with Captain Douglas at this stage, but I hope he will bear in mind some of the comments that I have said in summing up here. We have been a long, long time getting here (*Laughter*); there is no doubt about that.

Several Members: Hear, hear.

A Member: We are still not there.

Mr Downie: Forty minutes.

Mr Quine: And make yourselves comfortable: there is more to come. (*Laughter and interjections*). The issue has been sidestepped by a number of administrations, and it is against that sort of backdrop that we have to, I am afraid, stay with this subject and keep it in the public arena unless and until the public, through a referendum, tell us that they are no longer wishing to pursue that course.

I thank the hon. member for Peel, Mrs Hannan; she made a very interesting contribution indeed. She said, ‘Success at a cost, successful at a cost’, and I

really do feel that she has hit the nail on the head there. We herald success, we have every right to herald success, but we tend to go into a whisper, a whisper so low that you cannot hear what we are saying, when we are speaking of cost. And there is a cost; we are paying, we have paid and we are paying heavily, and that is why I believe there is an alternative approach, a better approach, that will lead us to an economic policy, but more particularly economic strategy, which would be more beneficial. I think the point that the hon. member for Peel was making there is that this 'success at a cost' is something we should keep at the forefront of our minds.

Again, she made the point that I have already covered: that this matter has now been sent to the Social Issues Committee, but the Social Issues Committee is not the government *per se*; it is just, if you wish, an arm or an agency of the Council of Ministers. And so we have this situation where it is going over to this agency, this secondary body, involving parties outside of the Council of Ministers. It is going to have to come back to the Council of Ministers, and we know from the Chief Minister's position and the position of a number of other ministers that they are totally opposed, so what productive element is going to come out of that? That underlines the reason why I believe we should be going to a referendum rather than wasting time going through this, as was the word that was used earlier, 'charade', because that is what it is.

Again, the Chief Minister used this term 'social engineering', and I think I have made my point quite clear on that. It just underlines to me, in the context in which he used that term, that he has already prejudged this issue, and he has prejudged it, I am afraid, in a less than frank fashion. I have before me here the Chief Minister's last two manifestos – not the last one, the last two manifestos – and it is quite clear: 'Residency control legislation is now in place and regulations being drafted so that there can be some control over the people coming to the Island.' And then he goes on, 'I support the forthcoming residency bill, which will have an important debate, which will be an important debate for the Island to consider, along' – if you please, not just residency, but 'with identity cards.' Leopards do change their spots.

Mrs Hannan made the point that government has financial limits, so when we are talking about, 'Keep our open-door policy. Let people come in, we will respond by increasing the infrastructure and the services. The hon. member for Peel made a very good point there; she was saying that the situation – and the message we have been given time and time again from the Treasury and the Chief Minister – is, 'Oh, no, you are going to have to tighten your belt; the money is not going to be available as it has been in the past.' So, there is a contradiction here. On the one hand, they are saying, 'We do not want to interfere with the numbers of people coming in. Our approach to that is to develop more houses, build more roads, do whatever needs to be done, more infrastructure, but you have got to do it for nothing, because the money is not going to be

available.' There is really no political credibility in taking that position.

Again, the hon. member for Peel made the very important point that we are contemplating residency control, but there are numerous countries that already have residency control. Issues of intrusiveness and all the rest of it, perception, criteria: they are there, these countries are applying them and that base is there from which we can work up whatever we wish to work up, and then it is for this Court to take a decision on it.

Mr Corkill – if I can turn to his contribution now – misquoted me in relation to a matter of subjective judgement. In fact, I did not offer a subjective judgement, and I will just read for his information what I did say. That is that the person in the street is inclined to make the case somewhat subjectively, and I went on, 'Dilution of national identity: unquestionably that has taken place.' I have not made a subjective judgement; I am giving you a statement as to what the man in the street is inclined to say.

He said, 'The referendum process is too complex.' For us, it is too complex; for other people, it is not too complex. I gave you the figures in my introduction for the number of referendums that have been held in the UK and throughout Europe. They are perfectly capable of organising them and perfectly capable of doing them, but for us, when it does not suit, it is too complex.

Mr Rimington: You use the constitutional issue –

Mr Delaney: Voice from Rushen there.

Mr Quine: And regarding the framing of the issues, there was a question raised about who is going to frame the questions et cetera. Well, of course, that is spelt out in the Act for us; that is there. It is made quite clear there that it is a matter for the deemsters and the drawing-up of the questions is by the deemsters, but it is in consultation, and it comes back to Tynwald to approve. So, it is not something where we pass a motion and then the deemster just runs away with it; if we support the concept of a referendum, then it is for the deemsters to consult and draw up the questions and it is for this hon. Court to approve or disapprove. (**A Member:** Perfectly.) Well, it would make no difference if I am, because you have slept through most of it. (*Laughter and interjections.*)

The Chief Minister made the point that we need some immigration, and it is absolutely true, of course. We are not talking about stopping population, we are not stopping growth, but we cannot sustain, I would suggest, 800 a year. He warned us against complacency, but I am not sure at whom he is pointing the finger. I am not complacent, and I have not heard any complacent remarks here today, but perhaps he has his own concerns.

On this matter of gateways, the Chief Minister, once or twice during my contribution here, has said, 'Let me have your ideas about gateways, about criteria.' He is very anxious to get them. I have made it equally clear. The basic approach is quite simple: either the Council of Ministers is going to complete

this exercise, in which case, with the resources that they have got which we have not, they come forward with their proposals and we scrutinise them and we give them our yea or our nay, or alternatively, if he or the Council are not capable of running with the exercise, then a select committee can carry out the same exercise. But whoever is going to do it, there is going to have to be a collection and collation of information in relation to gateways and in relation to the criteria, and we are going to have to draw upon a whole reservoir of similar gateways and criteria that have been established in different countries and operating for years.

Mr Rimington: But what are they?

Mr Quine: Now, what is difficult about that?

Mr Rimington: What are they? Ideas?

Mrs Crowe: Name one.

Mr Quine: Just let us have either one party do the exercise or the other party do it. If you cannot do it, say so –

Mr Karran: And we will get on with it.

Mr Quine: – and then a parliamentary committee will carry on with the exercise.

A Member: Good idea, that.

Mr Quine: Mr Rodan made the point – and again, I know his views on this – that he feels that there is some lack of clarity in the motion because of the word ‘introduced’, and it is not clear whether it means ‘introduced’ as a management tool or ‘introduced’ now in the context of time, in other words form or time. I do believe my good friend is scratching at the bottom of the barrel when he has to come up with that one. It is perfectly clear what we are proposing; I do not think there is any doubt at all about that. He is really grasping at straws.

Mr Downie’s comments, of course were principally in relation to the work permits and hon. member for Onchan’s amendment in relation to work permits. As far as I am concerned, in relation to residency control – and I do not think there has been any difference of opinion expressed on this – residency control and work permits are to be worked in tandem. (**Mr Delaney:** Hear, hear.), The only question is the extent to which we need the work permit and in what precise form, if these two things are running in parallel and in tandem. I think that is a valid question and that is one that does need to be addressed.

Obliquely, Mr Downie raised this question of intrusiveness, but he raised it in an interesting sense. He indicated the criteria which are already attached to work permits and which can be applied in certain circumstances, and what came to my mind when I was reading that was the great play that has been placed on intrusiveness in relation to residency control. The hon.

member read out a whole list of things which can be done in relation to the work permit and which are far more intrusive than what is proposed at the moment in relation to residency control. There are all sorts of things that can be applied which are far more intrusive. It does not stack up, and it just shows the shallowness of the argument.

I thank Mrs Cannell for her support and for her contribution. She made the point that, in her view, this motion is timely. I would like to reinforce that. I believe this motion is timely. It is timely for two reasons: firstly, because it provides the guidance which apparently the Council needs, and which indeed this hon. Court would benefit from; and, more importantly, hopefully because it would give some impetus to progressing this exercise to a point where it can be dealt with and where we can have some final decision taken on it.

Again, I thank Mr Speaker for his contribution; he raised some interesting points. I do not agree with him, however, that what is proposed is not known and understood. In the context of the basics and of how it is going to impact upon people locally, I think it is fairly well known and fairly well understood, and if you get into conversation with people, I think you will find – I certainly find – that they are fairly well informed. There may be some refinements which they are not particularly attuned to, but basically they are fairly well briefed. But I think that is less important, because the referendum process allows for public debate. Part and parcel of that is that whether we are for or whether we are against, have a commitment to get that message across. If we have not got the stomach to get out there and discuss this with people, then that is our fault, but the process allows for public debate, and it is up to us to get out there and debate and explain so that they do understand it.

Mr Speaker suggested that if you look at some of the controls or checks on population, in fact there are a number that are in place already, and he pointed to the qualifying period for housing and so on. I accept that, but I do not think it could be held that they are either adequate or effective.

Mr President, there was a point made by the Chief Minister about whether we are talking about allowing in somebody who has got his millions in his hand, irrespective of what he is going to bring to the Island. That is a fair point, and I just wanted to point out that, in fact, in the June 1989 report, government answered their own question on that. It was made quite clear, in the June 1989 report, where the balance was to be struck: ‘Thus, whilst a wealthy new resident might be admitted under this criterion, if the policy of the day allowed this, the more important use of the economic contribution criterion would be to provide an opportunity for residency to those who could contribute particular skills or enterprise which would benefit the economy.’ A view has already been taken, sponsored by this government study; it is in this study which was sponsored by government. That is there.

Mr President, I said that I set out with a view to supporting this motion on two fundamental grounds. One was that there is a strong case for residency

control and, irrespective of the outcome of today's motion, I shall leave this Court convinced that there is, because there has been not even a dent made in that case. The second basis upon which I sought to support my motion was that there are at least four particular factors which are compelling in terms of granting our people the right of referendum. The first is because it is blatantly obvious that this administration is not sincere in its commitment to advance residency controls, and I think today's debate has certainly clinched that; we have heard enough comments to clinch that; secondly, because residency control is uniquely important, not least in relation to its relevance to the economic and social well being of the people of this Island – again, that is not in dispute; that has been carried; thirdly, because a point has been reached where the information for an informed decision on whether or not residency control should be implemented is available to the public: we have got enough information to drown the public if we wanted to make it available to the public and if we wanted to give them an opportunity to express a view on it; and fourthly, a referendum should be afforded to the Island's electors on residency control because they had been denied an opportunity to make their positions known at the general election, and I have explained that and that is factual.

I believe that this motion has been well and truly justified. I believe that if we are going to be open and frank about this matter, if we are going to respect our commitment to our electorate, there can be no doubt that we will lend our support today to giving these good people an opportunity to express a view through the referendum. There is nothing unique about this, it is not a rarity, it is something which is a right that is afforded to millions of people in Western Europe – has been and is being all the time, and the only justifiable reason that we could come up with –

Mr Corkill: Constitutional issues.

Mr Quine: – for not granting them that right is a very simple straightforward one and that is that we know what the people want outside, and the administration is frightened to death to put the question. That is the truth of the matter. That is the only basis upon which this can be attempted to be rejected.

The President: Maybe I can put the question, hon. member?

Mr Quine: Yes.

Mrs Crowe: When is he going to finish?

Mr Quine: Any moment now, Mr President. I would ask if you would just give me two minutes more because I think this is important –

Mr Cannan: Only two minutes more.

Mr Rimington: Have an hour, another hour!

Mr Quine: – and that is this – I do not need to stop for tea once I am in full swing.

Mr Delaney: He is good for another two hours yet!

Mr Quine: I would just like to remind . . . and this is worth repeating, (*Interjections*) this is the quote: 'Undirected economic growth can do great damage to the long-term health of any community. The Manx nation, being small, is particularly vulnerable. The destruction of the Manx nation is not a price I can even contemplate paying. Such destruction would undoubtedly threaten the political independence of the Isle of Man, thereby destroying the rationale of the finance sector in the first instance.' Not my words, they are informed words from a person within the industry, but they certainly have turned out to be prophetic words and we ignore them at our own risk. I beg to move, sir.

The President: Hon. members, the motion I put to the Court is printed at 13 on your order paper and to that you have, circulated on the white paper, the amendment moved by the hon. member Mr Karran. I put to you first the amendment moved by Mr Karran. Those in favour please say aye; against, no. The noes have it.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

In the Keys –

For: Mr Quine, Mr Gill, Mr Houghton, Mrs Cannell, Mrs Hannan and Mr Karran – 6

Against: Mr Anderson, Mr Cannan, Mr Rodan, Mr Quayle, Mr Rimington, Mrs Crowe, Mr Cretney, Mr Braidwood, Mr Downie, Mr Shimmin, Mr Bell, Mr Singer, Mr Corkill, Mr Earnshaw, Capt. Douglas and the Speaker – 16

The Speaker: Mr President, the amendment fails to carry in the House of Keys with 6 votes for and 16 votes against.

In the Council –

For: The Lord Bishop, Mr Lowey, Dr Mann and Mr Delaney – 4

Against: Mr Waft, Mr Kniveton, Mrs Christian and Mr Gelling – 4

The President: Hon. members, the amendment fails to carry so I put to you the residency control motion as printed on the order paper. Those in favour please say aye; against, no. The noes have it.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

In the Keys –

*For: Mr Quine, Mr Houghton, Mrs Cannell,
Mrs Hannan, Mr Singer and Mr Karran – 6*

*Against: Mr Anderson, Mr Cannan, Mr Rodan,
Mr Quayle, Mr Rimington, Mr Gill, Mrs Crowe,
Mr Cretney, Mr Braidwood, Mr Downie,
Mr Shimmin, Mr Bell, Mr Corkill, Mr Earnshaw,
Capt. Douglas and the Speaker – 16*

The Speaker: Mr President, the motion fails to carry with 6 votes for and 16 votes against.

In the Council –

For: Mr Lowey, Dr Mann and Mr Delaney – 3

*Against: The Lord Bishop, Mr Waft, Mr Kniveton,
Mrs Christian and Mr Gelling – 5*

The President: With 5 against 3 for in the Council, hon. members, the motion fails to carry.

Hon. members, I think this an appropriate time at which to take a break for refreshment. I feel that we did well this morning but a certain stupor seems to have descended upon the Court this afternoon (*Laughter*) and perhaps when we return at 5 p.m. by the Court clock we will be ready to move on a little sharper. Thank you, hon. members.

The Court adjourned at 4.41 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 5 p.m.

Iraq – Government Policy – Amended Motion Carried

Item 14. Mr Cannan to move:

That Tynwald supports the policy of the United Kingdom Government in its relations with the Government of Iraq.

The President: Hon. members, let us see if we can make a little sharper progress this evening if we possibly can. We turn to item 14 and I call on the hon. member for Michael, Mr Cannan, to move.

Mr Cannan: Mr President, this item moves us out of the internal affairs of the Isle of Man into a wider arena. All of us are becoming well informed about the situation regarding Iraq, the policies of the United States Government, the policies of the United Nations, the policies of the British Government; it is becoming a matter of concern to most people and most certainly it has implications for the Isle of Man, as indeed does the serious problem of international terrorism. In my view it is important that Tynwald expresses an opinion on these very serious issues.

It is the policy of the government and parliament of the Isle of Man to play its part on the international

stage through membership of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Indeed, Mrs Hannan, the hon. member for Peel, recently stood for election as chairman of that august international body at this year's plenary conference in Namibia. We have membership of the British/Irish Council, membership of the British/Irish Interparliamentary Body, we seek negotiating rights of the OECD and the European Union and indeed have been represented at United Nations committees. So I believe it is right and proper that Tynwald should debate and express an opinion regarding a situation that is exercising the minds of the world's leaders, particularly at this time when it appears to the layperson that matters concerning Iraq and its implications for the world and the world economy are coming to a head. International inspectors have gone in; a policy of the United Nations Government is that there should be, or it appears to be the policy that there should be, régime change and the credibility perhaps, of the United States is very much vested in this matter.

The United Kingdom Government is responsible for defence and foreign affairs in respect of the Isle of Man, and the United Kingdom Government policies, in dealing with Iraq and the international terrorist situation, are by implication carried out in the Island's name. Indeed, Orders in Council and European directives have to come before this Court, or certainly the Chief Minister, in matters affecting international affairs, and if you look at item number 21 on your agenda, we are to support European Community's directives in respect of the Taliban and al-Qa'ida; they are on your agenda for later on, possibly this evening. So we are required to have an opinion on these matters.

Members of parliament representing England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have all expressed their opinions in the House of Commons, and I believe it is appropriate that members of the parliament of the Isle of Man also express their opinion and that that opinion is conveyed to the United Kingdom Government because, as I have said, what they do in matters of foreign policy and defence are carried out in our name also, and when travelling abroad our passport enjoys the protection of the British foreign service.

So, hon. members, this motion is basically to test the opinion of Tynwald in this matter, and the people of the Isle of Man will then have an idea of the opinions of their representatives in matters which may, in the next few weeks, come to a head.

Now, all of us want a peaceful solution, I can assure you of that, but it is not in our gift in this chamber to determine whether there is peace or war, but at least we can add our one small voice, and that is the opportunity that I give to Tynwald and to this debate this afternoon.

I beg to move the motion standing in my name that we support the British Government in their policies, because they have the benefit of the intelligence and the facts of their foreign service.

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

The President: Hon. member, the Chief Minister.

Mr Corkill: Thank you, Mr President. When discussing the annual report last month I referred to the situation in Iraq and described it, as others have done, as one of the uncertainties which face us. Very clearly the situation in that country, and indeed the Middle East generally, continues to be very volatile and continues to pose a threat to stability worldwide. We are not exempt from the threat, as the hon. mover's motion has stated. The world is threatened by that instability, but I would also say that we in the Isle of Man are perhaps not uniquely threatened; we are part of what is a very apprehensive world at this time.

Now, I will not seek to recite the various scenarios and predictions of what might happen in the weeks and months to come; the situation is evolving and has evolved. It has evolved since the hon. member first put this motion down and we were unfortunately unable to reach it a month or so ago.

We all have, I think, sufficient intelligence to understand the implications of what might happen, but the problem is we have a great deal of difficulty influencing – in fact I would say we cannot influence – those events; we can merely hope for a satisfactory solution. Can I say that when the hon. member first put his motion down in a previous order paper, the Council of Ministers discussed the motion at that time and it was agreed that the amendment which is being circulated in my name at the moment would be produced. I was reassured, having detailed that amendment and signed it last month and signed it again for this month's sitting, that in the interim period all members have received a letter from the United Nations Association of the Isle of Man, and I would like to thank Mr Charles Colvington for circulating that letter to us. I think I would also like to take the opportunity of thanking him for his patience in terms of waiting to get to this time on the order paper. I do know the depth of commitment that he feels in relation to the United Nations, so his comments are certainly well received.

We are talking about a world problem; it needs a world solution, and this is the nature of the amendment before us. The solution to the problem which is legitimately focused on concerns relating to Iraq acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction will be found in international action. The United Nations, with the support of the United Kingdom, will be seeking to secure that solution, and what I am saying to us today is that I hope that all members can support the United Nations in that endeavour.

The wording of the motion on the order paper, I know, is extremely well meant but I do have a concern that there is a potential there for a certain amount of divisiveness in that it is not always clear what the United Kingdom's policy will be in a number of different situations, and so members will be concerned about some of the options that could be pursued. My amendment, I hope, reflects an international

dimension. It avoids certain potential divisiveness of the original motion and I hope that it is seen as an improvement to the original motion. Mr President, I would beg to move it on behalf of the Council of Ministers:

*That the words after 'supports' be replaced by –
'the international attempts through the United Nations to prevent the acquisition and use of weapons of mass destruction by Iraq.'*

The President: The Lord Bishop.

The Lord Bishop: Thank you, Mr President. I am very happy to second that motion. I also recognise where the hon. member for Michael is coming from, but I had a little difficulty with the wording of his original motion so I am happy to see the amendment.

If I can be a little personal for a moment in my introduction, in my 20 years' service in the navy I was involved in four wars: one was Borneo and Sarawak, the other was the confrontation with Indonesia, the third was Aden and the fourth was the Falklands, and in each of those situations – you call them wars but over in Britain I guess they were minor events – military personnel were killed and their families were bereaved and civilians in those areas were mightily oppressed, and the reason that we went into action in the armed forces of the three arms was that we were relieving the oppression of the people of that country; we were not the invaders in any sense at all. Later, in the Gulf War, even with that major conflict which impinged on us rather more, we went to the relief of Kuwait, which had been invaded by a foreign power, another power, and on all those occasions in the military mind we felt we could be comfortable assisting in a war where we were not the invaders but we were the peacekeepers or the releasers from oppression of the people we were there to help.

I have a little difficulty with some of the sabre-rattling of perhaps the United States and the element of which the United Kingdom is tied on to something like this; but we could be in the scenarios invading a country for no real reason of releasing that country from oppression or that we have been asked to go in by anybody, and I think that is something we ought to bear in mind: this is a very different scenario from anything we have done to a good many generations.

From that, then, let me just give you a little background: although things have changed with the United Nations declaration recently, in October the House of Bishops meeting in London had a presentation from a military expert, Professor Michael Quinlan, who gave a very good paper on the situation which helped our thinking enormously.

He gave six points of thought which I know that you would be interested in. He said, as a start, a war is always a bad business, and although that seems a truism, it is something we ought to remember: war is always a bad business (**Mr Delaney:** Hear, hear.) He said, 'I give you six main causes for alarm or uncertainty': first, how the operation itself would be played out, and although the United States would

undoubtedly win and win probably easily, nevertheless in whatever scenario both military and civilian people would be killed, the infrastructure of the country would be damaged and the scale would depend on how things went; second, he said how would Iraq be governed afterwards, and how extensive and protracted external involvement from us might have to be? Third, the effect on stability around the region – for example, in Saudi Arabia and elsewhere around Iraq’s borders. Fourth, the effect on the current struggle against terrorism; this might evoke further outrages, and co-operation with the region would be set back. Fifth, the economic effect in the region, and more widely especially through oil supply and pricing, would come into play, and this would touch poor people and poor countries and not the rich ones. Sixth, but not unimportant or trivial, the resource demands of the whole affair.

So those are the six points of the background, which I thought were very thought provoking and led us in the House of Bishops to send a statement to the government. I might add that in accordance with that scenario, the Roman Catholic bishops sent very similar worded statements, as did the Chief Rabbi and various Islamic groups in England, so this is not just a one-horse show. The Church of England bishops sent this statement, which I hope again will be useful to this debate: ‘(1) We affirm the government’s stated policy of disarming Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction. Unfettered and unhindered access must be gained for the United Nations weapons inspectors in order to facilitate the identification or destruction of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction in compliance with all the United Nations Security Council resolutions. (2) We hold that the primary international concern remains Iraq’s blatant disregard of the United Nations and its authority as expressed in relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions. Any unilateral action to enforce Iraq’s compliance with such resolutions risks further undermining of the credibility and the authority of the United Nations’ – I think that is an important point to remember. ‘(3) We recognise that in those instances where diplomatic and economic pressure fail to ensure compliance with the United Nations Security Council resolutions, military action can sometimes be justified as a last resort to enforce those resolutions. We nonetheless hold that to undertake a preventative war against Iraq at this juncture would be to lower the threshold for war unacceptably. (4) We support and encourage the prime minister in his efforts to press for a new international conference, revitalise the Middle East process based on the twin principles of a secure Israel and a viable Palestinian state. We believe such a conference has a important rôle in trying to promote the wider stability of the region at a time of widespread suspicion and insecurity.’

Mr President, I think that sets the tone of how I would hope any message we send to the United Kingdom Government would appear, and I think that the Chief Minister’s amendment to item 14 does say that in a very simple term. I would find it easy to support that and to add our support in that sense to the hopes that Iraq will come into line in peaceful ways

and without resolving to an intervention on our part or following on the coat-tails of the United States, which I think would be unacceptable to a great many people, not least the military.

The President: Hon. member for Rushen, Mr Gill.

Mr Gill: Thank you, Eaghtyrane. I rise to speak to the motion because of the notes I have prepared; although I anticipated that the Chief Minister was going to make an amendment of this manner, I would like to speak specifically to the motion, if I may. The motion, of course, is that Tynwald supports the policy of the UK Government in its relations with the Government of Iraq – the policy. It does not say what that policy is. This, of course, came before Tynwald originally, over a month ago and the policy has changed any number of times during that period, and undoubtedly the nature of international relations will continue to be the reflection of the position of the British Government.

If I can begin by thanking the hon. mover, particularly in the inclement weather we have been suffering in the last month because, on reading this motion, he has taken me to the altogether sunnier climes of Australia, where I was reminded of the words of their prime minister, Mr Keating, who referred famously to ‘the colonial cringe.’ I have to say that is a sensation reading this has induced in me, and I would look to the hon. mover, to reassure me that I am mistaken in that reaction.

To begin with the basic premise of quite why the Isle of Man Government would want to support the policy of another government, any other government, when in doing so it would leave us tied to any policy changes the British Government, as proposed in this motion, decides upon in the light of ever- changing circumstances. Quite why the Isle of Man Government would want to do that is frankly beyond me. In our colonial past – the period, I hope, is past – in those times a motion of such acquiescence – in fact it might be always described as civility – I would say, might well attract some form of title or decorative reward from our imperial masters in the motherland. Who knows if this motion might not be viewed so favourably even in today’s climate, where we hopefully have moved towards a more mature and autonomous constitutional position.

Now, I am sure such considerations would not have influenced the hon. mover at all and that he will no doubt genuinely assert that there is no inconsistency in his motion and in representing Manx interests, but frankly I cannot see it. Maybe the purpose of his motion is to send a clear message of support to the Manx men and women serving either in the armed forces or in other hazardous and important duties in Iraq or elsewhere. If that is the intention – and certainly I picked up on that – then I would welcome it, and I would also refer back to my own personal experience as a member of the Royal Navy, although happily I avoided as many wars as the Lord Bishop –

Mr Delaney: So does everybody! (*Laughter*)

Mr Gill: – but also as a soldier in a territorial infantry regiment, and I mention that because I am very conscious that Mr Cannan has a son who is a serving officer in the army and I am sure that is very much to the forefront of our considerations in this debate. But in those rôles, in the Royal Navy and in the Territorial Army, I was always proud to be a Manxman serving in the British forces, and whilst my duty was to follow British orders, I would also be anxious at all times that my country – this nation, the Isle of Man – through its offices of government would represent mine and other Manx service men and women's interests without undermining the responsibility to independently represent the Island's views and opinions, even when these opinions may not coincide entirely with the policies of the UK Government.

The United Kingdom Government has, of course, other considerations in determining policy, not least their relationship with the United States and their responsibility as a member of the United Nations. Now, I had at this point intended saying that I was going to resist being drawn down the line of the rôle of the United Nations because I was aware that the Chief Minister was going to make the amendment that he has now done but, as we are at this juncture, I would just like to acknowledge the comments in Mr Colvington's letter and my support for the motion as amended by the Chief Minister. But I do acknowledge that the rôle of the United Nations is critical and must, I would suggest, be central to the policies of the United Kingdom and the United States, even though these sometimes may be conflicting considerations.

So the point is, as I see it, that the policy of the UK Government in its relations with the Government of Iraq is a dynamic matter, one in which the British must retain the flexibility to reflect the sometimes fast moving international situation, to reflect our government and indeed Tynwald's views and opinions about this important matter and the wider Middle Eastern situation, in fact any international or domestic matter, and that to do that we have an ongoing relationship through the Chief Minister, the Crown external relations divisions, the Lieutenant-Governor, many other government routes and indeed many other informal sources to convey our views, but it seems inconceivable that this or any national government would seek to ally itself to the principle of unquestioning, open-ended and uncritical support for another government.

I will certainly be voting against the original motion but I be voting for the motion as amended, and I would stand against the original motion both on the principles of such an obsequious message as it may well be interpreted, however unintentionally by the hon. mover, but also because of the very real practical issues such a motion potentially embraces.

So I would conclude by suggesting that most people in the Isle of Man and I hope, in this hon. chamber will concur with me when I say this: being blindly pro-British can be anti-Manx. However, being

pro-Manx is not being anti-British. Thank you, Eaghtyrane.

The President: Hon. member of Council, Mr Waft.

Mr Waft: Thank you, Mr President. There can be no doubt that the United States can go it alone and do what they like without reference to anyone; that has been conceded by most governments. The United States annual budget allows for arms and equipment that amounts to more than the rest of the world put together on an annual basis. So, having said that they will act, whether or not they have a mandate from the United Nations, this statement indicates to me that they are using the United Nations to give some legality or legitimacy to their actions. In the past the United States were notorious for not paying their dues to the United Nations, giving one excuse after the other, but I have a feeling those dues will be well paid up now; in fact, I know dues were paid up on September 12th.

So why do they want the United Kingdom and some of the Middle Eastern and European states to join them together with the attack on Iraq? They now have the backing from the United Nations and, as such, they can be seen by the rest of the world to justify their attack on this Third World country if the weapons inspectors are not given the access they have so far been denied.

The United Nations is the only world body which attempts to keep some semblance of peace, legitimacy and control in a world full of wars and political chaos. It must not be starved of funding and it needs the support both financially and militarily of all the First World countries. It is not there to provide a conduit through which they get asked for legitimacy for their actions of self-interest and ask for a rubber stamp by applying to the United Nations Security Council. In the 1990s there was little funding and very little help from the three nations which could help – the United States, the UK and France – to the situation in Rwanda. When the United Nations commander in Rwanda, supposedly on a chapter 6 peacekeeping mission, was faced with genocide taking place, with nearly a million murders of what are innocent men, women and children, there was very little help available from many of the first world countries (**Mrs Hannan:** Hear, hear.) and the response in his own words was pitiful.

A Member: No oil.

Mrs Crowe: That is right.

Mr Waft: There were mass graves. The United Nations that were there were forced mainly to be made up of Third World countries, and when the Hutu soldiers murdered 10 Belgian peacekeepers on April 7th, 1994, the US advised the Security Council to reduce the peacekeepers from 2,500 to 500. Four years later, apparently President Clinton did put down in Kigali in his helicopter with the engine kept running, and apologised for the response.

The problem is not just attacking Iraq; the problem for the United States lies in the fact that when it is all over, even if they have got rid of Saddam, they will be faced with having to finance and police a puppet régime which will support their political agenda. It has happened in Afghanistan; now that al-Qa'ida and Taliban have been dealt with, the ongoing military support for the new president will be necessary for many years. The military warlords continue to have their fiefdoms and little has changed for the poor in that country. Al-Qa'ida remains a world threat and the Taliban wait for the forces to leave.

On the positive side, aid has been getting in and lives have been changed for the women and girls who are now able to be educated in their own right, and the sign is that there has been a positive change in the country's attitude to the religious dogma which was allowed to prevail.

There can be no doubt that it will be a very long time before anything resembling human rights as we know it will be embraced in that country, and if the US, Britain and their allies want to carry on what they started, they will have to acknowledge they are in for a long haul and it is going to cost.

The United Kingdom tried to police all kinds of countries in their control in the British Empire only to find that it could not be done, and everything east of Egypt had to be abandoned to their own devices.

Israel has constantly ignored the United Nations with regard to their continued invasions into Palestine and conveniently fails to mention their invasion and occupation of Palestinian territories in 1967, after which they transferred parts of their own population into those territories. The Security Council Resolution 242 demanded withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the occupied territories. The United Nations Security Council is failing to act in Israel and the Palestinian situation, yet they are being asked to agree to a strike against Iraq.

Everyone must condemn terrorist strikes especially against innocent civilians, no matter from where they arise. Pakistan and India both have access to nuclear weapons and many weapons have been supplied by the UK. The double standards applied by the UK Government, after allowing them to be supplied with weapons, actually tried to broker a peace agreement.

The way in which this motion is written today intimates that if we do not support the UK line of going in with the United States, the UK having gained support from the United Nations, it means we will not be supporting our own Manx servicemen who will be put in the firing line and putting their lives at risk. Nothing could be further from the truth; the UK has a responsibility to make those decisions on our behalf. Make no mistake, if the war with Iraq does take place, you will be voting for and taking part in an action in which many innocent civilians, men, women and children will die. In Afghanistan the so-called smart bombs managed to hit a Red Cross station clearly marked with an enormous red cross, not once but twice. I have not heard anything about the Geneva

Convention with regard to this incident, but I hear quite a lot about collateral damage and friendly fire.

Attacking Iraq is only the start. The repercussions will go on for many years. We will not be able to walk away with the oil; we will be facing a commitment to support that country and put back all of the infrastructure that we demolish and try to sort out all the mess that we will have left behind. UNICEF has made the position clear. Following the invasion of Kuwait in 1990, a decade of sanctions has seriously affected the Iraqi population. One in eight Iraqis die before their fifth birthday, people's access to foodstuffs and other essentials is limited and the proportion of babies born with low birth weight has quadrupled to 22 per cent. Unemployment and inflation have also reduced people's purchasing powers, forcing them into debt and deprivation. The health budget since the Gulf War was cut by over 90 per cent, electricity and sanitation systems continue to collapse, poor water supplies continue to invoke fourteen episodes of diarrhoea each year for children up to five years old. It is estimated that 23 per cent of children between the ages of six and fifteen are no longer attending school.

Following the world's outrage at the effect that sanctions were having on the poor in Iraq, the Security Council in 1996 provided a temporary measure of humanitarian relief. It allowed Iraq to export oil for food: too little, too late. This only allowed for a stabilizing of a state of poverty, not an improvement. The NGO statement of Iraq brings concerns of the high possibility of large numbers of civilian casualties; aerial bombardment followed by a ground war that might be necessary to achieve a stated aim of some powers of régime change would place large numbers of civilians, particularly in densely populated urban areas, in grave danger. Years of wars and sanctions have already created an extremely vulnerable population, whose ability to cope with any additional hardship is very limited. This includes children who make up almost half of the Iraqi society, widows, the elderly and the poor. Child mortality rates have risen by 160 per cent under sanctions. According to UNICEF, if the substantial reduction in child mortality throughout Iraq during the 1980s had continued through the 1990s there would have been 50,000 fewer deaths of children under five in the country as a whole.

Extensive and prolonged conflict risks undermining the essential supply of food and medicines to Iraqi civilians. Extensive and prolonged conflict would threaten key infrastructures; water quality is already very poor for many Iraqis and the prime contributory cause of death for children. Risks of major health problems caused by further disruption to water supplies and the erosion of water quality would increase significantly if pumping stations and sewage treatment plants ceased functioning. Electricity infrastructure is vital for these installations as well as for hospitals but could become a military target, as occurred during the Gulf War.

Iraq already has approximately 700,000 internally displaced people. Increased conflict could lead to massive population displacement with catastrophic

consequences if these people's access to food is cut off or they find themselves trapped at closed borders. The heavily mined eastern and northern border not only poses a threat to those fleeing conflict but will cause major impediments to providing humanitarian supplies from external sources. A winter campaign would add to humanitarian problems as this mountainous region would be snow-bound.

There was some criticism of the Chief Minister advocating caution, and on Manx Radio there was some sarcasm as to what the Isle of Man could do; indeed, one comment was the possibility of sending the *Ben My Chree*. We have every right to make any comments on conflicts in which Manx servicemen will take part. Each and every one of them deserves political representation, even if they are in the armed forces, and deserve better than comments such as these on our national radio.

If you will permit me, Mr President, I must make comment on a statement which was made by the hon. member from Onchan, Mr Karran, who spoke of aid going into the deep pockets of corrupt régimes. He made this comment when it was going out live on the radio in a previous Tynwald debate. I sincerely hope he was not referring to our own Overseas Aid Committee. To put the record straight, the Island's Overseas Aid Committee do not give aid to any governmental régimes; they deal directly with non-governmental agencies, usually NGOs or the disaster emergency committees. This sort of comment does great harm to the work of the aid agencies and deflects our aim to bring us into line with the aid budgets of other similar jurisdictions. Neither does it take into consideration the sterling work done by those aid workers who put their lives on the line on a daily basis or the VSO volunteer workers who take years out of their lives to work in Third World countries for no pay whatsoever. At the moment we have two such workers from the Island working in the centre of Papua New Guinea and I am sure the member from West Douglas who has visited that country will tell you as to the situation they will have to endure. One Manxman is visiting Malawi, doing what he can to help in that country, trying to provide fresh water – this time of year is called 'the starving season' in Malawi. Another is helping with rag-picking children of India who live on the rubbish tips. Others are working with leprosy victims. None of these people will be putting money into the pockets of corrupt régimes.

Mr President, I believe that if the United States were to sign the environmental agreements and join the countries who called for a ban on land mines and spent less money on armaments and more on supporting the Third World countries, forming an aid coalition, they would have far more long-term influence on those régimes which are giving such concern. The concern is, of course, that America and Britain are so tied up with the world manufacturers in the arms trade, and I can well understand their stance; I can well understand the long-term need for a stable oil-exporting country to be compliant to their wishes.

Mr President, I was going to vote against the motion, but I am prepared to support the amendment. Thank you, Mr President.

The President: Hon member for Rushen, Mr Rimington.

Mr Rimington: Thank you, Mr President. I am very pleased to follow on from the last speaker, who I thought made a very excellent contribution, and probably better prepared than I am.

Obviously I rise to support the amendment. I think hon. member for Michael, Mr Cannan was correct in bringing the motion forward and the way in fact that he did it, although I disagree with the particular words of that motion and, that being addressed, it was laid wide open for amendment, but he did bring it forward, both in the memorandum that he gave to members prior to the sitting last month, and in his contribution today, in an open way that is for Tynwald to have the opportunity to express its feelings, and that is right because, although we devolved our position in foreign affairs while it is taken on board by the UK, we do not have external relations in the sense that our voice does not count amongst the nations of the world in terms of the United Nations or whatever, but we are through the UK. But we do have a voice and we should have that voice, even if it only equals that of one MP or one constituency in the adjacent isle, but similarly, as a small nation, I think that we should express that view responsibly. Therefore the amendment which has been put forward by the Council of Ministers through the Chief Minister is absolutely correct and is a mature response from our parliament and places us within the realm of other European nations and does not, unnecessarily antagonise the UK government with whom we have that relationship. So whatever our individual views on the question of Iraq from whatever position, I believe that amendment is one that we should support.

Personally I have great doubts that even the UN position of today is that valid. The UN has been and is bulldozed and bullied by the United States of America with the United Kingdom following along on the coat-tails, and we are now presently living a world where the belligerent and warmongering tendencies within the US Republican Party are dominant, and unfortunately the UK government is just following like a lap dog, or the famous nodding dog, behind. It is a shame, and it was correctly pointed out by the hon. member for Council that the UN has not acted resolutely in support of its resolutions when it does not concur with the mighty oil interests of the United States of America. So we are very concerned with anything that happens when it is in an oil-producing country or where vested interests are predominant, but if it is in some remoter part of Africa and there are hundreds of thousands of people dying – well, we will just not bother about that one. and it does not matter that there are illegal settlements in Palestine and there are clear and long-standing United Nations resolutions; they are just ignored, they are just forgotten about.

So how on earth can conflict in that part of the world be properly dealt with when the actual body which provides those resolutions, the United Nations, is ignored by the mighty power of the United States, because it is not concerned? Again there are other areas. East Timor would be a classic example – the conflict there that should never have been and never have gone for all those years because United Nations resolutions were never enforced.

The régime of Saddam Hussein is barbaric and dictatorial, but if you disagree with the method of dealing with that régime, whether it is the applied sanctions which the hon. member has talked about or the over-eagerness to use warfare, it does not make you an apologist for that régime, which is what happened to me in a previous court by the hon. member for Ramsey, Mr Singer. I am used to having my words cynically twisted by members of the APG, but it will come back to rebound and to haunt him in time to come. In fact, only in the last resolution the hon. absent member for Ayre cynically twisted and distorted the very clear and precise words I used. Never mind!

Saddam Hussein's régime has always been brutal and dictatorial and expansionist, all through the years when it suited western interests to support it, (**Members:** Yes.) with arms in its war against Iran, and for many years, those who are now in favour of war remained silent as Hussein suppressed his own population and used chemical weapons against the Kurds.

Mr President, I was not silent in my opposition to Saddam Hussein and western hypocrisy as that time. It is today's belligerent warmongers who are and were the apologists for Saddam Hussein. It is a perverse and alarming irony that the two current areas of conflict with the United States as the epitome of Western interests, Iraq and al-Qa'ida, the Taliban, were both previously supported and armed by the United States and its allies. The West, without any concern for principle, has helped to create the monster we are now in conflict with.

Finally we should be concerned about these issues in terms of our economics and our own welfare. Gordon Brown, the Chancellor, yesterday was talking about the downturn in the world's economy, the uncertainty, and what is a very large contributory factor to that uncertainty, to that downturn, is the threat and the continued threat of war in the Middle East. That downturn in the economy affects us all and it is affecting us now and will continue to affect us. So we should not be in favour of war, we should not be in favour of piling vast billions of pounds' worth of money into nothing but death and destruction, money that could be used to build things for humanity, not to destroy them. Thank you, Mr President.

The President: Hon. member of Council, Mr Delaney.

Mr Delaney: Mr President, thank you indeed, and I am sure everyone has got their own opinions, and I am not going to read out any articles from any

magazines or use papers; I am not going to make any statement on offending anybody, whether it be the President of the United States or the British Government or Saddam Hussein – I will not do any of that. What I will say to the hon. mover of the resolution is, will you accept the amendment put down by the Chief Minister, bearing in mind, that last month yours was the only game in town? There was no policy from the United Nations at the time, we could not get a decision, so that is why this was down. So if you will accept the amendment I am quite happy to go with the amendment.

I happened to be in this building on the dreadful morning of 11th September with the member for West Douglas when the planes hit, and I hope he recalls that because it will stick with me, like a lot of things stick with other people for the rest of your life. The game was afoot then, and that was what my point was. As soon as that happened, it was clear that the secret war was already started and the war was happening as we watched. The idea that somebody has to declare it when someone is blowing up their country and killing your people is a matter of formality, but the States, whether you love them or hate them, were the target at that time, and from that came the very thing I spoke to the hon. member for West Douglas about – they struck back, as they have the power to do. They struck back in the only way they knew how, and I am not going to condemn them for that; when somebody kills thousands of your people in your own country, no matter where they come from, you are going to strike back.

Now, I would agree with the member for Rushen that the reason Saddam Hussein is there is because it was diplomatically the right thing. They thought at the time to do – leave him there to carry on with the Iranians, knocking hell out of each other. That is exactly what they were left there for. It did not work out because then he became a threat to the States, but the issue in front of us is: do we as a small country . . .? And I take the words of the Chief Minister; he said, 'We cannot influence events,' but be sure as be damned, events will influence us, and if you do not believe me, see what happened to the stock market after that dreadful morning. If it happens again and again, you can forget about the amount of £130 million we initially lost on the stock exchange with a drop in shares recently which have come back £30 million, because you will not be worried about that lot. It will have gone, because there will only be bits of paper they will be trading, and everyone will be more worried about survival. That will be the issue.

As far as our servicemen are concerned, of course, when it comes down to a shooting war we will all stand up and support them wherever they are fighting, and I would think very poorly of anyone who did not. and I do not think they would be in this Court very long if they did not, because to send somebody over the top and not be there behind them to make sure he had got somewhere to come back to, when he has got someone backing him up, is the worst thing, it is a real coward's way. Let someone fight the war for you. If American soldiers are killed that will be very sad; if

Iraqi soldiers are killed I will be very sad, but I will be sadder still when any Manxmen are killed, because they are my own, and that is human nature to be that way. What we have got to remember is that if it comes to a shooting war our men and women will be there, because nobody has told me that they will not. The Chief Minister has not written to Whitehall, saying all our servicemen will not be going to war. We have got quite a few of them out there and they will expect us to back them and I hope we do.

So the issue is not that at the moment, but I am quite certain that, no matter what goes on, a dictator is a dictator and he knows, Saddam Hussein, that whatever the outcome of this he cannot afford to lose, because not only does he go but his whole shebang goes – all his officers, generals and all the crowd to back him up – and so he has got nothing to lose and he will go to the end, and a lot of good men and women unfortunately will go with him. They are the people we should be feeling sorry for.

If the member who moved the resolution in good faith last month is prepared to sort the amendment out, I will go with that, but I do not want to put it abroad, and I hope it is not put abroad, that we can sit here making out statements of what has gone on in the past which will not affect this issue, which will not keep you alive when the bullets start firing. No matter who is wrong, it is still the boys out there and the girls out there who are in danger, and I want this Court to get that record out straight, no matter what we think individually of the Americans or we think of any other country. It is our people that we are going to be supporting if they have got to fight in this war which is coming, and I am quite sure it is coming.

Mr President, I will ask the mover to stand up to support the amendment of the Chief Minister and let us give the support where it should be – with the people of the Isle of Man who are going be out there for us.

The President: Hon. member for Peel, Mrs Hannan.

Mrs Hannan: Thank you, Eaghtryane. This is not the first time that the mover has moved a motion such as this, and I do not know why he thinks he should be moving so that we should become involved in an issue such as this. It is not easy, and I am sure it was not easy for him when he was putting down this motion, to spell out exactly what the policy of the United Kingdom was –

Mr Karran: Because none of us know.

Mrs Hannan: – and it is only since we have had the vote in the United Nations that I suppose you could say that we know exactly what the United Kingdom is now actively supporting. Before that we were told very little about the discussions between the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the President of America. It said that the United Kingdom Prime Minister was having an influence on the President of the United States and trying to water down some of the action that the United States were going to take.

I dare say we will never know whether there was any influence brought to bear or not, or whether it was a case of the United Kingdom Prime Minister going along with the President of America, but in a way we have to ask, what has happened over the 10 years? We know there was the invasion of Kuwait, and after that, you could say, was resolved, you could also say it was resolved not to chase Saddam Hussein back to Baghdad, but nobody seems to be able to point out what has happened during that time and certainly the British have not pointed out what has happened since that time, except that Osama Bin Laden is supposed to have been responsible for September 11th.

I think, as some of the members who have spoken, and I would like to congratulate the two members for Rushen and also the member of Council, Mr Waft, on their speeches in relation to this – Osama Bin Laden was created by the Americans to fight the Russians to get the Russians out of Afghanistan. So the Americans are going around the world creating people to do something, as happened with Saddam Hussein, and then they cannot control the monsters that they have created, presumably because the monsters that they have created know something about what the Americans are really after. The incursion into Iraq is for oil. The involvement in Kuwait was for oil, and that is why there was no involvement in Rwanda. Rwanda did not have any resources, and so to gain Afghanistan and control there and then to go on and gain control of Kuwait with their oil and able to get the oil out of the Middle East – that is the reason why.

I think, if the United States of America actually sat down and thought about it they would not need quite as much oil if they changed their attitude, signed up to the agreement, as the member of Council has stated, and moved on into the real world of supporting everyone and not trying to take over the world. We do know that there are wishes to become the superior country and we know that the United States of America has never been affected, except September 11th, by any of the wars that have been around the world.

I can support the amendment but only just. I hope that the motion and the resolution that was supported by the United Nations would, if there is a breakdown with Iraq and the weapons inspectors go back to the United Nations before the United States feel that they can go in and bomb, because we do know that anyone who is going to be bombed in Iraq are going to be the ordinary people. We have been told that Saddam Hussein has an exit route and it is the ordinary people that are suffering now that are going to be mortally affected, and they are the ones that over the last century have been more affected by war than by the people that we have spoken about today, by the service people. As the last century went on, more and more civilians were killed in war as opposed to service people, and therefore I think it is almost goes without saying that more and more people will be killed should there be an incursion into Iraq. They are suffering at the moment through dictatorship and I do not think we should put any more onto them. We do know that the United Nations resolutions are not being adhered to by

Iraq, and I think everything should be put in place to make the resolutions that are already passed work in regard to the export of oil and the like.

So I can support the amendment because I feel that it is something where maybe the message can go out from this hon. Court that we must not be blindly led; and I think that is what the hon. member for Michael is suggesting that we should be, and I do not think we should. We should also remember that if armaments are used in any sort of incursion into Iraq, then more will need to be produced. The people that elected Bush, the republican supporters, will be able to accrue more wealth and I do not think that is something that should be the basis of going to war on. Thank you, Eaghtyrane.

The President: Hon. members, I appreciate members wish to develop their particular contribution, but could I ask if it could brief if they can, please? Hon. member for Garff, Mr Rodan.

Mr Rodan: Mr President, firstly I think the hon. member for Michael should be commended for putting down this resolution, not least to give us the opportunity to say whether we agree that the actions of the UK Government should be supported unconditionally or uncritically, and I for one do not support the UK Government unconditionally, and not least before the very welcome and critically important UN involvement I was extremely uneasy about the position of the UK Government. If one was cynical, one could say that the situation quite simply had been one where Saddam Hussein incurred the wrath of the Americans by refusing to let UN investigators see if Iraq had as many evil weapons of mass destruction stashed away as they did and, given this refusal, the US therefore determined that air strikes were necessary and Britain immediately agreed with them in accordance with the special relationship, which apparently required Britain to do precisely that.

That was the position before. Fortunately, having now had the UN Security Council command multilateral support, I think the position is now one we can more comfortably support, and I think it is well worth restating paragraph 3 of the letter which the Chairman of the UN Association of the Isle of Man branch, Mr Colvington, circulated to us: 'The up-to-date position, of course, of inspections taking place and the recommendation that any material breach be given further consideration by the Security Council to decide on any appropriate action. Maximum international support ought to be secured before military action is taken by any member. Should such action be taken without appropriate international backing, the UK Government must exercise maximum caution to avoid being in breach of international law, particularly in relation to the concept of régime change. This matter of régime change is very important, because that is for the people of Iraq to determine and not a third country to determine; it is an important principle.

I think many of us can be very uneasy about the hypocrisy whereby Saddam is hardly alone in

possessing weapons of mass destruction. If the position of nuclear weapons in one or two years' time is a reason for military action, where does that leave the seven nations which already possess them? America still has over 9,000 nuclear weapons; Russia still more than 4,000; Britain has 192 warheads; France 450; China possibly 250; India about 10 weapons and Pakistan enough plutonium for between, it is estimated, two and seven nuclear bombs, while Israel does have them but refuses to admit it. By the criteria of weapons inspection results there is as much a case for us or the Americans to attack India, Pakistan and Israel as Iraq and there is a ready-made excuse for any country to attack Britain.

Let us be clear that it is not the possession of weapons that make Saddam a threat to peace, but his attitude to his neighbours. We know he is capable of invading his neighbours and we also know that invading other countries without UN sanction is contrary to international law but it would be as totally unacceptable, and equally unacceptable in my opinion, for the US with UK support to unilaterally attack Iraq as it would be for Iraq to attack its neighbour. Therefore our message should clearly be, as is stated in point 4 of the letter, for the UK Government, with Isle of Man Government support, to go on applying pressure to the Bush administration to continue its multilateral approach, and that is precisely what the amendment to the resolution recommends and why the resolution as amended is worthy of our support.

The President: Hon. member for Ramsey, Mr Singer.

Mr Singer: Thank you, Mr President. The item put on the agenda by the hon. member for Michael does in fact refer to Iraq, and I think that if we are going to have a wider debate on all the countries which have not complied with the United Nations resolutions then that should be as a separate item. (**Mr Delaney:** Hear, hear.) We are discussing here Iraq, because the sanctions which are said to have been flouted have often been formulated by bias and political motivation and to US propaganda within the United Nations, so they are certainly not neutral resolutions. I do believe that we cannot isolate ourselves from what is going on in the world.

We are not party to all the confidential information accessed by the United Kingdom Government and therefore to a certain extent we have to trust the United Kingdom making decisions in relation to that information that they have received from their intelligence services.

Now, I understand the Bishop's concern about pre-emptive strikes and I am very concerned that innocent people would be killed, however careful and accurate the bombing is; unfortunately that is what happens – people are killed. But Saddam Hussein is the most horrific dictator, perhaps only surpassed by Adolf Hitler. He has no respect for life; he has no respect for the life of his own family – he killed his own family. He has killed and is killing a far greater number of his own people than would be killed by any

incursion into Iraq. He is getting rid of his own people by ethic cleansing and he has the weapons but he is using those weapons; they are not used to threaten people or other countries but he is actually using them, and that is certainly a difference. Can we sit back and endorse that continuing? We know there is so much poverty and there is so much sickness in Iraq. Saddam is spending the money that is being sent for medicines and food on his palaces and for military use.

Unfortunately members in the United Nations countries seem to have their own interests and act accordingly, and unfortunately in their own interests they are breaking the sanctions against Iraq. Our so-called allies, France and Germany, have recently been appearing at trade shows in Baghdad to push themselves to gain benefit, to portray themselves in the future that they were really friends of Iraq, to gain advantage when the crisis is over.

Let us deal with the present, not who supported who in the past; we hear so-and-so supported so-and-so and now they are reaping the rewards. Britain has been at war with most countries in the world over a period of time but you cannot revert back to that; you have got to look at the situation as it is at present. Most countries have fought other countries at a time but that does not mean that that stops you acting with those countries in the future and at present.

I think it is very fortunate, therefore, the way some of the United Nations countries work that in fact the Security Council has actually agreed a motion, and I think the Chief Minister's amendment supports that motion as the best way to find a unanimous way of action, and I would support the Chief Minister's amendment. What I think we also have to recognise in the real world is that if the inspectors are not successful and Saddam still has his weapons of destruction, then we should support action to be taken against him, endorsed by the United Nations, not only for the protection of his own people but for the people of other countries, and not to do that would make the United Nations impotent. Therefore, Mr President, with those words I am happy to support the amendment by the Chief Minister.

The President: Hon. member for Onchan, Mr Karran.

Mr Karran: Eaghtyrane, I have just got a couple of points. I will be happy when we see the same emphasis put on the likes of the poor people in Tibet and other places like that. I have to say that I have been quite impressed with some of the input into the debate today. I looked upon the original motion as just the usual flag-waving exercise that we have come to expect in this hon. Court. The original motion is nonsense, in my opinion; we do not know what the policy of the United Kingdom Government is and I am certainly not, as I have done in the past no matter how unpopular it is, not to just sit here and just go with the flow. There is no way I would vote for that because I do not know what the policy is, and I was not mandated to act like a nodding dog within this Court for these sorts of issues.

As far as I am concerned I have heard some interesting rewriting of history in this thing. I think Stalin was the biggest killer of all time –

Mrs Hannan: What about Pol Pot?

Mr Karran: As I say, Pol Pot was not as big as that (*Laughter and interjections*) but the point is that Stalin was more likely the biggest, and I just think that when we hear this sort of drip-feed stuff that we are getting given here, when we talk about human rights the people of the United States are wonderful people and I know some of them very well, but I cannot say the same about their government. Their records on human rights are appalling and I do not think that might is right, and I think that that is the bottom line on this whole affair. There is too much gimmickry.

I would have been happy to support the amendment because I do believe that the United Nations is the body that should be dealing with this; it should not be imperialism or used to try and flag up a dwindling economy in the United States to get people's eyes off the rabbit or the real issues that should be affecting them. But what does concern me is when I hear in this Court about these bogeymen and when we look at the way democratically elected governments have been overthrown, how they have propped up murderous evil régimes I do find that rather upsetting the way that some in this hon. Court try to just jump on this bandwagon.

I would have been a lot happier with the amendment. I could almost go with the amendment, but I just think the idea of the prevention of the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction from anywhere should be something that we should be working against (**Mrs Hannan:** Hear, hear.) not just one country or another country –

Mrs Hannan: America for a start.

Mr Karran: – everywhere as far as that is concerned, because it does get me rather upset in this Court when I hear this sort of stuff that is put out when the facts are simply not being put out, and I do not like the idea in this hon. Court when we debate issues from a viewpoint of ignorance, of not knowing the real issues and the real agendas behind these issues, and that is what concerns me. But I think at least there would be some modicum of sensible action as far as this Court is concerned to be associated with the United Nations. This idea of just blindly nodding through things is wrong, in my opinion, and I do not think it does this hon. Court much service by putting down motions like this that are spurious without the real knowledge behind them, even though some of the contributions within this hon. Court have been very good, I have to say, and were quite impressive, but some of the other ones, the way that they want to rewrite history, are appalling.

The President: Hon. member to reply.

Mr Cannan: Mr President, I am pleased that I put down this wide-open motion so that we had a small debate on foreign affairs because, as one of the hon. members said, we are not immune from the effects of what is happening in the outside world and they will affect us as much as anywhere else within the greater British Isles. But I put down the motion that we support the British Government because I do not know what their policies are, but they are doing them in our name just as much as they are doing it in the name of the people of Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Cornwall and wherever. The MPs for that area stood up in their parliaments and gave their views and conveyed them to the leaders of the government that are carrying out these actions, and that was the purpose of this motion – and I am not saying anything now that I have not said on the radio four weeks ago – to enable this Tynwald Court to express its views on actions that are and may be carried out in its name and, as I have said, just as the MP for a constituency can say to the prime minister what many people have said here, he gets the message and we should convey through the Chief Minister the message of this Tynwald Court.

So I have no regrets about putting down the motion whatsoever and, as the Chief Minister said, the Isle of Man is not immune from world events; he has produced an amendment that supports the United Nations and the way it is going and I support that too; I support that wholeheartedly. (**Mr Delaney:** Hear, hear.) The very last thing I want to see is a war. The Lord Bishop has seen actual wars; I have been in the theatre of two of his wars, in Malaya at the time that he was there and very, very close to action. It was happening in North Johor, 20 miles down the road from where I was when Indonesian paratroopers came in.

The last thing I want to see is war or young men, Manx, British, going to war – the very, very last thing I want to see, so I am supportive of the United Nations resolutions, I am supportive of a policy that preserves our freedom and our integrity. Now, we in the Isle of Man are not in the decision-making process, but there are people in that process and we hope that it is all done through the United Nations and our representative in the United Nations, is the British Ambassador. I am not flag-waving or saying everything the British do is right, but he is our representative at the Security Council, and that is why this motion is down, so at least we can say we sent a message. They might not take any notice of it, but at least we have aired our opinions and said what we feel ought to be said. Much of the United Nations letter, in particular paragraph 3, I wholeheartedly support.

I will not really go through each person's contributions. Mr Waft gave a wide-ranging review of the activities of the United Nations. Mr Rimington supported what I have just said – that we are giving a voice while others have given a voice in their own parliaments. Mrs Hannan gave a wide-ranging review of United States policy which we may or may not agree with. The member for Garff supported the United Nations. Mr Singer supported the United

Nations, and I am not sure who Mr Karran was supporting, but –

Mr Bell: The Council of Ministers. (*Laughter*)

Mr Delaney: You are living in hope, aren't you?

Mr Cannan: There are just two small points before I close and recommend that you vote for the amendment. One is I would like to comment on what Mr Delaney had to say. We are aware that Mr Delaney is a former regular soldier and a regular soldier would expect, when the chips are down, that he would have the support of the government and of the people from whence he came, and I hope we will do that. I hope we do not have to but, if it is necessary, we must do it.

Secondly, just a casual comment to the Chief Minister: what if the policy of the United Kingdom Government in the final analysis differs from the United Nations and they join the United States in unilateral action?

However, having said that and not wishing to prolong the debate, I am pleased that I had it to give members an opportunity to say what they had to say. I commend the amendment and hope that it will have unanimous support. Thank you, Mr President.

The President: Hon. members, the motion I put to you, therefore, is printed at 14 on your order paper, and to that you have the amendment circulated in the name of the Chief Minister. Hon. members, those in favour of the amendment please say aye; against, no.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

In the Keys –

For: Mr Anderson, Mr Cannan, Mr Quine, Mr Rodan, Mr Quayle, Mr Rimington, Mr Gill, Mrs Crowe, Mr Houghton, Mr Cretney, Mr Braidwood, Mrs Cannell, Mr Downie, Mr Shimmin, Mrs Hannan, Mr Bell, Mr Singer, Mr Karran, Mr Corkill, Mr Earnshaw, Capt. Douglas and the Speaker – 22

Against: None

The Speaker: Mr President, the amendment carries in the House of Keys with 22 votes for and no votes against.

In the Council –

For: The Lord Bishop, Mr Lowey, Mr Waft, Dr Mann, Mr Kniveton, Mrs Christian, Mr Delaney and Mr Gelling – 8

Against: None.

The President: Hon. members, with 8 votes for in the Council and none against, we have unanimity in the Court and the amendment carries.

I therefore put to you the motion as amended.
Those in favour, hon. members, please say aye;
against, no. The ayes have it.

A division was called for and voting resulted as follows:

In the Keys –

*For: Mr Anderson, Mr Cannan, Mr Quine, Mr Rodan,
Mr Quayle, Mr Rimington, Mr Gill, Mrs Crowe,
Mr Houghton, Mr Cretney, Mr Braidwood,
Mrs Cannell, Mr Downie, Mr Shimmin,
Mrs Hannan, Mr Bell, Mr Singer, Mr Corkill,
Mr Earnshaw, Capt. Douglas and the Speaker –
21*

Against: Mr Karran – 1

The Speaker: Mr President, the motion as amended carries in the House of Keys with 21 votes for and one vote against.

In the Council –

*For: The Lord Bishop, Mr Lowey, Mr Waft, Dr Mann,
Mr Kniveton, Mrs Christian, Mr Delaney and
Mr Gelling – 8*

Against: None.

The President: With 8 votes for in the Council, none against, hon. members, the motion therefore carries.

Now, hon. members, as I indicated yesterday, I think it is an appropriate time at which to adjourn. The Court will sit again at 10.30 in the morning and I hope that we can move quite speedily through the orders and the remaining motions which are on the order paper, hon. members.

The Court adjourned at 6.25 p.m.
